

REVIEWS

Anna Agafonova

Cherepovets State University

Senior Lecturer

a.b.agafonova@gmail.com

Review on the book: Lupanova E.M. *Istoriia zakreposhcheniia prirodnogo resursa. Lesnoe khoziaistvo v Rossii 1696–1802 gg.* [The History of ‘Enslavement’ of a Natural Resource. Forestry in Russia in 1696–1802]; Series: Territory of History. St Petersburg: EUSP Press in St. Petersburg, 2017. 352 p.

One of the topical issues of modern historiography in Environmental History is the history of forest management. Abroad, the history of forestry is a rather developed area of historical research: The Forest History Society has been operating in the USA since 1946; in the German cultural history, the forest has been positioned as one of the symbols of the spiritual unity of the nation, and at the contemporary stage, J. Radkau, H. Küster, etc., work in this direction. In addition, European and American researchers are working at questions of destruction of colonial forests, the impact of reducing the forest areas on the change of landscapes, climate, environmental management practices and so forth. In the domestic historical science, the history of forestry was covered during the Soviet period in the works of M.A. Tsvetkov, I.G. Beilin and S.V. Kirikov. In modern historiography, the interest in the history of forest management and forest conservation is reviving; however, works that cover the development of forestry in Russia are quite scarce and, as a rule, concern the history of the Soviet period. In this context, the monograph of Evgeniia Mikhailovna Lupanova, the senior researcher of the Department of the history of Kunstkamera and 18th century Russian science (M.V. Lomonosov museum), Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography (RAS), is very significant, as it touches upon a wide range of problems relating to political, ecological, technological, socio-economic and cultural history of the 18th century.

The author studies the process of establishment and evolvement of forestry as an important part of the modernization process of the 18th century. The work consists of five chapters that reveal the technological features of forest management (Chapter 1), the process of establishing a state monopoly on forests (Chapter 2), the creation of rights for private owners (Chapter 3), the changes in forestry in 1762–97 (Chapter 4), the specifics of forest management by the Admiralty Board (Chapter 5). E.M. Lupanova’s research is devoted to the study of the European part of Russia, since, as the author notes, there was practically no control over the forests in the Urals and Siberia during the covered period (pp. 62–63). The chronological framework of the research

covers the period when the forest management was primarily related to the jurisdiction of the Admiralty Board, and the government regarded forests as a resource for shipbuilding, considering its value to the state's economy (p. 61). E.M. Lupanova distinguishes four periods of forestry development within the designated chronological framework: the first period was associated with the introduction of the state monopoly on forests (1696–1726); the second – with the abolition of the said monopoly and its consequences (the period of palace coups); the third period was marked by the tendency to transfer the rights to own forest lands to private owners (in the reign of Catherine the Great); the fourth period was marked by the attempts to return to the previous monopolistic principles and the growth of state influence in the sphere of forest resources management (1798–1802) (p. 62).

The author adheres to the theory of ecological modernization, noting that the integration model of human-nature interaction, which suggests their harmonious coexistence with each other, was replaced by a transformation model in the studied period. The idea of a need for a transformative, orderly and rationalizing human activity was inherent for the above-mentioned transformation model (p. 13). In this regard, E.M. Lupanova interprets strengthening of control, introduction of monopolies and the process of general 'enslavement' as such transfer, as well as the desire to strengthen the traditional principles of autocracy (pp. 18–19). In her work, the researcher proceeds from the idea of 'total enslavement': the formation in the 18th century of the attitude to the forest as a property that could generate income and the preservation of which must have been taken care of (p. 31). The author's concept, based on the theory of ecological modernization and the idea of 'total enslavement', is implemented through a consistent analysis of the development of the legal background, law enforcement, operation and forest management practices at each of the four stages of forestry development.

The undeniable merit of the work is its extensive source base, which includes legislative acts, royal notes, bills, scientific and popular scientific works on forestry, pleas, petitions, complaints, court cases, documents of the Admiralty Board, documents relating to the work of the Senate and Legislative Commission, landowners' orders to the clerks of estates, instructions from the plant managers, documents from the chancellery of Admiral G.G. Kushelev, travel notes, diaries and letters.

The first chapter 'Forestry Technologies' introduces the reader to the causes and nature of the deficit of forest resources, with the specific nature of forestry supervision, and discloses the entire technological process of harvesting and primary processing of wood. In this chapter, the author reveals the prerequisites for 'enslaving' forest resources, referring to the analysis of the reasons that contributed to tightening control over forestry. In the first paragraph of this chapter, E.M. Lupanova notes that the problem of high-quality timber had sharply escalated at the time when the first Russian ships were built and remained as such for many decades (p. 65). In

this regard, the oak forests of the Volga region were recognized as the main strategic resource of the state, which constituted its main military potential in the first quarter of the 18th century (p. 66). The policy of Peter the Great with regards to the forest resources was aimed at achieving the practical goal of timber harvesting for shipbuilding, which resulted in toughening control over the use of wood for domestic purposes (p. 67). The second paragraph ‘Development of production and trade’ is devoted to the analysis of usage of forest resources in traditional industries: extraction of tar and salt production, which required the large expenditure for wood.

In the third paragraph, the author outlines the main characteristics of forest deficit. She notes that the problem with lack of forests in the 18th century was due to the lack of high-quality materials near the shipyards, enterprises or floatable rivers, which caused public concern about the exhaustibility of this resource. J. Radkau gives the same explanation of the concern for the depletion of forest resources in the States of Germany in the 19th century, which testifies to the similar perception of the problem related to the destruction of forests by European and Russian societies. In this context, E.M. Lupanova’s conclusion states that all four aspects of the forest deficit that are represented in modern foreign historiography were relevant for the 18th century-Russia. First, the deficit was felt by the population, especially in the North of the country; secondly, it was felt because of the ban on logging, which was part of the authoritarian policy of the state. Thirdly, the wood deficit was felt in the cities, which under the new conditions were forced to pay for it; fourthly, caring for the forest was a point of intersection between the interests of the state and the large expenditure of wood society, a means of management and a way to show concern for the country and its wealth (pp. 71–72).

The fourth paragraph tells about the people engaged in forestry: here the author gives a description of the formal duties of the officials engaged in supervision of forestry, timber stockpiling, scientific studies of forests, as well as of the actual situation regarding staffing of forest supervision. Moreover, E.M. Lupanova notes that the emergence of professional groups and persons responsible for the local forest health was one of the aspects of modernization. Characterizing the technological features of harvesting, processing and transportation of wood in the next four paragraphs, the author of the book concludes that in the 17th–18th centuries they did not change, the transition from cutting timber to sawing-up went very slowly, which required the government intervention (p. 111). In the long run, the development of technologies stimulated the volume growth in logging, which led to its deficit. In addition, Evgeniia Mikhailovna outlined the following adverse effects of logging upon the environment: clogging of small rivers and disappearance of fish in them, due to the molten alloy (p. 101); decay of harvested wood that was left outdoors, due to a shortage of sheds for storage (p. 103); inefficient use of timber and its loss in harvesting. Analyzing the consequences of technology transfer, in particular, borrowing the European

experience of cleaning of dead fallen wood, the author noted that they led to significant thinning of the forests, overall weakening and insecurity of trees standing apart from each other (p. 107). In general, in the first chapter, E.M. Lupanova explains the reasons why the forest gradually became a valuable resource under the control of the state through the study of uses and operational practices for the forest resources, the nature of their deficit and the problems of forestry supervision.

The second chapter of the monograph ‘The Formation of the State Monopoly on Forests’ reveals the essence of the process relating to the establishment of a special order of forest management, which was characterized by the state monopoly on forests and subordination of the procedures of using natural resources to the needs of the fleet and major state projects. Describing the French and the German experience of forest management, E.M. Lupanova concluded that in Russia, in the first quarter of the 18th century, both the administrative resource which the French forestry practices were based on and the scientific approach characteristic of the forestry in Germany were equally used for the preservation of forests (p. 127). The role of the administrative resource is disclosed by the author in two paragraphs on the legislation on forest management and the development of the forest management system. A study of law enforcement practice conducted by Evgeniia Mikhailovna showed that with the development of technology and the ‘enslavement’ of the natural resource, the forest lost its sacred significance, and the consumer sentiments and ideas of human conquest by nature came to the fore (p. 136). In addition, the legislation was declarative: the landlord forests were left without legal protection in the face of limited powers of the government to control the felling and the arbitrariness of the peasant communities (pp. 140–141). In addition to the legislative basis for dealing with the forest resources, another tool of total accounting and control, according to the author, was mapping and description of forests with their registration in cadastres (p. 147). Analyzing the consequences of the state’s policy on forests, E.M. Lupanova pointed out that there was a double monopoly in industry: a state monopoly on the forest and a monopoly on the production of salt, tar, resin, potash and so on (p. 147). Also, in this chapter, Evgeniia Mikhailovna essentially complements her conclusions from the first chapter on the awareness of the deficit of the forest resources by the population of the empire. She notes that the process of deforestation was most significant for peasants, who first witnessed changing landscapes and faced restrictions in the household consumption of wood (p. 148). Among the townspeople, the first deficit of the forest was felt by the Petersburgers, forced to buy wood for their own needs, as nearby forests were cut down during the construction of the city. In this chapter, the author turned to the development of social and scientific thought on the question of forest management in the Russian Empire, presenting the views of V.N. Tatishchev, F.S. Saltykov and I.T. Pososhkov on the rational use of forests. E.M. Lupanova, through the analysis of the legal system and law enforcement practices aimed at pro-

tecting the state forests from destruction, showed how positive it was for the state to put forestry under control. Restrictions on the use of forest resources imposed on citizens, state-owned factories and the legal insecurity of the landed forests lead the reader to a conclusion about the state's priority in the timber mining in the first quarter of the 18th century. At the same time, in the author's opinion, the tightening of control was accompanied by the modernization of the forestry in general: understanding of the value of the forest as a resource capable of yielding income and ensuring the strategic interests of the country had changed, the usage of forest resources had increased, the development of special legislation had begun, new technologies began to be introduced, and forestry was subjected to precise accounting and bureaucratization.

The third chapter 'The Formation of the Rights of Private Owners' tells about the contradictions of the state policy in the field of forest use. In this chapter, the author reveals the contradictions that the state encountered in the process of 'enslaving' the forest. The desire to put the forest resources under the tight control negatively affected the economic development of the state, which, in turn, led to the weakening of control and recognition of the rights of the citizens to acquire the 'forest wealth'. However, the relaxation of serfdom in the forest industries and attempts to grant the landlords with the right to own forests privately, according to E.M. Lupanova, did not solve the issue of who should have performed the paternalistic function – being responsible for the conditions of the forests and being interested in the rationalization of forestry (p. 219). In this chapter, the author appeals to the analysis of changes in the legislative base, noting that despite several decrees issued in 1726–27, 1736 and 1753, the right of the landowners to dispose of their forests as a matter of fact remained unchanged at the legislative level. At the same time, nevertheless, these decrees allowed the noblemen who owned the forests, to start working out their own measures to protect them (p. 217). Of special interest is the conclusion of E.M. Lupanova that the state, being the main consumer of forest resources, blamed their subjects of their devastation, prompting the latter to discuss the barbarous attitude to the nature on part of certain social or professional groups (pp. 191–192). Also, the author draws attention to the violations in the work of forest officials locally, calling these a more complex problem than the deficit of timber (p. 200). In the third chapter, Evgeniia Mikhailovna again turns to the problem of deficit of wood materials and fuel in the capitals and focused on the study of forests and experiments on forest management. In conclusion, the author summarizes that the abolition of the state monopoly and creation of the rights of private owners were delayed by the absolutist government, who were not ready to give up their supreme rights for the land, and the society where the notion of private ownership of the land had not been formed yet (p. 219). Consequently, the state monopoly on the forest formally abolished by Catherine the Great continued to exist in practice.

In the fourth chapter ‘Forestry in 1762–1797’, the author shows the development of the legislative base and the contradictions of law enforcement practices in the field of forest management and informs the reader of the coverage of the problems in forestry in printed publications. A distinctive feature of the period of 1762–97, according to E.M. Lupanova, was the increase in tendencies of private ownership for the forest with regular violation of private property rights and lack of effective ways to protect such rights. Evgeniia Mikhailovna underlines that the legislation in that period was developing in the direction of transferring responsibilities of forest supervision from the officials specializing in forest protection to other civil servants as well as toughening penalties for oversight of the state of forests. The observed increase in deforestation, according to the author, was associated with the development of trade and industry (pp. 235–236), as well as land-surveying and the division of property rights (p. 261). The latter was influenced by the increased profitability of shipbuilding using the state forests, as well as taxation of private individuals who sold timber (p. 223). In addition, the author again turned to the problem of the deficit of forest resources in St Petersburg, stressing the importance of this problem for the townspeople as consumers of the forest. The author drew attention to the growing public interest in the issue with the high prices of wood in the capital, presenting different points of view on this problem, as well as the governmental policy to solve the said problem. Forest mapping, as identified by E.M. Lupanova, seemed significant. The author noted that having understood the profitability and value of the forest, the state began to study it by sending special commissions to various provinces. At the same time, the data collected by these commissions was often seized by the government, and in the future, the access to this information was very limited. In the following decades, this desire of the authorities to monopolize the scientific knowledge of forests adversely affected the state of forestry in Russia.

Evgeniia Mikhailovna, agreeing with J. Radkau, notes that in its structure, the peasant economy could not lead to the ruin and destruction of forests, but, on the contrary, the peasants themselves were more interested in preserving these resources rather than anyone else (p. 265). Also, the researcher points out the emergence of ecological consciousness in the society by the end of the 18th century, which was orientated not only at solving the utilitarian problems but also meeting the aesthetic needs of the citizens (p. 270). The author reveals the last statement in the analysis of printed publications regarding the issues of forest management raised in these publications, as well as in the study of forestry in landlord estates. In this chapter, E.M. Lupanova shows that, despite the growing public interest in the problems of forestry development, who wished to be involved in regulating certain aspects of forest management, the state restricted access to the information revealing the condition of Russian forests.

The fifth chapter ‘Regulation of Forest Use by the Admiralty Department in 1798–1802’ covers the contradictions caused by the attempt to return the state monopoly to the forests during the process of creation of private ownership for the land. The author analyzes the development of legislation, which in those years was aimed at strengthening the prohibitive measures in the sphere of forest management, as well as law enforcement practices. In this chapter, E.M. Lupanova emphasizes that the return to prohibitive measures in the field of forest management that were taken under Peter the Great (strengthening of feudal orders in relation to the forests) could not have been made at the new stage of forestry modernization.

Thus, the book ‘The History of ‘Enslavement’ of a Natural Resource. Forestry in Russia in 1696–1802’ is the first modern complex study on the history of forest management during the period of foundation of the Russian Empire. The work makes a significant contribution to the Environment History in Russia, giving an idea not only about the specifics and the context of the development of forestry in the 18th century, but also helping specialists dealing with other epochs to understand the specifics of the state policy in the sphere of usage of forest resources. E.M. Lupanova’s study allows expanding the field of study relating to the history of legislation in forest protection, building intellectual ‘bridges’ to the history of the state and municipal government, to the history of social thought and so on. At the same time, it seems that the subject of further research may include issues insufficiently covered in this monograph, such as the environmental consequences and extent of deforestation in the 18th century, as well as practices of forest conservation and their effectiveness. The book will be useful for specialist historians, biologists, geographers, culture experts as well as non-specialist audiences.

For citation: Agafonova Anna Review on the book: Lupanova E.M. Istoriiia zakreposhcheniia prirodnogo resursa. Lesnoe khoziaistvo v Rossii 1696–1802 gg. [The History of ‘Enslavement’ of a Natural Resource. Forestry in Russia in 1696–1802]. *Historia provinciae – the journal of regional history*, 2018, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 101–107.