

War damage to the cultural heritage in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina presented by the Committee on Culture and Education

SECOND INFORMATION REPORT

Doc. 6869 revised

17 July 1993

Contents

A. **Declaration** on former Yugoslavia presented by the Chairman of the Committee, Mrs Leni Fischer 2

B. **Second information report** by Dr Colin Kaiser, consultant expert

I. Introduction 4

II. Types of information available 4

III. Continuing war destruction to the cultural heritage in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina 5

IV. Restoration work 16

V. Foreign initiatives 20

VI. General conclusions and recommendations 26

C. **Letter** from the Bosnia-Herzegovina authorities 29

D. **Action** by the Steiermärkisches Landesmuseum Joanneum in former Yugoslavia 1991-93, by Dr Diether Kramer 30

E. **Declaration** adopted at a Conference on the environmental effects of war, Zagreb 17 April 1993 32

A. DECLARATION ON FORMER YUGOSLAVIA presented by Mrs Leni Fischer and agreed by the Committee on Culture and Education

Oslo 9 June 1993

The situation is disastrous. It applies to Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia-Montenegro (and there especially to the Kosovo area).

Specific criticism can be directed against the involvement of Croatian elements in fighting around Mostar.

There is very little the Committee can do within its field of competence. But what little it can do, and however little effect it might have, the Committee should maintain *and continue to assert publicly* its concern for the human and cultural dimension of current hostilities.

This concern covers the culture in its widest sense: the heritage (which is a prime target), education, creative cultural activity, sport and the media. Recall the children who recently died on a football field in Sarajevo.

Why insist on the cultural dimension?

- to assert the right of peoples and individuals to their identity, dignity and quality of life
- to refuse to accept religious persecution in Europe
- to draw attention to the plight of children in the areas of hostility and look towards the future
- to reflect the fact that the heritage is a common concern
- to support those who are working on the spot in the cultural field
- to reinforce the shattered remnants of whatever administration survives
- to support those working inside and outside former Yugoslavia for the survival of the idea of a pluricultural society
- to help artists and research workers both inside and outside former Yugoslavia

Action should not simply wait on the conclusion of the war even if this action proves limited to expressions of concern and solidarity.

The Committee on Culture and Education proposes therefore the following:

(1) To release for public information as an Assembly document the second report by Dr Kaiser on war damage to the cultural heritage in Croatia and B-H.

(2) To reply to the invitation of the B-H authorities that efforts will continue to arrange for a fact-finding mission as soon as it is practicable and in concertation with IPU. Contacts will be pursued actively at both secretariat and also parliamentary levels with the UN and ECMM to this end (aiming now at the end of July)

(3) To ask the Sub-Committee on the Architectural and Artistic Heritage to hold a co-ordination meeting on international action for the cultural heritage of former Yugoslavia

on 28 June 1993, with a request to Dr Kaiser to prepare such a meeting with a further report on more recent developments.

(4) To pursue contacts in other fields (education, media, etc) with a view to a possible Assembly debate in the autumn.

B. SECOND INFORMATION REPORT on war damage to the cultural heritage in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina by Dr Colin Kaiser, consultant expert

I. INTRODUCTION

1. At the request of the Sub-Committee on the Architectural and Artistic Heritage of the Parliamentary Assembly, the work begun in November-December 1992 was continued.

2. The first report (Doc. 6756) was widely distributed throughout Europe, and some copies were sent to the United States. There was some press echo (for example in Europe & Liberté, Muséarts, Al Awaz, Radio-France International, Radio-Fréquence Pluriel in Paris and the information bulletin of the World Monuments Fund). The report was also made available for the CDCC Cultural Heritage Committee meeting on 1 March 1993. The photographs taken by Mr. Hatterer were used for an exhibition on "War damage in the regions of Dubrovnik and Mostar" in the Council of Europe building February-March 1993; they were used by the press and were also exhibited in London under the auspices of Bosnia-Herzegovina Heritage Rescue UK.

3. The work for this second report was begun at the end of March 1992 and was carried out mainly in Paris. It was supplemented by a brief visit to Dubrovnik at the invitation of the International Pen Club and the ARCH Foundation (21-23 April 1993), which permitted updating of information of the situation there and a meeting with architects and art historians from Mostar.

4. The purpose of this report is to update information on the war destruction to the cultural heritage in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina and to identify initiatives on behalf of that heritage, especially outside the countries of the war zone.

II. TYPES OF INFORMATION AVAILABLE

5. The report is largely dependent on sources of information coming from the war zones, and there has been virtually no possibility of verifying them. This also signifies dependency on the heritage administrations in Croatia, which are overworked and confronted by other priorities. Of the three institutes in Bosnia (Sarajevo, Mostar and Banja Luka), contact is only possible from Paris with Mostar, and even then only through intermediaries by fax and not direct telephone.

6. A circular letter was sent to all the Croatian Institutes for the Protection of Monuments and other heritage (April). This was followed up in Dubrovnik in meetings between the consultant expert and Dr Meder, the Director of the Institute national institute in Zagreb, Mr Domijan, Director of the Zadar Institute, and Dr Fiskovic and Mr Letunic, directors of the two Dubrovnik institutes. Discussions took place in May in Strasbourg with Mr Domljan and Mr Škrabalo, members of the Croatian Special Guest delegation to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. However, at the date of writing, no information was forthcoming from the Croatian institutes (with the exception of a report made available on 1 March on the occasion of the CDCC Cultural Heritage Committee and a report from the institute at Sibenik).

7. Contact has also been made with the Bosnian representative in Paris, Mr. Bekto, in order to have official information from the Bosnian Government, and with the Soros Foundation (Open Society Fund) in Zagreb and Sarajevo (which seem to have somewhat better communication capacity than the government). Dr. Marian Wenzel, Secretary-General of Bosnia-Herzegovina Heritage Rescue UK, provided most of the information on Bosnia.

8. Another source of information has been press dispatches, in the first place those from the Western press agencies, and secondly those of the Foreign Press Bureau in Zagreb, a Croatian agency. These are to be used with great caution (even foreign dispatches resort frequently to HINA, the official Croatian press agency), and their utility in identifying damaged heritage is very low. At best they provide a framework for the identification of threatened areas.

III. CONTINUING WAR DESTRUCTION TO THE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN CROATIA AND BOSNIA-HEREZEGOVINA

Croatia

The Unknown War

9. At the end of January 1993 the Croatian army attempted to re-establish a corridor for land communication from Velebit with northern Dalmatia. After this attack the front zone along the southern rim of the Krajina became a very active war zone. It has been largely ignored by the Western media. However, the foreign press dispatches received daily from the end of March until the beginning of May, confirmed by international agency dispatches and journalists, reveal a considerable amount of bombardment and counter-bombardment around Gospi_ and especially along a zone of some 60 kilometres from Zadar to Sibenik.

10. Most of this activity is restricted to front zones, and affects dozens of villages, but both Zadar and Sibenik themselves have been bombarded with heavy calibre artillery (Zadar is 15 kilometres from the front).

11. Needless to say, it is very difficult for local cultural authorities to know anything about the present condition of the villages in the area, and no information has been communicated to us on the condition of Zadar by the local institutes for the protection of monuments, though it is functioning and has excellent fax connections.

The February Report of the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of the Ministry of Culture and Education of Croatia.

12. The brief updated report of the Institute for Protection of Cultural Monuments of the Ministry of Culture and Education of Croatia shows a total of 801 damaged individual monuments (the surveys of April and June 1992 included 583 and 683 respectively). Their typology is indicated in Table 1:

Palaces and mansions: 249

Fortresses: 16 (down from 37 in April)

Churches: 468

Monasteries: 42

Public sculpture: 11

Tombs and cemeteries: 11

Commercial buildings: 4

Total: 801

13. 63.7% of the monuments hit were religious monuments. The text of the report notes that 73 of these monuments were destroyed and 167 heavily damaged, representing 47% of this kind of damaged heritage - much higher than the percentage of 30% indicated in the June 1992 report.

14. The February report notes 350 damaged historic sites, adding a new category of complexes of historic buildings. Table 2 presents the different types of heritage:

Memorial sites: 1

Historic cities: 48

Historic villages: 274

Historic building complexes: 17

Archaeological sites: 10

Total: 350

15. The vast increase is in the village categories (187 noted in April 1992), due in part to the addition of the villages from the commune of Dubrovnik. Of the villages fully 268 are unlisted heritage.

16. The February report also adds evaluations of degree of damage for individual monuments corresponding to the six-level damage evaluation used in Croatia. However,

this categorisation seems approximate, because many buildings have not yet been surveyed according to the methodology prescribed - this was the case in the Commune and the Old Town of Dubrovnik. Table 3 shows this damage evaluation in simplified form:

1-3 (minor damage to surface,
non-support and support structures): 406

4-5 (heavy damage to support structure,
partially collapsed building): 107

6 (wholly collapsed building): 94

no information: 194

Total: 801

17. It is something of a relief that over 50% of these major individual buildings (including monastic ensembles) show only light damage, and it can be hoped that this percentage will rise when more information is available. Yet, without leaning towards either a pessimistic or an optimistic conclusion, it should be stressed that these results are highly provisional, because the methodology has not been applied in many places.

18. However, these results are somewhat confusing. Scrutiny of earlier reports of the Institute for Protection of Cultural Monuments brought to light that the religious heritage was rather less damaged than other types of listed monuments; the new figures imply that the contrary is the case. Table 3 shows that 201 buildings are in the highest damage categories (4-6), but the report notes that 240 religious monuments are either destroyed or heavily damaged. One may ask how this is arithmetically possible, and to what damage categories must the numerous other heavily damaged buildings (summer palaces, town houses, etc.) be assigned.

19. The report of the Institute shows a similar six-part breakdown for historic sites, but the categorisation is more impressionistic ("place destroyed", "place burnt down", "place partly destroyed", "place damaged", "minor damage on historic entities", "minor structural damage on historic entities", "no information available"). The first two categories account for 83 places (23.7%), the second two for 237 (67.7%), the third pair for 15 (4%) and the "no information" for 15 (4%). The utility of this breakdown is in showing that when there is damage to a historic town or village it is likely to be considerable.

20. The report updates damage to museums and galleries (42), stressing that the fate of collections in the occupied areas (15) is still unknown. It notes that 9 archive buildings and depots have been damaged and 209 libraries, stressing the total loss of the libraries of Vinkovci, the Franciscan monastery of Hrvatski Cunti_ and the Inter-University Centre of Dubrovnik.

21. It goes without saying that this information remains incomplete, since access to the Krajina and Slavonia is not permitted to the Croatian cultural authorities.

War Damage to Sibenik and Skradin

22. The Institute for the Protection of Historic Monuments, in a brief report (4 May 1993), notes that in 1993 Sibenik has been shelled in March (2, 10, 12, 19, 22, 23, 24) and April (14, 15, 19, 23). There have been relatively few impacts in the old town itself (6). Listed heritage that has been hit in the old and new towns are the Church of St. Laurence (light damage to building structure) and three buildings of the Hospital (serious damage to building structure). Eight "apartment houses" of heritage value have also been hit (three destroyed, three with serious damage and two with light damage to building structure).

23. A variety of artillery calibres seems to have been used, and according to the map submitted by the Institute most of the city east and south of the old town has been hit by Orkan missiles (which contain cluster bombs, thus explaining the large surface area touched). These do little damage to buildings; they are above all an anti-personnel weapon of considerable psychological impact.

24. In Skradin the Institute also notes serious damage to the building structure of the listed Church of St. Spiridon and the parsonage, and lesser damage to the Church of St. Mary, also listed heritage.

The Commune of Dubrovnik

25. There is continuous random artillery fire from Serbian positions north of the Trebisnjica River in southern Bosnia-Herzegovina on the commune of Dubrovnik, notably in Konavle to the east. However, according to the members of the Dubrovnik institutes there seems to have been little damage.

26. On 23 March 12 to 16 130 mm shells were fired on the city district of Lapad and the adjoining port zones without damaging heritage buildings (the consultant expert did not visit these zones).

Psychological Reactions on the Part of the Inhabitants of the Commune of Dubrovnik and other problems having a impact on the Cultural Heritage

27. During the brief stay in Dubrovnik, a number of reactions were indicated by local architects. Some inhabitants - especially elderly people - are very passive about questions of repairs, even minor repairs, which means that in some cases unnecessary deterioration has set in. In many cases the inhabitants - even though the funds are not yet forthcoming - are determined to build new houses on their property and leave the ruins standing in the perspective of rebuilding the old houses in the indefinite future.

Some inhabitants think also that it is best never to repair the ruins, but leave them standing as a kind of memorial. In other words it seems that there is a sort of collective depression on the part of the people, one of whose characteristics is an attachment to the signs of their suffering.

28. Another problem that is arising is that some local engineers are recommending the implementation of strict seismic norms (concrete reinforcement) in the case of rebuilding, which will completely alter the traditional buildings. There are also cases of their hastily recommending that buildings be pulled down.

29. The priest's house in _ilipi, a lesser stone building but nevertheless part of the historic centre, has been pulled down on the initiative of the priest. This information could not however be verified.

For restoration initiatives in the Dubrovnik area see below

Bosnia-Herzegovina

The War Continues

30. The war has in no way abated over the past few months, and reached new intensity notably in the eastern parts of the country (_erska, Konjevi_-Polje, Srbenica, Goradze, Zepa, Gradaca_), in combats opposing Serbian and Bosnian troops, and in fighting in central Bosnia between the HVO and Bosnian troops. Alongside bombardments of towns there are bombardments of villages, as Serbian and to a lesser extent HVO units carry out operations designed to evict rural populations. The Croatian press agencies also accuse Bosnian units of these practices in the Konjic region.

31. Accordingly the dearth of information to which attention was called in the preceding report (Doc 6756) is still a critical problem. Inaccurate information is being presented abroad (for example, the description of damage to Mostar contained in a petition signed by hundreds of US academics and printed in the New York Times on 31 March 1993), which risks being turned against defenders of the cultural heritage when the inaccuracy or exaggeration of this information is known.

Lists of the Damaged Cultural Heritage and the Situation in Sarajevo

32. Bosnia Herzegovina Heritage Rescue UK has forwarded information received from Sarajevo via Zagreb. Its quality is variable, but it is still useful.

33. List of the Riyasat of the Islamic Community of Bosnia Herzegovina. The Riyasat is the supreme body of the Islamic community in the country, and it has produced several lists of damaged religious properties (12 September, 10 November 1992, 4 February 1993). These contain 613 properties throughout Bosnia-Herzegovina (the credible list prepared by Bosnia-Herzegovina Heritage Rescue used in the previous report (Doc 6756) was more limited geographically). Unfortunately, the credibility of the Riyasat lists (apart from Sarajevo and towns in the Drina valley, see below) is in doubt, if the number of errors and exaggerations contained in the entries on Mostar is taken as an

example. For this reason they are not reproduced here. Yet they are of importance as a kind of check-list for further inquiry in the field: the problem may lie more in exaggeration of the degree of damage rather than in the buildings' having been damaged.

34. List of the Catholic Archbishopric of Bosnia. The Archbishopric has provided a list of damaged and occupied church property in Sarajevo and attached areas (29 instances of damage or occupation) and the decanates of Bugogno (11), Travnik (3), Dervent (15), Usors (8), Brčan (8), Dobor (16), Sama_ (7), Zepa_ (3), and Sutjes (3). The information is often very detailed as to damage and type of artillery used, and the archbishopric admits clearly when it does not have information. Only the information relating to Sarajevo is presented below.

35. Letter from Orthodox Church authorities. This letter, dated 29 March 1993 and signed by A Pocu, describes damage to Orthodox heritage in Sarajevo. It will be considered below.

War Destruction in Sarajevo

36. Despite the reservations that may be expressed about some of the sources of information, it is possible to give an updated, if incomplete, list of damage to the heritage of all the communities in central Sarajevo. Damage claimed to the numerous mosques in the new districts and the suburbs is not included. An asterisk (*) indicates supplementary information of importance concerning Ottoman monuments mentioned in the December report (Doc 6756). Two asterisks (**) are new entries.

37. Ottoman and Islamic Heritage

Virtually all sources note only major structures, and there is no information on the traditional residential architecture that has survived urban redevelopment in the centre of Sarajevo.

* The Bey's Mosque (Gazi Husreva-Begova dzamija), built in 1530, the largest Moslem sanctuary in Europe outside of Turkey: heavily damaged on dome and minaret. The tombs of Gazi Husreva Bey and Murat Bey have been seriously damaged by impacts.

* Mosque of the Sultan (Careva Džamija), built in 1565, had been restored, heavily damaged. The monuments in the cemetery were seriously damaged by shelling.

* The nearby Gazi-Husrev Bey library, founded in 1537 and containing an extremely rich collection of 4,500 manuscripts, was damaged, and one reliable eye-witness report maintains that both were burned.

* Ali Pasha Mosque (Ali-pasina dzamija), built in 1560, incurred heavy damage, especially to the dome.

Bascarisija Mosque (Džamija Havadze Duraka), built in 1550, hit by numerous projectiles.

* Koranic School (Kursumlija medresa), built in 1537, suffered numerous hits, and was partly burned.

* Cekrcina Mosque (Cekrcina dzamija) (1526), seriously damaged along with surrounding houses.

Ferhat Bey Mosque (Ferhat-begova dzamija) (1561), seriously damaged.

Tabacki Mesjid (Hadzi Osmanov mesdzid) (1591), burned out.

Cobanija Mosque (Cobanija dzamija) (1562), damaged.

Dzanica Mosque (Dzamija Dzindo-zade) (17th century), damaged by many projectiles.

Hadzi Ibrahim Mosque (Dzamija Dajanli Hadzi Ibrahima na Gorici) (17th century), seriously damaged.

Gazgani Hadzi Ali Mesjid (Mesdzid Gazgani Hadzi Alije na Sirokaci) (1561), seriously damaged.

Magribija Mosque (Dzamija Sejha Magribije) (15th Century), mosque and minaret in state of ruin (bombardments of May 1992).

** Hadzi Mehmed Mesjid (Ivlakovli Haezi Mehmedov mesdzid) (1528-1540), very heavily damaged (bombardment of 12 June 1992).

** Sinanova Mosque (Ijdidzik Dinanova dzamija na Sirokaci) (1562), extremely heavily damaged by rocket attack of 19-20 May 1992.

Sarac Ali Mosque (Sarac Alijina dzamija na Vrbanjusi) (1892-93) was seriously damaged.

Seik Faruh Mosque (Sejh Feruhova dzamija) (1541) was heavily damaged.

Hadzi Ihnan-age Topalovica Mosque (Dzamija Hadzi Ihnan-age Topalovica) (1525), very heavily damaged.

Sinan Hatun Mosque (Dzamija Sinan Vojvode Hatun na Vratnik-Mejdanu) (1552), damaged periodically by projectiles.

The new mosque of Kobiloj Glavi was totally destroyed by tank guns and heavy artillery, and has been confirmed by an eye-witness.

* The covered market (Brusa Bezistan), built in 1551, according to an eye-witness interviewed was damaged, but not entirely destroyed.

* The Institute for Oriental Studies. If the information contained in the special report of the Office for Information of the Government of Bosnia-Herzegovina (2 June 1992) is correct, the destruction of the collection of the institute may well be *the most serious single cultural loss of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina*. The manuscript collection

contained 5,263 Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian manuscripts (encyclopedias, works of history, geography, politics, theology, Islamic philosophy and Sufi works, works in natural sciences and mathematics, law, dictionaries, collections of poetry by Bosnian and Ottoman poets) from the 11th to the beginning of the 20th Century. The Archives contained 7,000 documents (16th-19th century) comprising the sultans' orders (ferman) and edicts (berat), the charts (bujuruldy) of the governors, court and land certificates, accounts and financial reports. In addition there were 60 series of Bosnian and Herzegovinian judges' (kadi) and judges' assistants' (naib) reports. The archives of the Vilajet contained 200,000 different documents and certificates of land ownership for the entire territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina (second half of the 19th century). It may be hoped that some of the manuscripts and sultans' documents (which were works of art in their own right) exist elsewhere as copies or in photo or microfilm reproductions; some of the administrative archives may have been copied and deposited in Istanbul, but the local archives, of critical importance for local social, economic and institutional history of the region, are probably a total loss. It should also be mentioned that the Institute also contained many photo-copies and microfilms of material from other archives, as well as a specialised library of 10,000 volumes.

38. Heritage from the Austro-Hungarian period

As in Mostar the Austro-Hungarian Empire sought to establish a new identity in Sarajevo in the last quarter of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. From this period there are a number of large buildings (administrative, museums, hotels), some of them in the "Moorish" style, that have been given special attention by the artillery of the Serbian militias since April 1992. The fin de siècle was also characterised by a great deal of construction by the Catholic Church, but these buildings seem to have suffered less.

Cathedral (1889): damage to roof, facades, and stained glass windows; most recent damage from a tank gun (15 February 1993)

St. Cyril and Metoda Church (1896): direct hits on dome and wall in March 1993; windows broken; church closed

Archbishop's Residence (1893): windows broken, facade damaged by direct hit, roof of the library pierced by direct hit.

Queen's Church of Holy Crown (1910, in neo-Baroque style): direct impacts on the roof.

St. Vinka Church (1910): very heavily damaged, especially the roof, three paintings of Gabriel Jurkic destroyed, along with organ and most of church interior.

Church and Seminary of St. Anthony (1912-14): direct hits on church and seminary, with the second being particularly damaged (7 direct hits)

Church of the Christ Child (1890-92): completely burned by fires started by shelling.

Archbishop's Ordination Building (1895): damage to roof, facades and windows from shelling.

Townhall (National and Municipal Library): built in 1896, this "Moorish" style building is both a national and local symbol (seat of the Parliament in 1910-14, townhall after the First World War, national library in 1946. The building was burnt out by the bombardment of 25-27 August 1992, along with at least part of a collection whose content is, curiously enough, a bit hard to evaluate. The national library is described as having a collection of 1.5 (or 3) million volumes, 155,000 manuscripts and rare books, and some sources note that it contained the municipal archives as well.

National Museum of Bosnia-Herzegovina (Zemaljski muzej): four pavilions built specifically as a museum in 1909-13. According to an earlier report this year by Dr. Rizo Sijaric, Director of the Museum, the roofs and glass domes of the pavilions have received considerable damage, and there is damage of varying degrees to the facades, not mention the breaking of most of the 300 double windows. The greenhouse was totally destroyed. Many of the exhibition showcases and their contents have been damaged, and rain water poses another problem. An eye-witness says that there has been some damage from fire as well. The extensive inventoried material (prehistory, ancient, medieval, ethnographic) has been completely saved.

Post Office Building: also an Austrian building and an important local landmark, it was completely burned out by bombardment at the beginning of the war.

Hotel Europa: an Austrian building, partly burned out

Municipal Museum (Muzej Grada Sarajeva): an Austrian building in the "Moorish" style, about half-burnt out by bombardment. Condition of collection unknown.

Olympic Games Museum ((Olimpijski Muzej): an Austrian building, totally burned out. Condition of Collection unknown.

39. Orthodox Heritage

The Old Orthodox Church (Church of the Archangels) (16th Century, with Neo-Byzantine bell-tower of 1908): damage to the roof and windows, mainly during the bombardment of 1 March 1993.

This damage has been repaired. The Museum of the Old Orthodox Church damaged, but apparently not seriously, but other parish dependencies were harder hit.

Saborna Church: serious damage to the roof, windows and stained-glass windows destroyed.

New Sarajevo Church: totally burned out.

Metropolitane Building: roof partially burned by bombardment and library of 5,000 volumes totally burned along with the archives.

Conclusion for Sarajevo

40. It has frequently been said that Sarajevo is "less damaged" than Mostar. Given the generally mediocre, and even poor quality of the information received, it is impossible

at the present time to evaluate this appreciation. It should be recalled that the information on the condition of civil (Austrian) architecture and domestic architecture (Austrian and Ottoman) is very scarce. It is quite clear that the damage is extensive, and that patterns of targeting were similar to those at Mostar, with concentration on specific large buildings, sometimes of symbolic importance, which includes their contents (as the Oriental Institute).

Mostar

41. Mostar was bombarded for a week in January (22-27), and again in February, but the shelling was scattered and caused little additional damage to historic buildings. The recent lack of interest shown in Mostar by the Serbian artillery does not mean that the city cannot be hit again by long-range guns. However, at the present time a much greater danger to the city, its people and its heritage comes from the recent fighting between HVO and Bosnian forces (see below).

42. The situation steadily worsened during the first four months of 1993, even before the fighting in May. While dangerous buildings were marked as being off limits, nothing was done to stabilise damaged buildings. None were covered, with the exception of the modern cathedral, and their condition noticeably deteriorated: the walls of the Sevril-Hadji Hacin mosque were said to be collapsing; cherefa stones fell off the Karaduz Mosque and the hole on the minaret widened with the falling of other stones; the Elementary School, which had already suffered from the rains by December 1992, became much worse; the manufactured decorative motifs of the Austrian buildings were falling off and generally speaking the deterioration of interior walls was very noticeable.

43. A very serious problem that was arising is vandalism, which seems to fall into two different categories.

44. The first is the removal of useable building materials, especially roof tiles, and interior fixtures and furniture. For example the central part of the roof of the Music School was removed, adding considerably to the already serious water damage to the building. The striking interior decorations and furniture of the Art Nouveau Baths building on Musala Square were looted.

45. A second type of vandalism may be linked to the political and ethnic situation of Herzegovina. The Art Nouveau building opposite Lucka bridge was burned by unknown parties, as were other Austrian buildings on the Left Bank, and at least one Austrian house in the Donja Mahalla on the Right Bank. Near the ruins of the New Orthodox Church a late Turkish house, which housed the Russian Consulate, was also burned. Perhaps the most serious act of vandalism was the firing of the Old Orthodox Church at the beginning of 1993. This fine small stone church, built in 1835 and covered with the traditional slab stone roof, had been spared the fate of the New Orthodox Church, dynamited by Herzegovinian forces in June 1992.

46. While most of this destruction took place in zones controlled by the Bosnian forces, it would be hazardous, *without an inquiry carried out on the spot by neutral foreign*

observers, to conclude that they - or uncontrolled elements from their forces - were the perpetrators.

47. However, there were tensions between the Mostar Office for Historic Monuments and the Islamic Association for the Protection of Islamic monuments, which were already visible in December 1992. According to architects from the Mostar Office for Historic Monuments, the Islamic Association removed the roof of a damaged mesjid in the Donja Mahalla district, and intended to replace the traditional roof with a concrete one. Informal talks were apparently being carried to prevent this from happening.

48. This and the possibility of politically-motivated vandalism make it all the more necessary for some *arbitration on the spot by representatives of international organisations*. Yet the difficult situation between the communities, which worsened in April and led to the shooting of several persons in the streets of Mostar - not to mention the armed clashes between Bosnian and Herzegovinian forces in the Konjic area to the north of Mostar - make it extremely hard for international representatives other than the local UNPROFOR to intervene.

49. The situation degenerated sharply on 6 May, with heavy fighting in Mostar between HVO and Bosnian forces. On 9 May artillery was used on the town itself. At the moment of writing this fighting continues and there are no details on the damage done, though the Croatian dispatches mention bombardments and burnings. According to international press agencies two Moslem residential districts (the mahallas on the right bank?) were emptied of their Moslem inhabitants.

50. Apart from a brief visit by Francesca von Habsburg, Chairman of the ARCH Foundation in April, no representative of an international cultural organisation has been to Mostar to look at the situation of the cultural heritage (with the exception of the mission authorised by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in December last year (Doc 6756). The condition of the monuments is critical and the city is in desperate need of international attention and help.

Banja Luka

51. According to press reports, echoed by local officials themselves, the 16th-century mosques of Arnaudija (Dzamiya Hasana Defterdara) and Ferhadija (Ferhat-pasina Dzamiya) were dynamited on 7 May 1993. The minaret of the Ferhad mosque survived the explosion, but according to the French press was later dynamited, and the whole site bulldozed. This mosque was a rare Bosnian example of a three-naved mosque; moreover, its enclosure contained three outstanding mausoleums of the 16th and 17th centuries. Banja Luka is an example of a major Bosnian city occupied by the militias whose Moslem population is reported to have decreased from 27,000 to 20,000, and it is not unlikely that the destruction of these great mosques is part of systematic intimidation designed to make other people leave.

The Towns of the Drina River Valley

52. Close to Serbia and Montenegro, the towns of the Drina Valley were seized early in the war. The first information report (Doc 6756) referred to the destruction of the mosques of Foca; the Riyasat list notes heavy damage from artillery and from burning to the heritage of this area, especially in April 1992. Western journalists based in Belgrade have from time to time noted the destruction of mosques in Foca, Zvornik and Visegrad, without identifying the destroyed monuments. Here the Riyasat lists would seem generally credible. Similar fears can be expressed about the mosques listed by this organisation in the towns of Bratunac, Cajnice, Kalesija and Rogatica.

Southeastern Bosnia-Herzegovina

53. Neither the military observers of the UN (there are 18 based in Dubrovnik) nor the ECMM (who have completely transferred operations to Herceg Novi in Montenegro) have access to the rear and front-line positions of the Croatian and Serbian forces that confront each other across the Trebisnjica River. The artillery positions of both are often anchored on the villages in this area, which are principally Serb. A Croatian liaison officer with the international organisations confirmed that there has been a very considerable amount of damage to the villages on both sides from artillery fire since the reoccupation by Croatian forces in May 1992 (and October for the zone north of Konavle).

54. This same officer noted that forward Croatian observation posts witnessed the dynamiting of two mosques by Serb forces in Trebinje, incidents that were apparently described in the Croatian press, but for which no precise date could be given by the officer (but this probably occurred in January, when the Moslem population was driven from Trebinje).

Conclusions on War Destruction in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina

The Continuing Problem of Information

55. Despite the inevitable information gap that stems from the impossibility of access to certain zones and the continuation of the war in the Zadar-Sibenik region, the quality of information on the condition of the cultural heritage in Croatia could be better than it is. High quality information is necessary for the foreign public, professionals, administrations and organisations if international help for the cultural heritage is to be properly organised for Croatia.

56. For Bosnia it is difficult to fault the less well organised institutes that are responsible for the cultural heritage. They must function in terrible conditions in Sarajevo and Mostar. It is not known whether the institute in Banja Luka even survives. Moreover, their means of contact with the outside world are extremely limited.

57. There is very little information in this report of destruction from reprisals by Bosnian and Croatian forces and uncontrolled elements. Only fact-finding missions in the field are likely to come across such cases, since they are rarely admitted in print.

58. In both Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina the help of the international community for the cultural heritage is clearly needed (see conclusions and recommendations).

The Continuation of war destruction and the spread of war-linked destruction

59. The war continues, even on Croatian territory, and the destruction spreads. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, even though the information at our disposal remains very inadequate, the effects of fighting and its aftermath have clearly reached catastrophic proportions in the zones occupied by the Serbian militias, especially for the Ottoman heritage, where the dynamiting and bull-doing of mosques (and perhaps of the cemeteries that often surround these buildings) seem to be common. There is even less information on damage to domestic architecture, and the worse can be feared here as well.

60. To this original destruction can be added the effects of neglect of buildings (lack of funding, materials and emergency work), vandalism (for recuperation of materials), and the psychological attitudes of the population.

IV. RESTORATION WORK - REGION OF DUBROVNIK

61. The Old Town of Dubrovnik, thanks to its fame as a tourist site and Unesco's intervention on its behalf, is the only cultural property in the war zones to benefit so far from major international attention.

International Initiatives for the Old Town

The Unesco Action Plan

62. The published Unesco Action Plan was presented during the Pen Club meetings in Dubrovnik. The Unesco representative informed the participants that Unesco had made available \$200,000 and the World Heritage Committee \$50,000.

63. The task of Unesco is not to finance the operations itself, but to circulate its plan, and to coordinate the initiatives that arise. An international consultative committee, made up of specialists from several European countries, advises on questions of doctrine and on the projects proposed. In Dubrovnik itself a working group made up of members of the Institute for the Restoration of Dubrovnik and the Institute for the Protection of Historic Monuments oversees the work directly, in conjunction with the Unesco expert.

Archeo-Club of Rome

64. This club has launched a fund-raising campaign for the big Onofrio Fountain. See below for description of this organisation. This foundation has taken over management of the funds collected by Lady Beresford-Pierce (see below, Icomos) for a project in the Old Town, which will be chosen in the near future. For a description of this foundation and its activities, see below.

The French Committee for Humanitarian Aid and the Safeguarding of Dubrovnik

65. This committee was set up in 1992 on the initiative of Mr Baumel, Mayor of Rueil Malmaison (and Chairman of the Sub-Committee on the Architectural and Artistic Heritage of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe).

66. On the basis of the projects of the local specialists the committee intends to finance the restoration of the medallion of St. Blaise, the Amerling Fountain, the Well of the St. Claire Convent, and the Festival Palace, which will include creation of an on-site school devoted especially to stonework. The Committee will bring a stone mason and a sculptor for the smaller projects, and will field a French architect and specialised personnel for the Palace project. Once funding is ensured for the medallion and the agreement of the Croatian authorities is secured work should begin, hopefully this summer.

Rebuild Dubrovnik Fund

67. The American Society of Travel Agents and Atlas Ambassador of Dubrovnik (the leading tour operator in Croatia) set up the Save Dubrovnik Fund in November 1991. It has since been reorganised and renamed the Rebuild Dubrovnik Fund. The Fund has launched the "Buy a Tile for Dubrovnik" campaign in the United States and hopes to raise \$10,000,000 over the next five to six years.

Work in progress on the Old Town

Rebuilding of Roofs

68. The roof tiles supplied by Unesco were said to be almost entirely at the Port of Gruj, only three houses having been covered in the Old Town. Inflationary costs for labour and wood and the growing poverty of much of the population of Dubrovnik make it virtually impossible for owners to repair their roofs, even though the tiles themselves are free.

69. The problem has been recognised locally, and the Croatian Bank for Development has been studying loan mechanisms: the problem is the lack of funds. However, national tendering procedures for tiles, timber roofing and stone frames for the doorways on the Stradun will shortly be opened.

Restoration Work

70. On the other hand restoration has already been carried out on the Old Town, financed mainly by Croatian sources (the government, companies, the Croatian diaspora): the town bell-tower cupola, the cupola of the Franciscan bell-tower, the dome and roof of Od Sigurate Convent have all been repaired, and the Unesco Plan notes that work is being carried out on the roofing of the Sponza Palace, which houses the

Archives of Ragusa, with funding from the Croatian government, the Soros Foundation (Zagreb) and the Croatian diaspora.

Restoration Workshop in the Franciscan Convent

71. A local workshop, with four craftsman, has been established for restoration of paintings and furniture in the Franciscan Convent.

Local Initiatives regarding infrastructures

72. Although the question concerns all sorts of buildings, it is worth mentioning that the Institute for the Restoration of Dubrovnik has identified large stocks of infrastructure materials in the former East Germany, and hopes to have free access to these.

The Rural Zones of the Commune of Dubrovnik

Foreign Initiatives in the Commune

- ARCH Foundation

73. Following several weeks of courses for young conservators in Zagreb (November 1992) organised around the theme of stabilisation of conditions of the heritage ("less is more") the ARCH Foundation has already set up a task force for the documentation of moveable cultural properties in Konavle, and intends to create a series of specific projects around this activity. It should probably have at its disposal a building in Cavdat.

- The Institute for Advanced Architectural Studies

74. The Institute for Advanced Architectural Studies of the University of York (UK) has demonstrated interest in the revitalisation of Mali Ston, whose historic centre was in a state of abandon before the war.

Work being carried out in Rural Zones of the Commune

75. Architects of the Institute for the Protection of Historic Monuments informed the consultant that they had begun the work of inventorying of registered monuments, and the Institute for the Restoration of Dubrovnik is undertaking pilot studies (analysis of conditions of buildings, social, demographic and economic studies) on four villages - Dubravka, Brgat, Osolnjik and Lisac.

76. The Franciscan Monastery at Pridvorje will, according to local sources of information, be restored by a British group, which was not unidentified.

77. There has been aid in materials for Slano from Germany, Austria and Belgium. A German Land (so far unidentified) will be bringing in 15,000 square metres of wood.

78. It seems that much of this material aid (there was no time in April to tour around the commune) has come from the European diaspora.

79. A project with the Swedish government for the installation of pre-fabricated houses in the commune fell through, according to Dubrovnik sources of information because of the unwillingness to use local labour.

Remarks on the disparity of international attention (Old Town of Dubrovnik, Commune of Dubrovnik)

80. It is to Old Dubrovnik's advantage that it benefit from international attention, and some of the financial aid may eventually come to the rural zones of the commune itself. Yet it is ironic that little has been done - even by local and national authorities - to draw attention to the far worse cultural disaster that took place in the rural zones. The effect of distortion is amplified overseas, where the descriptions of damage to Old Dubrovnik are abundant, but descriptions of the state of the commune rare - with the exception of the village of Cilipi, itself linked to the tourist economy of the pre-war period. Although Croatian conservation professionals are aware of this lack of balance - which affects also the chances of the lesser known heritage of the north - there seems to be a policy of the political authorities to re-establish Dubrovnik as a tourist attraction, which means deliberately down-playing the unattractive situation of the villages.

81. This is most unfortunate, because it prevents the problems of the commune from being addressed in a global way. The restoration of the Old Town and the villages is linked to the economic planning of the region: to date the only planning is for the Dubrovnik nucleus, with its hotels, and the only option that seems to be taken seriously is the return of the tourists. Already fragile before the war because of this dependency, the commune risks a kind of desertification if town and country planning is not seriously taken up, with the help of international organisations and foundations (CC-PAT, United Nations programmes for the Mediterranean, ARCH - which intends to address this question in the Konavle district, etc.).

V. FOREIGN INITIATIVES

82. There are a number of initiatives for the cultural heritage, mainly for Croatia.

83. In the absence of any international coordination in the field, there is however a great deal of confusion, with the consequences of poorly circulating information, of accumulations of material in zones that do not require much aid, the sending of inappropriate materials, the presentation to international bodies of programmes that mix peace-time and war-time restoration.

84. To date the only coordinated international programme in Croatia is the Unesco Action Plan for the Safeguarding of Old Dubrovnik. However, the programme of the Austrian museums is taking on the aspects of a major bilateral effort.

85. The different initiatives are presented in the following order: inter-governmental international and regional organisations; non-governmental organisations; museums; associations and foundations. Meetings and exhibitions are listed after organisations. Understandably some of these initiatives are combined, but will be dealt with under only one heading. The situation of Dubrovnik is a special one, and has been treated above.

86. The list is far from exhaustive. Further information has often been promised but has still to materialise. The information available for this report must be supplemented subsequently.

International and Inter-governmental Organisations

- Council of Europe

(a) CDCC Cultural Heritage Committee (CC-PAT)

Following the decision taken by the Cultural Heritage Committee, during its meeting of the 1-2 March 1993 and after the on-site visit by the Secretariat (21-25 April 1993), a Specific Plan for Intervention in Croatia is in preparation. The Plan is based on four types of complementary activities:

- a polyvalent workshop tackling questions concerning legal systems, funding and management of heritage;
- three technical assistance missions; the projects concerned by these missions will benefit from special financial assistance in setting them up;
- training programmes concerning especially the management field;
- professional exchange programmes.

The implementation of this plan, which could span a 3-5 year period, could begin in September 1993. The search for a multiplying effect, either by the educational nature of the activities or by the experience which will be acquired by the local specialists, is the main characteristic of this plan.

(b) Standing Conference of Local and Regional Authorities (CLRAE)

In Resolution 241 (1993) the CLRAE decided to ask local and regional authorities throughout Europe to develop twinnings and co-operation with municipalities in the regions and areas affected by the war "particularly in respect of programmes for technical assistance and material help in the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the damaged physical structures and monuments". In Resolution 251 (1993) the CLRAE offered its support to the Belgian and Swiss initiative "Causes Communes" to set up a number of "Local Democracy Embassies", aimed at building confidence between ethnic groups". This second action could have a positive effect regarding the situation of the cultural heritage. The towns suggested as the first "Local Democracy Embassies" are: Pula, Subotica, Skopije, Sarajevo and Tuzla.

(c) Parliamentary Assembly [see Doc 6756]

- *Iccrom*

At the beginning of 1993 Iccrom received a small number of young Croatian specialists for training courses of several months. Iccrom is also planning a large coordinated effort with Unesco, the European Community, the Council of Europe, Icomos, and other organisations for practical intervention on the cultural heritage when the war ends. This is in the conceptualisation stage.

- *Unesco*

Unesco organised, in conjunction with the International Council on Monuments and Sites (Icomos) and the Dutch government, an initiative for improving the Hague Convention (initial meeting held in October 1992). In the context of this effort Icomos is addressing specifically the problem of "disaster preparedness", which will take the form of the publication of a manual. The Unesco expert on the Hague Convention is elaborating recommendations that will bear upon the operational aspects of the Convention (soldiers with conservation skills in international forces) rather than the philosophy of the text itself. These questions will be treated in an international meeting in Holland in September or October 1993.

See also above IV for work in Dubrovnik.

Non-Governmental Organisations

- *European Committee on Villages and Small Towns (Ecovast)*

Individual members, including Jane Wade, John Sell and Angus Fowler, members of the Executive Committee, have visited Croatia. The Wade-Sell mission to Croatia (11-17 July) was particularly important, in terms of fact-finding (mainly in Slavonia) and of advising local authorities on planning procedures and appropriate responses for war-damage (discouraging destruction of damaged buildings, recuperation of tiles, decoration and other elements).

During this mission a Croatian branch of ECOVAST was established.

- *International Council on Museums (Icom)*

Icom is organising an expert mission to Croatia to examine the condition of museums, make recommendations on the spot and, where possible, implement them directly.

The Austrian national committee, chaired by Dr Waidacher of the Joanneum in Graz, is actively following the question (see below).

- *Icomos* (see above)

The German national committee of Icomos has sought funding for technical missions to Mostar, but to date without success.

The UK national committee chapter assisted Lady Beresford-Pierce, who organised several exhibitions on destruction of the Croatian heritage and a fund-raising concert for Dubrovnik in London in 1992.

A national committee of Icomos has been established in Croatia.

Museums

Landesmuseum Joanneum (Graz, Austria), Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna City Museums, Vorarlberg Regional Museum (Bregenz)

At a meeting in Zagreb (15-16 December 1991), called on the initiative of ARCH, a commission of specialists drawn from the aforementioned museums was set up to examine the causes and effects of war destruction in Slavonia. This commission's conclusions (deliberate economic and cultural destruction by the JNA and auxiliary forces, total lack of respect for international and European conventions on the cultural heritage) were sent to the Council of Europe in February 1993.

In connection with this initiative the Croatian ministries of Environment, Culture and Reconstruction have held discussions with the Austrian International Society for Town Planning (Internationale Gesellschaft für Stadtgestaltung) and in December 1992 an interim report of the IGS, by Dr. Reinhard Breit, on the replanning of the towns of Pakrac and Lipik, was terminated, and sent to the Council of Europe in May.

Associations and Foundations

- *Belgian Committee for Dubrovnik* [information requested]

- *French Committee for Humanitarian Aid and the Safeguarding of Dubrovnik (France).*

See above IV.

- *Archeo-Club of Rome (Italy)*

The Archeo-Club, which has 600 branches throughout Italy grouping a wide public, including professionals and amateurs, has done much to sensitise the Italian public to war destruction (meetings, benefit concerts, brochures). It has developed especially close links with the city of Zadar, and the dynamism of the Director of the Zadar Institute, Dr Domijan, has been a very significant contributing factor in this collaboration.

- *ARCH Foundation (Switzerland)*

Founded in 1990 and based in Lugano, ARCH is dedicated to the protection, preservation and restoration of moveable cultural properties in Europe, especially in

Eastern and Central Europe. In addition to its activities in Croatia, it has programmes in Hungary (Serbian Orthodox Church at Rackeve) and Russia (conservation aid to the State Hermitage Museum). One of its special projects is the development of Mobile Conservation Studios. ARCH is one of the few organisations to stress the necessity of practical intervention in both Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina while the war continues.

See above IV for its work in Dubrovnik.

- Bosnia-Herzegovina Heritage Rescue UK

Until recently this association has been a virtually one-person affair (the Secretary-General, Dr Marian Wenzel, is a specialist in early mediaeval Bosnian culture). Yet it is the only foreign organisation in Europe that has been able (and willing) to provide us with information on the situation of the cultural heritage in Bosnia-Herzegovina. It has had some logistical support from the Courtauld Institute, a little financial aid from the Turkish Embassy in the UK and financial support from the Cress Foundation (European programme of the World Monuments Fund). It has organised small exhibitions of photos.

- Consortium for Rebuilding Croatia (UK)

This association, of which Sell, Wade and Postins (consultants on building and parks conservation) are founding members, was created in 1992 and intends to raise funds for reconstruction projects, to be carried out with Croats. The consortium is since said to be planning to assist Sarajevo as well.

- Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (UK)

The SPAB has launched a campaign, entitled "Operation Tarpaulin" for temporary roofing materials, and has prepared a pamphlet entitled "First aid repair to war-damaged buildings".

- York Institute for Advanced Architectural Studies (University of York, UK).

The Institute has organised meetings and training courses on restoration following war damage. For its specific work for Dubrovnik, see above in IV.

- Rebuild Dubrovnik Fund (US)

See above IV.

- Getty Grant Programme (US)

This programme, which functions mainly on matched funding, is dependent upon specific projects being presented. It has been contacted by Bosnia-Herzegovina Heritage Rescue UK, and the consultant expert has transmitted applications to the architects of Mostar.

- *Soros Foundation (Open Society Fund)(US)*

The Soros Foundation in the United States, created by a wealthy Hungarian, and devoted to development activities in Eastern Europe, has branches in both Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Its activities seem so far to have concerned more classic humanitarian aid, but it has funded some restoration activity in Dubrovnik, and seems willing, according to the Bosnia-Herzegovina Heritage Rescue UK, to pay more attention to the cultural heritage.

- *World Monuments Fund (US)*

Based in New York, with an office in Paris, this non-profit organisation, which undertakes restoration and restoration planning on individual monuments, has published articles on damage to cultural heritage in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina. It is a serious interlocutor which could be able to intervene on specific monuments (or else decide on other forms of assistance, such as training) when better information is available and the situation clearer.

Other Initiatives

Every representative or consultant for an international organisation in ex-Yugoslavia has come across free-lance visitors to the war zones. Some of these represent companies, some of them are present only on their own account. They are all looking for work in one form or another. Some are credible, others not. If the image of international organisations has suffered much in this war, the image of the civil society of the West has not always gained from the presence of these visitors, referred to by one British architect as "carpet-baggers".

It is in the interests of all international organisations, and in the first place of Unesco and the Council of Europe, not to attempt to control directly these initiatives but simply to identify them and exchange information about them, advise national and local authorities about them, and bring the more credible initiatives into a coordinated international effort on behalf of Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Meetings

- Meeting in Zagreb, 15-16 December 1991 (see above under Landesmuseum Joanneum)

- "Saving Croatia's Artistic and Architectural Heritage", held by the Centre for Conservation and the Post-War Development Unit of the Institute of Advanced Architectural Studies, University of York (UK) on 9 May 1992.

(Also see above IV, under Dubrovnik).

- Meetings on the Hague Convention (see above, Unesco).

- International Conference on the Environmental Effects of War (organised by the Government of Croatia, Zagreb, 13-17 April 1993): the participants of the session on cultural heritage made a declaration that repeats many of the points made in the consultant's earlier report (necessity of ECMM providing transport for visits of international experts, improvement of information, intervention of organisations, international, regional, national and local for repairs and advice for reconstruction and repair work), but also asking for review of the conventions on the cultural heritage in order to make them more operative in time of war, and calling upon the Council of Europe to coordinate international action and the Croatian government to set up national, regional and local coordination bodies.
- International Conference on Destruction of Cultural Monuments (organised by Dr Azra Begic, Chairman of the Sarajevo branch of the Soros Foundation, in Sarajevo, 5-6 May 1993)
- International Conference on Reconstruction, Restoration, Rebuilding in the Wake of War, organised by the International City Forum of Graz (12-16 May 1993)
- Seminar on war damage to works of art, planned by the Courtauld Institute (London UK) in June 1993.

Exhibitions

- Exhibitions in Styria (Austria): Osijek- Portrait of a Croatian city (Feldbach, July 1992), Damage to the Cultural Heritage of Croatia (Landesmuseum Joanneum, July-October 1992), exhibition on Karlovac in Hartberg and Pinkafeld (no dates).
- Unesco (The Cultural Heritage of Croatia on the World Heritage List, October 1992).
- Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (Strasbourg): "Dubrovnik in the mirror of Guernica" (montage by Mr Tummers, September 1992); "War damage to the cultural heritage in the regions of Dubrovnik and Mostar" (photographs by Mr Hatterer, February-March 1993)
- Cultural destruction in Croatia (Graz, spring of 1993).
- Exhibition on the cultural heritage of Bosnia-Herzegovina (prepared by the Islamic Centre, Istanbul, second half of May 1993)
- "Urbicid", exhibition on the destruction of Mostar organised by the Croatian Defense Council (Mostar) and prepared by the Mostar office on monuments with the help of the cultural authorities of Zagreb. The exhibition, first shown in Zagreb in December 1992, has since travelled to Maribor, Ljubljana, and Vienna and is scheduled to be shown in Paris on 24 May-7 June, perhaps at Unesco headquarters. It will be sent to Helsinki and Chicago. In Paris it will be shown with photos of Sarajevo.

VI. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

87. Virtually every point in the conclusions of the preceding report (Doc 6756) can be repeated here: about the catastrophe the war represents for the European cultural heritage, the continuing destruction (which increasingly affects the Ottoman heritage), the need for better information. This means further international fact-finding missions in the field, foreign technical assistance and assistance in materials, and the need for the international peace-keeping forces in former Yugoslavia to be aware of the heritage factor, which is to say that they must be mandated to protect the cultural heritage from vandalism and reprisals, and be able to advise on and organise emergency operations for damaged heritage.

88. This last point has been repeatedly made in the Assembly, and most recently in Mr Baume's introduction to Doc.6756 para 6. It would be interesting to know if the request has been formally made by the Secretary-General of the Council of Europe to the UN and whether there has been any reaction.

89. There is a considerable consensus from outside Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina (ARCH Foundation, members of Ecovast, Declaration of the Zagreb conference of 13-17 April 1993) on the possibilities of action "before the war is over" and especially on the necessity of international coordination.

90. It is not easy for NGOs to act directly in the field - this is not normally their role during a war - but in the present situation in former Yugoslavia they are probably in a better position to react than governments, at least in areas where violence has greatly subsided. They have financial problems, and it is in facilitating this aspect (and transport) that governments and governmental organisations (UN and ECMM) can assist. NGOs often have national bodies and individual units (commercial firms for example) that are ideally placed to make practical contributions.

91. In particular the international organisations must move closer, just as Unesco and the Council of Europe have done in the media field by setting up a co-ordination centre in Ljubljana. Forward posts should be set up in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina that would ensure, in cooperation with the national and local authorities, a better flow of information on destruction and needs, identify foreign initiatives and assist associations and organisations seeking to help Croatian and Bosnian authorities. The traditional techniques of peacetime cooperation - periodic meetings and study tours, training abroad, relatively short missions from London, Vienna, Paris or Strasbourg - are in themselves woefully inadequate in the present disastrous situation and need the sort of forward coordination structure suggested.

92. This structure should be able easily enough to find a viable national partner in Croatia, but in the most optimistic hypothesis for Bosnia-Herzegovina - there will be three community partners (Moslems, Croats, Serbs) and a multitude of institutional interlocutors (a weak national government and nine provincial governments corresponding to ethnic criteria, and a mixed province of Sarajevo). In other words, an international coordination structure for the Bosnia-Herzegovinian cultural heritage, may make the difference between the survival of this heritage and its disappearance in a confused post-war period, which may well be characterised by a continuation of "cultural cleansing".

93. As the CDCC Cultural Heritage Committee (Council of Europe) is to concentrate its attention on "post-war restoration" and in the first place in Croatia as this country is signatory to the European Cultural Convention, and as Unesco continues to concentrate its attention on Dubrovnik, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe must itself continue to take the initiative with regard to the heritage in a war situation in general and Bosnia-Herzegovina in particular.

94. The following recommendations can be made concerning Bosnia-Herzegovina. However, most of them could also be adapted for the parts of Croatia that are still in a war situation:

1) that the mandate of the UN peace-keeping forces include protection of the cultural heritage from vandalism, and the organisation of emergency repairs in conjunction with local authorities;

2) that a mission be sent to Sarajevo, Mostar and Banja Luka to collect information on the situation of the cultural heritage and to identify and discuss with cultural interlocutors (institutes, government departments) immediate needs in materials, technical assistance and operational structures; this mission should seek to arbitrate debates between the different communities regarding the heritage ;

3) that this mission be continued into the Drina River Valley as soon as possible and also into other areas of Bosnia-Herzegovina when they cease to be war zones;

4) that the Council of Europe establish an international coordination body including Unesco and representatives of those associations and NGOs who have experience in the war zones; a small forward structure, based for example in Sarajevo, but operational throughout the country, should be established as soon as possible;

5) that the Council of Europe initiate discussions with Unesco and other organisations concerned with a view to launching an international or European campaign for the safeguarding of the cultural heritage of Bosnia-Herzegovina as soon as the conditions permit;

6) that the Council of Europe and Unesco facilitate the access of Bosnia-Herzegovina to all conventions and instruments that will assist it to reconstruct its cultural heritage.

D. LETTER

from Azra Begic, Association of International Activities and Heritage Rescue

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sarajevo, Bosnia-Herzegovina

to Jacques Baumel, Chairman of the Sub-Committee on the Architectural and Artistic Heritage, Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

We have been interested to receive a copy of the Council of Europe Information Report on the destruction by war of the cultural heritage in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

We are extremely grateful for the attention given to our situation by the Parliamentary Assembly.

There have been no official, cultural missions to Sarajevo from the outside world, and the condition of the cultural heritage in all senses of the term is exceedingly critical here, and gets more critical every day, despite all our efforts on its behalf. We desperately need this kind of foreign mission because we feel our culture has been abandoned by the world.

We could do everything possible to us to inform this mission of the present situation of our cultural heritage, and will make available to them all information they may require. We will assure that they meet all cultural authorities who now remain in Sarajevo, and that they receive all necessary access to cultural monuments. We will do everything to assure the security of the mission.

We request this mission be sent to us as soon as is at all possible.

Sarajevo, 30 May 1993

D. ACTION BY THE STEIERMÄRKISCHE LANDESMUSEUM JOANNEUM

(Styrian Provincial Joanneum Museum)

in the former Yugoslavia 1991-93

Qui tacet, consentire videtur

Dr Diether Kramer

The assignment

In 1991, Austrian museums were asked to help with the restoration of war-damaged cultural assets in those parts of Croatia that had been particularly hard hit by destruction.

The Steiermärkische Landesmuseum Joanneum was prepared to respond to this request promptly and has since been represented by a delegate on the committee that is assessing works of art and cultural assets deliberately damaged in Croatia, as well as on the working party of the "Planning for restoration in Croatia" of the International Society for Town Planning and on the Foundation "Art Restoration for Cultural Heritage".

In the course of a series of preliminary discussions, as well as consultations lasting several days and numerous visits to the war-zone, joint attempts have been made to establish the extent of destruction in Croatia, especially to its cultural wealth, and analyse it so that precise tasks and an appropriate restoration work schedule can be drawn up at a future date.

Areas of work

The Rapporteur's activities since 1991 have included participation in the following areas:

- * recording and formulating problems;
- * gathering and registering background material;
- * documentation in war zones;
- * investigating the whereabouts of cultural works;
- * analysing the historical development of settlements;
- * information on historical events;
- * consultations with Croatian officials and departments;
- * drawing up recommendations and plans;
- * arranging and designing exhibitions;
- * preparatory work for experts' discussions.

Efforts were initially centred on the regions of Vukovar, Osijek, Pakrac, Novska and Karlovac. Investigations were also carried out in many other places in Slavonia. Broadly speaking, it is planned to restore or rebuild damaged monuments in 590 Croatian towns and villages. The historical ensembles in Vukovar, Vinkovci, Petrinja, Kostajnica, Otocac and Gospic should, as far as possible, be rebuilt. This also applies to the scientific infrastructure damaged by the war (institutes, museums and archives).

In view of developments, in 1993 contacts were also stepped up with Bosnia-Herzegovina, reports on the destruction of cultural monuments in Bratunac, Foca, Mostar and Zvornik were appraised and preliminary investigations carried out.

Conclusion and prospects

Rebuilding and restoring the cultural heritage in the affected areas have become tasks that can no longer be dealt with at national level. Even with large-scale international assistance, they can only be tackled and carried out over the course of a lengthy period of time. Other factors also have to be taken into account such as the vast extent of the damage to cultural monuments, which cannot yet be definitively assessed, the possibilities and length of the planning stage along with the condition of the construction industry and above all the current extremely difficult political and economic situation. Consequently, for some considerable time to come, it will still be necessary and even vital to support by word and deed all measures to save and restore Croatia's cultural monuments and encourage appropriate initiatives. Assistance in getting to grips with the methodology for the necessary planning work is still required.

As many of the areas ravaged by the war are still not accessible, it would appear useful to devise model approaches on the basis of examples.

They may of course prove to be just as relevant for Bosnia-Herzegovina in future.

E. DECLARATION

adopted at a Conference on the environmental effects of war

Zagreb 17 April 1993

A. Recognising that information concerning the effect of war on the cultural heritage is sufficient as a basis for planning future action we:

1. ask the European Community Monitoring Mission to facilitate visits by international experts to areas inaccessible to the Croatian and Bosnian authorities and further
2. ask that a decision to enable this is taken at the highest possible level within the European Community.

In addition given the feeling that the present information being provided by Croatian and Bosnian institutions is insufficient in extent and detail to allow a full and objective assessment of the cultural heritage to be made we:

3. ask those institutions to carry out more fieldwork as a matter of urgency.

B. Recognising that international conventions concerning the protection of cultural monuments and cultural property have not been observed during the conflict in the former Yugoslavia we:

1. call upon the Croatian authorities to organise a conference in Croatia to discuss practical means for enforcing these conventions.
2. ask the United Nations to review, as a matter of urgency, the efficacy of the Hague Convention of 1954, the 1977, protocols to the 1949 Geneva Convention and the 1972 Paris Convention.

C. Realising that in order to prevent secondary damage to the environment and to the cultural heritage by neglect, planning needs to be begun at the earliest possible moment we:

1. call upon the relevant international, national, regional and local bodies to begin preparations for repair and reconstruction immediately,

and realising that this process is being hampered by lack of co-ordination and dissipated by duplication call upon

2. the Council of Europe as the European body most concerned with the protection of the environment and the cultural heritage to co-ordinate the efforts of the various international bodies interested in the preservation of the heritage.

3. the Croatian government to determine one body responsible for the co-ordination of the national response to war damage and to ensure that similar co-ordination is achieved at the regional and local level and which involves local people and values their contribution.

And further realising that further loss through deterioration is a serious possibility and that there is a desperate need for shelter we:

4. call upon the relevant international, national, regional and local bodies to provide immediate practical aid and advice to the owners of historic buildings, including the owners of traditional rural buildings, to enable repairs to begin in a non-destructive way.

5. ask the Croatian authorities to make a clear assessment from the detailed surveys called for above, of the material needs of the cultural heritage so that international aid can be directed to the main priority areas.