

.....

APPENDIX C

WAR DAMAGE TO THE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN CROATIA AND BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA

Report by Dr Colin Kaiser, consultant expert

Contents

I. INTRODUCTION (para 1)

II. THE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF CROATIA AND BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA

- Croatia
- Bosnia-Herzegovina
- Official bodies for protection of the cultural heritage in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina
- Definition of the cultural heritage
- General remarks on destruction of the cultural heritage in ex-Yugoslavia

III. THE DESTRUCTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN CROATIA (para 16)

- An incomplete picture
- Statistical overview
- (a) Historic Sites and Cities: distribution and intensity of damage
- (b) Typology of historic sites and cities
- (c) Individual monuments: typology, distribution, intensity of damage
- (d) Museums, galleries, archives, libraries
- The most serious losses to the cultural heritage of Croatia
- Financial evaluation of damage
- Immediate and mid-term needs
- International assistance

IV. DESTRUCTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN THE COMMUNE OF DUBROVNIK (para 52)

- Background of military operations
- Old Town of Dubrovnik
- (a) Evaluation of damage, the Unesco Action Plan
- (b) Roofs and burned buildings
- (c) Cultural vandalism in the Old Town
- The cultural heritage in the environs of the Town of Dubrovnik
- (a) The University Centre

(b) The Benedictine Monastery on Lokrum Island

(c) The Summer Palaces in Rijeka Dubrovacka

(d) Mount Srdj and Zarkovica

(e) Mali Ston

- War destruction to villages and small towns in the Commune of Dubrovnik

(a) Calendar and types of destruction

(b) Statistics on destruction of buildings outside the Old Town

(c) The destruction to the cultural heritage in Primorje and Konavle

- The villages, churches, funeral chapels and cemeteries of Primorje

- The destruction of the heritage at Slano

- Villages, churches, funeral chapels, and cemeteries in Konavle

- The Franciscan Monastery at Pridvorije

- The firing of Ivanica and Croatian reprisals in southern Bosnia-Herzegovina

- Conclusion for the Commune of Dubrovnik

V. WAR DAMAGE IN BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA (para 108)

- The need for information and enhanced international cooperation

- A cultural catastrophe for all the communities of Bosnia-Herzegovina?

VI. WAR DAMAGE TO THE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN THE LOWER NERETVA RIVER VALLEY AND THE ENVIRONS OF MOSTAR (para 116)

- Background of military operations

- Areas not seen on the right bank

- The left bank: the villages of Klepci, Tasovcici, Pocitelj

- The Orthodox Monastery and Serbian village of Zitomislic

- Blagaj

- Miljecovic

- The route to Tomislavgrad

VII. WAR DAMAGE TO THE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF MOSTAR CITY (para 124)

- The cultural heritage of Mostar

- Background of military operations
- Types of damage
- Zones of damage
- Local surveys of damage
- Damage to major historic buildings and districts
- (a) Ottoman heritage
 - Old Bridge and connecting streets
 - Mosques
 - Mahallas (residential areas)
- (b) Austrian heritage
 - Left Bank
 - Musala Square
 - Right Bank
- (c) Orthodox heritage
 - The situation of the cultural heritage at Mostar

VIII. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS (para 195)

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This report is based upon a fact-finding mission carried out for the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe by a consultant expert, Dr Colin Kaiser (formerly Director of Icomos and now Vice-President of the *Comité national d'aide humanitaire et de sauvegarde de Dubrovnik*, set up this year by Mr Baumel), and a Council of Europe staff photographer, Mr. Jean-Claude Hatterer, in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina from 29 November to 20 December 1992. This mission was a follow-up to the visit of a Parliamentary Assembly delegation composed of Mr Baumel and Mr Tummers to Croatia (31 July-3 August, 1992). It draws largely on observations made in the region of Dubrovnik (Croatia), the lower valley of the Neretva River (in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina) and the region of Mostar (Bosnia-Herzegovina). It had been hoped to include the Croatian Krajina, southeast Bosnia-Herzegovina and Sarajevo, but the difficulties encountered in organising the transport assistance of the UN Protection Forces (UNPROFOR) and the UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and the refusal of the European Community Monitor Mission (ECMM) to help, made it

impossible to envisage visiting the first two areas; steps were undertaken to organise a one-day visit to Sarajevo, but the sudden intensification of fighting there led to suspension of UN air traffic and made this visit impossible.

2. The report also draws upon secondary material, mainly that provided by official Croatian sources, and some lists of suspected damage that originate in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Special thanks are due to Dr. Ferdinand Meder, Director, and Mr Damir Dijakovic of the Institute for Protection of Cultural Monuments (Zagreb); to Mr Matko Vetma and Mr Zvonimir Franic of the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments in Dubrovnik; to Mr Bozo Letunic of the Dubrovnik Restoration Institute; and to Mrs Ivanka Ribarevic and Mr Tihomir Rozic of the Department for the Protection of Monuments of Mostar, who provided constant assistance, including transport.

3. Accordingly, this report in no way pretends to be an exhaustive synthesis. If the balance sheet on damage to the cultural heritage in Croatia is progressing (with the exception of the zones presently occupied by United Nations forces and autonomous Serbian authorities), the situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina is totally different. There the war continues and the zones of destruction spread.

II. THE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF CROATIA AND BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA

4. The heritage of these two countries is extremely different, the consequence of two very different histories.

Croatia

5. In Croatia one is confronted principally by two cultural traditions. The romanesque and mediaeval architectural heritage of much of Northern Croatia was destroyed by the Turkish invasion, and the reconquest by the Austro-Hungarian Empire, beginning in the 16th century and completed by the end of the 17th century, covered cities and countryside alike with the Baroque architecture of central Europe. The architecture and urbanism of this part of Croatia continued, down through the 19th century, to reflect integration into the Empire.

6. On the Adriatic coast the dependencies of Venice - virtually city states - and the Ragusan Republic flourished in the shadow of the Ottomans, borrowing from Italian architecture, but adapting it to their own architectural and urban traditions. Political integration into the Austro-Hungarian Empire did not radically alter the face of these regions, which remained part of the Mediterranean world.

7. One can, however, evoke another tradition, for beginning in the 1530s the Austrians invited Serbian refugees into the regions bordering the Ottoman territory of Bosnia, and the "military confines" (Krajina, Slavonia) are dotted with Orthodox churches, Serbian villages and towns.

Bosnia-Herzegovina

8. The Bosnian cultural heritage is marked by centuries of Ottoman rule (mid-15th century to 1878). The cities, with their mosques, medreses, bazaars and residential mahalla districts, have retained their distinctive character down to the present day, despite the intense building campaigns that followed absorption into the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In its later years the Tito régime even encouraged the strengthening of the Bosnian Moslem identity, as testified by the construction of religious edifices during this period. Ottoman culture dominated in the cities and towns, but the Orthodox and especially the Catholic heritage - in the form of Franciscan establishments - have been present since the 16th century. It would be over simplifying to draw a dichotomy between Christian rurality and Moslem city existence, however strong the tendency in the past. The intermingling was always strong, and became increasingly marked following the end of Ottoman rule.

Official bodies for protection of the cultural heritage in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina

9. In Croatia the protection of the cultural heritage is well organised (see AS/Cult/AA (44) 4), with a central body at Zagreb attached to the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports, 4 regional institutes (Osijek, Rijeka, Split, Zagreb), 6 local offices (Dubrovnik, Karlovac, Split, Sibenik, Varazdin, Zadar), and several specialised institutes (the Dubrovnik Restoration Institute was created for the restoration of the Old Town after the earthquakes of 1979).

10. In principle the administration of monuments is organised in Bosnia-Herzegovina on similar lines as in Croatia, but the fact-finding mission could not find complete information on this, and the picture seems somewhat confused. The Department for the Protection of Monuments of Mostar, a kind of regional centre, is part of the Public Office for the Building and Reconstruction of Mostar. The consultant of the fact-finding mission recommended to the authorities that this Department be established as a separate body, with clear responsibilities for protection of heritage, which would enhance its operational capacities.

Definition of the cultural heritage

11. In this report the cultural heritage includes monuments, historic towns and districts, vernacular heritage, both rural and urban, art galleries and museums, libraries and archives. Listed heritage is obviously present, but neither age nor notoriety are determining factors. An Orthodox church built in the 1870s or a mosque built in the 1890s may be judged mediocre in terms of aesthetics and originality, but they are focal points of cultural identity. While urban and rural vernacular architecture is officially recognised, it is all too absent from local damage evaluations, and the institutes concerned with protection tend to concentrate on publically owned buildings. The monuments to the resistance in World War II may annoy some because of their style of "socialist realism", but they too are a part of a cultural landscape - and in many places they are rapidly disappearing. Widespread destruction has the painful virtue of enlarging notions of the heritage to all objects in which a people see carried the values of their culture, however new or old, however outstanding or run-of-the-mill these objects are.

General remarks on destruction of the cultural heritage in ex-Yugoslavia

12. Yugoslav army strategy was geared to a "NATO style" war, imagining operations from a defensive point of view: hence the considerable amount of heavy artillery, mortars and rocket launchers suitable for both warfare in the open and incapacitating invaders along valley roads in the hills or along the coast. In the war in ex-Yugoslavia this school of strategy has resulted in offensive operations not being particularly imaginative or audacious; they are characterised by a great deal of softening up by artillery bombardment, which means that some damage is less deliberate vandalism than the implementation of a school of military thinking.

13. Two types of destruction can be identified - one arising from military operations, the second occurring outside of them. In the first damage is done for military reasons - to drive the opposing forces away from a village or town.

14. Yet even this kind of destruction is motivated by other factors. French artificers to whom the author of this report showed projectiles at Dubrovnik in December 1991 were very surprised at the utilisation of armour-piercing projectiles against city walls and houses built of very hard limestone, and of small mortars more suitable to warfare in the open. The use of these arms seemed to obey the imperative of psychological warfare against a civilian population - of making it leave a city or a village. For similar psychological reasons, targetting the cultural heritage can be singled out as another way of scaring off a population.

15. The second type of damage occurs outside of offensive or defensive military action. In this case a building, an ensemble, or a village is burned, or sometimes dynamited. A building may be left standing, but its interior may be vandalised. This kind of destruction is deliberate action whose objective may be to remove all cultural traces of a population, and to make it impossible for that population to return to an area; it may also be a reprisal. The cycle of provocation and reprisals seems to be escalating.

III. THE DESTRUCTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN CROATIA

An incomplete picture

16. Despite the winding down of the war between Croatia and Serbia-Montenegro, the destruction in Croatian territory has not been fully documented. The central Institute for Protection of Cultural Monuments of Croatia, working with its local branches, has compiled statistics and evaluations for the territory in the control of Croatia; it has some information on the occupied zones of Slavonia- which have also been visited by an Austrian fact-finding mission- but the data on the Krajina seem in all respects very incomplete.

17. This section is based upon the last complete report of the Institute (1 April 1992), and an update (27 June 1992), which has statistics only according to the region and not the type of heritage; these are incomplete in another respect, because they clearly do not include much of the rural zone of the Commune of Dubrovnik.

18. These reports are difficult to use for other reasons: the tables use approximate classifications of damage (resorting to two different scales); the statistics are global and

no evaluation of damage is presented city by city or monument by monument. The chronological account in these reports of the destruction is helpful, but impressionistic.

Statistical overview

(a) Historic Sites and Cities: geographical distribution and intensity of damage

19. About two-thirds of Croatian territory has been exposed to war- 64 of 102 administrative districts in the country. These districts are almost entirely districts with a large Serbian minority, or else bordering on such areas.

20. The June report notes a total of 236 damaged historic sites (memorial sites, archaeological sites, villages) and cities. Table 1 presents their geographical distribution.

IV. DESTRUCTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN THE COMMUNE OF DUBROVNIK

Background of military operations

52. From October 1991 until May 1992 virtually all the Commune (district) of Dubrovnik was occupied by the Federal Army: only the city of Dubrovnik, part of the east bank of Rijeka Dubrovacka and the Napoleonic fortress on Mount Srdj remained in Croatian hands. In May the Federal Army retreated from the western half of the Commune, but only in October 1992 did it withdraw from the eastern zone.

53. The limited Croatian resistance in October 1991 meant that relatively little damage through shelling was done to the region: this was restricted to a kind of crescent around the city, where resistance crystallised. The city and Old Town were subjected to scattered bombardment in October and November, and the population of the region shrank to about 15,000 in December 1991. The worst single bombardment on the Old Town, mainly with mortars, took place on 6 December. The rapid withdrawal by the Federal forces in May, and the equally rapid advance of Croatian forces, far better equipped in artillery than in October, led to a serious cycle of bombardments in May-July on the Old and New Towns that was potentially far more dangerous than the earlier bombardments, because large calibres were being used. However, a truce was organised by the international organisations present.

54. While international attention was drawn to the Old Town, the most serious damage, both to the heritage and to a way of life, was being carried out in the rural zone of the Commune. Western journalists wrote about this as early as December 1991, more of it was visible after June to the delegation of the Parliamentary Assembly, but the full extent was known only after October. This part of the report deals mainly with the destruction in the rural areas of the Commune, but refers also to the situation of the Old Town and the immediate environs.

Old Town of Dubrovnik

(a) Evaluation of damage, the Unesco Action Plan

55. The damage to the Old Town has been documented in a series of unpublished Unesco reports, and evaluations have been carried out by the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments on the whole city, but have not apparently been updated since the latest bombardments. In December 1992 Unesco finalised with the national and local heritage authorities an action plan for the Old Town, which is a World Heritage Site (estimated at \$10,000,000 according to the local authorities), and this effort has been much enhanced by the active participation of Italian and French experts.

(b) Roofs and burned buildings

56. The fact-finding mission found that repair and restoration work in the Old Town was at a virtual standstill. The hundreds of holes in the roofs of Dubrovnik were still covered with fading tarpaper, which is periodically blown off by the strong north wind, and it is often several days before the paper is set back in place, and during this time the roofing structures and interiors are exposed to the elements.

57. Moreover, the detonations of the heavy calibre shells in June had severely shaken some roof structures (for example the Convent of the Clarisses), causing sliding of tiles and the opening of roofs. These roofs had clearly received little attention since June.

58. The fact-finding mission also noticed large holes in two roofs that had not been covered: according to credible sources of information, one of these was the roof of the Orthodox priest's house, apparently locked and therefore "inaccessible". The other building, in the northwest part of the Old Town, too was locked.

59. Of the nine buildings burned, or partially burned in the 6 December 1991 bombardment, one - the Dubrovnik Festival building - has received a temporary roof cover, but none of the others (although the tops of the façades have been capped to prevent seepage). One of these buildings, the Sorkocevic Palace in Ulica Miha Pracata, is even accessible from the street.

(c) Cultural vandalism in the Old Town

60. The bronze statue to the memory of the "unknown partisan", by a local sculptor of national reknown, Frano Krsinic, located in the small public square within Ploce Gate, was dynamited and the pieces, visible at the beginning of the expert's stay, were removed by unknown parties to an unknown location several days later. Stone plaques commemorating the liberation and heroes of the post-war Yugoslav Republic have been shot away.

The cultural heritage in the environs of the Town of Dubrovnik

(a) The University Centre

61. West of the Old Town a 19th-century Austrian building, the University Centre, was burned along with its library- probably the single most serious cultural loss at Dubrovnik during the war- on 6 December 1991. It is presently being rebuilt under the auspices of the University of Zagreb.

(b) The Benedictine Monastery on Lokrum Island

62. It had been said that the Benedictine Monastery on Lokrum Island opposite the Old Town, used as a restaurant and a museum of marine life, was heavily damaged in shelling. In the monastery the 19th-century residence of Maximilian, Emperor of Mexico, was damaged by a heavy calibre impact on the upper façade (since filled with bricks), and the buildings on the cloister have surface damage from fragments. The roof over the east gallery has been open since before the war, because the monastery was undergoing restoration, and perhaps the most significant damage has been due to the elements (this restoration includes a large amount of concrete reinforcing, such as Unesco has done its best to discourage in the Old Town). Other parts of the ensemble, said to be damaged, could not be visited. A small chapel outside the monastery complex was hit in the roof.

63. The round military tower on Lokrum was consistently targetted by the Federal artillery, and received numerous hits from all types of calibres, with serious damage to the upper sections.

(c) The Summer Palaces in Rijeka Dubrovacka

64. A series of beautiful aristocratic summer residences were built in Lapad and the Rijeka Dubrovacka from the last part of the 16th century until the 18th century. The Parliamentary Assembly delegation visited three of these in August and the present fact-finding mission restricted its activities to the palaces in Rijeka Dubrovacka.

65. The most seriously damaged palace is the very large (17th-century) Bizzaro palace at Komolac, whose grove of cypresses and chapel are still intact, despite the road that was driven through the grounds before the war. This structure, disfigured by concrete additions, was destroyed by burning and not by shelling. The cornice of the Sorkocevic Palace (visited in August) has been replaced with Brac stone, whose surface has been treated to resemble Korcula stone, and the impact on the façade has been plugged with concrete.

(d) Mount Srdj and Zarkovica

66. The "Imperial Fort", built during the Napoleonic occupation, was heavily damaged by Federal bombardment, but could not be visited because it is occupied by the Croatian army. A big redoubt, on Zarkovica, was built by the Austrians: it too was damaged by shelling from both Croatian and Federal forces, but it could not be seen from the inside for similar reasons. The great cross on Srdj was destroyed by shelling- it was indeed a favorite target of the Federal artillery. A gift from the people of the Island of Brac in 1936, the cross will be rebuilt by Brac; the fact-finding mission suggested that the pieces of the destroyed cross be used as a balustrade.

(e) Mali Ston

67. Commanding access to the Peljesac peninsula (and thence to the island of Korcula), the town of Mali Ston, established as a kind of military colony of Dubrovnik in the 14th century and similar in architecture and urbanism to the mother town, was continuously bombarded by the Federal artillery in October-December 1991 and later. Two houses were burned out, many roofs broken open, the Chapel of St. Anthony and the pillars of the bell emplacement were heavily damaged.

68. The fact-finding mission was pleasantly surprised to discover that many roofs had been repaired, along with the chapel (for which tiles in the traditional form, and similar in colour if not material had been found) and bell emplacement. This happy initiative was due to the town of Makarska, southeast of Split, which had provided workers and organised the purchase of tiles.

69. In nearby Ston the memorial to the partisans was vandalised- the statue was removed, though a dramatic bronze frieze was left intact.

War destruction to villages and small towns in the Commune of Dubrovnik

(a) Calendar and types of destruction

70. The fact-finding mission was repeatedly told that this devastation took place from October to December 1991, but it was clear that it continued until the late spring of 1992, and perhaps longer. In Slano at least one building was marked as having been burned in April 1992, in Bosanka and Zvecovica, in the eastern part of the Commune, soldiers' calendars running up until March and April were found painted on walls.

71. Some of the destruction occurred during fighting: in the western part of the Commune of Lisac was damaged by Federal artillery in October 1991, but probably by Croatian artillery in May 1992; in this zone Trnova was the scene of fighting in October, as was Osojnik; Brgat and Bosanka, northeast of Dubrovnik, were hit during the Federal advance.

72. Yet this kind of military damage is minimal compared to the damage done by the firing of villages and individual houses. Firing is not even the extreme on a scale of vandalism- for there are cases of dynamiting, usually for modern houses (Zupa Dubrovacka, Slano, Mocosica).

73. Vandalism affected probably every built structure in the Commune of Dubrovnik under the control of Federal forces: in other words, in the opinion of this expert, every building was visited. Yet, if some received only a bullet or two in the windows and were vandalised of only a video-cassette player, others were totally emptied and still others were fired. Schools, co-operatives, community centres, shops, houses, farm buildings, churches, administrative buildings, cement plants and quarry works were all visited: the quarry of Visocani lost all its machinery. Pigs, cows and sheep were driven off, barrels of wine and brandy, and wine-presses were taken away, cars and tractors were stolen, blown up, crushed by tanks or else damaged and pushed into ditches; televisions, stoves and refrigerators were shot up when they were not burned in houses and dumped into ditches.

74. This vandalism was clearly organised and not spontaneous: in Slano it was even signed by an officer; moreover, destruction of such extent simply had to be organised, because it was an extraordinary expenditure of an army's energy.

75. However, it was fortunately more erratic than is commonly admitted and many villages escaped the worst. In Trnovica, the first village on one of the invasion routes, only three buildings were burned: two were apparently fired by mistake, before the Federal forces found the house they were looking for- that of a rich farmer who was an

outspoken Croatian nationalist. In the villages on the north part of Cilipi valley in the eastern zone there was little damage, the burnings here and there being targeted specifically against individuals with political connections or of some socio-economic status. In Cavdat, occupied by its 3,000 inhabitants, who were unable to escape to Dubrovnik there was no burning, and in other villages where a few people remained firing was infrequent. In other words there was an element of shame in destroying people's homes in their presence. Moreover, the differing degrees of destruction - in the opinion of this expert - reflected the reticences of individual officers about carrying out orders.

76. Some villages- notably those on the Adriatic just west of the Rijeka Dubrovacka- escaped with little damage because the Federal army pulled out so rapidly in May.

(b) Statistics on destruction of buildings outside the Old Town

77. The central Institute for Protection of Cultural Monuments has elaborated a six-category scale of damage for detailed evaluations of monuments. The first three are "light to medium damage", the fourth "heavy damage", the fifth "partly destroyed", the sixth "entirely destroyed". These classifications and the evaluation system have also been used in Herzegovina.

78. The Dubrovnik Restoration Institute has surveyed the damage to the Commune and presented it in three categories: "light to medium" (direct impact on roof or façade, categories 1 to 3 on the central scale), "heavy" (many impacts, building burned out totally or partially, categories 4 and 5 on the scale), "destruction" (building reduced to an unstable shell or totally levelled, category 6 on the scale).

79. In the western part of the Commune, Primorje, 1,094 structures suffered light to medium damage, 349 heavy damage and 393 destruction.

80. In the central zone, including the Rijecka Dubrovacka, the new and old towns and Bosanka northeast of the city, 2,748 buildings suffered light to medium damage, 307 heavy damage and 86 destruction.

81. In the Zupa Dubrovacka, which contains a great many buildings built in the last twenty years, 942 suffered light to medium damage, 416 heavy damage, and 96 destruction.

82. In Konavle 1,047 structures are listed as having suffered light to medium damage, 572 heavy damage and 38 destruction.

83. A total of 5,831 buildings are in the light to medium damage category, and 2,257

in the heavy damage to destroyed categories, representing 29% of the total building stock of the Commune, certainly over 40% of the occupied rural zones. While these figures are subject to some discussion- the total of 116 destroyed buildings in Slano (Primorje) seems too high- they reflect fairly faithfully the extent of heavy damage throughout the Commune.

(c) The destruction to the cultural heritage in Primorje and Konavle

84. The Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Dubrovnik has not carried out a survey of the damage to the cultural heritage outside of the city area, and accordingly only a partial view can be presented here. It should also be pointed out that the fact-finding mission did not visit all the villages.

- the villages, churches, funeral chapels and cemeteries of Primorje

85. The villages above the coast are the least known to tourists of Dubrovnik Commune; they are also the most beautiful and, in terms of heritage, the most authentic. They are set at the foot of arid rocky hills, marked by the age-old boundaries of sheep pens. Strung out in groups of hamlets- the result of family groupings- they overlook more or less fertile plains and terraces, interspersed with olive trees and scrub oaks. The two or three- storey buildings are of limestone blocks, often laid out in rows as are the houses of Dubrovniks: red tiles have replaced the limestone slabs that link this architecture to the Turkish and Christian architecture of Herzegovina- but these slabs are still found on some of the farm buildings. Circular emplacements for grinding grain are extremely common. After World War II a few concrete structures were added to these buildings, but they are invisible from a distance, and the poverty of the area has prevented the kind of building that is prevalent in Zupa Dubrovacka (stucco on concrete and brick, balconies). Chapels built in the Austrian period, also of limestone, are perched in the midst of cemeteries on hills above the villages or on hillocks in the valleys. The combination of colours, building elements and landscape is striking, and one is tempted to say that with the Old Town of Dubrovnik, these are the heritage treasures of the Commune. These areas have slowly been depopulated since World War II, and they seem to function in quasi-autarcty. The villages of Visocani and Smokovljani are kept alive to a large extent through the activity of the nearby quarry.

86. The fact-finding mission carefully visited Lisac, Majkovi (upper), , Oslje, Osojnik, Slano, Smokovljani, Trnova, Trnovica, Visocani, and passed through or beside Cepikuce, Majkovi (lower), Mravinca, Podgora, and Stupa. The figures for destruction, which concern mainly traditional stone houses built before World War II, are as follows:

Heavily damaged and destroyed buildings :

Cepikuce: 35

Lisac: 40

Majkovi: 29

Mravinca: 13

Oslje: 14

Osojnik: 143

Podgora: 15

Slano: 250

Smokovljani: 33

Stupa: 14

Trnova: 23

Trnovica: 5

Visocani: 30

87. At Trnovica the funeral chapel was vandalised, as was the Holy Spirit church near Lisac, the roof of the funeral chapel between Stupa and Oslje was destroyed by bombardment, and the cemetery slightly damaged by mortars, the roof of the church of St. George at Osojnik was destroyed by bombardment and by fire provoked by the shelling, and the village cemetery heavily damaged by mortars, the funeral chapel at Trnova was also vandalised and the cemetery damaged by mortars. The damage done to cemeteries is striking, but it must be set in a military context- the cemeteries, on high ground, are excellent observation points, which does not exclude the possibility of deliberate bombardment for non-military reasons.

88. The opening of graves by Federal soldiers was often evoked, but the fact-finding mission can say that only one village cemetery (Osojnik) presents some evidence of this kind of desecration. Some slabs in the poor zone seem to have been moved violently and recently with crow-bars. Given the gravity of the accusations, and the powerful impact of such allegations on local feelings, it can only be hoped that the Croatian police will open their files and make available all their photographic evidence.

- The destruction of heritage at Slano

89. Slano was deliberately burned out: practically only the village church and the Franciscan monastery of St. Jerome (15th century) escaped this damage. It was reported to the Austrian fact-finding mission (AS/Cult/AA (44) 9), which did not go to Dubrovnik, that a collection of 300 paintings was stolen at the monastery, but no such collection existed and only three paintings (unfortunately unidentified Italian masters) were removed. A half-hearted attempt to burn the door of the monastery was made, and its buildings suffered interior damage through burning. The monastery church itself was vandalised, the organ damaged, and there were several hits on the tower.

90. Apart from the monastery the heritage value of Slano is represented mainly by the Austrian buildings of the old centre, which were burned out and in two important buildings on the outskirts, the Palace of the Rectors (15th century) and the Ohmučević Summer Palace (18th century), both of which met the same fate. The destruction of the latter, privately owned and containing a library and traditional Dubrovnik furniture of quality, is regarded as a very serious loss.

- Villages, churches, funeral chapels, and cemeteries in Konavle

91. The eastern zone of the Commune is known as Konavle: it is dominated by the long valley of Cilipi, also the location of the airport of Dubrovnik. The contrast with Primorje is striking- the mountains are less barren, the farmland (vinyards, fields of

wheat and barley, market gardens) more fertile. While the characteristic family compounds, surrounded by family lands, loosen the texture of villages, there are tighter village structures (such as Gruda) and a great many large buildings of quality denote the old implantation of the noble families of Dubrovnik in the region. There are many new houses, some of them built to receive tourists, and entire new villages (such as Zvecovica), also a reflection of the integration of the region into the tourist economy of Dubrovnik. The farmers of Konavle sell much produce on Montenegrin and Bosnian market places. The area also retains the memory of the Montenegrin incursion of 1806 (the fact-finding mission found a commemorative plaque to this event in one of the burned houses of Gruda). Though the area was seriously vandalised, the destruction is concentrated in Cilipi and Gruda (237 of 610 heavily damaged and destroyed buildings), Mocici and Zvekovicica (respectively 63 and 61 buildings): in other words the worst destruction took place along the main invasion and transport axis.

92. For purposes of convenience Bosanka, Brgat, Bujici, Grdavac, and Postranje have been included in this zone; accurately speaking they do not belong to Konavle.

93. The fact-finding mission visited Bosanka, Brgat, Cilipi, Dubravka, Dunave, Grdavac, Gruda, Mocici, and Pridvorje, and passed rapidly through Molunat and Radovcici (at dusk for these last two localities). Bujici and Zvekovicica have been left out of the report, though the second village contains half-a-dozen traditional houses that met the same fate of their modern counterparts.

Heavily damaged and destroyed structures:

Bosanka: 44

Cilipi: 122

Dubravka: 29

Dunave: 9

Gruda: 115

Mocici: 63

Molunat: 11

Pridvorje: 5

Radovcici: 44

(Brgat, Bujici, Grdavac, Postranje were grouped in the figures for Zupa Dubrovacka by the Dubrovnik Restoration Institute)

94. The most striking village ensembles to be damaged are Cilipi and Gruda.

95. The historic centre of Cilipi, including a street of stone houses leading off the main road, contained a fine palace with pillars, two buildings of the ethnographic museum of

Konavle (part of the collection was saved), the priest's house and several other large stone buildings, and formed a handsome, if somewhat theatrical ensemble isolated from the rest of the village, grouped around the church of St. Nicholas. This historic centre was visited by some 40,000 tourists every year, drawn by folk manifestations. All the buildings were burned out in December 1991: only the Church of St. Nicholas, which was vandalised (the group of the Holy Family being singled out for particularly savage treatment), was left standing, its belfry damaged slightly by mortars and the sacristy roof destroyed, apparently by mortars (this part of the building could not be visited). The inscription on the church celebrating the millenium of the Croatian king Tomislav, was painted over in red.

96. Gruda, grouped along a main road, received similar treatment from the Federal Army, and its traditional building stock, containing big country houses and farm complexes, may be of even greater heritage interest than that of Cilipi.

97. At Bosanka, Brgat, and Postranje, rather more damage was done by artillery, which seriously damaged the upper façade of the small Holy Saviour church (the front and side walls are leaning away from each other) and the cemetery at Bosanka. In Brgat the new Church of St. Anne (beginning of the 20th century) was hit on its north and south walls, which suggests that it may also have targetted by Croatian artillery. This church was also vandalised, and the inscription commemorating the millenium of Tomislav painted over. The Old Church of St. Anne was also damaged in the roof by rockets and the cemetery hit by mortars. At Postranje the village church (beginning of the 20th century) was heavily damaged by artillery, which destroyed the roof. Finally, mention should also be made of the "Sailor's Church" (1873) on the main road approaching Zupa Dubrovačka, whose roof was blown in when the Federal Army dynamited the road and hamlet of Dubac.

- The Franciscan Monastery at Pridvorje

98. The most serious damage to the religious heritage in the Commune was the burning of part of the monastic buildings of the Franciscan monastery (15th-16th centuries) at Pridvorje, a small ensemble with a very beautiful, if overgrown cloister. The monastery contained a remarkable 15th-century wooden Christ on the Cross, which was saved by the Dubrovnik Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments at the beginning of the war. The church and monastic buildings were damaged by artillery fire in October 1991, which may have destroyed the roof of the east wing of the monastic buildings, but this wing and the first floor of the north wing were probably destroyed later by fire. Over the main entrance of the monastery figures a plaque to a visit of the Croatian leader of the Peasant's Party, Stiepan Radic, assassinated in the Yugoslav Parliament by a Serbian nationalist in 1928, set up in 1971, and it may be wondered if the presence of this plaque provided the excuse for burning the buildings and vandalising the interior of the church (altars smashed, paintings slashed and statutes damaged). The Franciscan monastery was in bad need of restoration before the war, and the war damage has added to the list of work that must be done to return to the establishment to something of its original beauty.

- The firing of Ivanica and Croatian reprisals in southern Bosnia-Herzegovina

99. Visible to the north of Brgat, just within the borders of Bosnia-Herzegovina, is the Serbian village of Ivanica. This village was burned by the Croatian army, according to an EC monitor, blocked at the entrance of the village by Croatian forces while the firing was taking place.

100. Both EC monitors and UNPROFOR are convinced that similar burnings have taken place in the areas of southern Bosnia-Herzegovina in the control of the Croatian army or the (Croatian) Herzegovinian Corps, but they do not have access to these zones. The EC monitors, whose mission includes recording of infractions against human rights, have also registered cases of dynamiting of Serbian property in the Commune of Dubrovnik, but did not make any statistics available.

Conclusion for the Commune of Dubrovnik

101. The Federal Army attempted to destroy the economic capacity of the Commune of Dubrovnik, which includes its cultural heritage, but the religious heritage was, by and large, treated less brutally than palaces and traditional houses.

102. There has been at least one major act of reprisal against a Serbian village on the border of the Commune.

103. The traditional houses of the Commune have often suffered more than modern houses: when fired, the wooden roof structure and floors of the former burn entirely, leaving a heap of charred wood and roofing tiles in a shell; in the modern houses the fires are often contained by concrete floors and the roofs do not burn out. Many of these gutted buildings have remained exposed to the elements for over a year now, and the stability of many walls has worsened.

104. There is a great need for emergency materials (tarpaulins, tar paper, plastic, wood, tiles), tools, and scaffolding, but even if these were available the general feeling is that little could be done this winter to rebuild.

105. When the mechanisms for long-term loans are put into place (for the moment there are loans of DM 6,000 per owner, virtually useless for major work), the temptation to tear down the older buildings and replace them with new homes will be very strong. Uncontrolled building had already modified the landscape of Zupa Dubrovacka and Konavle before the war. Moreover, there is no binding legal protection for the villages in the Commune, even though the vernacular heritage was inventoried about fifteen years ago. The recent Croatian administrative reform, creating numerous local municipalities, is probably a godsend for reconstruction. However, it may be difficult, in the face of the initiatives and demands of local municipalities, to enforce protection of the heritage.

106. It would be desirable to organise on the spot a major international meeting (Council of Europe, Unesco, Unep, Icomos, Ecovast) in order to discuss protection of villages and post-war restoration policy.

107. The war is not over: the rural zones and the city of Dubrovnik itself are still within the range of artillery stationed around Trebinje in southern Bosnia. Small arms and

heavy artillery fire are audible in Konavle near Dunave, and every so often a heavy calibre shell falls in the area of Osojnik.