

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

## **THIRD INFORMATION REPORT**

**Doc. 6904**

20 September 1993

---

### **Contents**

**A. Update** by Dr Colin Kaiser, consultant expert 2

**B. The situation of the cultural heritage in Mostar and Sarajevo** by Dr Marian Wenzel, Bosnia-Herzegovina Heritage Rescue Foundation, consultant expert 11

**C. Note on war damage in Zadar** by Dr Marian Wenzel 28

**D. Brief note on a visit to Sarajevo (June 1993)**

by Mr Roger C Shrimplin, Chairman East Europe Committee, Royal Institute of British Architects 31

**E. Co-ordination meeting on the cultural heritage of former Yugoslavia (Paris, 28 June 1993)** 34

**F. Concluding note** 42

---

### **A. UPDATE ON WAR DAMAGE TO THE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN CROATIA AND BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA**

by Dr Colin Kaiser, consultant expert

(June 1993)

#### **Introduction**

1. At the request of the Committee on Education and Culture (8 June, Oslo), fact-finding activities were continued by the Sub-Committee on the Architectural and Artistic Heritage. The following brief report has been prepared for the coordination meeting of international organisations called at the request of Mr. Jacques Baumel, Chairman of the Sub-Committee on 28 June, in Paris.

2. Two notable contacts were made in June - one with the Institute for the Protection of Historical and Natural Heritage of Sarajevo, the other with Dr. Nikola Kovac, Minister

of Culture of Bosnia-Herzegovina, who was informed by Dr. Kaiser of the activity of the Sub-Committee and the next mission, which he is looking forward to receiving in Sarajevo.

## **Croatia**

### Continuation of the War

3. The zones indicated in the second report, from Gospic to Sibenik, continue to undergo heavy fighting, less in the form of attempts to seize territory than as artillery bombardments, mainly on front positions, but sometimes on towns (notably Zadar) and villages behind the lines. None of the Croatian institutes have forwarded information on the condition of the cultural heritage previous to or following these bombardments.

4. The situation in the occupied zones of Croatia continues to be unknown. However the Croatian medias claimed that the late medieval Catholic Church of St. Anthony at Knin (southern Krajina) was recently destroyed and the emplacement turned into a parking lot (similar accusations have been made regarding the site of the Aladza mosque in Foca in Bosnia-Herzegovina).

### Restoration Initiatives

5. Following the previous information report further initiatives have come to light:

#### *Ecole d'Architecture de Nantes (France)*

6. Contacts have been established between a group of young architects of Zagreb and the School of Architecture of Nantes in view of carrying out an evaluation of the destruction of the heritage and housing of the village of Nustar in Slavonia and preparing restoration projects. An exhibition on Nustar was shown at the School of Architecture on 26 May - 3 June.

#### *Initiatives in the Commune of Dubrovnik*

7. Generally speaking foreign aid, apart from that sent by the Croatian diaspora, is slow in coming, and the most noticeable initiatives are those based within the country.

8. The Zagreb branch of the Soros Foundation has provided financial support for documentation of the condition of the villages in the Primorje, to be carried out in cooperation with the Dubrovnik Institute for the Protection of Historic Monuments. This initial aid may be followed by aid for building materials.

9. Croatian Caritas has brought in building materials for the villages.

## **Bosnia-Herzegovina**

### Intensification and Spread of Fighting

10. War destruction to cultural heritage continues, spreading into areas that hitherto have been spared. Although the heritage of Croatia is slowly acquiring international attention, Bosnia-Herzegovina has not been so fortunate. Moreover, good information remains scarce.

11. However, Dr. Marian Wenzel, Secretary General of Bosnia-Herzegovina Heritage Rescue U.K., and Roger Shrimplin, Chairman of the East Europe Committee of the Royal Institute of British Architects, carried out the very first international mission for cultural heritage to Sarajevo on 12-18 June. This reports refers to some of the information transmitted during their mission, but more should be forthcoming in time for the meeting of 28 June.

### Central Bosnia

12. Following the Washington Conference, the situation in Central Bosnia, from Mostar to Travnik exploded: fighting around Konjic, initiated earlier by Bosnian forces (BiH), intensified, with the Croatian press accusing these forces of burning many villages; around Travnik, where fighting in April was confirmed by UNPROFOR to have been provoked by the HVO, there was a strong counter-offensive by BiH, with Travnik being damaged by the artillery of both sides, along with surrounding villages. Each side accuses the other of "ethnic cleansing", which relies heavily on burning. It should be pointed out that Konjic and especially Travnik are historic towns in their own right.

13. There is no precise information on the damage done to heritage, though the correspondent of Le Monde, Yves Heller, confirmed that savage vandalism by BiH forces had taken place in the Franciscan monastery at Guca Gora and in at least one Catholic church in Travnik (19 June)

14. However, there is apparently a group of Bosnian architects in Zenica who are collecting information on the situation of cultural heritage there. Perhaps the projected Sub-Committee mission could attempt to contact them.

### Herzegovina

15. Dr. Marian Wenzel was in Mostar on 7-8 June, but she was unable to see the town centre, which is a front zone. According to the staff of the Office for Monuments, the university library, stored in the basement of a building used by Caritas, was destroyed by fire; moreover, the two fine late 19th-century Austrian school buildings located on the west bank - the Grammar School had received only minor damage to the facade from impacts during the fighting from April to June 1992 - were also destroyed by fire. These incidents took place during the fighting in May between HVO and BiH forces. In other words, the destruction of the heritage of Mostar knows no respite. Moreover, it may be feared that the "ethnic cleansing" carried out in Central Bosnia by BiH forces

will provoke a vast retaliation in Mostar that will spare neither the traditional mahala districts nor the mosques.

16. It was reported by Reuters (15 May, on the basis of a dispatch from Tanjug, the Yugoslavian press agency) that a mosque was destroyed at Ljubuški i.e. in a zone controlled by HVO forces.

#### Eastern and Northern Bosnia

17. The Moslem enclaves of Gorazde and Srebrenica have been the scene of fierce fighting, with heavy bombardment of the former throughout June. Western media cited UNPROFOR observers as saying that 44% of the houses in the eastern part of Gora\_de had been destroyed. Moreover, Sarajevo Radio accuses the Serbian militias of destroying many villages around both of these towns.

18. The town of Maglaj, which boasts one of the finest mosques in Bosnia-Herzegovina (Kuršumli D\_amija - "the lead mosque"), and a town centre with 18th-century buildings, came under really serious Serbian militia artillery bombardment for the first time since the war began.

19. Finally, there has been much fighting elsewhere (notably around Grada\_ac).

20. For these areas is virtually no information on the situation of cultural heritage.

#### Cultural Cleansing behind the Lines

21. In the second information report the problem of the continuation of cultural cleansing after the war was evoked. This situation exists de facto in the zones that fell rapidly under the control of the Serbian militias in April-May 1992. While a great deal of destruction seems to have taken place early in the war, in some places the mosques were left alone.

22. In Banja Luka, it seems that the most of the incidents involving the dynamiting or firing of mosques took place in May 1993 (at least four of five). However, according to Jean-Baptiste Naudet (Le Monde, 17 June) there are still 10 mosques standing in Banja Luka of 15 that the city boasted before the war. In other words, to cry "apocalypse" is to treat the remaining 10 mosques as already destroyed and to discourage attempts to address the question of cultural heritage (see below, Letter from the Sarajevo Institute for the Protection of Historical and Natural Heritage). If slow ethnic cleansing is turning into the norm in occupied zones, the cultural heritage is a prime target for nocturnal vandalism that kills nobody but which is designed to intimidate the population that has persisted in remaining. This makes it all the more imperative to attempt to discover exactly what has happened to cultural heritage in the zones occupied especially by the Serbian militias and to seek to protect what remains.

23. Perhaps one ways of heading off such destruction (and laying the foundations for cultural cooperation in Bosnia-Herzegovina after the war) would be to set up exchanges of experts from the different zones. They would check the condition of the heritage, and

the neutrality of their conclusions could be assured by the presence of outside observers. This was suggested to Dr. Wenzel in Mostar, and perhaps an appeal along these lines could be made by the Sub-Committee.

#### Rectification of Damage Reports for Sarajevo

24. In the second information report a list of likely damage to heritage was presented. Since then information has been received on several cultural institutions and one mosque (which has been identified on video-cassettes).

#### *National and University Library*

25. According to Relief Fund for the National and University Library of Sarajevo the fire in the library provoked by the Serbian bombardment of 23-24 August 1992 destroyed the upper repositories - the complete lending stock, all the reference publications, the music collection. However, the incunabules, the manuscripts, the archives, the rare books, the Bosnian collection and much of the Bosnia-Herzegovinian periodical collection - not to mention some stored volumes from the other lending library - were saved. In other words, the damage was fortunately less than feared in terms of losses to irreplaceable documents, but still very serious (perhaps 600,000 volumes - a figure given by Dr. Mustafi\_, see below - out of a total of 1,500,000 library units).

#### *Zemalski Musej*

26. Dr. Wenzel reported that the museum shows little damage, but that much of the archaeological collection remains unprotected, in situ. She recommended that the Roman stone monuments and medieval tombstones be swathed in plaster and that curtains and plastic for roofing be recuperated to make sandbags.

#### *Magribija Mosque (15th century)*

27. This mosque was described in the Riyasat list as being in a state of ruin, with the minaret knocked down. This mosque, with its distinctive wooden porch, figures clearly in a video taken probably in the summer of 1992. The stone minaret was indeed cut, just below roof level, but the pinnacle, probably of traditional materials and not a heavy concrete restoration, was visible on the roof. While the roof tiles had been blown off the wooden frame, the frame itself had not collapsed. A second video, taken just a few months ago shows the mosque in the same state, without any covering on the roof.

28. This information on the library and the mosque demonstrate that all data coming out of the war zones must be treated with circumspection; the second and third cases also reveal the enormous material - and probably psychological difficulties - that prevent people from being able to protect their heritage. Both of these points render all the more necessary an international presence and aid.

#### Letter from the Institute for the Protection of Historical and Natural Heritage (Sarajevo)

29. For the first time, official contact has been made with the cultural heritage authorities of Sarajevo. In response to the consultant's letter of 6 April, Dr. Sejdalića Mustafić, Director of the Institute for the Protection of Historical and Natural Heritage of Sarajevo, sent a letter to Paris on 16 June by fax. This letter presents approximate global figures for serious damage down to sacred buildings and points out some examples of destruction to individual examples of heritage. Given the importance of the cultural authority this letter must receive careful consideration.

30. For sacred Islamic heritage it claims that in Bosnia-Herzegovina 900 mosques have been destroyed, another 550 heavily damaged, and that 100 of the destroyed mosques represent "the most valuable cultural monuments" - these include 20 mosques dating from the 16th century.

31. It is impossible to evaluate these global figures, except to note that they are far higher than the number of 613 Islamic properties (including mektebs, madrasas, etc.) contained in the lists of the Riyasat (dated September 1992 to February 1993, referred to in the previous report), and the information in the Riyasat lists was frequently exaggerated.

32. Moreover, it is interesting to compare the figure of 1,450 mosques destroyed or heavily damaged with the total number of 801 registered monuments damaged in Croatia, which includes monuments receiving only minor damage. If the figures are accurate, the damage done to the sacred heritage of the Ottoman period would far exceed the destruction carried out in both world wars in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Indeed, it would represent close to the total annihilation of that heritage in occupied zones.

33. The letter also notes that about 100 Catholic churches, monasteries and other Catholic properties have been destroyed, and "about the same number...seriously damaged". The Archbishopric of Bosnia, in its list of March 1993, indicated 103 properties for which there was damage of varying level, but this list also included properties for which there was no information (5). According to a French journalist who has been to Banja Luka on two occasions (Jean-Baptiste Naudet), the Archbishopric of Banja Luka reported that 26 churches had been destroyed and another 32 damaged to some degree in zones outside of the fronts, not to mention presbyteries and other ecclesiastical properties. If the two lists are added together - and they do not include Catholic properties in Herzegovina and Southeast Bosnia - they represent a total of 156 buildings and complexes for which there are varying degrees of damage. They do not provide, in fact, any standard of comparison for the figures of the Institute of Sarajevo. Furthermore neither the Institute's figures nor those of the two archbishoprics have been verified by outsiders.

34. The letter advances no figures for Orthodox properties, except to note that "several very valuable sacral installations...are also destroyed".

35. The letter draws attention to destruction (or serious damage) to pilgrimage churches and other holy sites, to archaeological sites, to the cultural institutions of Sarajevo. If the information on Sarajevo seems largely correct, it is not at all certain that archaeological site of Mogorjelo was damaged: in December 1992 the architects and archaeologists of Mostar did not show it to the consultant, affirming that it had not suffered harm.

36. Finally, the letter notes the "systematic and planned destruction of old city urban units mostly inhabited by Bosnian Muslims (average 90%)", and cites a number of towns and cities that have undergone serious bombardment, but it also refers to Blagaj, which at least in December 1992, had not received much damage. It is not entirely clear if the "90%" refers to the urban population that is Muslim, or to the destruction. Percentages this high were frequently bandied about for Mostar (for the period before December 1992), and they were nonsense and counter-productive. Moreover, it is not just Muslim districts that are bombarded. Apart from these questions and reservations there can be no doubt that old urban centres are often targetted.

37. The letter from Dr. Mustafi\_ is exceedingly alarming: inasmuch as the Muslim heritage is concerned, the word "catastrophe" that seemed appropriate in the earlier information reports, is being challenged by "apocalypse". It is easy to criticize a letter whose basic intention was to establish contact with the Sub-Committee and not to provide information. Without endorsing what Dr. Mustafi\_ has written, it is serious enough - notably following the earlier information reports - to underscore the necessity of strengthening the interest of the international community and its representatives on the spot in the situation of the cultural heritage in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Exaggerated evaluations by locals of destruction will be branded as propaganda (when they are often a reflection of despair and astonishment in the face of destruction) and they can backfire on those who propose them and hinder the work of those organisations who attempt to intervene on behalf of this heritage. If an apocalypse has taken place, only an international organisation will be believed by the international community.

#### Restoration of the Cultural Heritage of Bosnia-Herzegovina

##### *Fund for the Restoration of National and University Libraries in Bosnia and Herzegovina*

38. In November 1992 at the meeting of members of the Citizen's Helsinki Assembly it was decided to launch a project for the reconstruction of the National and University Libraries of Sarajevo. The appeal sent by the international secretariat stressed that "we must not wait for "better times" or for "more appropriate conditions", and that "in launching projects for reconstruction - despite continuation of the war and destruction we cancel the effects of the destruction".

39. The project called for utilisation of the network of the International Pen Club, sponsorship by intellectuals, distribution and publication of petitions in prestigious periodicals and other techniques to sensitize intellectuals everywhere, providing of facilities by great libraries to receive and stock books for the future reconstructed library, contacting a wide variety of publishers, libraries, academies, the churches to reconstitute the book fund, asking for equipment and system donations from the major manufacturers of computers. Sub-projects include creation of Archives on the War and a related data-base, and the donations by artists of works for a museum of modern art that will be part of the library complex (sub-project Guernica).

40. Following launching of the project a Disaster Relief Fund was established at the Institute for Information Science in Maribor Slovenia, which is now the institutional base for the project. Coordinators have been designated in Copenhagen, Sienna and Malta.

41. The scope of this project has steadily widened to include the Oriental Institute and all national and university libraries having suffered war damage (15 June). An international committee for the foundation will be designated by Unesco, and the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions will be closely associated.

42. To date, along with the Unesco Action Plan for the Old Town of Dubrovnik this is the most ambitious international reconstruction/restoration project in the cultural field in the countries directly involved in the war. It is easy to point out the difficulties inherent in such large undertakings, but what must not be forgotten is their capacity to mobilize attention and stimulate other efforts, especially by breaking down the tenacious prejudice that nothing can be done until the war ends.

### **Conclusion**

43. This report adds nothing to the conclusions and recommendations of the previous reports: the situation today for Bosnia-Herzegovina and much of Croatia is worse than it was six months ago, and the same conclusions and recommendations can be made. What may be stressed, rather than added, is the astonishing lack of will on the part of the international community with respect to the defence of the cultural heritage of Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina or even to imagining what its future could be when the fighting stops.

44. This will could be expressed in the launching of a campaign for either or both of the countries grievously scarred by the war, or even of campaigns on the model of those noted above for the mosques of Bosnia-Herzegovina or for the historic districts of Mostar -many times worse damaged by the ongoing war than Old Dubrovnik, and although perhaps not of equal value for world architectural heritage, certainly of far greater value in human terms as a symbol of the cohabitation of different communities. Either would be severely criticized as leaving to one side this or that type of cultural heritage, but such criticisms might serve to stimulate other efforts. At the present time the international community seems to be falling back on routine notions of international cultural cooperation without being able to come to grips with the size and significance of the disaster that continues to spread.

### **Appendix**

#### **Letter to Dr Kaiser from Dr Sejdaliya Mustafi\_, Director of the Institute for the protection of the cultural-historical and natural heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo (June 1993)**

.....

We are writing to you on the basis of your letter sent to Mrs Azra Begic on 6 April, in which you asked for information about destruction of cultural heritage in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We would like to inform you that the Institute for the protection of the cultural-historical and natural heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina, established in 1945, is the official institution for the protection of the cultural and natural heritage. Our Institute regularly informed Unesco and other international organisations dealing with the problem of destroying and ruining cultural heritage in B&H from the beginning of



the aggression in April 1992, on the basis of data collected in the last year. However, we have not received any answer up to now. Maybe, there are some problems of communication blockade, but in any case our Institute can be in touch through the Government or its Ministries.

We are glad to know you would like to be informed on destruction of cultural heritage in order to undertake some initiative. We seize the opportunity to inform you in brief, for the first time, about the very difficult condition of the heritage of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian population, especially of the Moslems:

1) Destroyed or heavily ruined are spiritual holy places of the Catholic religion (Church of St Ivo in Podmila\_je near Jajce, Mother of Jesus holy places in Komušina and Olovo), Moslem religion (Ajvatovica near Prusac), Orthodox religion (monastery in \_itomisli\_i near Mostar), Jewish religion (grave and Havra Moše Danona).

2) Many archaeological localities are damages (Mogorjelo, Visi\_i, Ošani\_i), and specially many necropolis with tombstones (Radimlja, Boljuni, Bivolje Brdo).

3) Numerous sacral buildings are totally destroyed or heavily damaged. 900 mosques are completely destroyed (550 seriously ruined) from which about 100 represent the most valuable cultural monuments (about 20 mosques dated to the 16th century). About 100 churches, monasteries and other buildings belonging to the Catholic Church (almost the same number is seriously damaged). Several very valuable sacral installations of the Orthodox Church are also destroyed.

4) Several cultural institutions are completely destroyed. The National Library is completely burnt (600,000 books), the Oriental Institute (about 30,000 manuscripts from the 16th and 17th centuries), the Olympic Museum and other institutions. The Worldly Museum (established 1888), the City Museum of Sarajevo (established in 1945), the Archive of Sarajevo City, the Art Gallery and some other institutions are seriously damaged.

5) The basic characteristic of destroying burst of aggressor army is systematic and planned destruction of old city urban units mostly inhabited by Bosnian Moslems (average 70%), as follows: Grada\_ac, Stolac, Tesanj, Prusac, Blagaj, Zvornik, Višegrad, Fo\_a, Biha\_, Maglaj. The Old City of Mostar and Sarajevo are especially heavily damaged.

We have mentioned just in brief how much cultural heritage is destroyed or damaged, being even further destroyed on the day we send you this fax. That is why, we would like to ask you to let us know what kind of information you are interested in, so that we can send you documented and more explained information to be at your disposal for the purposes you need.

For the beginning of our co-operation, we would like to suggest:

1) We think it would be very useful if you and the delegation of the Council of Europe visit B&H, in fact Sarajevo and some other places possible to visit, to assure yourself on the spot about the catastrophic destruction of cultural heritage of B&H, as a part of Europe's heritage.

2) Please, let us suggest what kind of initiative to start in order to make the Council of Europe discuss the subject of destruction of B&H cultural heritage.

3) We think it is necessary to discuss the question of the influence and coordination of the Council of Europe, Unesco and other international organisation dealing with the cultural heritage.

4) We are ready to send you all wider and documented information from the localities we have information about.

5) For further contacts our address is Njogoševa 8/III, 71000 Sarajevo, PB 650; telephone (071) 663 299; telefax (071) 144 63 27 through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Expecting to continue our contacts

.....

## **B. THE SITUATION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN MOSTAR AND SARAJEVO**

by Dr Marian Wenzel

Bosnia-Herzegovina Heritage Rescue Foundation

and consultant expert (London 27 June 1993)

The following information was gathered by Dr Marian Wenzel, Secretary General, Bosnia-Herzegovina Heritage Rescue Foundation (UK), between 3 and 26 June 1993, and by Mr Roger Shrimplin, Chairman East Europe Committee, Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), between 12 and 19 June 1993.

Whilst a limited number of performing artists as well as journalists, politicians and aid workers have visited Sarajevo, and representatives of various cultural organisations concerned with the heritage have visited Mostar (such as Dr Colin Kaiser, consultant expert for the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, and Francesca von Habsburg and Dr Eric von Hendriksen of the ARCH Foundation), Marian Wenzel and Roger Shrimplin became, by means of this trip, **the first experts concerned with the cultural heritage to visit Sarajevo.**

## **I. Circumstances of the visits to Mostar and Sarajevo**

### **(a) Patrons of the journey**

Both Marian Wenzel and Roger Shrimplin were invited as guests of the Bosnian Government. However, the expenses of their visit were shared by a number of bodies, not all of them Bosnian.

Free movement of both parties was facilitated by provision of press cards from the Art Newspaper, London and Turin (editor, Anna Somers-Cocks).

The ticket for Wenzel and a portion of hotel expenses in Split and Medjugorje, which latter town served as locale for some meetings with colleagues in Mostar, were paid by Mr Mamon Nahas, of the Bosnia-Herzegovina Information Centre in London, which functions at present as a Bosnian Embassy.

In Split, Wenzel was initially guest of the Institute for Protection of Historic Monuments, \_upa Split (director, Dr Joško Belamari\_), and subsequently, until the arrival of Mr Shrimplin on 12 June, personal guest of Dr Nada Ru\_i\_, Minister of Culture, History and Sport in the Government of the town of Split.

After the arrival of Mr Shrimplin, a contribution towards the hotel expenses of both parties was made by the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Government Logistic Centre, Split.

In Sarajevo, hotel expenses of Wenzel in the Holiday Inn were paid by the Open Society Fund, Soros Bosnia, (director: Zdravko Grebo) while the expenses of Roger Shrimplin were paid in full by the Bosnian Government at the specific request of Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic before his departure to Turkey. It must be said that the British Council, which usually covers travel expenses of Roger Shrimplin in Eastern Europe, had been informed by the British Foreign Service shortly before this visit that they were not permitted to pay for any cultural visits to Bosnia. Hence, Shrimplin had to pay his air fares, and most other expenses incurred outside Sarajevo, from his own pocket.

Wenzel has subsequently received a fee from the Council of Europe for the preparation of this report.

#### **(b) Method of travel**

Entry to and exit from Sarajevo was gained by air, on UNHCR food and troop transport carriers. To use these, possession of an UNPROFOR validated press car and a flak jacket was necessary. Internal transport, to the Post and Telegraph (PTT) building within Sarajevo, was provided by UNPROFOR and UNICEF armoured carriers. Both Shrimplin and Wenzel used occasional taxis: Wenzel crossed "Sniper's Alley" (the Boulevard Vojvode Putnik) separating the Zemaljski Museum and the Holiday Inn, by taxi, but walked from the Museum to the town parallel with "Sniper's Alley" on foot, as this was considered more safe.

Relevant parts of the town were visited by walking from one to the next. The rule of thumb was that, when a street crossing allowed a vista of the Trebevi\_ hills, which was from where snipers operated, you ran. It was felt no sniper could get you if you ran. He could get you by mistake if you ran, shooting at someone in front of you, but that was rare. In some parts of the town big screens had been placed alongside walkways to

protect pedestrians from the view of snipers. Snipers were interested in indicating to pedestrians they could in fact shoot them at any time, but sometimes chose not to do so. While Wenzel and Shrimplin were in Sarajevo, snipers shot dogs, walking the street in company with people, and the walls of water-carrying lorries providing water to the populace at various points round the town.

(During the visit to Sarajevo there were only short periods lacking bursts of sniper fire and the sounds of grenades; on the noon of Friday, June 18 there was a short cease-fire which was timed as lasting only 32 minutes).

Entering Mostar was in fact more complicated than entering Sarajevo. Fighting was going on in the town between 5 and 8 June, when Wenzel wished to visit, and although Split-Mostar buses were running on all those days, they were avoided. Wenzel joined a select group of cultural representatives invited from Split to attend celebrations at the town of Siroki Brijeg, Herzegovina, celebrating the "martyrdom" of a large number of Franciscans from that town at the hands of Partisans at the end of the Second World War. The Mostar Department for Protection of Historic Monuments meanwhile made contact with the Split Institute for Protection of Monuments, and on learning Wenzel was at Siroki Brijeg, located her there. The Mostar Department found her a place to stay in Medjugorje where their members joined her daily for discussions.

On 7 June Wenzel was invited into the town to see the Institute headquarters, and to meet Srećko Vučina, President of the Cabinet of the Governing Council of Western Herzegovina. This individual vowed his devotion to the protection of monuments, gave assurances the Mostar bridge stood still happily in its place, gave Wenzel two inscribed books and the loan of a flak jacket, and paid for the petrol for Institute members to drive her back to Split the next day. There was a small-arms exchange going on near his office and there was no possibility to inspect monuments, though the Office provided careful information of recent losses.

On the day of June 7 1993, the front line of the war was said to be around the Catholic Church which Kaiser had visited, about 300-400 metres from the office of Srećko Vučina.

## **II. MOSTAR**

### **(a) Heritage institutions**

The Department for the Protection of Monuments is a sub-section of a body called the Public Enterprise for the Reconstruction and Development of Mostar from which the Department would prefer greater independence.

The **Public Enterprise for the Reconstruction and Development of Mostar** was described by its Director Borislav Puljić as being in toto responsible for:

- a) Town infrastructure (utilities)
- b) Town planning control
- c) Protection of the environment

d) Protection of historic buildings (the above-mentioned Department)

e) Allotment of town-controlled Buildings and residences.

Personnel of the **Mostar Department for Protection of Historic Monuments**: The Director, Tihomir Rozi\_ and art historians Ivanka Ribarevi\_-Nikoli\_ and Tanja Mi\_evi\_, accompanied Wenzel on her visits. These individuals were not able to visit the war zone, nor could they visit their families and friends on the left bank, held by Bosnian (called Moslem) forces attacking the HVO. Several other members of the Department had been caught on the left bank, but were alive and well, as were the parents of Tanja Mi\_evi\_. Two further members of the Office, said to be Moslems, were not caught on the left bank, and are in a Department photograph taken by Wenzel. The photographer \_iro Rai\_ was also present.

**(b) Losses in Mostar and new damage, post-dating the publication of the book "Mostar Urbicid" and the visit of Dr Colin Kaiser in December, 1993**

Members of the Department apologised that they had been unable to complete the damage listing forms given them by Kaiser. They could not move freely to examine closely buildings; their typewriters did not function.

Some new damage can be seen as a continuation of the former situation, aggravated because left without aid. The basic facilities of the town, including electricity, canalisation and running water, are still in the main destroyed. The right bank has water; a number of wells and springs on the right bank provide this. The left bank has no water; people have to go distances for it. Some institutions now do have telephones; it was possible to telephone Kaiser in Paris from the Department office.

The condition in respect to public buildings is not basically changed. They have not received what they needed in the way of quick repairs. People did repairs to their own houses (this was apparent in all of Mostar that was visible; most broken glass had for instance been replaced; access to the coast allowed for this kind of repair), but no-one repaired the historic public buildings; they were awaiting expert attention. By now, rain and atmosphere have affected everything.

The Department had planned to make some repairs to the Museum of Herzegovina, in the old Mesjid by the Old Bridge, but now the Museum of Herzegovina is taken over by the "Islamska Zajednica" (Islamic Society). And in any case, damage to the Museum included damage to its collections as a result of theft by occupying Serbs. In the early days of the war, a great number of displays disappeared, including weapons, a part of the jewellery, and the gold coins from the numismatic collection.

The **archives** became very damaged, because the atmosphere affected the tracing paper, and it may be that very few of the drawings concerning buildings of the town may be regarded as saved.

**Newly Destroyed Monuments** have been marked on the xerox copies of the photographs taken by Kaiser, and on a copy of the map in "Mostar Urbicid".

What is mentioned here are only losses securely attested by members of the Department for Protection of Historic Monuments, Mostar. They are :

**A. Losses from January to June:** in the area of Bjelusina, Brankovac and Luka:

1. The Old Orthodox Church, destroyed 14-15 January.
2. The "Ruska ambasada" so called, a Russian consulate in Austrian times, fired. (1 and 2 are located each side of the New East Orthodox Church)
3. "Kruljeva kuca", an old house in Austrian style on the left bank, Donja Mahala, destroyed after Kaiser left.
4. An Austrian house on Marshall Tito Street
5. Austrian house on the Lucki Bridge.

**B. Losses in May:** These losses lie west of the earlier historic centre of the town, towards the later centre of the town, between the area called "Cernica" and the big "Rondo" or roundabout to its west. They consist of:

1. Mikacica House: an Art Nouveau building, completely burned. There is no photo of it in "Mostar Urbicid" or among Kaiser's photographs taken in December 1992.
2. The University Library. The books were moved into the basement, and the upper part of the building was used by Caritas. The Caritas priest Ivan Vukci\_ was imprisoned.
3. The Third Elementary School.

Although the Department members are quite sure of all these losses, they could only visit the University Library at the time of recording this material.

### **(c) Recent activity of the Mostar Department of Historic Monuments Team**

Very little. They said, initially, they had a lot of energy. They hardly knew how they managed to bring out the "Mostar Urbicid" book. But now everything was much harder. Tihomir's wife and baby girl were by the sea. Ivanka's husband and daughter were in Zagreb. There was shooting all night and it kept them awake; it wore them down (Wenzel was told the same about the shooting by the people in Zadar).

Recently, they had written to the Aga Khan foundation; but had received no help.

**What Mostar wanted told to Sarajevo:** Mostar wanted Sarajevo told their Department was active - they felt themselves to be still active, though being so was much harder than before, as they had so many technical problems. They had told all international institutions about what had happened to them, and sent "Mostar Urbicid" to everyone. They had lost all their books by fire, and needed books for research. They had hoped to receive books in exchange for "Mostar Urbicid", but had not managed to get any. They

hoped somehow they could make contact with parallel institutes in Sarajevo, and exchange material.

**For what concrete projects did Mostar need funds:**

(i) **They would like to bring out a sequel to the "Mostar Urbicid" book which would cover new damage, and also include additional types of monuments, such as the notable medieval tombstones (stecci).** Like the other, they imagined a run of around 3000 copies, amounting to 60,000 printed pages.

(ii) **They are left with no photo laboratory**, that of \_iro Rai\_ having been burnt up. Nor have they any photo materials, and their entire archive with contact copies of the photos for the whole of Herzegovina was burnt up. However, they still have the negatives - around 100,000 negatives for Herzegovina, packed in boxes by number. **They need money to re-print all of \_iro's photographs.** This would save some documentation about Herzegovina.

*Note:* in Sarajevo, it was ascertained that the entire photo negative collection of Gojko Sikimi\_, photographer of the Umjetni\_ka Galerija who did a vast amount of photography of cultural heritage all over Bosnia, is preserved. He is retired, but is arranging that his successor at the Gallery will have the right to reprint these photos if needed. He took these photos as private investment, unfortunately, and probably still sells his prints at a high price. The negatives do, however, exist.

(iii) **They need to buy or obtain publications and books.** As stated above their complete library burnt. They would like anything to do with the war situation, particularly anything published in Sarajevo.

(iv) **They need a clearing office outside the war zone to which things for them could be sent.** They would suggest Medjugorje, nearby and accessible to post.

*Observation:* While the team **badly** wanted contact with colleagues in Sarajevo, they believed terrible propaganda stories about Moslems and every one of them said they expected nothing from Sarajevo which always wanted to be the centre of everything. Moslems had a plan to push all Croats out of Mostar and had printed an issue of "Oslobodjene" in advance (discovered by the HVO) saying Bosnian Moslems had "freed" Mostar by doing so. People in Sarajevo laughed heartily when told of this joke, but Tihomir Rozi\_ believed in it fiercely. Sarajevo, in turn, felt rather threatened at the idea of a clearing office for anything to do with Bosnian culture in Medjugorje.

**(d) Other losses in Herzegovina**

Medieval graveyards with tombstones inspected by \_iro Rai\_ and still intact: **Jezero, Konjic region** (tombstones moved to a new site after building a hydrocentral). **Boljuni, Hrasno** (these tombstones have been overgrown, which aids preservation) **Glumina, Hrasno**. Damaged tombstones: **Trebimlja, Popovo Polje**, alongside a little church, which is now razed to the ground. This would tie in with destruction in Konavlje, because that little church is halfway between Popovo Polje and the coast. The

tombstones he maintains were blown up with grenades. Compared with the other sites mentioned, there were very few stones at Trebimlja with figurative decoration.

\_iro Rai\_ said that the **Radimlja necropolis in Stolac** was still undamaged, but Vlado Palameta (formerly of Stolac and now resident in Medjugorje and keenly interested in medieval tombstones) disagreed. He said everything was all right there, except the late 15th century tombstone in the form of a huge cross depicting a man with raised enlarged right hand which had the face shot away.

### **III. SARAJEVO**

#### **(a) Cultural and intellectual organisations based in Sarajevo**

##### **1. GOVERNMENTAL BODIES (BiH)**

##### **Ministry of Foreign Affairs:**

Jasmina Pašali\_, Minister

Hasan Dervišbegovi\_, Minister (former Ambassador to Kuwait)

Husein Panjata, Minister (relations with Unesco)

##### **Department of Urban Planning:**

Mustafa Dizdarevi\_, Minister for architecture, spatial planning, urban reconstruction and heritage

Amra Had\_i Muhamedovi\_, Deputy Minister

Mustafa Dizdarevi\_ is perhaps best known as leader in the design and production of housing estates in and around Sarajevo before and after the time of the Olympic Games, during which period he built over 1000 flats. His department is responsible for town planning throughout Bosnia-Herzegovina.

His comments: it is with difficulty that he looks upon this destruction of Bosnia's built heritage. Almost 75% of the whole cultural heritage in the country has, he feels, been destroyed and there is no doubt that this particular destruction of heritage is an aspect of genocide.

Sarajevo institutions have been producing damage lists since the beginning of Serbian aggression into Bosnia, but have great difficulty in accurately assessing damage reports because of the lack of information concerning occupied territories. Sarajevo wants a special Unesco mission to Bosnia - a permanent mission:

(1) to obtain reliable information from occupied areas

(2) to help save what is remaining, particularly in Sarajevo



(3) to help Bosnian experts to expand their expertise by means of technical advice from outside.

## 2. SARAJEVO LOCAL GOVERNMENT (Skupština Grada Sarajevo):

Prof Muhamed Kreševljaković, Mayor of Sarajevo and President of the Governmental Assembly

The Mayor takes a great interest in culture and in the fate of monuments. He holds information about the secret locations of stored movable heritage.

## 3. INSTITUTES FOR MONUMENT PROTECTION

**Federalni Zavod za zaštitu spomenika** (National institute for the protection of historical and natural heritage):

Dr Sejdalija Mustafić, Director

Mevlida Serdarević, Secretary

Ferhad Mulabegović, Architect and conservationist

Visited by Wenzel on 15 June 1993. All documentation is safe. A computerised list exists of the principal monuments in BiH against which damage can be checked (at present the list cannot be printed as there is no electricity or printing ink).

The Institute is very anxious for news about Mostar, since Mostar is within their area of concern. They wanted to know the degree to which Mostar's documentation for the whole of Herzegovina has been lost, since they should be able to replace some of it. They are also following the situation concerning monuments destroyed in Mostar and Wenzel was able to give them fresh information.

### **Gradski Zavod za zaštitu kulturno-istorijskog i prirodnog nasledja**

**Sarajevo** (Town Institute for protection of the cultural-historical and natural heritage - Sarajevo):

Dženane Gološ, Director

Snežana Mustapić, Art historian and archaeologist

The documentation is safe, but most personnel have left. There are in fact very few art historians and archaeologists now remaining in non-Serbian held Sarajevo; most have

left, others reside in Serbian-held Grbavica and cannot cross to the Bosnian government side, others still in Sarajevo are newly-retired and avoid offering assistance.

#### 4. ART HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTIONS

##### **Umjetni\_a Galerija** (art gallery):

Vefik Had\_ismailovi\_, Director

Azra Begi\_, Keeper

Nermina Zild\_o, Keeper

The building has had windows broken but is basically in good condition. Works of art (mainly modern) are packed and stored in the basement.

Among a number of art exhibitions arranged by the Gallery during the war period was one entitled "Wounded paintings", consisting of damaged paintings and held in a damaged church, and the exhibit of works by 20th century Jewish painters.

##### **Fine Arts Academy:**

Dr Muhamed Karamehmedovi\_, Professor of history of art

##### **Zemaljski Muzej** (Land Museum):

Dr Rizo Sijari\_, Director (natural history)

Lidija \_eravica Feke\_a, Archaeologist

Esad Voškovi\_ and Jasminka Šiši\_, Conservation laboratory

The moveable museum objects (including the 14th century Spanish Jewish Haggadah) have been packed safely by Prof Imamovi\_ (Sarajevo University) but the Roman stone monuments in the courtyard lapidarium and inside remain exposed.

Seventy members of museum staff have gone. The remaining technician did not know what materials to use to protect the exposed monuments: Wenzel suggested making sandbags with the curtains. Here is additional evidence of the need in Sarajevo of foreign technical assistance. There has been little general interest in the vast technical difficulties faced by the museum. Wenzel was told she was the first foreign authority to inquire about the fate of the museum since the beginning of the war.

#### 5. CULTURAL ASSOCIATIONS (from pre-war times)

**Kulturno Društvo Muslimana: Preporod** (The Muslim Cultural Society: Rebirth or Renaissance):

Prof Dr Enes Durakovi\_, President

Muharun Hasanbegovi\_, General Secretary

Enes Pelidija, President of the Board of Governors

Munib Maglajli\_, Director of the Institute for literature at the Centar za bosansko-muslimanske studije (KDM Preporod)

Other members: Prof Dr Envar Imamovi\_ (art historian and archaeologist), Azra Begi\_ (art historian), Prof Dr Muhamed Nezirovi\_ (linguist and Hebrew scholar), Alija Isakovi\_ (writer and philologist), Muhidin Palesi\_

Members wished to confirm that although Moslems, they felt solidly European and less able to join mentally with Islamic lands than say with Austria.

One initiative, suggested by the visit of Wenzel, is for "Preporod" to mediate between the Mostar Institute for Protection of Monuments and the Moslem counterparts with whom that Institute is having difficulties. The Mostar Moslems had felt responsible for Mostar mosques and wished to restore them in their own way, without allowing the technically superior Institute any say. The Institute had wished to collaborate with the Moslems, but the Moslems would not allow this. "Preporod" was in perfect sympathy with the Mostar Institute's point of view and felt it would have authority over the Mostar Moslem organisations.

**Hrvatsko Kulturno Društva Napredak** (The Croatian Cultural Society: Advance):

Prof Dr Franjo Topi\_, President

**La Benevolencia** located in the Jewish Centre **Jevrejska opština Sarajevo**:

Jakica Finci, President

David Kanihi, Vice-President

In 1992 during the war period, this Jewish organisation put on the festival of "Sefarad 92", celebrating the 500th anniversary of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, in order to demonstrate that the combined Moslem, Croatian and Serbian culture of Sarajevo is founded on the golden base of Spanish culture. They see their Sarajevan Jewish culture as one of the early links between Bosnia and Europe.

The 16th century Old Synagogue that houses the museum was structurally undamaged in June 1993.

## 6. CULTURAL ORGANISATIONS (1992 or more recent)

**Asocijacija za interkulturalne aktivnosti i spašavanje nasledje Republike BiH - AIASN** (The Association for intercultural activities and rescue of the heritage of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina):

Mevlida Serdarević, President

Edina Vlasić, Secretary

Founder members: Azra Begić, Snežana Mutapić, Enver Imamović and Nihad Čengić

The group began by organising the packing and storage of movable monuments of cultural value and by gathering information about the damage to immovable monuments, insofar as the circumstances permitted.

In a letter of 30 March 1993, the President recorded as saved:

- (1) The Sarajevo Haggadah and other movable cultural displays from the Zemaljski Muzej
- (2) Film and cinematographic material relating to film-making in BiH and taken from the Jagomir Studio the day before it was occupied by the Serbs
- (3) Certain unburned works from the Oriental Institute Library, where most was lost
- (4) Manuscripts and books from the Gazi Husref Beg Library (total contents)
- (5) The most valuable source material and periodicals from the National and University Libraries before the "Vještica" building was burned
- (6) The movable treasures from the Hadži Sinan tekija (shrine)
- (7) Paintings from the Metropolitan's mansion of the Serbian Orthodox Church
- (8) Exhibits from the Town Museum and the Despic House
- (9) The documentation from the National Institute for the Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage, as well as from a series of other, less well-known libraries and collections.

In August 1992, the group began to concern itself increasingly with documentation: (a) inventories of what was saved and where it was put; (b) documentation of damage and the circumstances of damage; (c) documentation of what was looted; (d) documentation of what was known about monuments which had disappeared before the war; and (e) assessment of the value and true nature of what was irretrievably lost.

Although an independent and non-political society of Sarajevan citizens, AIASN proposed to use the information it was gathering to inform the public both within Bosnia and abroad, through the press whenever possible, of the situation in Bosnia in respect to attack on its cultural heritage. Thus study of (d) above was needed to bring the world's attention to the fact that the attack on BiH had been planned well in advance: the most valuable books in the Yugoslav Federal Army's Library began to be removed from Sarajevo to Belgrade as early as 1988. From then on, various individuals within Sarajevan institutions, libraries and museums, including certain responsible for the preservation of cultural heritage, could be seen to have removed valuable items, particularly Orthodox objects, out of Bosnian territory.

As destruction of immovable monuments reached massive proportions, the work of AIASN began to inter-relate with that of the National Commission for War Crimes (see following).

**Dr\_avna komisija za ratno zlo\_ina** (National Commission for War Crimes):

Stepan Kluji\_, President

Zvonimir Topic, Vice President

Mirsad Toka\_a, Secretary

This organisation sifts through eye-witness accounts of injuries and damage inflicted upon Moslems. It gains some information through two other affiliated bodies: the **Centar za prikupljenje stradanje Muslimana** (Centre for collection of information concerning the destruction of Muslims) in Zenica (Director: Ragib Hadi\_) and a similar organisation in Tuzla (Director: Rifat Kadi\_).

The information needs however to be confirmed on the ground by international experts qualified in damage assessment.

**Muslimanski Akademski Klub MAK "Bosanka"** (The Muslim Academic Club - Poppy -the Bosnian women):

Azra Begi\_, President

Hamiseta Ibri\_evi\_, Vice President

Jasna Bakši\_-Mufti\_, Secretary

Directors: Mevlida Serdarevi\_, Nermina Kurspahi\_ (editor of the literary journal "Odjek" -"Echo"), Jasmina Musabegovic (editor in the publishing house "Svjetlost")

Members: Emira Dragulj-Idrizovic (architect), Abasa Begi\_ (judge), Edina Vlasi\_, Tanja Najdhart (architect), Sne\_ana Mutap\_i\_ (art historian)

The organisation came into being through conversations between women in the street, who identified themselves as poppies by the roadside. At first there was a tendency to describe the rapes of Moslem women as "contamination". The organisation was founded to elevate the Moslem women in their own minds as above this approach. This was a war against culture, and the Moslem woman was here seen as a carrier of culture - a library of Bosnian tradition - hence under attack. Members include women active in many professions, particularly the media, the arts and the sciences.

**The Open Society Fund of Soros Bosnia:**

Prof Dr Sdravko Grebo, Executive Director

Azra Begi\_, President of the Board of Directors

The Fund was founded early in 1993 as a branch of the Soros Foundations in Eastern Europe concerned mainly with provision of humanitarian aid. It has however a freer mandate and can fund various endeavours which it feels are to Bosnia's general good. It has the potential to interest itself in funding the cultural heritage, although political studies and the performing arts are its principal present concerns.

**7. UNIVERSITY**

Prof Dr Enes Durakovi\_ (philosophy)

Dr Hamiseta Ibri\_evi\_ (stomatology)

Prof Dr Enver Imamovi\_ (Roman and medieval archaeology)

Prof Dr Muhamed Nezirovi\_ (philosophy, Hebrew studies)

**8. OTHER**

**Commission for the renewal of Islamic societies in Bosnia:**

Muharun Hasanbegovi\_, Member

**Historical Institute:**

Enes Pelidija

Muhidin Pelesi\_

**Narodna Pozorište, Sarajevo (National Theatre):**

Alija Isakovi\_, Director

**Society of Librarians of BiH:**

Edina Vlasi\_, President

**(b) Additional note on cultural property in Sarajevo**

**Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church (Marshall Tito Street)**

The contents of the museum have been removed to Belgrade. None of the historic treasures within the actual church building have however been protected or removed - in June 1993 Wenzel observed some 17th century icons in place, the early iconostasis, the 15th-16th century wrought iron chandelier and a large quantity of early carved wood. A projectile had pierced the church roof (since repaired) and another the courtyard wall. The shells came from the same direction as those which struck the nearby Muslim Theological Seminary.

*For further information on the situation in Sarajevo in June 1993 see the separate report by Mr Roger Shrimplin.*

**IV. Discussions including reactions to the proposals made by Dr Kaiser (see Doc. 6869).**

**(a) 6 June 1993: meeting in Medjugorje with the Mostar team: Tihomir Rozi\_, Ivanka Ribarevic and Tanja Mi\_evi\_.**

With regard to the **proposal that the mandate of the UN peace-keeping forces include protection of cultural heritage**, Tihomir Rozi\_ recommended that experts go with the military groups into East Bosnia; each group would be able to advise the other.

With regard to the **exchange of experts**, Tihomir Rozic felt that free movement between those interested in culture should be encouraged between all the contending groups. Serbs should be invited to look at the condition of Orthodox monuments in Herzegovina just as those such as himself could assess the situation of Moslem monuments in east Bosnia. He himself is a student of Sarajevo architect Nejat Kurto, and is very interested in what has really happened to Islamic and other monuments in East Bosnia.

The other suggestions were approved, but additional comments were made:

**Ethnographic production should be studied along with other cultural monuments.** Ivanka Ribarevi\_ was concerned about those who produced speciality objects in certain endangered areas, such as the apparently well-known horse-bags and horse-bag makers of Stolac.

Mostar needs outside help from her near neighbours, such as Split; and other Dalmatian centres could help Mostar in conservation problems and with the needed replacement of literature. Josko Belamari\_ of the Split Institute for Protection of Monuments had said he did not want to overstep the jurisdiction boundaries between states, by Croatian Split helping Bosnian Mostar. But he was willing to do more for Mostar, and did offer the use of the Split Zavod as a clearing house for books to be collected for Mostar and other aid to be discussed.

Tihomir Rozi\_ suggested there is need for a wide information chain between all cultural bodies all over Bosnia and over a wider fringe area. Everywhere people desperately want to know what is happening in other war areas with culture related to their own.

**There is a need for a decentralised centre for Bosnia outside the war zone. Communications in Bosnia just do not work. Can we count on Sarajevo as a centre right now?** Tihomir wanted a centre in Medjugorje pro tem, until Sarajevo was freed of being under siege. In Medjugorje you could easily get space for an office, and have faxes set up. UNPROFOR is in Medjugorje, and the pilgrim passage assures continuation of transport facilities.

This point was later answered by Mevlida Serdarevi\_ of the Institute for Protection of Monuments in Sarajevo who said: We do have a centre outside of the war zone - it is London.

Ivanka Ribarevi\_ felt firmly: Members of this chain need to be part of a correctly paid organisation. None of them in Mostar have been paid for months; enthusiasm to do good work has to become related again to working to earn what people need for livelihood.

"Mostar Urbicid" was paid for by the organisation of Herzegovinians; "Herceg Stjepan" in Zagreb. Perhaps such organisations could contribute towards paying daily expenses for cultural projects.

**In respect to the culture-information chain, money must be allotted to smaller centres, and not just to central control areas.** This again expressed resentment about Sarajevo which was in an inactive situation, being likely to wish to seize authority and finance over a larger area than its siege situation allowed it to handle.

Certainly, many (though not all) in Sarajevo felt they should have central rights over all parts of Bosnia, even though at present they are obviously out of touch.

**Worry about Moslem Groups and need for arbitration between these groups and the Zavod.** This had been mentioned in Kaiser's report and was again brought up. There was a fear of sudden, ill-informed restoration. Ill-informed restoration is however generally felt allowable for private residences. Igor Fiskovi\_, now in Dubrovnik, mentioned when he happened to be in Split, that window frames fitted with glass were coming into the Dubrovnik area from Slovenia, with window-frame dimensions that did not fit the space accorded within traditional Primorje house design. So the people of Primorje were knocking apertures in their walls to fit the new windows.

**(b) 16 June 1993: meeting of the Moslem Cultural Society Preporod in Sarajevo.**

Preporod unanimously agreed to mediate if needed, as they were in total sympathy with the Mostar Zavod and felt they could certainly have influence over the local Mostar Islamic group, if necessary using the Reis, or head of the Bosnian Islamic Church, to calm the waters in this case. The Reis is in fact a very sympathetic and culturally minded figure.

**(c) 8 June 1993: meeting in Split**



On June 8th, 1993, the Mostar team drove Wenzel to Split and held a conference on these matters with Josko Belamari\_, Director, Institute for the Protection of Historical Monuments, zupa Split.

Concerning the Kaiser proposals Belamari\_ commented: "We have to have people for culture moving along with UNPROFOR. We have no idea what is happening in the Serbian territories which adjoin Dalmatia - Knin, Biskuplje, for instance. They are building an airfield at Knin, on an archaeologically very interesting valley. They have got no experts present for the archaeology of the valley, which they should for such an undertaking.

"We know nothing about Jajce. An international group should go to inspect Jajce; it is a complex of Roman, medieval and Islamic monuments of various dates, and of the highest importance. In Croatia, an unfortunate fact is that only the fate of the Croatian heritage is commented upon. They only hear about the fate of monuments in Serbian Knin by accident. The Split Zavod restored the medieval church of Sv. Ante there, after an earthquake. Now it is completely destroyed, and the place where it was has been reportedly asphalted over to make a market. Nobody has been to see what really happened".

UNPROFOR with its strength must have specialists who can be taken to these places to comment on what has and is being done. In Split, they tried at one point to give UNPROFOR a catalogue of what was needed to observe. UNPROFOR should be responsible to have a list of monuments to look at. But they would not consent to take on that responsibility.

#### **(d) 17 June 1993: Sarajevo cultural societies**

Consideration of Kaiser's suggestions continued in Sarajevo on 17 June at a meeting of a number of select members of Sarajevo's many cultural societies. The report and recommendations, given into the care of Saidalija Mustafi\_, director of the national Institute for the Protection of Monuments, was translated by Azra Begi\_, Curator of the Art Gallery, Sarajevo and Director of the Governing Board of Soros, Bosnia.

The assembled company supported all the proposals made in Kaiser's report, but wished to add that it should be somewhere emphasised, that destruction is not the **result** of this war, but rather the **objective** of the war, where both culture (monuments) and the carriers of culture and inheritors of culture (women, who had to be a sort of library, educating children about the culture in which they lived, and children), were chosen for annihilation.

A distinction should not be made between humanitarian and cultural crimes, and humanitarian aid should have one aspect, which is aid to monuments. At its closest point of contact, the rebuilding of historic home complexes, such as the mahalas, should be taken under consideration.

Sejidalija Mustafi\_ begged that the Council of Europe should use any possible influence on the General Director of Unesco that they cancel or rethink the conclusions of the Unesco meeting where they (Boutros Ghali) said they did not have convenient circumstances for the director of Unesco to visit Sarajevo. They needed someone such

as the Director General of Unesco or an eminent representative, to come. They would like to have a small cell functioning from Sarajevo, for Unesco, relating to the observation of Bosnian losses elsewhere.

**(e) Meeting with the Deputy Minister for Architecture and Urban Reconstruction, Sarajevo**

Both Shrimplin and Wenzel participated in a meeting of cultural experts in the office of **Mustafa Dizdarevi**, Deputy Minister for architecture, spatial planning, Urban reconstruction and heritage, who in more fortunate times was personally responsible for the design of over 11,000 flats in Sarajevo. Here a discussion concerning the future of Sarajevo culture was led by the Minister, and by Mrs. Mevlida Serdarovic of the Association for Intercultural Activities and the Rescue of the Cultural heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina (a body designed to run parallel with the activities of London's BHHR).

The Minister returned to the, now usual, **plea for a permanent mission of experts in Sarajevo** - a special Unesco mission - to concern themselves specifically with historic monuments, advising local architects and conservationists about what to do, and where they could look for additional required help. He maintained Sarajevo did not as yet have exact information. but it was believed that up to 90% of these monuments were destroyed, or else had been heavily attacked. Study of the losses by foreign experts should begin now, so that the monuments could be properly stabilised until they could be rebuilt. He did not really feel Sarajevo needed foreign experts in respect to objects other than cultural monuments; concerning different sorts of buildings, Sarajevo architects could do what was needed themselves.

Unfortunately, it seemed next to impossible for Sarajevans to force the attention of the world upon this as one of their basic needs. "An architect walking or not walking around Sarajevo", it was said, "does not sell newspapers".

The usual embarrassing question was asked, this time directed at Roger Shrimplin: "Why doesn't anyone do anything?"

Shrimplin's answer was:

"1: **Cost.** It is known to the UNHCR how many millions of dollars it costs to keep Sarajevo going. Additional efforts to help Sarajevo's cultural heritage in more positive ways are bound to raise those sums.

"2: **Heavy manpower.** It is generally believed it would take more UN soldiers than anyone wants to provide.

"3: **In most of Europe they do not understand the fierceness of hatred being expressed here.** This tends to make people stand back. Wild, ancient hatred can be seen at times between Ireland and England, or amongst the Basques in southern France. But anyone reaching this particular level of fierceness, we can't understand."

The Minister, Mustafa Dizdarevi, responded: "We can see, there gets to be a general belief, everyone has been bad. The world is not somehow able to understand - perhaps

because of wrongly directed articles in the Press - that the destruction of one particular people is involved. Even so, the Moslems here are of such numbers - maybe around 2 and one half million - that they cannot all be killed off. But even assuming Moslems do survive, it is very hard to accept that all the bad things that happen here can happen in the heart of Europe. Destruction of our heritage - a part of genocide - is destruction of heritage in the heart of Europe. And Bosnia as a European state, upon whose traditions our Moslem heritage is formed, is older than either Croatia or Serbia.

"We need urgent help in the following forms:

- 1) Information from occupied areas
- 2) Help from experts towards saving what is left
- 3) Help from foreign experts to help our experts. We already have groups of people gathered and organized to protect heritage. But they need additional experts, and technical aid."

#### **(f) Final observations by Roger Shrimplin**

On 27 June Roger Shrimplin provided some further comments based on the above meetings and other architectural meetings he had attended and not Wenzel:

"There needs to be a Unesco presence in Bosnia - first, for real help in protecting monuments, and second, to review how the money is to be spent there. For there will be money.

"Third - and this is very important - resentment in Bosnia about the rest of the world not taking any interest in what happens to their ruined monuments is really very deep, and is in the course of mounting and becoming extremely strong. Unless international bodies do something immediately to show that such resentment is being taken seriously - not slighted - these foreign bodies can find themselves facing penalty. **Our** view is that **people** suffering is of first priority, never mind the monuments. But that is not **their** view. **They** take global destruction of their monuments very seriously indeed. It is time that their attitude about what is happening to their cultural heritage should be taken seriously by us".

#### **POSTSCRIPT**

Bosnian consideration of Bosnians being European, whether Moslem or Christian, seems to us of primary international importance. It was expressed at a meeting of the Bosnian Moslem organisation Preporod, that if the Bosnian Moslems needed to choose a government to which they had been formerly allied as a kind of surrogate fatherland, they would choose Austria before Turkey. They agreed the Austro-Hungarian rule had wiped from them their feeling of being an Eastern people. The European, as well as the Serbian and Croatian press were trying to force a Moslem "Easternness" upon them,

seemingly because they would then be conveniently alienated out of the European scene. Few of them, however, would know how to begin being "Eastern" in the way others seemed to require of them.

The western Press has favoured illustrating suffering Bosnian peasants in national costume in tears, at gravesides. As for citizens of the European city, Sarajevo, the press has preferred picturing them dying, dead, or in great distress, like chosen victims of gladiatorial combat, rather than as the well-dressed Europeans engaged in a remarkable variety of cultural pursuits (as well as in carrying their own water) apparent on any and all of the Sarajevan streets. Dead and dying Sarajevans are more readily "Easternised", it is felt.

In the same way as Sarajevo is still an active, European town, with the majority of its citizens remarkably surviving the Apocalypse forced on them, Sarajevo's monuments in the core of the city also survive the Apocalypse. Though they are often damaged and need care, most of Sarajevo's principal monuments still retain the basic elements of their former appearances, and are **not** all flattened into moon-landscape (although some individual buildings on the fringes of the older town have moon-landscape qualities.)

Certainly, some monuments survive in rather good condition and test fortune. These include those preserved around and within the Zemaljski Muzej (Land Museum), an Austrian building which backs on the front line and is daily pounded with grenades and rifle shot. All the stone monuments of this museum, within and without, are still in situ and totally unprotected, and are in the main, until now, very well preserved. They have not been protected because seventy people have left the museum and of the five people left, no-one remained with the skill to see this protection properly done. Here is a type of badly needed technical assistance that should be well within the scope of Unesco.

## **C. NOTE ON WAR DAMAGE IN ZADAR**

by Dr Marian Wenzel

### **1. Official body responsible for monuments**

Institute for the Protection of Monuments (Regionalni zavod za zaštitu spomenika kulture), Pave \_ingrije 3, 57000 Zadar:

Miljenko Damjan, Director

Pavuša Vezi\_, Conservation Officer

### **2. Damage to the city of Zadar in 1992-93,**

*(as recounted by Professor Ivo Petricioli, historian and art historian, University of Zadar, by telephone from Zadar on 21 June 1993)*

**The Tower** (Bablja Kula or Bovo d'Antono), part of the medieval fortifications of the town, was hit early in the war, when bombardment of the town was at its height. The tower has now been repaired.

**The Church of St Simeon** (Sveti Šimun) was hit with two shells but was not badly damaged.

**The Cathedral of St Anastasia** (Sveta Stošija), 13th-early 14th century, was heavily hit by one very powerful shell, which gravely damaged an important fresco of St Donatus (Sveti Donat) dated 1300, which had only been recently discovered in 1986. The eyes, nose and mouth are all that now remain.

**The Archaeological Museum** was struck, but has now been repaired.

**The Church of St Chrysogonos** (Sveti Krševan), consecrated in 1175, a Romanesque building with blind arcades on the exterior of the middle apse, was struck by a shell on the north side of this apse, precisely where the Romanesque architecture was most complex, producing a large hole. Subsequently, sandbags were appended to the church exterior and also on the Cathedral façade, but not before the damage to the present church had been made.

The buildings around the main square of Zadar, **Narodni Trg**, are mainly Renaissance in date. One shell struck the 19th century tower of the **Loggia** (1562), once the town's law court. It was not of great artistic value, but had been built of fine quality stone, which is now heavily damaged.

**The Grisogno-Vovo Palace**, opposite the Church of St Simeon, boasted a superb interior chamber with inset mirrors, typical of the best quality 19th century design. Two big shells destroyed this interior - chairs, piano and all historical fittings. This happened at the very beginning of the war.

The most recent major damage had taken place around 6 June. At the beginning of the war the **Bastion of the Town Fortifications** had been shelled and subsequently repaired. It had now been shelled again and once more badly damaged.

As well as the damage inflicted on the public buildings of Zadar, there has been considerable damage to the private sector of the town. Many **old houses in the historic core of the town** have been badly damaged and a certain number, some of which are medieval, have been completely destroyed. For instance, on 10 June, one such old house collapsed after a night in which five shells struck the town.

It had become the norm for three to six shells to be fired into the historic part of the town each night around 11pm. There was shelling at odd intervals during the day as well.

Although the **Roman Forum** has been shelled the **Church of St Donatus** (Sveti Donat), dating to the 9th century, was so far undamaged.

Likewise, **St Mary's Convent Church** (Sveta Marija), of the 16th century, has not been struck, although a shell did fall on the adjoining convent buildings. Happily all the art

objects, including the treasures in precious metals, which are normally on display in these convent buildings, have been stored out of harm's way.

Prof Petricoli wished to state that he felt too little attention has been given to this terrible attack on the historical monuments of the town of Zadar. Huge outrage has been expressed about the damaging of Dubrovnik, but Dubrovnik does not have such important early monuments within its city complex as does Zadar. Dubrovnik lacks Romanesque churches or anything like the early Christian basilica which has recently been discovered by the Church of St Simeon, its south wall with its original bifora window. St Simeon is only by the greatest luck so far fairly well preserved, but there seems to be no cessation to its endangerment.

### **3. Comments offered by Pavuša Vezi\_ (10 June 1993)**

These concerned Orthodox Church treasures which were removed by Serbia from the Zadar commune in the August before the beginning of the war and were never returned. The treasures were transferred to Belgrade under false pretences and by means of trickery which had, it seems, been planned for some time.

The treasures were removed from Zadar's Convent Museum, ostensibly for a straightforward exhibition of the Orthodox treasures of Zadar to be held in Belgrade. Once in Belgrade however, the objects were presented in the form of a different sort of exhibition - an exhibition of Orthodox treasures which were improperly cared for by Zadar. Zadar only learned about this new approach when they acquired a catalogue. The approach was particularly shocking to Zadar because all the objects had been prepared for exhibition by Miljenko Damjan himself, the highly skilled director of the Zadar Institute for Protection of Monuments, and by other very senior Zadar experts.

The new slant given to the exhibition was found even more astonishing because Serbian experts had participated in its reparation at the expense of Croatia. They had been invited by Croatia to come and consult with them on certain projects including fresco restoration in which Serbians are particularly skilled. In return, as a good will gesture, Zadar was to lend Serbia its Orthodox objects for exhibition in Belgrade. The Serbs had given assurances that all the objects would be returned after the exhibition. In the event the exhibition was mounted along the lines indicated above and the exhibits were never returned.

What was worse in Pavuša Vezi\_'s view, was the fact that these Byzantine Orthodox treasures were not in the main Serbian in origin and had always been the specific property of the town of Zadar. The Eastern Orthodox Church in Zadar had been built at the expense of the town for the use of Greek traders doing business with Venice in the 16th century. At that time Zadar was itself Venetian. In the 18th century the town gave this Orthodox church to the newly enlarged Serbian Orthodox community for their use and allowed them access to the Greek Byzantine religious treasures which the Zadar Orthodox church had by then accumulated and which the town held for the continuing ritual of this specific Orthodox church.

### **D. NOTE ON A VISIT TO SARAJEVO**

**to review damage to the cultural heritage and to assess prospects**

## **for a repair/restoration programme**

**June 1993**

by Roger C Shrimplin

Chairman East Europe Committee

Royal Institute of British Architects

### Introduction

1. The visit was due to take place on Sunday 13 June to Tuesday 15 June 1993 but the considerable difficulties in the local situation caused unplanned changes to that programme. In fact flights between Split in Croatia and Sarajevo in Bosnia were suspended on Sunday 13 June and transport between Sarajevo Airport and the centre of the city was suspended for most of Monday 14 June due to fighting in the vicinity of the airport.

2. For the same reason, and because threats had been made to UNHCR aircraft, all UNHCR flights out of Sarajevo were suspended from Tuesday afternoon, 15 June to Saturday 19 June inclusive.

3. The visit therefore took place from Monday 14 June to Sunday 20 June inclusive. A flight out of Sarajevo Airport was taken on Sunday morning, 29 June.

4. The difficulties of visiting Sarajevo should not be underestimated. Apart from sniper and shell fire (artillery and mortar) less dramatic difficulties pose very serious problems in undertaking any real study. Only hard currency (cash Deutsche Marks) is really useful and in any case there is a grave shortage of all commodities. Even food is in extremely short supply and some foodstuffs are simply not available for the local population (for example fresh meat, fruit, coffee and so on). So far as work is concerned photographic materials are virtually unobtainable and even writing paper is difficult to find.

5. The ordinary routine of everyday living in Sarajevo is difficult, tiring and dangerous.

### Summary of meetings

6. Nevertheless, it did prove possible to hold discussions with representatives of a number of organisations involved in the care of the cultural heritage including the Sarajevo Association of Architects, the Sarajevo Faculty of Architecture, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Construction and Redevelopment.

7. It also proved possible to view a number of significant buildings in Sarajevo.

8. The visit coincided with a major conference ("Strategija Obnove") on reconstruction issues at the Holiday Inn Hotel in Sarajevo and while views were by no means

unanimous it was evident that overall there is a strong commitment among professionals and policy makers to a free market enterprise culture and also to the rebuilding of the city and state as quickly as may be possible after the end of the present hostilities.

9. Similarly, a visit to the office of the Society of Architects in Sarajevo (as well as discussions with representatives of the Society of Architects) demonstrated the willingness and ability of local architects to document damage to the cultural heritage. Indeed, an exhibition illustrating that damage is to be mounted in Sarajevo in the near future although at the present time it is delayed by a lack of electricity (required to operate printing presses which are needed to print exhibition catalogues).

### Impressions and conclusions

10. Without going into great detail it is possible to state a number of clear impressions and conclusions which derive from the visit and which in turn lead to recommendations for action.

11. First, it is plain that Sarajevo has suffered badly at the hands of its attackers. Apart from the obvious human cost in the continued suffering and difficulties of day to day living, there has been serious damage to the urban fabric. The infrastructure (drainage, electricity, telephone services etc) is badly damaged. Most buildings are damaged significantly and probably all buildings are damaged to a greater or lesser degree (broken glass etc). Some buildings have been completely destroyed including ancient monuments (such as the Library) and including a number of modern steel framed buildings (such as the Unis Building) which in some cases have simply collapsed. 35,000 dwellings are also assessed to have been destroyed during the past year.

12. On the other had Sarajevo has not been razed to the ground. Many interesting and significant buildings remain and the character of the city is very far from having been destroyed. It would be eminently possible to reconstruct the city and reconstitute its historic character, given sufficient investment of professional time and energy and of course of money.

13. There is a widely held view in Sarajevo that the attack on the physical fabric of the city is part of the deliberate policy of a foreign aggressor (Serbia). The fear caused by the intermittent bombardment and the effect on facilities in the city make this style of attack a sort of "military terrorism", which over a period of time could have the effect of undermining morale in the city. After all Sarajevo is a Western European city not a third world refugee camp with many modern buildings as well as historic monuments (it hosted the winter Olympic Games in 1984).

14. It is perhaps not surprising therefore that the protection and restoration of the cultural heritage is given a particularly high priority by Bosnians of all religions/origins. It was emphasised in meetings with Ministers and at the conference on reconstruction. The Bosnian cultural heritage is a particularly rich and mixed heritage and it is important for "Yugoslavia" as well as for Europe as a whole that it be reconstituted as quickly and as effectively as possible after the war.

15. Records of damage have been kept with considerable care in spite of the difficulties, although recording work is proving increasingly difficult and depressing. In order to



facilitate the continuing work materials are needed but both architects and Government representatives were insistent that a panel of external advisers should visit Sarajevo to advise on the restoration of the damaged buildings and the organisation of the process.

16. In any case architects and others concerned with the cultural heritage have become so isolated from professional colleagues in other countries during the past fifteen months that contact with foreign professionals is desirable to stimulate new activity. There seems to be no reason why the United Nations should impose a cultural isolation on Bosnia (whatever the merits of the military arguments) yet experience during the visit showed that the United Nations organisations were, officially at least, not likely to be supportive of any cultural mission to Sarajevo. In reality, of course, local representatives of the United Nations were helpful but an officially sponsored and organised panel of experts would be welcomed.

### Recommendations

17. In the light of all the foregoing a number of clear recommendations should be made.

18. First, it must be emphasised that Unesco should be closely involved with promoting the protection of the cultural heritage in Sarajevo and looking towards its reconstitution as soon as possible after the cessation of hostilities.

19. In association with that it would be desirable to involve other international organisations such as the UIA and Icomos. Bearing in mind the fact that Sarajevo lies within the historic frontiers of Europe it would also be desirable for European organisations such as the Council of Europe to take a more positive role in promoting the protection and restoration of the cultural heritage.

20. Preferably under the auspices of Unesco (if only for reasons of practical administration) a delegation of cultural experts including Western European architect representatives should be dispatched to Sarajevo as soon as possible with a specific programme in view (including meetings with architects and Government representatives).

21. The United Nations and the Council of Europe should begin to give some thought to the question of funding the reconstruction of Bosnia, not only of historic buildings but also of "ordinary" buildings (homes, offices and factories) and the urban infrastructure.

22. In order to stimulate private concern and charity, as well as to reinforce official concern, funding should be provided for a series of exhibitions to be established throughout Western Europe, presumably through architects' institutes, to illustrate and publicise damage to the cultural heritage in Bosnia and Croatia.

## **E. COORDINATION MEETING ON THE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF FORMER YUGOSLAVIA**

**(Paris, 28 June 1993)**

### **1. List of participants**

Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

Jacques BAUMEL (Chairman of the Sub-Committee on the Architectural and Artistic Heritage of the Committee on Culture and Education)

Nic TUMMERS (General Rapporteur on the Architectural Heritage))

\_arko DOMLJAN (Leader of the Croatian Special Guest Delegation))

Colin KAISER (Consultant expert)

Christopher GRAYSON (Secretary to the Committee on Culture and Education)

Council of Europe Working Group on Technical Co-operation

André MEYER, Chairman (Chairman of the Swiss Federal Commission for Historic Monuments)

Christina VON ARBIN (Head of Department of the Swedish Central Board of Antiquities)

José Maria BALLESTER (Head of the Cultural Heritage Division)

Unesco

Mounir BOUCHENAKI (Director Physical Heritage Division)

Gisèle HYVERT (Consultant expert)

International Council of Museums (ICOM)

Elisabeth DES PORTES (Secretary General)

International Council for Monuments and Sites (Icomos)

Leo van NISPEN (Director)

ARCH Foundation (Art Restoration for the Cultural Heritage)

Eric Chr. von HENRIKSEN (Secretary General)

Bosnia-Herzegovina Heritage Rescue Foundation

Marian WENZEL (Secretary General)

## 2. Summary of discussion

**Mr Baumel** (Chairman of the Sub-Committee on the Architectural and Artistic Heritage) in opening the meeting stressed its exceptional nature. It was the first time so many organisations concerned with the cultural heritage in former Yugoslavia had come together. They shared a common concern for this heritage and if their action could be coordinated something useful might be achieved. The first objective of the meeting was to exchange information. He welcomed the work of the consultant expert, Dr Kaiser, who had been monitoring the activities of the various organisations as well as events on the spot in Croatia and in BiH. The folly of what was going on there went beyond human reason: men and women were dying and their irreplaceable cultural identity being destroyed while Europe and the international community stood by.

**Dr Wenzel** had just returned from visiting Mostar and Sarajevo. Herself a specialist in Bosnian medieval architecture, she had been accompanied by Mr Roger Shrimplin, Chairman of the East Europe Committee of the Royal Institute of British Architects and an expert on more recent architecture. They had been the first experts concerned with the cultural heritage to visit Sarajevo since the siege had begun and their visit had clearly boosted the morale of cultural workers on the spot.

Much help was needed immediately and before the end of the war: information on a standard system of damage evaluation; advice on the protection of façades; advice on priorities in the use of the scarce resources available; the establishment of a network of contacts between experts inside BiH and in peripheral areas; the setting up of a base just outside the war zone as a central point for materials, expertise and information (Split and the pilgrim centre of Medjugorje were mentioned); and the development of a corridor of human contacts.

The Bosnians supported the idea of including experts in cultural heritage as observers in UNPROFOR teams, but the idea did not seem universally well received by UNPROFOR.

Another possibility mentioned in BiH was to negotiate the movement of cultural heritage observers to and from areas held by the Serbs.

Technical assistance and interest now was essential to the morale inside BiH. There was considerable resentment growing that the outside world had its own agenda and refused to accept the concern of BiH for its monuments. Humanitarian aid should not be limited to food, medicine and blankets. People were fighting for their cultural identity.

*[The written reports by Dr Wenzel and Mr Shrimplin are reproduced in full above in B, C and D]*

**Dr Kaiser** (consultant expert) referred to the three reports he had so far produced on war damage to the cultural heritage in Croatia and BiH *[see Docs 6756 and 6869; and above A]*. Fighting continued and information was uneven. Very little was yet known about what had happened in Serb controlled areas of Croatia (there were rumours that St Anthony's Church in Knin had been bull-dozed), of BiH or within Serbia itself.

Destruction of mosques in Banja Luka in May 1993 showed that cultural cleansing was continuing behind the lines, as it probably would even after fighting stopped. There was a real danger of destruction spreading into areas that had so far been spared, such as Maglaj.

The situation in Mostar was particularly explosive. The town should be immediately placed on Unesco's World Heritage in Danger List as it was on the front line between HVO and BiH forces. There was a great deal of vandalism going on.

He appealed for presence on the spot of international cultural observers - to get the experts and local authorities talking and prevent more heritage being destroyed. Support should also be mobilised for restoration work. An international campaign had been launched for the National and University Library in Sarajevo that had been burned at the beginning of the war.

**Mrs des Portes** (Secretary General of ICOM) welcomed the Assembly's attempt to encourage the exchange of information and co-ordination of international effort. The situation was indeed dramatic, with the cultural heritage being used as a target in the conflict and this had led ICOM to abandon its usual role of a professional organisation. By resolution of its latest General Conference, an Intervention Unit has been set up and was considering together with the Documentation Centre in Zagreb how best to act. Lists of experts were being drawn up and financial and logistical arrangements investigated. When funding was assured, it was hoped that a mission of experts could be sent.

The problem was how to link cultural assistance with humanitarian aid. All the humanitarian organisations were not reacting very favourably. Arguments based on the importance of the heritage for the cultural identity of those involved in the conflict had to be more forcibly developed.

**Dr Meyer** (Chairman of the Council of Europe Working Group on Technical Co-operation and President of the Swiss Federal Commission for Historic Monuments) welcomed the opportunity the meeting provided of exchanging views and of possible co-ordination. His Working Group agreed with the view that humanitarian aid should also cover protection of the cultural heritage: ethnic and cultural cleansing were linked.

The Working Group had drawn up a specific action plan for the heritage of Croatia. Given the limited means available, emphasis was placed on activities that might encourage others. The plan involved (a) a polyvalent workshop to be held in Zagreb in September 1993 with 5-6 foreign experts and 50 Croatian participants on priorities, legislation and conservation techniques; and (b) 3 cases of direct technical assistance - modification of Ludbreg Castle for the storage of works of art, reconstruction of the spa buildings in Lipik and strategies for promoting the fortified town of Tvrđa.

He hoped that individual countries could be encouraged to intervene with assistance on a bilateral basis.

**Mrs Von Arbin** (Council of Europe Working Group and Head of Department in the Swedish Central Board of National Antiquities) pointed out that the Working Group had

also discussed the eventual transfer of such an action plan to BiH. The idea of workshops was to help local professionals help themselves.

**Dr von Henriksen** (Secretary General of the ARCH Foundation) regretted that it had been two years since the war started before international organisations had come together to attempt to co-ordinate their action for the cultural heritage in Croatia and BiH. Even now several of those involved were not represented.

Overlap had to be avoided and certain misconceptions dispelled. The Croatians for example were not ignorant of conservation techniques, but the international community could usefully find practical areas in which it might work alongside the skills that were available.

The ARCH Foundation had been set up two years ago with the specific objective of going to Croatia when the war broke out. It held the first conference on the protection of the cultural heritage in December 1991 (together with the Austrian Kunsthistorischesmuseum) and in Zagreb in 1992 ran a course for 27 trainees on emergency techniques for protecting works of art (evacuation, storage, climate control and the provisional handling of damaged pieces). Three courses were planned in 1993 in Split, Dubrovnik and Bele\_ to update 45 conservators in new techniques. He feared overlap with the workshop announced by the Council of Europe Working Group.

Another area where there was risk of overlap was with regard to the Master Plan for Dubrovnik on which six or seven independent organisations seemed to be working. Overall coordination was clearly necessary.

The organisations should look at their existing programmes and consider how they might apply to the situation in Croatia and BiH. One approach could be the designation of significant natural resource areas for protection against rampant tourist development.

Another was to ensure the availability of appropriate materials (for example lime for the repair of pock-marked façades which could be carried out by local craftsmen).

More facilities were needed to enable the professionals to consult each other. He very much supported the idea of a local centralising office (for example in Split) to coordinate international effort.

**Mr Bouchenaki** (Director for the Physical Heritage, Unesco) recalled the fact that Dr Kaiser had been in Dubrovnik as an observer for Unesco with Bruno Carneze for a month in December 1991 when the city had been first shelled. Their appeals at that moment and their presence there had helped place Dubrovnik on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Unesco's efforts had since been concentrated on its protection.

At the same time and more generally, Unesco together with the Dutch Government was examining ways of reinforcing the Convention for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict (The Hague 1954). The aim was to give the United Nations a supplementary responsibility to look after the cultural heritage as well as the civil population.

Despite resolutions of its Executive Committee, Unesco lacked means for effective intervention on the spot. It had failed to gain access to Mostar or elsewhere in BiH. The information being collected and published by the Assembly was invaluable for any assessment of the damage so far caused.

Unesco had however made a certain contribution through the efforts of Mrs Hyvert. A quantity of tiles had, despite considerable delays, been sent to Dubrovnik. Meetings had been held with experts in Dubrovnik and Zagreb to put together an action plan for Dubrovnik and draw up a list of priority activities, and first of all a fund-raising campaign. A mission was also being prepared for September 1993 under Dr Wolf Tochtermann (of the Unesco Division for Human Settlements) to look at the villages and traditional architecture in the area around Dubrovnik.

These were isolated activities in face of the overall problems. Co-ordination of international effort was however necessary. The credibility of international organisations depended on their ability to conduct concerted action in a diversified and complex situation.

**Mrs Hyvert** (Consultant expert - Unesco Physical Heritage Division) confirmed the importance of coordination at national and international levels. She had been responsible for a Unesco working party involving several organisations but exclusively concerned with the medieval city of Dubrovnik; only last week their remit had been extended to include a limited area extra muros. For over a year she had also been planning a training programme and was expecting that the training courses organised by ICCROM and the University of Split would be open soon to Croatian architects, technicians and conservators. The local conservators needed retraining in new conservation techniques after having been long cut off from developments in this field. Next week Unesco would be organising a seminar on stone conservation and she hoped that specialists from Dubrovnik and other parts of Croatia would participate.

**Mr van Nispen** (Director of Icomos) laid claim to no programme for former Yugoslavia. Icomos had analysed its situation and decided that, while its individual members might have much to offer by way of technical assistance to former Yugoslavia, the organisation as such had another priority. This was to concentrate and coordinate international effort for the cultural heritage so as to bring it up to the level of international support and funding for wild life. This would be the focal point of the International Conservation Fair to be held in Amsterdam in 1994. It would not be difficult to find examples from Lebanon, Cyprus and the former Yugoslavia.

For action in former Yugoslavia he felt that Unesco's considerable past experience in mounting on the spot missions should be invoked.

**Mr Domljan** (Leader of the Croatian Special Guest Delegation to the Assembly) had been in charge of the Croatian Committee for the Reconstruction of Dubrovnik set up by the Croatian Parliament following the earthquake of 1979. This controlled all action intra muros and Mrs Hyvert was a member. A new situation had been created by the war damage of 1991 and 1992. The heritage had been selected as a target.

He welcomed the monitoring carried out by Dr Kaiser. While the most recent report concentrated on BiH, it should not be forgotten that one third of Croatia was not under

Croatian control and that the situation of the cultural heritage in that area was not known. He was particularly concerned about Knin, where it was reported that a unique archaeological site had been destroyed in the construction of a new airport. He also expressed concern about the condition of the Plitvica national park, on the World Heritage List but located in the Krajina. He appealed for an international mission to the area.

It was also necessary to verify the claims made by the Serbs concerning the safe-keeping and ultimate return of art collections seized from the museums of Vukovar.

He repeated his invitation for a meeting of the Assembly Committee on Culture and Education or the present Sub-Committee in Croatia to investigate these problems in greater depth. He reminded those present that the damage being done now to Croatian culture was far greater than the destruction carried out in the Second World War.

**Mr Baumel** regretted that neither the Council of Europe nor the UN military forces had so far shown a willingness to admit the cultural dimension alongside humanitarian considerations in former Yugoslavia. Media coverage continued to dwell on the details of physical carnage.

He concluded this part of the discussion by thanking those present for their contribution to this first attempt to co-ordinate international action for the cultural heritage of former Yugoslavia.

He noted that there was general agreement on the following items:

- There was a need for the **regular exchange of information between organisations concerned** with the cultural heritage in former Yugoslavia. Duplication of effort should be avoided. The present meeting should be followed by another in the autumn.

- **Experts should be enabled to visit the areas in question and contact networks should be established involving those on the spot.** An important objective of such missions would be to reassure those responsible for the cultural heritage on the spot of the support and sympathy of the international community. The Sub-Committee on the Architectural and Artistic Heritage would seek Assembly authorisation for a **fact-finding mission to Sarajevo and Mostar** in the course of the summer and would hope to be accompanied on this by experts. Parallel missions should be sought by other organisations and experts.

- Most important was the **creation of a small but suitably located central co-ordination point** for cultural heritage rescue operations. In the first instance this might most conveniently be placed in Split (for reasons of access to both Mostar and Sarajevo, but also to the north Croatian coastal region which was still being heavily bombarded). With **minimal personnel** such a centre would nevertheless serve as a practical starting point for the co-ordination of international action and a clearing house for information. It would also be a symbol of international concern for the cultural heritage of former Yugoslavia. Regular reviews should be issued on the current situation and convoys arranged to meet immediate needs (whether tiles, hammers, nails or plastic sheeting). The Council of Europe should be encouraged to give its official support to such an initiative. Could the Croatian authorities make premises available?

- In more general terms **a human corridor should be established** alongside that of humanitarian aid. The Committee on Culture and Education could launch an initiative for a broader approach to the cultural dimension (media, artists and other cultural activity) in the coming autumn. A campaign should therefore be launched to establish the case for cultural assistance and to raise financial support.

He thanked those involved for their contribution and regretted that he had to leave before the meeting finally concluded.

**Mr Tummers** (General Rapporteur for the Architectural Heritage) now took the chair.

He recalled the parallel parliamentary moves made within the Western European Union (WEU). In early 1991 he had tabled a proposal for the involvement of Council of Europe cultural observers alongside the military force it had been hoped that the WEU would send. The response of the military had been to await peace.

The immediate question arose from the use of the cultural heritage as a target in the present conflict. This had already been seen in the Middle East and in Cyprus; it had occurred most recently in Florence. The implications of such "iconocide" had to be directly studied. One line of investigation was to update the 1954 Convention of The Hague; another was to include crimes against the cultural heritage in the War Crimes Tribunal currently being established.

A more general issue, that would only arise after the war was over, was whether to rebuild the cultural heritage. Was reconstruction as in Warsaw justified? And what should be done with traces of the more recent 20th century heritage?

**Mr Ballester** (Head of the Cultural Heritage Division, Council of Europe) welcomed the opportunity for co-ordination of the action of the different organisations concerned for the cultural heritage in former Yugoslavia. The problems were immediate and rapid action necessary. He invited those present to provide operational information on what was being planned so that a consolidated report could be produced.

**Mr Grayson** (Secretary to the Committee on Culture and Education, Parliamentary Assembly) pointed out that the objective of the series of information reports being produced by the Assembly was to assess the situation, monitor developments and list action by the different organisations involved, including the various levels of Council of Europe activity. This was also the reason for calling the present meeting. The information contained in the Assembly reports should be completed but not repeated.

**Mr von Henriksen** believed that the proposed coordination centre in Croatia could also serve as a basis for attracting emergency funding. A permanent representative should be nominated to co-ordinate matters from that base.

**Mr Domljan** welcomed the technical assistance programmes, pilot projects and seminars that were being proposed. The real problem was however lack of money. Loans had been offered (6000 DM) and stacks of roof tiles existed (200,000 in Dubrovnik), but neither could be used as private persons could not afford them; the government had had to drop the scheme as it was too expensive. There were enough skilled workers, but no-one could pay them.



**Mrs von Arbin** took up the point of raising funds and public involvement. She hoped that the present meeting, at which all the organisations present were seen to be co-operating, would be publicised so as to attract international attention.

**Mr Tummers** agreed and hoped that the Council of Europe would also be able to continue to publish regular information on the situation. The holding of a subsequent meeting would depend on developments during the summer, but should not in any case be postponed beyond the autumn.

**Mr von Henriksen** suggested it be held in Split in late August after the proposed mission to Mostar and Sarajevo.

**Mr Grayson** drew attention to the practical difficulties of this mission. It required Assembly authorisation (the Bureau would be meeting on 2 July) and the provision of a military escort (which had still to be negotiated). It should be understood that all the organisations involved would have to cover their individual costs both for the mission and second meeting.

**Mr Tummers** concluded by noting that the first priority was to arrange the fact-finding mission of parliamentarians and experts to Mostar and Sarajevo. Another priority was to convene a second co-ordination meeting at the end of the summer. Information would be circulated in due course on how these matters would be carried forward.

## **F. CONCLUDING NOTE**

*The Assembly Bureau meeting on 2 July 1993 decided not to give the authorisation requested for a fact-finding mission in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina at the end of July. The Committee on Culture and Education (through its Sub-Committee on the Architectural and Artistic Heritage and consultant experts) continues to monitor the situation from the outside.*

*In a parallel initiative Mrs Leni Fischer, Chair of the Committee on Culture and Education, and other members tabled on 1 July 1993 a Motion for a recommendation on the cultural situation on the territory of former Yugoslavia (see Doc 6889). It is hoped that this will lead to a report and debate on the wider cultural dimension: including the cultural heritage, the media, young people, education higher education and research; and the arts and artists.*