

## ZNA NSTV EN I SKUP »HRVATSKA – NOVA EUROPSKA DRŽAVA«

U Zagrebu i Čakovcu održan je od 22. do 25. rujna 1993. godine međunarodni geografski skup »Hrvatska – nova europska država«. Bio je to nastavak uspješne djelatnosti hrvatskih geografa u afirmaciji znanstvene istine o Hrvatskoj u svijetu. Glavni organizator skupa bio je Zavod za geografiju i prostorno uređenje PMF-a, a suorganizator Leksikografski zavod »Miroslav Krleža« iz Zagreba.

Postavljeni ciljevi simpozija gotovo su u cijelosti ostvareni, kako po broju sudionika i referata, tako osobito prema kvaliteti predočenih izlaganja. Glavni cilj skupa bila je razmjena stajališta europskih i hrvatskih geografa o gledanju na poziciju nove hrvatske države u okvirima novih državnih granica i krupnih promjena unutar bivšeg jugoslavenskog prostora i istočne Europe u cjelini. U cilju što kvalitetnijeg elaboriranja spomenute zadaće, referati su na simpoziju bili podijeljeni u pet logičnih cjelina, koje su se međusobno upotpunjavale: (1) Geopolitički položaj Hrvatske, (2) Demografski i drugi unutrašnji problemi nove hrvatske države, (3) Gospodarsko prestrukturiranje Hrvatske u novim uvjetima, (4) Hrvatska i odnosi sa susjedima i (5) Analogna pitanja – na primjerima europskih država.

Za simpozij je prijavljeno 25 a održan (ili poslan) 21 referat, uz slijedeću državnu strukturu: Engleska 1, Francuska 1, Njemačka 2, Austrija 1, Italija 1, Poljska 1, Češka 1, Slovačka 1, Mađarska 2, Slovenija 1 i Hrvatska 9 priloga. Simpozij je jednim dijelom održan u dvorani Leksikografskog zavoda u Zagrebu, a na otvorenju, uz prisustvo više od 50 sudionika, govorili su uvodno i dr. Žarko Domljan, dopredsjednik Sabora, akademik Dalibor Brozović, glavni direktor LZ, prof. dr. Zlatko Pepeonik, pročelnik Geografskog odjela i prof. dr. Dragutin Feletar, predsjednik organizacijskog odbora skupa. U Čakovcu je simpozij nastavljen u dvorani Međimurske trikotaže, gdje su skup pozdravili i mr. Davorin Radošević, dožupan međimurski i mr. Alojz Hudček, generalni direktor MTC-a. U Zagrebu su sudionici skupa posjetili industrijsku firmu »Badel 1862«, gdje se razgovaralo o tijeku pretvorbe i o problemima poslovanja, a u Čakovcu je takav vrlo polemičan razgovor nastavljen u MTC-u. Tijekom poslijepodneva organiziran je i vrlo instruktivan i koristan stručni izlet po Čakovcu i Gornjem Međimurju (Čakovec–Belica–Podturen–Štrigova–Željezna Gora–Vukanovec).

Skup je pratio primjeren tiskani materijal, te ovaj put izuzetno obilna medijska pozornost (osobito HTV, Vje-

snik, Varaždinske vijesti, Međimurje, Hrvatski radio Zagreb i drugi). Uz Ministarstvo znanosti i Zakladu Otvoreno društvo, ovaj put geografski simpozij je uvelike pomoglo i naše gospodarstvo i drugi sponzori (Badel 1862, MTČ, Županija međimur-

ska, Podravka i drugi). Očekuje se da će početkom 1994. iz tiska izaći i posebna knjiga, koja će sadržavati sve referate s ovoga uspjeloga skupa, a tiska se uglavnom na engleskom (i djelomično njemačkom) jeziku.

Dragutin FELETAR

### III. SVJETSKI KONGRES GEOMORFOLOGA

*Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, 23-28.VIII 1993.*

Tijekom 1983-1984. godine Britanska geomorfološka istraživalačka grupa (British Geomorphological Research Group - BGRG) inicirala je međunarodno povezivanje geomorfologa-znanstvenika. Pod vodstvom profesora Iana Douglasa organiziran je I svjetski geomorfološki kongres, i to u Manchesteru (V. Britanija) tijekom rujna 1985. godine. Velik interes pokazan na tom Kongresu (700 delegata iz 54 države s 713 referata u okviru 25 znanstvenih komisija) pokrenuo je i pitanje formalnog utemeljenja jedne međunarodne geomorfološke organizacije. Na II svjetskom kongresu održanom početkom rujna 1989. godine u Frankfurtu u Njemačkoj predstavnici nacionalnih delegacija donijeli su odluku (7.IX 1989.) o osnivanju *Međunarodnog udruženja geomorfologa* (International Association of Geomorphologists - IAG) koje bi postalo član Međunarodnog savjeta znanstvenih podružnica (International Council of Scientific Unions). Istodobno je prihvaćeno i uključivanje IAG-a u Međunarodnu geografsku uniju - I.G.U. Istaknuto je i veliko značenje u Manchesteru pokrenutog geomorfološkog informacijskog biltena »Newsletter«, pa je novom vodstvu IAG-a sugerirano da se nastavi

njegovo izdavanje. Donesena je osim toga odluka da se Kanadi povjeri organizacija III svjetskog kongresa, a Turskoj organizacija prve regionalne konferencije, posvećene problematici prirodnih nesreća (International Conference on Natural Disasters).

Rad IAG-a u narednih četiri godine (1989-1993) pokazao se je izuzetno uspješnim. Izdan je Zbornik radova tematske regionalne konferencije u Turskoj (Ankara, 6-10.V.1991), monografija »Razvoj geomorfologije« (urednika H. J. Walker-a) posvećena razvoju naše znanosti u pojedinim državama Svijeta, i to iz pera vodećih geomorfologa, Zbornik radova međunarodnog Simpozija posvećenog teoretskim pitanjima geomorfologije (»Geomorphology the Research Frontier and Beyond«) i Adresar, koji sadrži odgovarajuće podatke 5.494 geomorfologa u Svijetu. IAG-e je službeno primljen kao podružnica Međunarodne geografske unije (IGU) i Međunarodne unije geoloških znanosti (IUGS).

III svjetski kongres geomorfologa (Third International Geomorphology Conference, August 23-28.1993. Mc Master University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada) održan je u Kanadi od



23–28. kolovoza 1993. g. i to u organizaciji IAG-e i Mc Master Sveučilišta u Hamiltonu, Kanada. Na konferenciji je bilo prisutno cca 1000 učesnika iz 52 države sa svih naseljenih kontinenata. Održano je 776 referata i to u okviru 21 sekcije, 17 znanstvenih simpozija i 6 poster izlaganja. Autor ovoga prikaza, koji je predstavljao Republiku Hrvatsku, koja je po prvi puta participirala na jednom Svjetskom geomorfološkom kongresu sudjelovao je s dva referata, od kojih je jedan bio koautorski (s mr. Vilko Klein). Svi sažeci referata tiskani su u okviru prigodnog zbornika, koji je uz to sadržavao i detaljni program skupa. Hrvatska je uz to bila prisutna i na generalnoj skupštini »Međunarodnog udruženja geomorfologa – IAG«, gdje je njen predstavnik (prof. dr. Andrija Bognar) formalno pozvan da u domovini inicira osnivanje nacionalnog geomorfološkog društva. Na generalnoj skupštini izabrano je novo vodstvo za slijedeće četiri godine. Organizacija IV svjetskog kongresa povjerena je Italiji, i to Sveučilištu u Bologni. Skup će se, kako se predviđa održati od 28.VIII do 3.IX 1997. godine. Predviđeno je osim toga, što je generalna skupština i prihvatila, održavanje dviju regionalnih tematskih konferencija, i to u Singapuru (1995. g.) i Mađarskoj (1996. g.).

U okviru rada pojedinih sekcija i prigodnih simpozija velika pažnja poklonjena je temeljnim pitanjima geomorfologije, koja kao geoznanstvena disciplina ima specifični, kontakti položaj između geografije i geologije. U skladu s tim razvili su se i razvijaju

se specifični pristupi i metode, pa je i toj problematici posvećen posebni simpozij. Zapažen broj referata obrađivao je i problematiku tzv. tektonske ili strukturne geomorfologije. Može se reći da je ta do sada zanemarivana grana opće geomorfologije dobila adekvatni tretman u novijim geomorfološkim istraživanjima. Problematika egzogene geomorfologije tradicionalno i dalje ima vodeće mjesto u istraživanjima geomorfologa diljem svijeta. To se posebno odnosi na istraživanja iz sfere fluvijalne, periglacialne, glacialne, eolske i padinske geomorfologije. Dužna pažnja posvećena je i aplikativnoj geomorfologiji te ulozi geomorfologije u ekološkim istraživanjima. Pažnju su zaslužili i veoma zanimljivi referati, iz morfometrije i paleogeomorfologije. Dodati treba i sve veću specijalizaciju geomorfologa, što je i razumljivo obzirom na njen zaista revolucionarni razvoj u posljednjim desetljećima kao i na trend njenog sve većeg osamostaljivanja u odnosu na geografiju i geologiju.

Tijekom kongresa organiziran je čitav niz jednodnevnih ekskurzija u geomorfološko i kulturno-povijesno najatraktivnije dijelove Ontaria (Niagara falls, itd.), te gradske aglomeracije Toronta i Hamiltona. Bile su izvanredno posjećene i zaslužuju posebnu pohvalu učesnika Kongresa.

Da bi se dobio uvid u geomorfološku (prvenstveno glacialnu i periglacialnu), dijelom i kvartarogeološku problematiku i posjetili prirodno najatraktivniji dijelovi područja Kanade i USA, organizirano je 7 pred i post kongresnih znanstvenih ekskur-



zija. Prethodno ih je bilo predviđeno znatno veći broj, međutim, očito da je opća svjetska gospodarska recesija učinila svoje pa je većina njih, naročito u područje Kanadskog Arktika, otkazana.

Zaključili bi da je prisustvovanje tako važnom Skupu predstavnika geomorfologa iz čitavog svijeta bilo od izuzetnog značenja za dalje učvršćivanje kontakata i razmjenu iskustava, kao i upoznavanje s rezultatima najnovijih istraživanja.

Za očekivati je u budućnosti participaciju i mladih geomorfologa iz Hrvatske na sve brojnijim znanstvenim skupovima, što bi bilo od velike koristi za razvoj i afirmaciju naše geomorfologije na međunarodnom planu.

Andrija BOGNAR

## MEĐUNARODNI SKUP ZA KORELACIJU, KLASIFIKACIJU I ZAŠTITU TLA UGROŽENIM PERMAFROSTOM

*Alaska, USA, Yukon i Northwest Territories,  
Kanada, 18-30.VII. 1993. godine*

### I

## EKSPEDICIJA U DELTI MACKENZI-A, OBALAMA BEAUFORTOVOG MORA I SJEVERNOG YUKONA

*Yukon 31.VII. do 14.VIII. 1993.*

Na poziv Alaska/Yukon Society of Professional Soil Scientists USDA – Soil Conservation Service, Agriculture Canada – Centre for Land and Biological Resources Research i University of Alaska, Fairbanks kao predstavnik geomorfologa-geografa R Hrvatske prisustvovao sam Međunarodnom skupu posvećenom problematici korelacije, klasifikacije i zaštite tla ugroženog periglacialnim geomorfološkim procesima (kriofrakcija, krioturbacija, gelisoliflukcija itd.) specifičnim za područja Kanadskog Arktika i Alaske (USA) i razvojem stalno zamrznutog zemljišta (permafrost, tjäl, mjerzlota). Nakon završetka skupa kao član manje grupe znanstvenika učestvovao sam u pedološkim i geomorfološkim istraživanjima na području delte rijeke Mackenzi, obali Beaufortovog mora (dio Sjevernog ledenog oceana) i području sjevernog Yukona (Kanada).

Međunarodni skup održan je u periglacialnoj zoni krajnjeg sjeverozapadnog dijela Kanadskog Arktika i središnje te istočne Alaske (USA) i

to na trasi Inuvik (NW Territories)–Eagle Plains–Dawson City u Yukonu (Canada)–Tok (Alaska)–Fairbanks (Alaska)–Denali nacionalni park (s vrhom Mt Mc Kinley 6194 m)–Anchorage (Alaska). Uz referalni dio i poster izlaganja u Inuviku i Fairbanksu (održao referat »Traces of Pleistocene Periglacial Processes and their Recent Presence in Relief of the Croatia« – Inuvik 29.VII. 1993) radni dio Skupa obuhvatio je dvonedeljni terenski obilazak odgovarajućih pedoloških, kvartargeoloških i geomorfoloških profila na navedenoj trasi puta. Učesnici su bili upoznati s recentnim, ali i reliktnim periglacialnim krioprocesima, brojnim tipovima i vrstama tundri i šumskih tla (kriosola) u područjima kontinuiranog i diskontinuiranog rasprostranjenja stalno zamrznutog zemljišta, koji se oblikuju u uvjetima ekstremno hladne polarne klime (prosječna godišnja temperatura Inuvika –9,6°, Old Crow –10,0 °C, Tuktoyaktuk –10,7 °C, s ekstremima od –57 °C Inuvik, visoravan Yukon –63 °C, Tuktoyaktuk –50 °C itd.) i prevladavajućeg vege-



tacijskog pokrova, kao što je to tundra i borealna šuma crne i bijele jele (tajga). Na završnoj plenarnoj sjednici u Fairbanksu (Alaska, USA, 30.VII. 11993) formirana je Svjetska komisija za »klasifikaciju, korelaciju i zaštitu tla ugroženog permafrostom«, koje sam postao član. Uz sjajnu organizaciju Skupa, koja je uključivala prvorazredni smještaj, prehranu, prijevoz, opremu i odgovarajuće vodiče i uputstva, može se zaključiti da je i referalni i terenski dio (2.800 – 3.000 km) bio veoma uspješan i poučan. I na kraju treba reći da je na Skupu učestvovalo 40-ak predstavnika iz 8 država (USA, Kanade, Ruske federacije, Kine, Hrvatske, Mađarske, Finske i Njemačke) sa 17 referata i 18 poster izlaganja.

Nakon završetka znanstvenog skupa na poziv kanadske vladine institucije Agriculture Canada – Centre for Land and Biological Resources Research sudjelovao sam kao član istraživačke ekipe pedologa i geokriologa kao geomorfolog-geograf u ekspediciji na području delte rijeke Mackenzie, obali Sjevernog ledenog oceana (Beaufortovo more),

dijelu kanadskog štita (Northwestern Territories), dolinama rijeka Peel, Blackstone, Klondike i Yukon te visoravni Sjevernog Yukona (Yukon Territory). Istraživanja su se odnosila na skupljanje uzoraka tla, mjerenje termičkih osobina permafrosta i intenziteta djelovanja abrazije na obali Beaufortovog mora i periglacialnih geomorfoloških procesa kao što su kriofrakcija, krioturbacija i gelisoliflukcija te termokrških procesa u svezi oblikovanja talika i pinga. Kao vođa jedne grupe posebnu pažnju u istraživanju posvetio sam recentnom oblikovanju kriopedimentata u podnožju Richardson i Ogilvie Mountains-a (Yukon Territory) na granitnim i vapnenačkim stijenskim kompleksima. Istraživanja su provedena u zoni nizinske i gorske (Alpine) tundre i borealnih šuma. Uz upoznavanje s vrhunskom opremom koja se koristila prilikom istraživanja najnovijim metodama rada od posebne koristi su bila neposredna upoznavanja i praćenja periglacialnih geomorfoloških procesa, koji u našoj domovini u današnjim klimatskim prilikama nedostaju.

Andrija BOGNAR

PREDRAG SIMIĆ

»BÜRGERKRIEG IN JUGOSLAWIEN:  
VOM LOKALEN KONFLIKT ZUR EUROPÄISCHEN KRISE«

*Südosteuropa Mitteilungen 1993,  
Nr. 1-33. Jahrgang.*

The article is a German translation of an English text that was presented by Predrag Simić, director of the Institute for International Politics and Economics in Belgrade, at the »New Orientations for Foreign and Security Policies of Eastern and Southeastern Europe« international conference. The conference was organized by Südosteuropa Gesellschaft and the Woodrow Wilson Center (Washington) and held in the Celiendorf Hall in Potsdam on June 23-25, 1992.

In his article Simić explains that the Yugoslav crisis has two dimensions: internal-political and international, which in due time overlapped. As such, the article is broken down into three chapters: an introductory section, an internal-political description of the causes of the crisis, and the a section dealing with the internationalization of the crisis.

The author's opinion on the causes of the crisis in the former Yugoslavia is outlined in his introduction in an incomplete fashion and without any clarifications. It can be summed up in the following points:

1. Civil war in Yugoslavia is a result of a long-term crisis of Yugoslav

communism and concurrent political problems in the individual republics, which turned long-suppressed nationalisms and unsolved ethnic and border problems into the main instrument for political mobilization and legalization of increased republican authority.

2. Multi-party elections sharpened the crisis because the winners were parties that did not distinguish themselves by ideology but rather by levels of militant nationalism or totalitarian leanings.

3. International intervention had a detrimental effect because the opposing sides in the Yugoslav conflict used the international community's desire for peace for their own purposes. Rather than confining the conflicts, as expected, international intervention encouraged separatism among many ethnic groups.

It should be expected that Simić would explain his views, which describe heavy consequences, in the ensuing sections of his article. But in his section on the internal-political origins of the crisis he discusses the end of communism as well as the unsolved national question only briefly, without making the appropriate



connection to the problem mentioned in the title of his article. He is somewhat more focused when talking about civil war, but even here, when it comes to causes, he generally limits himself to Croatia. He neglected to present the global origins of the conflicts in the whole of Yugoslavia. The reader is given the impression that the author purposefully stresses only those events that lead to the conclusion that all of the nations, and of these mainly Croatia, are responsible for the crisis in the former Yugoslavia.

Simić states that the war in Croatia is a conflict between the Serbian population in Croatia that wanted to remain in Yugoslavia, and Croatian armed groups who tried to prevent the secession of parts of Croatia with predominantly Serb populations.

Moreover, according to Simić, the conflict in Croatia was spurred by the following reasons: fear on the part of the Serbs of once more becoming victims of genocide; that this fear was provoked by Croatian leaders who revived symbols from World War II, rehabilitated Ustashe (Croatian fascist) emigres and displayed a general intolerance towards the Serbian population; attempts by Croatian president Franjo Tuđman to diminish the number of victims in Ustashe-run concentration camps during World War II; Serbian fears of becoming a national minority in the new Croatian state as well as demands by Croatian institutions and busi-

nesses that Serb employees take loyalty oaths to the Croatian state.

Not once in the article (entitled »The Civil War in Yugoslavia«) does Simić detail any of the numerous events in Serbia which actually determined the political circumstances in Yugoslavia as a whole, and eventually led to war in Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina and the end of Yugoslavia as a state.

Among the most important events which go unmentioned: numerous mass and expressly militant meetings of Serbian nationalists with Greater Serbian demands and overtones; one-sided, arbitrary changes of the 1974 Yugoslav Constitution, most notably the annulment of autonomy for Vojvodina and Kosovo; a trade embargo on Slovenia; confiscation of numerous Croatian properties on Serbian territory; Serbia's raid on the Yugoslav monetary fund; Serbia and Montenegro's insistence on maintaining a unified communist party for all of Yugoslavia (organized according to their needs).

It is apparent that Simić neglected to mention some of the important causes of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia, but those that he does mention demand a broader commentary that will clarify their actual significance. The previously cited opinions of Simić on the causes of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia will be analyzed as points 1-5 in this review. I must stress that my commentaries are not criticisms of Simić but rather a presentation of

facts in a context in which his views can be more realistically accessed.

1. Even if Bosnia-Herzegovina, Slovenia and Croatia gained independence before the international conference held in Potsdam, Simić still speaks of Yugoslavia rather than the former Yugoslavia throughout his article.

The conflict on the territory of the former Yugoslavia cannot be called a civil war, as it is a war of Serbian aggression aimed at creating a Greater Serbia. The following facts support this view:

– The realization of a Greater Serbia is publicly discussed by leaders of Serbian political parties, including those in power.

– There is no war in Serbia (the 34.2% non-Serb population is not fighting against the Serbs, even if they have almost no national rights) nor in Montenegro (where there is a 38.2% non-Montenegrin population not at war against the Montenegrins). There is also no fighting in Macedonia (where there are not enough Serbs to lead a war against Macedonians and Macedonian Albanians) nor in Slovenia (where there are no Serbs). But there is a war in Croatia (where the 12.2% Serb population wants to secede with one fourth of the republic's territory) and in Bosnia-Herzegovina (where the 31.4% Serb population is demanding about 70% of the territory).

– Greater Serbian aggression has its ideological roots in the »Načertanije« (Outline) written in 1844,

and its modern inspiration in the »Memorandum« of the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences written in 1986.

– The continuity of the Greater Serbian idea is expressed in a large number of geographic maps showing the proposed spatial arrangement of expansion at the expense of neighboring countries.

2. The former communist party, with a Greater Serbian program (summed up in the slogan »All Serbs in one state«), won the elections in Serbia, while in Croatia and Slovenia newly-formed parties won. These parties promised voters freedom from the type of living conditions that had existed in Yugoslavia and were being offered by Serbia and Montenegro in a future Yugoslavia. Thus, parties with significantly varied ideologies, whose activities in a democratic multi-party atmosphere could not be curbed, came into power. The new parties in Croatia and Slovenia were not strictly opposed to Yugoslavia, but they were against the type of Yugoslavia that existed and the one being proposed by Serbia and Montenegro. Croatia and Slovenia proposed the formation of a federation of free states or some sort of confederation. Serbia and Montenegro rejected these proposals and proposed an even more centralized Yugoslavia.

3. The international community correctly assessed that the situation in Yugoslavia was not a case of the secession of certain republics but the break-up of Yugoslavia as a unitary



state. As a result, international intervention did not lead to the separatism of numerous ethnic groups but to the independence of historical nations. Croatia has a 1,000 year tradition of statehood with its territory, people and history. Slovenians and Croatians are not ethnic groups, they are historic nations.

4. The war in Croatia is not a conflict between the Serbian population and Croatian armed groups trying to prevent their secession in areas where they form a majority. This war is a result of Serbian aggression with the aim of creating a Greater Serbia. This is shown by the following:

– Serbs revolted not only against Croatian authority in those regions where they form a majority, but also in areas where they are an obvious minority (in 4 municipalities in Eastern Croatia where they are 22.5% of the local population, and in 5 municipalities in Western Slavonia where they are 28.8% of the local population), and they carried out their aggression in areas of Croatia (such as the Dubrovnik region) where there were almost no Serbs.

– Serbs revolted against Croatian authority in those regions of Croatia where there was a relatively larger percentage of Serbs (although not necessarily a majority) that were located in areas that they wanted to conquer. In other words, territory that fit into their publicly proclaimed program of conquest of Croatian lands east of the Virovitica–Karlovac–Karlobag line.

– They carried out »ethnic cleaning« of the non-Serb population in territories that they temporarily occupied. They enacted genocide over about 250,000 non-Serbs, aimed at creating a pure Serbian ethnic territory. In 1991, about 550,000 people lived in the occupied parts of Croatia, about half of whom were non-Serbs. Almost all of them were expelled or killed, and their homes, churches and cultural and educational institutions were looted and destroyed.

5. Attributing genocide solely to the Croats (a frequent characteristic of Serbian propaganda) is a historical injustice. Actual data on the victims of World War II in the former Yugoslavia show this.

In the course of World War II a civil war was being fought on the territory of the former Yugoslavia in which the Croats and Muslims (as Ustashe) carried out genocide against the Serbs, while the Serbs (as Chetniks) did the same to Croats and Muslims. At the same time Croats, Muslims and Serbs who were in communist Partisan units carried out genocide against all three peoples.

The exaggerated official total number of war victims for the former Yugoslavia, 1.7 million, was more correctly estimated at 1,014,000 by Bogoljub Kočović, a Serb, in 1988<sup>1</sup>, and at 1,027,000 by Vladimir Žerjavić, a Croat, in 1989.<sup>2</sup> Both used scientific demographic methods. Of these figures, Serbs accounted for between 487,000 and 530,000 persons, Croats between 207,000 and

192,000, Muslims between 86,000 and 103,000, Jews between 60,000 and 57,000 and Slovenes between 32,000 and 42,000 (the first number according to Kočović, the second according to Žerjavić). Serbian propaganda claims that between 500,000 and 750,000 people, mainly Serbs, were killed in the Croatian concentration camp Jasenovac alone. However, the above-cited demographic research showed that 216,000 persons were killed in all of the concentration camps throughout the former Yugoslavia. In Jasenovac and Stara Gradiška, the two principle camps on the territory of the Republic of Croatia, 92,000 people were killed.

As for implications that the new Croatian state is a revival of the Ustashe state, it must be said that the Croatian government did not revive symbols from the Croatian Ustashe state of World War II. In fact, most of the Croatian state symbols were in use long before World War II and also during the entire period after the war in »socialist« Yugoslavia. The only original symbol from the second World War, the letter »U« (standing for Ustashe) is not in official use.

Neither did the Croatian government make any sort of decree to rehabilitate former Ustashe emigres, as Simić seems to imply in his article. If by this he means the return of many Croatian emigrants, it

must be noted that these are primarily people who left after the World War II either for economic or political reasons. The majority of the Ustashe were killed immediately after the war, when they were handed over to the communist Partisans by the British government. At the time they were seeking refuge in Austria (Bleiburg). 60,000 Croats were then killed without a trial (most of them at Kočevski Rog in Slovenia), among them not only Ustashe but members of the regular Croatian army (national guard) and civilians. A significant number of Ustashe and national guard officers were tried and executed in Zagreb. If this number of 60,000 is added to the number of Croat victims of the war, the total number of Croats who died as a result of World War II is about 250,000. Taken as a percentage of the total number of Croats, this figure is relatively the same as the number of Serbs who were killed.

The Croatian government's stance that Serbs in Croatia are not a constituent people but rather a minority community was confirmed by the Peace Conference on the Former Yugoslavia. Every state seeks and expects the loyalty of its citizens.

It can be seen that the Croatian Serbs had no reason to fear persecution on the part of the Croats. This fear was artificially created by Ser-

1 Kočović, Bogoljub, »Žrtve drugog svetskog rata u Jugoslaviji, Biblioteka Naše Delo, London 1988.

2 Žerjavić, Vladimir, *Gubici stanovništva Jugoslavije u drugom svjetskom ratu*, Zagreb 1989.



bia to prepare the Serbian population in Croatia for their aggression aimed at creating a Greater Serbia. This conclusion is also confirmed by the fact that the Serbs revolted against Croatian authority (by setting up barricades on roads and railways, first around the city of Knin and then in other parts of Croatia) not only before any Serbs was even hurt or killed, but before any actual incidents occurred. That the nationalistic Croatian Serbs need no serious reason to put up barricades (around the Knin area) is shown by the fact that they did the same thing 100 ye-

ars ago (1893) during the ceremonies opening the Croatian Museum of Antiquities in Knin. Knin and the wider surrounding regions were the core of the medieval Croatian state, so that there are valuable cultural and spiritual artifacts from Croatia's past in that area. The Serbs only needed an innocuous cultural manifestation as an excuse to put up barricades and express their hatred of Croatia.

It is obvious that Dr. Simić gave his article a content which not only misinforms the reader but misleads in the style of Serbian propoganda.<sup>3</sup>

Ivan CRKVENČIĆ

<sup>3</sup> This is a translation of a review that was written in German and sent to the editors of *Südosteuropa Mitteilungen*, with the request that they publish it in their periodical.