

RIJEČ UREDNIŠTVA

ŠUMARSTVO KAO GOSPODARSKA GRANA, DANAŠNJE STANJE I TRETMAN

Već smo pisali u ovoj rubrici o šumarstvu kao gospodarskoj grani, i to posebno značajnoj i važnoj, koju naša Država nažalost ne prepoznaje. Naime, šumarstva „nema“ u Hrvatskoj gospodarskoj komori, izbačeno je iz naziva resornog Ministarstva, o njemu se ne raspravlja u Saboru i prema njemu se postupa mačehinski u svakome pogledu, od političkog kadroviranja do nerazumljivog tretmana. Struka koja brine o 47,5 % kopnene površine Države, i to o najsloženijem ekosustavu, nema čak ni svoju redovitu TV ili radio emisiju, kao primjerice poljoprivreda ili more. Načela konzistentne šumarske politike i strategije koja iz nje proizlazi, u uređenoj državi propisuje i kontrolira Država putem resornog Ministarstva. Kako naša Država nema ni politike ni strategije šumarstva, status šumarstva rješava se putem trgovačkog društva (u stvari koncesionara), koje ga provodi kroz dugo najavljivano restrukturiranje, ali usmjereno isključivo prema klasičnom profitu.

U inozemnoj i domaćoj literaturi, pa i u Šumarskome listu, pisano je o tome kako treba tretirati šumarstvo, ali i dalje je očito da se ne uvažava znanstveno-stručno gledište kako šumarstvo ne smijemo promatrati kao privrednu granu na isti način kao ostale privredne grane, kojima priliči klasična definicija privredne grane. Naime, zbog specifično vrijednog činitelja proizvodnje kao što je šuma i šumsko zemljište i usluge općekorisnih funkcija šume, ono ne smije biti tretirano kao ostale privredne grane. Te usluge nisu roba u klasičnom smislu, pa šumarstvo u cjelini ne možemo smatrati klasičnim robnim proizvođačem, što definira privrednu granu. Tretiramo li pak šumarstvo kao klasičnu privrednu granu, postoji objektivna opasnost da držeći se samo načela rentabilnosti i ekonomičnosti budu zapostavljeni neophodni zahvati u šumi koji onda pridonose padu ravnoteže i njezine vrijednosti u budućnosti. Upozoravajući na to, u članku o problemu tvorbe konzistentne šumarske politike u Glasniku za šumske pokuse (Sabadi i Jakovac 1993), naznačeno je da se „iz šuma ne smije ništa odnijeti, tj. ono što smo posjekli valja vraćati kroz šumsko uzgojne radove šumske proizvodnje kao jednostavnu reprodukciju ili pak ulagati u poboljšanje sastojina i njihovo otvaranje, kao proširenu reprodukciju, no zaboravlja se i stremi se zahvaćanju u trenutne probitke. To je pouzdan način da se ovaj naš obnovljivi resurs polako, ali sigurno pretvori u neobnovljiv“. Stoga

je i razumljiv zaključak da bi Hrvatske šume trebale biti javno i neprofitno poduzeće, koje „ako ostvari prihode veće od rashoda u okvirima racionalnog poslovanja, ima svu pozitivnu razliku utrošiti na unapređenje šuma kojima gospodariti“ (osim onih najvrjednijih imamo i oko 40 % degradiranih šuma različitog stupnja degradacije). Naravno, državne šume „imaju se promatrati nedodirljivima tj. zabranjuje se alijenacija (otuđivenje)“. Ostajući samo na prihodima iz klasičnog iskorištavanja šuma putem drvne sirovine, i to nažalost uglavnom iz one najkvalitetnije, ne uvažavajući načela potrajnog gospodarenja i na način da se pojedine sastavnice struke izbacuju iz svoga poslovanja, nije čudo što se teži smanjenju broja zaposlenih. Posebice bi bilo pogubno da se u svrhu veće dobiti dodatno propisuju veći etati, vrši tzv. kvalitetna sječa, dozvoljava prevelik broj Ad stabala, prekomjerno oštećuju stabla pri izvlačenju drvne sirovine i uhrpavanju na pomoćnom stovarištu, značajno oštećuje stanište radom izvan prometne infrastrukture i u ekstremnim vremenskim uvjetima i sl. I naposljetku u zaključku prethodno spomenutog članka kaže se kako „ne treba isticati da su na određenim mjestima potrebni najkvalificiraniji stručnjaci koje imamo.“ Uz časne iznimke, upitajmo se držimo li se toga.

Preustrojem Hrvatskih šuma d.o.o. iz javnog poduzeća u trgovačko društvo dobili smo to što imamo danas, tako da je glavni motiv postao klasični profit, a ne gore spomenuta načela poslovanja u šumarstvu, i što je posebno pogubno za stanovništvo ruralnih područja, izbjegavaju se obveze značajnijeg sudjelovanja u regionalnom i ruralnom razvoju, što izričito proklamira EU Strategija šumarstva. Zabluda je zastupati mišljenje da šumarstvo ne pripada socijalnoj kategoriji, kada se sve njegove aktivnosti obavljaju isključivo na ruralnom području. Oduvijek je šumarstvo živjelo „s narodom i za narod“, ne podliježući isključivo kapitalu, a narod je za uzvrat čuvao ruralni prostor iz kojega ga nerazumnom politikom tjeramo, čudeći se što ga svakodnevno sve više napušta. Pametan čovjek bi se duboko zamislio, pa bi možda i shvatio da isključivo profit nije uvijek i svugdje sinonim za blagostanje, kojemu svi težimo.

EDITORIAL

FORESTRY AS AN ECONOMIC BRANCH, THE CURRENT SITUATION AND TREATMENT

This column has already addressed the topic of forestry as a particularly important economic branch, which is regrettably not recognized by our State. Namely, not only does forestry not "exist" in the Croatian Economic Chamber, but it has also been omitted from the name of the competent Ministry, nor is it a subject of discussion in the Parliament. In short, it is treated with hostility in all its aspects, from politically based recruitment to an utterly incomprehensible approach. The profession that manages 47.5 % of the most complex ecosystem of the country's land surface not does even have its own TV or radio programme, unlike agriculture or the marine industry. In an organized state, the principles of a consistent forestry policy and the ensuing strategy are regulated and controlled by the State through a competent Ministry. Since our State has neither forestry policy nor strategy, the status of forestry is dealt with by a company (in fact, a concessioner), which is guided by long-announced restructuring, but is targeted exclusively towards achieving classical profit.

The treatment of forestry has been frequently discussed in both foreign and domestic journals, including the Forestry Journal, but it is evident that we still do not abide by the scientific-professional view that forestry should not be perceived as an economic branch in the same way as other classical economic branches are. Due to the specific and valuable production factor such as forests and forestland, as well as an array of non-market forest functions, it should be treated differently than other economic branches. These services are not goods in the classical sense of the word: therefore, forestry as a whole cannot be viewed as a classical producer of goods, a definition that is applied to an economic branch. If we treat forestry as a classical economic branch, there is a danger that by adhering only to the principles of profitability and efficiency, the necessary operations in forests will be neglected, which will in turn result in diminished balance and decreased value in the future. An article published in the journal *Forest Experiments*, which deals with the problem of creating a consistent forestry policy (Sabadi and Jakovac, 1993), states that "*nothing should be taken out of forests; in other words, what has been felled should be restored through silvicultural operations in the form of simple reproduction, or investment should be made in the improvement and opening of stands in the form of extended reproduction. However, this is often overlooked and all effort is targeted towards achieving momentary gains. This is a sure way of converting, slowly but inevitably, this renewable resource into*

a non-renewable one". This is why the conclusion that the company *Hrvatske Šume* should be a public and non-profit company is understandable. Such a company, "*if achieving income that exceeds expenses within rational business making, should invest all positive difference into the improvement of forests which it manages*" (in addition to the most valuable forests, we have about 40% of forests in different stages of degradation). Needles to say, state forests "*should be regarded as sacrosanct, or in other words, alienation is forbidden*". By generating profit only from classical exploitation of forests through raw wood material, generally of the highest quality, by not applying the principles of sustainable management and by eliminating certain components from its business, it is no wonder that there is a tendency towards downsizing the labour force. It would be particularly detrimental, in order to achieve higher income, to additionally prescribe larger annual cuts, perform so-called quality felling, allow too many accidentally felled trees, inflict excessively damage to trees during the extraction and stacking the raw material in auxiliary depots, significantly harm forest sites by conducting operations outside forest roads and under extreme weather conditions, etc. The conclusion of the afore-mentioned article states that "*it goes without saying that certain jobs require the best qualified specialists*". With some honourable exceptions, let us ask ourselves whether we all adhere to this.

The reorganisation of *Hrvatske Šume* Ltd from a public company into a limited liability company has resulted in what we have today. The main motive is now classical profit instead of the principles of forestry business mentioned above. What is particularly disadvantageous for the population in rural areas is that the obligation to participate in regional and rural development, as explicitly proclaimed by the EU Forestry Strategy, is also avoided. In view of the fact that all forestry activities are performed exclusively in rural areas, it is erroneous to claim that forestry does not belong to a social category. Forestry has always lived "with the people and for the people" and has not succumbed exclusively to capital. Rural inhabitants have always guarded the rural area from which we drive them away with unreasonable politics, wondering in the process why so many are increasingly abandoning it. A reasonable man would think twice and would probably understand that profit itself and profit only is not always a synonym for prosperity to which we all strive.

Editorial Board