

RIJEČ UREDNIŠTVA

KAKO DALJE S OVOM RUBRIKOM

U Šumarskome listu 7-8/2014. nakon neopravdane kritike tadašnjeg vodstva Hrvatskih šuma d.o.o., tema ove rubrike bila je ukazati na njenu zadaću. Između ostaloga, naglasili smo kako Uredništvo prenosi „riječ šumarske struke“, i da bi s obzirom na širinu i sveobuhvatnost činjenica glede šuma i šumarstva, pametnima i u politici i u šumskom gospodarstvu mogla poslužiti da shvate koliko to bogatstvo imamo u svojim rukama te kako bi s njime valjalo upravljati onako kako smo učili tj. na znanstvenim i stručnim načelima. U nastavku podsjetili smo čitateljstvo na neke od tema o kojima smo pisali, upućujući na brojeve Šumarskoga lista u kojima se mogu naći odnosni tekstovi. No, uz brojeve 1-2 Šumarskog lista, svake godine priložen je i Godišnji sadržaj u kojemu zainteresirani mogu naći sve naslove tema ove rubrike.

Listajući te godišnje sadržaje samo 4-5 godina unatrag, pa slijedom istih čitajući tekstove odnosnih tema, neupitno se nameće pitanje: da li je bar u glavnim segmentima poslušana riječ struke, ili je to bilo „gluhome dobro jutro“? Najbolje bi bilo da svaki čitatelj, a posebice odgovorni za sadašnje stanje struke, odgovori na to pitanje, makar i pred ogledalom, ako se ustručava reći javno. No, većina šuti, a odgovorni se ljute na kritiku, ne pružajući argumente da pobiju činjenice. Nema nam druge nego ponovo tražiti odgovore na pitanja, ili „zatvoriti“ ovu rubriku.

Primjerice, očekuje se donošenje novog Zakona o šumama koji se u Općim odredbama, čl. 2., točka 3 oslanja na Nacionalnu strategiju za šume i Nacionalni programa za šume, a članak 3., točka 3 prijedloga Zakona upućuje na „primjenu načela potrajnog gospodarenja šumama u svrhu trenutnog i budućeg ispunjavanja odgovarajuće **ekološke gospodarske i društvene funkcije** na lokalnoj, nacionalnoj i globalnoj razini, uvažavajući socioekonomsku važnost šuma i njihovo pridonosenje ruralnom razvoju“. U nastavku se uz održivo gospodarenje šumama i višenamjensku ulogu šuma ukazuje na **učinkovito korištenje resursa**, a u članku 4. navedene su **općekorisne funkcije šuma**. Sve lijepo piše, no držimo li se mi tih načela ili njima pretpostavljamo klasičan profit, smanjujući radove koje šumu drže u optimumu i osiguravaju sve općekorisne funkcije šume. Kako to da uz lijepo obrazloženje svih funkcija šume još nismo uspjeli uvjeriti sve korisnike da nije obveza i dužnost samo šumarstva, već i svih ostalih sudjelovati bar djelimično u financiranju njezinih benefita.

Imali smo prigovor na čl. 65. (1) kojim se oslobađaju naknade za općekorisne funkcije šuma u iznosu od 0,0265 % godišnjeg prihoda oni s prometom manjim od 1,000.000 kn, a Ministar to podigne na 3,000.000 kn. Popotom iznos ubrane ukupne te naknade od do sada 5 % za znanost, smanji na 1 %. Naravno, pretpostavljamo kako bi mogli opravdati epitet Hrvatske kao zemlje znanja!

Glede učinkovitog korištenja resursa zadanog u Nacionalnoj strategiji za šume nema pomaka, jer se i nadalje posluje neracionalno, odnosno netržišno. Ustanove koje gospodare šumama u vlasništvu Republike Hrvatske Zakonom, čl. 16. (7), obvezuju se prodavati drvene sortimente javnim nadmetanjem, ali drvene sortimente javnog šumoposjednika (Hrvatske šume d.o.o.) ne. Kažu, podigli smo cijene drvnim sortimentima za prosječno 5 %, a onda smo „finalistima“ dali bonus od 25 %. Kojim finalistima i tko će podmiriti šumarijama manjak prihoda? Pravih finalista gotovo i nema. Kada se na televiziji hvali izvoz drvene industrije, stidljivo se priznaje da je to u većini drvena sirovina i poluproizvodi s malom dodanom vrijednošću – od namještaja nismo vidjeli primjerice regale, krevete, stolove i dr., nego samo ojašteni namještaj, a tu su negdje i sjedala za autobuse, koja se kažu ubrajaju kao finalni proizvod drvene industrije. Potvrdu rečenog dobili smo nedavno i na televiziji u intervjuu gosp. Karduma s direktorom „Emezete“, koji na sugestiju da u svojim trgovinama ima mogućnost ponude hrvatskog namještaja pita: „kojeg namještaja – njega nema“! Rekli bi ljudi – „tko je tu lud“. No, drveni sortiment kao nacionalno bogatstvo nemilice se rasipa, da bi se napunili privatni džepovi. Štitimo kažu male pilanare, bez uvida u kapacitete u odnosu na raspoloživu drvenu sirovinu, broj zaposlenih, koje starosne i stručne razine te za koga proizvode piljenu građu. Za burzu piljene građe sigurno ne, jer nje nema kao što nema niti svojevremeno proklamirane i profanirane burze ribe. Uglavnom su to proizvodi za Bliski istok, s minimalnom dodanom vrijednosti. Glede proizvodnje drvnih peleta od 1,2 % svjetske proizvodnje, čime se hvali Drvni klaster, pravo pitanje bilo bi: od koje drvene sirovine se proizvode i što bi se dogodilo kada ne bi troškove sušenja sirovine kompenzirali nabavom drvnih sortimenata po netržišnoj cijeni. O proizvodnji parketa, kao proizvodu tzv. „dorade“, u više smo navrata izrekli svoje mišljenje.

Uredništvo

EDITORIAL

HOW TO PROCEED IN THE FUTURE?

In reaction to unjustified criticism levelled at us by the then management of the company Croatian Forests Ltd, we highlighted the multiple role of this column in Forestry Journal 7-8/2014. Among other things, we stressed that the Editorial Board used this column to communicate “the word of the forestry profession” to the readers. Considering the broad and comprehensive nature of forests and forestry, we also tried to impress on those in politics and forest economy who were willing to listen the obvious fact that Croatian forests represent exceptional wealth and that this wealth should be managed on strictly scientific and professional principles. We went on to remind our readers of some other topics that we discussed, and we made a list of all the volumes where these topics could be found. Every year, Volumes 1-2 of the Forestry Journal bring fourth the Annual Content, in which all those interested can find all the topics discussed in the column.

After browsing through the annual contents of the issues from the last 4-5 years and reading about the different topics, we may well ask ourselves if the word of the profession was adhered to at least in the main segments or if we were just “flogging a dead horse”. It would be best if our readers, and particularly those responsible for the current state of the profession, answered this question themselves; if unwilling to speak out loudly, let them say it to the mirror. Yet, the vast majority keeps silent, while those responsible react furiously to our criticism, but do not provide any counter-arguments. There are but two things we can do now: renew our search for the answers to the questions, or “close down” this column.

For example, in the new Forest Act that is under way, the General Provisions, article 3, paragraph 4, follow the National Forest Strategy and the National Forest Programme. Article 3, paragraph 3 of the proposed Act mentions the “implementation of the principles of sustainable forest management aimed at achieving the present and future fulfilment of the ecological-commercial and social function at the local, national and global level, taking into consideration the socio-economic importance of forests and their contribution to rural development”. In addition to sustainable forest management and the multipurpose role of forests, the text goes on to mention the efficient use of resources, and article 4 lists non-market forest functions. As we can see, it is all stated loud and clear, but do we adhere to these principles or do we disregard these principles in favour of classical profit and cut down on the amount of activities needed to maintain forests in an optimal condition and ensure all of their non-market functions? How is it possible then, that in spite of the repeated statements of the importance of forest functions, we have failed to convince the public that the obligation and duty to finance, at least partially, non-market forest functions does not fall only on forester but on the whole society?

There was an objection to article 65 (1), which states that those with an annual income less than 1,000.000 kuna should be exempt from paying a non-market forest functions fee in the amount of 0.0265 % of the annual income. The Minister then raised this minimum to 3,000.000 kuna, and then reduced the amount of the collected fee designated to science from 5 % to 1%. We only presume that it was done to justify the epithet of Croatia being the Land of Knowledge!

Regarding the efficient use of resources as prescribed by the National Forest Strategy, there are no advances in this respect because we continue to act irrationally, inefficiently and contrary to market laws. Article 16 (7) of the Law binds institutions responsible for the management of state-owned forests to sell wood assortments in public bids, but the same does not apply to the public forest owner (Croatian Forests Ltd). They say, “we have raised the price of wood assortments by 5 % on average”, but then they give the “finalists” a bonus of 25 %. Which finalists, and who will compensate forest administrations for the losses incurred? There are almost no real finalists. The public television praises exports achieved by the wood industry, but only reluctantly do they admit that this export includes mainly raw wood material and semi-finished products with low additional value - we have seen no furniture in the form of cabinets, beds, tables and other pieces, only upholstered pieces and sporadic bus seats that pretend to be the finished goods of the wood industry.

All the above was confirmed recently in a television interview with Mr Kardum, director of “Emmezeta”, who, when asked if there was a possibility to sell Croatian furniture in their shops, answered; “What furniture? There is none!” People would say - “someone is loony here”. Yet, wood assortments - our national treasure - are being mercilessly squandered just so that private pockets can be lined. They say they protect small sawmill owners, and yet no control is made of how many people they employ, what the employee age and educational profile is, and for whom sawmill goods are produced. Definitely not for the sawmill stock market, since it does not exist, just as the once advertised fish stock market does not exist either. Sawmill products are mainly manufactured for the Near East markets, where they achieve minimal added value. As for the production of wood pallets amounting to 1.2 % of world production, something that the Wood Cluster is bragging about, the real question should be: which raw wood material is used for their production and what would happen if the cost of drying the raw material were not compensated for by the acquisition of wood assortments at non-market prices? Regarding the production of parquet, the so-called “processing” product, we have already given our opinion on this issue on several occasions.

Editorial Board