

Topic / Tema broja:

**ENVIRONMENTAL HISTORIES OF SOUTHERN CENTRAL
EUROPE: STATE OF THE FIELD PERSPECTIVES
(HUNGARY, CROATIA AND SLOVENIA) / POVIJESTI
OKOLIŠA JUŽNOG DIJELA SREDNJE EUROPE: PREGLEDI
STANJA ISTRAŽIVANJA (MAĐARSKA, HRVATSKA I
SLOVENIJA)**

**BREAKING THE GREEN CAGE: ENVIRONMENTAL
HISTORY EVERYWHERE!**

RAZBIJANJE ZELENOG KAVEZA: POVIJEST OKOLIŠA POSVUDA!

Marco ARMIERO

University of Santiago de Compostela and
Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain
marco.armiero@usc.es

Received / Priljeno: 17. 11. 2022.

Accepted / Prihvaćeno: 21. 12. 2025.

Stručni rad / Professional paper

UDK / UDC: 502.12:316.334.5

502.2:930

Summary

This article reflects on the intellectual foundations and future directions of environmental history as a historical discipline. Armiero argues that although environmental history emerged with the promise of challenging anthropocentrism, it has often remained confined within a narrow thematic and disciplinary space. He critiques the dominant definition of environmental history as the study of human–nature relationships, suggesting that it fails to fully overcome the nature–society dichotomy. Instead, the article proposes a reconceptualization of environmental history as the historical analysis of socioecological formations, emphasizing the inseparability of social, political, cultural, and ecological processes. Armiero warns against the risk of transforming environmental history into a “green ghetto” or a marginal sidebar discipline within mainstream historiography. Through examples drawn from his own research on Italian mountains, fascism, and infrastructure, he demonstrates how environmental history can critically reshape central historical narratives. The article introduces the metaphor of the “tent” versus the “fortress” to describe alternative models for the institutionalization of environmental history. While acknowledging the need for disciplinary consolidation, Armiero advocates for an open, inclusive, and transdisciplinary approach. He concludes that environmental history can remain truly transformative only if it actively unsettles dominant historical frameworks rather than adapting to them.

Ključne riječi: povijest okoliša; socioekološke formacije; antropocentrizam; historiografija; interdisciplinarnost

Keywords: environmental history; socioecological formations; anthropocentrism; historiography; interdisciplinarity

Environmental history was born with the promise to shift the focus of history--the most anthropocentric of all disciplines--from humans to nature. It was indeed a revolution. Think, for instance, of the canonical iconographies of crucial historical facts or protagonists: Napoleon on his white horse,¹ George Washington crossing the Delaware,² or Columbus planting the Spanish flag on the Caribbean soil.³ What can we see through the environmental history lens that remains invisible to other historians? In unison, we will answer “nature,” of course, meaning Napoleon’s white horse, the river crossed by George Washington and the vegetation, or perhaps the ocean surrounding Columbus’ colonial gesture. Analyzing these images, we should focus less on the humans and more on the rest; our mission as environmental historians seems to be to recover that rest from the scraps of the past.

In reality, at least up to the post-humanistic turn in environmental humanities, environmental history kept the canon’s anthropocentric approach. The discipline is commonly conceptualized as the study of human-nature relationships throughout time. This definition speaks more of relationships than it does of a shift. Applying this definition to the images I have evoked above, an environmental history approach should not make the humans disappear; rather it should make visible the relationships linking them to the rest of nature. It is unquestionable that nature was – and still is – invisibilized in historical accounts: horses, rivers, the sea or the trees might be in the picture but they remain mute, without any story to tell. Noticing them is not a minor achievement, but I argue that the challenge for environmental historians is more ambitious than simply pointing towards the horse and its history. I would say that what is invisible is not just the horse – or the vegetation, the river etc. – but the intricate relationships linking humans to those fragments of nature. Our anti-anthropocentrism can lead us to see the horse, but it seems unable to recognize that the human on its back is also nature, in flesh, bones, ideas, and uniforms. Instead of either the horse or the general, we should be able to see a centaur, a blend of culture and nature, and analyze the processes governing that relationship.

For this reason, although I admire the simplicity of the most popular definition of environmental history – the study of the relationships between humans and nature -- I propose another definition that aims to overcome the dichotomy human-nature while retaining the focus on relationships. I claim that environmental history should have at its very core the analysis of socioecological formations through time.⁴ Speaking of socioecological formations might sound quite jargon-heavy but it does allow us to overcome the nature vs human dichotomy. In other words, it crystallizes that the challenge is to see the interwoven threads between them, and not just one of the two sides of the relationship. What we are invited to see are the multifold formations blending nature and society together -- because however simple or complex they might seem, they are precisely what our world is made of.

This definition also invites scholars from a diversity of fields to understand these socio ecological formations through time. The point is not whether one defines herself an environmental historian, but whether she is willing to see the socioecological formations embedded within history. One should not stop studying political history, gender, or cultural history to become an environmental historian. But one should see how much political history, gender and cultures are entrenched within socioecological formations.

If it is true – and I do believe it is – that environmental history was a revolutionary proposal for the field, it can be revolutionary only in as much as it unsettles mainstream history. Doing our “things,” researching what we are supposed to research without trespassing the borders we are assigned does not, in any way, challenge the mainstream organization of memory. When I was invited to teach one of the

¹ I am referring here to Jacques-Louis David’s portraits of Napoleon crossing the Alps on his white horse. See the image here https://it.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bonaparte_valica_il_Gran_San_Bernardo#/media/File:David_-_Napoleon_crossing_the_Alps_-_Malmaison2.jpg.

² Emanuel Leutze painting is available here [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Washington_Crossing_the_Delaware_\(1851_paintings\)#/media/File:Washington_Crossing_the_Delaware_by_Emanuel_Leutze,_MMA-NYC,_1851.jpg](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Washington_Crossing_the_Delaware_(1851_paintings)#/media/File:Washington_Crossing_the_Delaware_by_Emanuel_Leutze,_MMA-NYC,_1851.jpg)

³ Among the so many representations of Columbus’ arrival in the Americas, I have selected the one realized by John Vanderlyn (1775–1852) entitled the *Landing of Columbus*, available at <https://www.aoc.gov/explore-capitol-campus/art/landing-columbus>.

⁴ Marco Armiero, *Environmental History between Institutionalization and Revolution: A Short Commentary with Two Sites and One Experiment*. In *Environmental Humanities. Voices from the Anthropocene* (eds. Serenella Iovino and Serpil Opperman). Rowman & Littlefield International. 45-59



Fig. 1 At the European Society for Environmental History (ESEH) conference in Zagreb in 2017, Marco Armiero (in the photograph in the middle) was the chair of the programme committee, and this text was written at the time when he was serving as president of the ESEH.

first courses in environmental history in Italy, I remember the disappointment of most of my colleagues: “we thought you were an environmental historian”, they kept saying. The problem was that I decided to offer a course on imperialism and, apparently, this was not what they expected from an environmental historian, as if imperialism had nothing to do with nature. I was trespassing the borders of the disciplinary territory that was assigned to environmental history. According to that vision, environmental history was about separating the natural from the rest; while the approach I am proposing aims to focus on relations, on what I have called socioecological formations. As an intellectual project, my proposal implies that environmental history is not determined by a set of “green” themes, but rather by a broader set of questions that view nature and society as intertwined.

This approach challenges the temptation to build what I have called the green ghetto. With this expression, I indicate a vision of environmental history as a strong and close community, with very clear borders and strong belonging. The risk with this approach is to build a side bar discipline; a discipline that is recognized as such -- and I understand the importance of this -- one that is introverted, almost secluded within itself. Clear examples of this “side bar vocation” are the almost ‘fun fact’ boxes found in the corners of history textbooks. If they are lucky, students might find a box on potatoes, germs, or horses in the chapter on the discovery of the Americas – then, if the chapter will actually be dedicated to the conquest of the Americas rather than to its “discovery” those students are more than lucky. Or maybe in a chapter on the industrial revolution students will find a box on energy, pollution, or waste. What is wrong with this? Of course, nothing is wrong; I wish my university textbooks had included boxes like these. Nonetheless, I argue that a side bar discipline, an environmental history confined in a box on the side of the chapter, is not changing our way of understanding history; it does not change our reading of neither colonialism nor of the industrial revolution. It is only a small, confined box that students can easily skip reading. Even more radically, this side bar approach re-affirms the dichotomy between nature (confined in the box) and the rest (occupying the entire chapter).

In an essay published a few years ago, I argued that the alternative to a side bar approach might be a revolutionary approach, i.e. an environmental history that nurtures the ambition to challenge the

mainstream historical narratives, or at least, to have something to say about them.⁵ Let me use a few examples from my own work. In my research on the Italian mountains, I have looked at forests, goats, rivers, floods, and wolves; but I have also blended these subjects with studies on fascist rhetoric, hydro-power capitalism, and common property.⁶ In *A Rugged Nation* I argued that the Italian mountains have been shaped by words and bombs, by the narratives of modernization, and the tons of concrete which brought that modernization to life through dams, roads, and railways. Was that book an environmental history of Italian mountains or was it rather an environmental history of nation-state building through the lens of mountains? Can dams, fascism, capitalism, and wars be objects of environmental history without invisibilizing nature again, turning our attention to themes too familiar to historians? More recently, Roberta Biasillo, Wilko Graf von Hardenberg and I have written on the environmental history of the Italian fascist regime. In our book *Mussolini's Nature*⁷ we have explored the political ecologies of the regime, that is, the ways in which fascism created ecologies for its own interest. We wished to go beyond what we called the “green arithmetic” – a sort of evaluation of the environmentalist credentials of the regime. Faithful to an intellectual project that looks at socioecological formations rather than at the “environment”, we have studied the intertwining of fascism and nature in discourses, technologies, practices, politics, and bodies. Bears and coal, drought and dams are not odd themes to add to our knowledge of fascism but lenses through which one can rethink the history of the regime. Speaking of the political ecologies of fascism reminds us that nature is always political, but also, as David Harvey has taught us, that every political project is an ecological project, even without acknowledging it.

At the legendary concert in Central Park, at a certain point Simon and Garfunkel -- the famous US folk-singers -- recollect almost with nostalgia the times in which they were street musicians collecting money in the streets of London; and they close this short parenthesis in the concert commenting: “How nice poverty looks in retrospect”. They were so right and I do not want to fall in the same trap and romanticize the old time when we were “poor but happy”. I do not miss the times when environmental history was weak, struggling to survive among hostile colleagues. I know that in many countries the situation is still difficult with no academic positions, programs and journals in the field; I feel no fascination for frustration and precarity. Today, with several academic societies, at least two first-class scholarly journals, and courses offered in the most prestigious universities, environmental history has a stronger profile. As a former president of one of those societies, I am pleased to see this progress and I am committed to support the consolidation of our field where it is still struggling to emerge. But this can be done in different ways.

Briefly, I would argue that there are two models for the establishment of environmental history: the fortress and the tent. The fortress represents the option of a strong disciplinary identity; the fortification implies the need for a clear disciplinary perimeter, with gatekeepers selecting what can enter through the walls. The fortress can be mostly – although not only—defensive but it infers a warlike context, the idea of a permanent or at least possible siege. Having experienced the academic weakness of environmental history, I am not underestimating the power of the fortress. I wish I could have had some kind of protection in the most difficult moments of my career. But the truth is that no walls are high enough, and if they are, perhaps we have ended up in a prison. The alternative to the fortress is the tent. In many cultures, the tent is the symbol of a nomadic life, offering a sense of mobility and adaptability. In the academic desert, dominated by competition and individualism, a tent is a welcoming space for everyone. No disciplinary passport will be asked. One can be with us for a while or just for a short time. Someone might say that this is making us vulnerable, that a tent does not have foundation. I believe, instead, that a tent is everywhere, it is agile, it can camouflage in the enemy territory almost unnoticed, it is more sustainable than a massive fortress and adaptable to different contexts. But most of all, a tent produces friends and allies rather than frightened enemies.

⁵ Armiero, *Environmental History between Institutionalization and Revolution*.

⁶ Marco Armiero, *A Rugged Nation. Mountains and the Making of Modern Italy, 1860-2000* (Cambridge, UK: White Horse Press).

⁷ Cambridge: MIT, 2022.

* * *

Povijest okoliša nastala je s obećanjem da će pomaknuti fokus povijesti – najantropocentričnije od svih disciplina – s ljudi na prirodu. Doista, bila je to revolucija. Pomislimo, primjerice, na kanonske ikonografije ključnih povijesnih događaja ili protagonista: Napoleon na bijelom konju, George Washington kako prelazi Delaware ili Kolumbo koji zabija španjolsku zastavu u karipsko tlo. Što možemo vidjeti kroz leću okolišne povijesti, a što drugim povjesničarima ostaje nevidljivo? Uglas ćemo odgovoriti: »prirodu«, dakako – Napoleonova bijelog konja, rijeku koju prelazi George Washington te vegetaciju, ili možda ocean koji okružuje Kolumbovu kolonijalnu gestu. Analizirajući te slike, trebali bismo se manje usredotočiti na ljude, a više na ono ostalo; čini se da je naša misija kao okolišnih povjesničara izvući to »ostalo« iz krhotina prošlosti.

U stvarnosti, barem do posthumanističkog obrata u okolišnim humanističkim znanostima, povijest okoliša je zadržala kanonski antropocentrični pristup. Disciplina se najčešće definira kao proučavanje odnosa između ljudi i prirode kroz vrijeme. Ta definicija govori više o odnosima nego o stvarnom pomaku. Ako tu definiciju primijenimo na slike koje sam upravo prizvao, okolišnopovijesni pristup ne bi trebao učiniti da ljudi nestanu; naprotiv, trebao bi učiniti vidljivima odnose koji ih povezuju s ostatkom prirode. Neupitno je da je priroda bila – i još uvijek jest – nevidljiva u povijesnim prikazima: konji, rijeke, more ili drveće mogu biti prisutni na slici, ali ostaju nijemi, bez vlastite priče. Uočiti ih nije mali uspjeh, ali tvrdim da je izazov za okolišne povjesničare ambiciozniji od pukog pokazivanja na konja i njegovu povijest. Rekao bih da nije nevidljiv samo konj – ili vegetacija, rijeka itd. – nego složeni odnosi koji povezuju ljude s tim fragmentima prirode. Naš antiantropocentrizam može nas navesti da vidimo konja, ali čini se da ne uspijeva prepoznati da je i čovjek na njegovim leđima također priroda – od mesa, kostiju, ideja i uniformi. Umjesto da vidimo ili konja ili generala, trebali bismo moći vidjeti kentavra, spoj kulture i prirode, i analizirati procese koji upravljaju tim odnosom.

Zbog toga, iako se divim jednostavnosti najraširenije definicije okolišne povijesti – proučavanju odnosa između ljudi i prirode – predlažem drukčiju definiciju koja nastoji prevladati dihotomiju čovjek–priroda, a da pritom zadrži fokus na odnosima. Tvrdim da bi u samom središtu okolišne povijesti trebala stajati analiza socioekoloških formacija kroz vrijeme. Govoriti o socioekološkim formacijama može zvučati prilično žargonski, ali taj pojam omogućuje nam da nadiđemo suprotstavljanje prirode i čovjeka. Drugim riječima, on kristalizira spoznaju da je izazov u tome da vidimo isprepletene niti koje ih povezuju, a ne samo jednu stranu odnosa. Ono što nam se nudi jest promatranje višestrukih formacija koje stapaju prirodu i društvo – jer, koliko god jednostavne ili složene bile, upravo su one ono od čega je naš svijet sazdan.

Ova definicija također poziva znanstvenike iz različitih područja da proučavaju te socioekološke formacije kroz vrijeme. Pitanje nije definira li se netko kao okolišni povjesničar, nego je li spreman uočiti socioekološke formacije utkane u povijest. Ne treba prestati proučavati političku povijest, rod, ili kulturnu povijest kako bi se postalo okolišnim povjesničarom. No potrebno je vidjeti koliko su politička povijest, rod i kultura duboko ukorijenjeni u socioekološke formacije.

Ako je istina, a vjerujem da jest, da je povijest okoliša bila revolucionaran prijedlog za povijesnu znanost, ona može ostati revolucionarna samo ako uzdrma dominantnu historiografiju. Raditi »svoje stvari«, istraživati ono što se od nas očekuje bez prelaska dodijeljenih granica, ni na koji način ne dovodi u pitanje prevladavajuću organizaciju povijesnog pamćenja. Kada sam bio pozvan držati jedan od prvih kolegija iz povijesti okoliša u Italiji, sjećam se razočaranja većine kolega: »Mislili smo da si povjesničar okoliša«, neprestano su mi govorili. Problem je bio u tome što sam odlučio ponuditi kolegij o imperijalizmu, a to, očito, nije bilo ono što su očekivali od okolišnog povjesničara – kao da imperijalizam nema nikakve veze s prirodom. Prelazio sam granice disciplinarnog teritorija koji je bio dodijeljen povijesti okoliša. Prema toj viziji, povijest okoliša bavila se odvajanjem prirode od ostatka; dok pristup koji ja predlažem nastoji usredotočiti se na odnose, na ono što sam nazvao socioekološkim formacijama. Kao intelektualni projekt, moj prijedlog podrazumijeva da okolišna povijest nije određena skupom »zelenih« tema, nego širim skupom pitanja koja prirodu i društvo promatraju kao isprepletene.

Takav pristup dovodi u pitanje iskušenje izgradnje onoga što sam nazvao zelenim getom. Tim izrazom označavam shvaćanje okolišne povijesti kao snažne i zatvorene zajednice, s vrlo jasnim granicama i snažnim osjećajem pripadnosti. Rizik takvog pristupa jest stvaranje sporedne discipline; discipline koja je kao takva prepoznata – i razumijem važnost toga – ali koja je introvertirana, gotovo izolirana sama u sebi. Jasni primjeri te »sporedne« vokacije jesu gotovo »zanimljivosti« u okvirima povijesnih udžbenika. Ako imaju sreće, studenti će u poglavlju o otkriću Amerike pronaći okvir o krumpiru, klicama ili konjima – pod uvjetom da je poglavlje uopće posvećeno osvajanju Amerike, a ne njezinu »otkriću«. Ili će možda u poglavlju o industrijskoj revoluciji pronaći okvir o energiji, onečišćenju ili otpadu. Što je tu pogrešno? Naravno, ništa; volio bih da su moji sveučilišni udžbenici sadržavali takve okvire. Ipak, tvrdim da sporedna disciplina, povijest okoliša zatvorena u mali okvir sa strane poglavlja, ne mijenja naš način razumijevanja povijesti; ona ne mijenja naše čitanje ni kolonijalizma ni industrijske revolucije. To je samo mali, ograničeni okvir koji studenti lako mogu preskočiti. Štoviše, takav pristup ponovno potvrđuje dihotomiju između prirode (zatvorene u okvir) i ostatka (koji zauzima cijelo poglavlje).

U eseju objavljenom prije nekoliko godina tvrdio sam da bi alternativa tom sporednom pristupu mogao biti revolucionarni pristup, odnosno okolišna povijest koja njeguje ambiciju da izazove dominantne povijesne narative, ili barem da ima nešto reći o njima. Dopustite mi da navedem nekoliko primjera iz vlastitog rada. U svojim istraživanjima talijanskih planina bavio sam se šumama, kozama, rijekama, poplavama i vukovima; ali sam te teme povezo i s proučavanjem fašističke retorike, hidroenergetskog kapitalizma i zajedničkog vlasništva. U knjizi *A Rugged Nation* tvrdio sam da su talijanske planine oblikovane riječima i bombama, narativima modernizacije i tonama betona koje su tu modernizaciju materijalizirale kroz brane, ceste i željeznice. Je li ta knjiga bila okolišna povijest talijanskih planina ili prije okolišna povijest izgradnje nacije-države kroz prizmu planina? Mogu li brane, fašizam, kapitalizam i ratovi biti predmeti okolišne povijesti, a da se pritom priroda ponovno ne učini nevidljivom, skrećući našu pažnju na teme previše poznate povjesničarima?

U novije vrijeme Roberta Biasillo, Wilko Graf von Hardenberg i ja pisali smo o okolišnoj povijesti talijanskog fašističkog režima. U knjizi *Mussolini's Nature* istražili smo političke ekologije režima, odnosno načine na koje je fašizam stvarao ekologije u vlastitu korist. Željeli smo nadići ono što smo nazvali »zelenom aritmetikom« – svojevrsnim vrednovanjem okolišnih zasluga režima. Vjerni intelektualnom projektu koji se usredotočuje na socioekološke formacije, a ne na »okoliš«, proučavali smo isprepletanje fašizma i prirode u diskursima, tehnologijama, praksama, politici i tijelima. Medvjedi i ugljen, suša i brane nisu neobične teme koje se tek dodaju našem znanju o fašizmu, nego leće kroz koje se može iznova promisliti povijest režima. Govoreći o političkim ekologijama fašizma podsjećamo se da je priroda uvijek politička, ali i, kako nas je poučio David Harvey, da je svaki politički projekt ujedno i ekološki projekt, čak i kada to ne priznaje.

Na legendarnom koncertu u Central Parku, u jednom trenutku Simon i Garfunkel, poznati američki folk-pjevači, s nostalgijom se prisjećaju vremena kada su bili ulični glazbenici i skupljali novac na ulicama Londona; tu kratku digresiju zaključuju komentarom: »Kako siromaštvo lijepo izgleda u retrospektivi.« Bili su potpuno u pravu i ne želim upasti u istu zamku romantiziranja vremena kada smo bili »siromašni, ali sretni«. Ne nedostaju mi vremena kada je okolišna povijest bila slaba i borila se za opstanak među neprijateljski raspoloženim kolegama. Znam da je u mnogim zemljama situacija i dalje teška, bez akademskih pozicija, programa i časopisa u tom području; ne osjećam nikakvu privlačnost prema frustraciji i nesigurnosti. Danas, s nekoliko akademskih društava, barem dva vrhunska znanstvena časopisa i kolegijima na najprestižnijim sveučilištima, povijest okoliša ima snažniji profil. Kao bivši predsjednik jednog od tih društava, zadovoljan sam tim napretkom i predan sam podršci konsolidaciji našeg područja ondje gdje se ono još uvijek bori za priznanje. No to se može činiti na različite načine.

Ukratko, tvrdio bih da postoje dva modela uspostavljanja okolišne povijesti: utvrda i šator. Utvrda predstavlja opciju snažnog disciplinarnog identiteta; fortifikacija podrazumijeva potrebu za jasnim disciplinarnim perimetrom, s čuvarima na vratima koji odlučuju što smije ući unutar zidina. Utvrda može biti uglavnom, iako ne isključivo, obrambena, ali podrazumijeva ratni kontekst, ideju stalne ili

barem moguće opsade. Nakon što sam iskusio akademsku slabost povijesti okoliša, ne podcjenjujem snagu utvrde. Volio bih da sam u najtežim trenucima svoje karijere imao neku vrstu zaštite. No istina je da nijedni zidovi nisu dovoljno visoki, a ako jesu, možda smo završili u zatvoru. Alternativa utvrde jest šator. U mnogim kulturama šator je simbol nomadskog života, koji pruža osjećaj pokretljivosti i prilagodljivosti. U akademskoj pustinji, obilježenoj natjecanjem i individualizmom, šator je gostoljubiv prostor za sve. Nitko neće tražiti disciplinarnu putovnicu. Netko može biti s nama neko vrijeme ili samo nakratko. Netko bi mogao reći da nas to čini ranjivima, da šator nema temelje. Ja, naprotiv, vjerujem da je šator posvuda; on je agiln, može se gotovo neprimjetno stopiti s neprijateljskim teritorijem, održiviji je od masivne utvrde i prilagodljiv različitim kontekstima. Ali prije svega, šator stvara prijatelje i saveznike, a ne prestrašene neprijatelje.

SAŽETAK

U članku autor promišlja teorijske temelje i buduće smjerove razvoja povijesti okoliša. Armiero polazi od teze da je povijest okoliša nastala s ambicijom da razbije antropocentrizam povijesne znanosti, ali da je u praksi često ostala ograničena uskim tematskim i disciplinarnim okvirom. Kritizira prevladavajuću definiciju okolišne povijesti kao povijesti odnosa ljudi i prirode, jer ona ne uspijeva u potpunosti nadići dihotomiju društvo–priroda. Kao alternativu predlaže koncept socioekoloških formacija, kojim se naglašava nerazdvojenost društvenih, političkih i ekoloških procesa. Autor upozorava na opasnost pretvaranja povijesti okoliša u »zeleni geto«, odnosno u sporednu i izoliranu poddisciplinu. Na primjerima vlastitih istraživanja o talijanskim planinama, fašizmu i infrastrukturnim projektima pokazuje kako okolišna povijest može preispitati temeljne povijesne narative. Posebno ističe razliku između modela »utvrde« i »šatora« kao metafora za institucionalni razvoj discipline. Dok prepoznaje važnost institucionalne stabilnosti, Armiero se zalaže za otvoren, fleksibilan i interdisciplinarn pristup. Zaključno, tvrdi da okolišna povijest može zadržati svoj kritički potencijal samo ako aktivno intervenira u glavne tokove historiografije

Economic- and Ecohistory

Ekonomska i ekohistorija

Journal for Economic History and Environmental History

Časopis za gospodarsku povijest i povijest okoliša

Topic / Tema broja

Environmental Histories of Southern Central
Europe: State of the Field Perspectives
(Hungary, Croatia and Slovenia)

*Povijesti okoliša južnog dijela srednje Europe: Pregledi stanja
istraživanja (Mađarska, Hrvatska i Slovenija)*

Volume XXI / Number 21

Zagreb – Samobor 2025

ISSN 1845-5867

UDK 33 + 9 + 504.3

Publishers / Nakladnici:

Društvo za hrvatsku ekonomsku povijest i ekohistoriju
Society for Croatian Economic History and Environmental History
Ivana Lučića 3, HR – 10000 Zagreb
sites.google.com/site/ekoekohist/

Izdavačka kuća Meridijani
p.p. 132, 10430 Samobor
tel.: 01/33-62-367, faks: 01/33-60-321
e-mail: meridijani@meridijani.com
www.meridijani.com

Co-publisher / Sunakladnik: Ekohistorijski laboratorij Centra za inovativne studije Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu Ivana Lučića 3, 10000 Zagreb, Hrvatska www.ffzg.unizg.hr; <http://ckhis.ffzg.unizg.hr/>

Editor-in-chief / Glavni i odgovorni urednik:
Hrvoje Petrić

Guest Co-Editor / Gost su-urednik:
Žiga Zwitter

Editorial Staff / Uredništvo:

Željko Holjevac, Mira Kolar-Dimitrijević, Dubravka Mlinarić, Nenad Moačanin, Hrvoje Petrić, Drago Roksandić, Mirela Slukan Altić, Ivica Šute, Žiga Zwitter

International Editorial Board / Međunarodno uredničko vijeće:

Drago Roksandić – president/predsjednik (*Zagreb*), Daniel Barić (*Sorbonne-Paris, Francuska*), Marija Benić Penava (*Dubrovnik*), Slaven Bertoša (*Pula*), Zrinka Blažević (*Zagreb*), Tatjana Buklijaš (*Auckland, New Zealand*), Ljiljana Dobrovšak (*Zagreb*), Goran Đurđević, Josip Faričić (*Zadar*), Borna Fürst Bjeliš (*Zagreb*), Boris Golec (*Ljubljana, Slovenija*), Hrvoje Gračanin (*Zagreb*), Paul Hirt (*Tempe, SAD*), Andrej Hozjan (*Maribor, Slovenija*), Egidio Ivetić (*Padova, Italija*), Silvije Jerčinović (*Križevci*), Isao Koshimura (*Tokio, Japan*), Marino Manin (*Zagreb*), Christof Mauch (*München, Njemačka*), Kristina Milković (*Zagreb*), Ivan Mirnik (*Zagreb*), Mirjana Morosini Dominick (*Washington D.C., SAD*), Géza Pálffy (*Budimpešta, Mađarska*), Daniel Patafta (*Zagreb*), Hrvoje Petrić (*Zagreb*), Lajos Rácz (*Szeged, Mađarska*), Gordan Ravančić (*Zagreb*), Marko Šarić (*Zagreb*), Mladen Tomorad (*Zagreb*), Milan Vrbanus (*Slavonski Brod, Zagreb*), Frank Zelko (*Honolulu, SAD*), Žiga Zwitter (*Ljubljana, Slovenija*) Zlata Živaković Kerže (*Osijek*), Matija Zorn (*Ljubljana*), Ivana Žebec Šilj (*Zagreb*)

Article's UDC markups / UDK oznake članaka:
Ivica Zvonar

Layout / Prijelom:
Saša Bogadi

Journal directors / Za nakladnike:
Petra Somek, Hrvoje Petrić, Domagoj Tončinić

ISSN 1849-0190 (Online) ISSN 1845-5867 (Tisak)

Print by / Tisak:
Bogadigrafika, Koprivnica 2025.

Mailing addresses / Adresa uredništva:

Hrvoje Petrić (editor/urednik)
Odsjek za povijest, Filozofski fakultet
Ivana Lučića 3, HR-10000 Zagreb
e-mail: hrvoje.petric@ffzg.hr
ili Vinka Vošickog 5, HR-48000 Koprivnica

Cover / Na naslovnici:

Plan for reinforcing the banks of the Savinja in the district of Novo Celje, 1832.

Ekonomsku i ekohistoriju referiraju:

CAB Abstracts
HISTORICAL ABSTRACTS, ABC CLIO Library, Santa Barbara, California, USA
AMERICA: HISTORY AND LIFE, Washington, USA
JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC LITERATURE (JEL), Pittsburgh, USA
CENTRAL AND EASTERN ONLINE LIBRARY, Frankfurt am Main, Deutschland
ECONLIT – AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION, Nashville, USA