

RIJEČ UREDNIŠTVA

ZAŠTO SE ČUDIMO?

Na upravo održanoj 118. redovitoj izbornoj sjednici Skupštine HŠD-a, našu pažnju posebno privlače (sugerirajući nam u ovome uvodniku komentirati kao aktualnu problematiku), pojedini zaključci iz izvješća dosadašnjeg predsjednika HŠD-a mr. sc. Petra Jurjevića, kao i neka načela najavljene programske orijentacije iz obraćanja skupu novog predsjednika Olivera Vlainića, dipl. ing. šum. i napose činjenično stanje naznačeno u stručnoj temi EU fondovi u šumarstvu, referenta mr. sc. Gorana Gregurovića. Predviđena jedna stranica za ovu rubriku ne dozvoljava nam da široko citiramo odnosna zapažanja, pa ćemo ih kratko naznačiti, a čitateljstvo upućujemo na Zapisnik i stručnu temu Skupštine. „Šumari i šumarska struka niti danas ne mogu niti hoće prihvatiti činjenicu da šumarstva prvi puta u povijesti nema u nazivu ministarstva kojemu pripada... Još uvijek se nadamo, ... da će ponajprije ministar poljoprivrede g. Jakovina, učiniti sve što je u njegovoj moći, a na temelju svog obećanja ispraviti ovu povijesnu nepravdu“. Obećanje je dano prije dvije godine, a šumarska struka nije imala priliku ozbiljno raspravljati s resornim ministrom o šumarstvu, jer se ministar, iako pozivan, gotovo nije pojavljivao na šumarskim skupovima, a da i ne govorimo o izvršenju spomenutog obećanja. Kako je tretirana šumarska struka unutar našeg resornog ministarstva i općenito na razini Vlade, gdje i od resornog ministra za regionalni razvoj nikada nismo čuli niti riječi o šumarstvu (a EU Strategija šumarstva upravo se oslanja na ruralni i regionalni razvoj), ne treba nas čuditi odnos prema našoj struci. Ako tome pridodamo činjenicu da referent stručne teme Skupštine navodi kako šumarstvo kao posebna gospodarska grana, na žalost nije naznačeno u EU fondovima (čini se da je o šumarstvu bilo riječi samo kada su prekomjerne šumske površine uključivane u mrežu NATURA 2000), nego ćemo ga morati „ugurati“ na mala vrata kroz fondove za ruralni razvoj, stav odgovornih postaje još jasniji. Stoga je, unatoč naših stručno argumentiranih stavova struke po svim pitanjima, navedenih u izvješću mr. sc. Jurjevića i upućenih na odnosne adrese, opravdan njegov zaključak kako „*danas slobodno iznosimo stavove, ali nas, i ne samo nas, nadležna tijela niti čuju, niti slušaju*“.

U svome obraćanju skupu novi predsjednik HŠD-a kolega Vlainić citira pok. profesora emeritusa Branimira Prpića, koji 1979. god. upozorava kako „*smo se ogradili od kontakta s javnošću, izolirali smo se i ne povezujemo se sa društveno-političkim radnicima i ne upoznajemo ih s našom stručnom problematikom... druge se struke snažnije bore i nameću ...*

cjelokupna struka ne smije čekati da nam drugi kroje i rješavaju našu stručnu problematiku... trebali bi javno kazati kako zapravo stvari stoje, što je najbolje i zašto se struka bori“. Komparirajući današnje stanje sa citiranim, kolega Vlainić zaključuje, „*da nam budućnost nalaže što širi i sveobuhvatniji nastavak zalaganja u smjeru poboljšanja statusa struke*“... Pritom treba optimalno koristiti sve resurse koje nam šuma sa svojim prostorom pruža na dobrobit, ponajprije samog šumskog ekosustava, zatim države, lokalne zajednice, zaposlenika u šumarstvu i drvnoj industriji te građana Republike Hrvatske“.

Začudeni smo današnjim stanjem u šumarstvu. Zbog čega? Sve je jasno ako si postavimo i odgovorimo na pitanje, imamo li i tko provodi **šumarsku politiku**? Svaka je, posebice šumovita zemlja ima, a ona se temelji na nizu specifičnih okolnosti, od kojih su glavne tradicija i interes. Kada bi Država imala šumarsku politiku, politika bi poslušala struku, šumski resursi i šumski prostor kao dio opće infrastrukture koristili bi se optimalno, ne bi se raspravljalo o ukidanju sredstava OKFŠ-a koja se ulažu u očuvanje ekosustava, prepoznale bi se potrebe lokalne zajednice, posebice kroz zapošljavanje, a drvna sirovina koristila bi se u cijelosti i usmjeravala u tokove proizvodnje koji daju najveću dodanu vrijednost. Ako tako ispravno vrednujemo šumarstvo kao značajnu gospodarsku granu, onda nalazimo i opravdanje za ulaganje u nju. Naime, poznato je, da kada gledamo samo ulaganje u jednostavnu reprodukciju šuma, šumski kamatnjak iznosi svega 2 %, za razliku npr. od bankarske štednje ili drugih ulaganja. Tražimo li od Hrvatskih šuma d.o.o. maksimalnu rentabilnost, a ne „optimalnu korist“, ne dovodimo li se u opasnost da se smanji ulaganje u proširenu reprodukciju šuma, otvaranje šuma i sl. prethodno navedeno? Ako se traži isključivo maksimalna rentabilnost a ne vrednuje optimalna korist od šuma i šumarstva (OKFŠ, biomasa kao obnovljivi energent, turistički objekti, širenje-vraćanje djelatnosti na hortikulturu, rekreaciju, doprinos lokalnoj zajednici kroz zapošljavanje i očuvanje ruralnih područja i dr.), onda se ne trebamo čuditi i procjenama o višku radnika u šumarstvu.

No, kako će se upravljati i gospodariti šumama, ne bi smjelo određivati trgovačko društvo, kojemu je samo povjereno gospodarenje državnim šumama, nego Država kao vlasnik putem konzistentne šumarske politike, koju, kao i štošta drugo, nažalost nemamo.

Uredništvo

EDITORIAL

WHY ARE WE SURPRISED?

At a recent 118th regular electoral meeting of the CFA Assembly, we were particularly intrigued by several conclusions from the report by CFA's former president Petar Jurjević, MSc, by some principles of planned programme trends outlined by the new president Oliver Vlainić, BSc in forestry, and especially by the factual state contained in the expert topic of EU funds in forestry reported by Goran Gregurović, MSc. The limited space of one page of this column does not allow us to discuss the mentioned observations in depth; we shall therefore only briefly touch on them, while the readers are referred to the Minutes of the Assembly and its expert topic. *"Foresters and the forestry profession cannot and will not accept the fact that, for the first time in history, forestry has been omitted from the name of the ministry to which it belongs ... We are still hoping ... that Mr Jakovina, Minister of Agriculture, will do his best, as he has promised, to rectify this historical injustice."* The promise was made two years ago, but the forestry profession has not yet had the opportunity to seriously discuss forestry issues with the minister, since he, although invited, has almost never attended forestry meetings, let alone fulfilled his promise. In view of how the forestry profession is treated by the competent ministry and the Government in general, where we have never heard a word about forestry from the Minister for Regional Development (at the same time, the EU Forestry Strategy is closely associated with rural and regional development), we should not be surprised by the attitude towards our profession. Add to this the fact that, according to the presenter at the Assembly, forestry as a separate economic branch is, regrettably, not included in the EU funds (apparently, forestry seems to have been the issue only when excessive forest areas were included in the NATURA 2000 network), but will have to be "squeezed in" via the rural development funds, the attitude of those responsible becomes even clearer. For this reason, despite the well argued attitudes of the profession concerning the issues contained in the report by Mr Jurjević, MSc. and submitted to many relevant addresses, his conclusion that *"today we are free to express our opinions, but we, and not only we, are neither heard nor heeded by the competent bodies"* is more than accurate.

Mr Vlainić, the new CFA President, addressed the assembly by citing the late Professor Emeritus Branimir Prpić, who warned in 1979 that *"we have severed contacts with the public and isolated ourselves, we do not relate to socio-political workers and we do not introduce them to our specialist problem issues. ... Other professions fight more strongly and assert themselves. ... The entire profession should not wait for others to decide on and solve our problem matter. ... We*

should disclose to the public how things stand, what is best and what the profession is fighting for". Comparing the present situation with the one he cited, our colleague Vlainić concluded that *"our future requires that we continue to improve the state of the profession" In doing so, we should optimally use all the resources provided by the forest, primarily of the forest ecosystem itself, the state, the local community, all those employed in forestry and the wood industry, and the citizens of the Republic of Croatia"*.

Why should we wonder at the present state in forestry? Everything becomes clear if we answer the following question: do we have a **forest policy** and if so, who is responsible for it? Every country, and especially a mountainous one, has such a policy, which is based on a set of specific circumstances with tradition and interest being the most important. If the State had a forest policy, then the politicians would listen to the profession. Forest resources and forest areas as a part of general infrastructure would be put to optimal use. There would be no question of abolishing the means for non-market forest functions, which are otherwise invested in the ecosystem conservation. The needs of the local communities would be recognized, especially through the employment policy, and wood raw material would be utilized fully and directed into production that yields the highest additional value. If forestry was valued as an important economic branch, then there would be sufficient justification to invest into it. It is a well known fact that, in terms of investing only into simple forest reproduction, the interest on forests amounts to just 2 %, unlike the interest on bank savings or other investments. If we demand from the company Hrvatske Šume maximum rentability and not the "optimal benefit", do we not force it to cut down on investments in extended forest reproduction, forest accessibility and other issues? If only maximum rentability is required, and optimal benefits provided by forests and forestry are not valued (non-market forest functions, biomass as a renewable energy source, tourist facilities, broadening the activities to include horticulture, recreation, contribution to the local community through employment and preservation of rural areas, etc.), then we should not wonder at the reported surplus labour in forestry.

However, the manner in which forests are managed should not be determined by a company which is entrusted only with caring for state forests, but by the State as the owner. The State should adhere to a consistent forestry policy which we regrettably, along with many other things, do not have.

Editorial Board