

# Translation of Four Texts from Croatian into English: Wine Tourism, Economics and History

---

**Petrone, Vedran**

**Undergraduate thesis / Završni rad**

**2019**

*Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj:* **University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Rijeci, Filozofski fakultet**

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:186:138054>

*Rights / Prava:* [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2024-12-12**



*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[Repository of the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences - FHSSRI Repository](#)



UNIVERSITY OF RIJEKA  
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES  
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Vedran Petrone

TRANSLATION OF FOUR TEXTS FROM CROATIAN INTO ENGLISH:  
WINE TOURISM, ECONOMICS AND HISTORY

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the B.A. in English Language and Literature and German Language and Literature at the University of Rijeka

Supervisor:

Dr.sc. Anita Memišević

September 2019

## ABSTRACT

The main topic of this B.A. thesis is the translation of four different texts from the Croatian into the English language. This abstract is followed by the table of contents which is then followed by an introduction in which there is a definition of translation alongside with the aim of this thesis. After the introduction comes the analysis of four texts: the first one is about wine tourism in Dalmatia, the second one is about the debt crisis in Germany, the third one touches upon the topic of Jewish emigration from Croatia and the last one is about the emigration from Rijeka. The analysis of each one of these texts consists of some of the problematic words and expressions that I came across as well as how I solved the problems I encountered. Lastly, there is a conclusion and appendix in which all the original texts in the Croatian language can be found.

**Keywords:** analysis, Croatian language, economics, English language, history, tourism, translation

# Table of Contents

- INTRODUCTION .....1
- 2. WINE TOURISM TEXT TRANSLATION.....4
  - 2.1. Introduction.....4
  - 2.2. Translation.....4
  - 2.3. Analysis.....13
- 3. POLITICAL TEXT TRANSLATION .....17
  - 3.1. Introduction.....17
  - 3.2. Translation.....17
  - 3.3. Analysis.....23
- 4. TRANSLATION OF A TEXT ABOUT THE JEWISH EMIGRATION .....27
  - 4.1. Introduction.....27
  - 4.2. Translation.....27
  - 4.3. Analysis.....34
- 5. TRANSLATION OF A TEXT ABOUT EMIGRATION FROM RIJEKA TO AMERICA .....37
  - 5.1. Introduction.....37
  - 5.2. Translation.....38
  - 5.3. Analysis.....45
- CONCLUSION .....48
- BIBLIOGRAPHY.....49
- APPENDICES.....51

## INTRODUCTION

Even though the main goal of this thesis is the translation and the analysis of the four different texts that have never been translated before, I still need to focus a little bit on the definition of translation, common problems that translators can stumble upon, and also on the methods that I used while translating and the general aim of this thesis.

Translation is an old practice that has been present for a long period of time and our communication depends on it, however, it is still not entirely explained. The whole concept of translating is very ambiguous and poses many questions, such as what actually is translation and how is it connected with human society and communication.<sup>1</sup>

According to Roger T. Bell, it is hard to give an exact definition of translation, however he mentions a couple of them, some of which are: *“Translation is the expression in another language (or target language) of what has been expressed in another, source language, preserving semantic and stylistic equivalences.”*<sup>2</sup> and *“Translation is the replacement of a representation of a text in one language by a representation of an equivalent text in a second language.”*<sup>3</sup>

In his book he mentions that some of the problems encountered when translating are the fact that languages are very different in form, meaning that they are made of different rules and codes. During translation, these forms need to be changed, which results in conveying meaning

---

<sup>1</sup> T. Bell, Candlin, 1991, pp. 3-4

<sup>2</sup> *Ivi*, p. 5

<sup>3</sup> *Ivi*, p. 6

that fails to coincide completely. Absolute synonymy between languages and words does not exist, resulting in occasional loss of something in the translation process. The most famous quote showcasing this problem is an Italian proverb *traduttore traditore*, emphasizing the fact that translators can sometimes be guilty of not entirely sticking to the original and losing a part of the author's intentions somewhere along the way.<sup>4</sup>

Translators have two choices: literal translation or free translation. One way or another, they will be accused either of not translating accurately enough or the translation will end up being too accurate resulting in the 'ugliness' of the sentences and translation as a whole.<sup>5</sup>

Multiple translation methods exist and an experienced translator has to know how to properly utilize each of them. According to Newmark, there are eight translation methods. The first one is the *Word-for-word translation*, which "*preserves the word order of the SL and the words are being translated singly by their most common meanings, out of context.*"<sup>6</sup> The second one is *Literal translation* and it is a translation method „*in which the SL grammatical constructions are converted to their nearest TL equivalents, but the lexical words are again translated singly, out of context.*"<sup>7</sup> The third one is the *Faithful translation* and its definition is: "*it attempts to produce the precise contextual meaning of the original within the constraints of the TL grammatical structures.*"<sup>8</sup> The next one is the *Semantic translation* and it "*differs from 'faithful translation' only in as far as it must take more account of the aesthetic value of the SL text.*"<sup>9</sup> The *Adaptation* is: "*the freest form of translation, and is used mainly for plays (comedies)*

---

<sup>4</sup> T. Bell, Candlin, 1991, p. 6

<sup>5</sup> Ivi, p. 7

<sup>6</sup> <https://translationjournal.net/journal/41culture.htm>

<sup>7</sup> *Ibidem*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibidem*

<sup>9</sup> *Ibidem*

and poetry; the themes, characters, plots are usually preserved, the SL culture is converted to the TL culture and the text is rewritten.<sup>10</sup> The *Free translation* is defined as: “producing the TL text without the style, form, or content of the original.”<sup>11</sup> Another one is the *Idiomatic translation* which: “reproduces the 'message' of the original but tends to distort nuances of meaning by preferring colloquialisms and idioms where these do not exist in the original.”<sup>12</sup> And the last one is the *Communicative translation* with the following definition: “it attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership.”<sup>13</sup>

From the above mentioned methods, I have used *Faithful translation*, as well as the *Semantic translation*, because not only have I tried to stick to the writing style of the original text, but I have also tried to find the best suited equivalents for idioms and phrases in the target language, if a direct translation did not exist, instead of just removing them.

I wanted to keep the meaning of the original texts as much as possible, while still changing some parts in order to make them easier to read and understand. One of the main problems is that the Croatian language does not have a fixed word order, i.e. one can change the word order while still maintaining the same meaning of the sentence. In the English language, however, this is not the case, so I had to pay attention to that aspect of the translation process.

When it comes to the tools that I used, a major help was the online dictionary glosbe.com because it gives examples of sentences in which a particular word is used. Another dictionary that

---

<sup>10</sup><https://translationjournal.net/journal/41culture.htm>

<sup>11</sup>*Ibidem*

<sup>12</sup>*Ibidem*

<sup>13</sup>*Ibidem*

I found to be very helpful is Bujas's and the online website Hrvatski jezični portal that helped in explaining some of the words, especially from the text about the bank-debt crisis in Germany.

The aim of this thesis was to give the most accurate possible translation and to learn more about the translation process and how time-consuming it can be.

## **2. WINE TOURISM TEXT TRANSLATION**

### **2.1. Introduction**

The first article that I translated was written by Mili Razović and discusses wine tourism in Dalmatia. It goes over the effects which wine tourism has on the region, talks about the region and its tourist offer and finally how wine tourism can develop even further and expand the region's tourist offer and attract even more tourists.

### **2.2. Translation**

#### **1. Introduction**

Tourism on the Croatian Adriatic coast, including Dalmatia, is burdened by a high concentration of tourist traffic in July and August. The tourist season is being prolonged through innovations in the tourist offer – the implementation of new tourist products. One of those products is tourism that includes wine – wine tourism. Natural predispositions, the age old tradition of cultivating



vine stock and winemaking create exceptional opportunities for the development of wine tourism and the enrichment of Dalmatia's tourist offer.

Tourists seek an authentic and unique experience while visiting certain tourist destinations. While visiting a destination where vine stock is cultivated and the consumption of wine is organized, the tourist comes in direct contact with the culture of the host, exchanges positive experiences with other people, gets introduced to cultural activities, attractions and all that the tourist destination has to offer. The development of wine tourism contributes to the positioning and recognition of a particular tourist area giving it a competitive advantage.

Among various products which can be considered as developmental priorities of Dalmatia's tourism, wine tourism is one of them for a number of reasons. First, Dalmatia has a long lasting tradition of vine stock cultivation and wine production, with a steady growth over the past few decades. Wine is the main source of income for many families on the Dalmatian coast and its islands. The cultivation of vine stock and production of grapes and wine are ingrained in the local Dalmatian lifestyle and are a part of the "sense of place". It is in the interest of tourism to preserve local traditions and sustainable economic development. Second, winemakers have already invested in the development of basic infrastructure to accommodate visitors and with the modest help of the public sector this product could achieve high market positioning. Third, wine tourism is considered to be a product in line with the current market demand, which means that the tourist demand for an authentic and unique experience at tourist destinations is rising. Local food and wine create an opportunity for tourists to meet the people who produce these products. This enables them to meet the need of the tourist for an authentic experience through the mediation of wine tourism. Finally, wine is often associated with certain characteristics and a

particular taste, which the tourist destination possesses, and business activities in wine tourism are a prerequisite for an alluring image of the destination.

Understanding the motivation and entrepreneurial orientation, as well as having an insight into the potential of wineries is the first step towards the development of an effective strategy for wine tourism. The high importance of products of the sun and the sea, the high tourist demand during the two summer months on a narrow coastal strip and the islands of Dalmatia and the traditional winemaking, which has been modernized in the meantime, require significant advancements in the field of wine tourism.

Dalmatia may serve as a prime example for the study of wine tourism. The goal of this paper is to examine the profile of wineries that operate in Dalmatia. This research is a continuation of a research on Dalmatia's wine tourism conducted in 2011. The same methodology and procedures have been used in this research, which was conducted in 2014, as in the one conducted in 2011 about the providers of wine tourism in Dalmatia. However, the goal of this study is to identify the changes which have occurred in Dalmatian wine tourism over the period of the past four years. In order to further highlight the current issues concerning wine tourism in Dalmatia, a research was conducted in 2014 on the vineyards of the Pelješac peninsula. The wineries of the Pelješac peninsula are some of the best representatives in terms of wine production and organizational models of wine tourism in Dalmatia. This paper attempts to highlight the following: the entrepreneurship potential of participants in wine tourism in Dalmatia and Pelješac; and second; the identification of the elements of the development policy regarding the development of wine trail tourism, which should be in line with the entrepreneurship potential, creating a unique product of Dalmatian tourism.

## 2. The Dalmatian region – the destination – of wine tourism

According to Getz and Brown (2006), and Tomljenović and Getz (2009) a wine region is an area where the best wine is made and “it is a special place, even magical”. A wine region is a rural area and is in direct contact with the visitors – wine consumers. The entertainment, gastronomy, scenery and nature activities of the region are the basis of its future development.

Hall (2003) states that instead of wine region, the term “tourist area” should be used, which encompasses a combination of physical, cultural and natural environments and gives each region a certain appeal as a wine tourism destination.

The development of wine tourism destinations includes attractions, services, education of staff members, infrastructure and the organization development and marketing plans. The particularity of the wine region as a wine product includes wine education of the guests and interpretation centers, wine communities, wine tours, sightseeing tours of the land of wine – wine land.

These “products” are a combination of special development regarding wineries or public investment in wine tourism, such as the image and function changing program of the service centers – becoming “wine villages”. (Getz and Brown, 2006; Tomljenović and Getz, 2009)

Dalmatia, as a wine and tourist region, is located in the central Croatian coast on the east side of the Adriatic.

The southern Croatian littoral or Dalmatia is an elongated coastal split, around 400 km in length and up to 70 km in width in its central part. It stretches over a surface of 11 960 km<sup>2</sup> or 21% of the area of Croatia. Around 855 000 citizens live in Dalmatia, or 20% of the population of Croatia. The Dalmatian aquatorium contains 926 islands, islets, cliffs and reefs, or 78% of

Croatia's total. They take up 1770 km<sup>2</sup>, which is 58% of Croatia's total island area, or 15% of the area of Dalmatia. The terrestrial coastal split is 1200 km long, which is almost 2/3 of Croatia's mainland coast.

The production of wine is a millennia old tradition in Dalmatia, which can be proven by findings of wine containers (amphorae and wine glasses) and preserved silver and copper coins from the Greek city of Pharos (an ancient town on the island of Hvar) from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC and the excavated coins from the city of Issa (Vis) with images of amphorae and grapes dating back to the year 385 BC. The most important wine of this area is the Plavac mali crni, which came into being in the distant past through the crossing of the indigenous Dalmatian wines Kaštelanska crljanka (internationally known as zinfandel) and Dobričić.

The period from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> all the way to the 20<sup>th</sup> century is known as the period of the big boom in Dalmatian viticulture and oenology. During that period, 68 000 ha of Dalmatia was covered by vineyards, with an annual production over 600 000 hl of wine, more than 2/3 of which were exported.

As a vineyard sub-region, Dalmatia is divided into: North Dalmatia, Dalmatinska zagora, Central and South Dalmatia. In the area of North Dalmatia around 3600 ha is under vineyards. This area is best known on the market for its two indigenous wines the Primoštanski crni babičić and the Bijeli oklajski debit.

In the area of Dalmatinska zagora around 2000 ha are occupied by vineyards. Alongside the traditional varieties in this area (debit, plavina, trnjak, hrvaština), kujundūša, from which the eponymous white wine is made, is the most dominant one.

The area of Central and South Dalmatia encompasses the majority (12) of Dalmatia's wine countries. Seven wine countries are located on the islands: Mljet, Korčula, Lastovo, Vis, Hvar, Brač and Šolta. Five wine countries are on the mainland area of Kaštel – Trogir, Split – Omiš – Makraska, Neretva, Konavle and Pelješac. In this region 4450 ha are occupied by vineyards, and the most prominent variety of grapes is the red Plavac mali. These grapes are the key to top-quality Croatian red wines such as the Dingač, Postup, Zlatni plavac and Plavac pharos. In comparison to the red wines, white wines are not as widespread in this region, but some of the more popular ones are Vugava (Vis), Pošip and Grk (Korčula), Malvasija duborvačka.

Tourism in the Dalmatian region has a shorter history than wine does. The beginning of tourism can be traced back to the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century. However, the main tourist development in the Dalmatian region began in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The Dalmatian region has enough capacities to accommodate approximately 407 000 tourists, out of which 57 000 in hotels, 60 000 in camps, 270 000 in family housing and 20 000 in marines.

In 2014 Dalmatia was visited by 5.5 million tourists (42% of Croatia's tourist total) and realized a total of 29.7 overnight stays (45% of Croatia's tourist total). Pelješac, as a special destination for wine tourism, is the subject of this paper, not only because of its centuries-old tradition of vine stock cultivation, but also because it is the place of origin of the first Croatian wine with a PGI (protected place of origin), which was the Dingač, produced in 1961. Pelješac is the second largest peninsula in Croatia, which is 65 km long. The surface of Pelješac is 952 km<sup>2</sup>. On the Pelješac peninsula 14 000 accommodation facilities have been registered and in 2014 the peninsula was visited by 160 000 tourists, with a total of 1.2 million overnight stays. In the area of the peninsula 51 wineries have been registered (Šundrica, p. 27), six wine associations are active and even a wine road, on which eight wineries are located, has been organized.

The main motives for tourists to come to Dalmatia are passive vacation and relaxation 75%, fun 44%, new experiences and adventure 24%, gastronomy 22% and cultural landmarks and events 7%. Considering the number of tourists and their different motives for vacation in Dalmatia, wine tourism could possibly be a major reason for their visit and stay in Dalmatia.

### 3. Wine tourism

Wine tourism, as a special tourist product, plays an important role in the tourist offer of many tourist destinations and countries. Historically, wine tourism dates back to the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when the participants of the Grand Tour travels would visit vineyards and taste wines.

Wine and tourism go hand in glove. From an economic standpoint, wine and tourism reflect the competitiveness of a particular destination (Tomljenović, 2006).

The definition and concept of “wine tourism” are not the result of a universal approach. The majority of definitions concerning “wine tourism” relate to the experiences and motives of the tourists. Because of that, wine tourism is all about visiting vineyards, wineries, wine festivals and exhibitions organized with the purpose of recreation (Johnson, 1997).

For Hall, Sharples, Cambourne and Macionis (2000) wine tourism is about visits to vineyards, wineries, wine festivals and wine exhibitions, where wine tasting and/or experiencing the attractions of the wine region take center stage.

Including elements of marketing “Wine tourism is an adventure combined with the appeal of wineries and vineyard regions, a type of marketing niche and an opportunity to directly sell to the wine industry” (Getz, 2000).

Also, through this definition Getz indicates that many underdeveloped countries started investing in the development of wine tourism through which they are trying to restore their vineyards and further improve the economic situation of their wine-growing regions (Getz, 2000).

He actually bases his thesis on the mutual benefit and interaction reflected in the wine sales, education of visitors, attraction of market segments, valorization of other natural and cultural values, while at the same time increasing the number of visitors and creating a new image of the destination and, of course, bringing in revenue. The same author puts emphasis on three key components of wine tourism: wine producers, tourist agencies (who present the destination) and the tourists – consumers. This form of wine tourism views the tourist simultaneously as a consumer and establishes a special kind of wine market. It is a strategy that lets the destination further expand upon its attractions and the education of the hosts, through which a direct sales channel is being created between their products and the consumers – tourists at the place of production.

In many places wine tourism has emerged as one of the most important products of rural tourism (Marques, 2006). The rise of wine tourism comes with countless benefits for rural destinations, including an increase in wine sales, increased tourist numbers and an overall better image for the destination (Brunori and Rosi, 2000; Getz, 2000; Hall, Sharples, Cambourne and Macionis, 2000). The development of wine tourism depends on the policies and programs of government agencies, the destination's marketing organizations, tourist organizations and independent entrepreneurial activities (Tomljenović and Getz, 2009).

The same studies indicate that key elements of the wine tourism experience are a “mixture” (amalgam) of basic wine products (the hospitality and warmth of the host towards the visitors, the

staff's knowledge about wine, wine festivals), the appeal of the destination (an attractive landscape and favorable climate conditions, affordable accommodation, easily accessible information, an established market) and the products of cultural tourism (special accommodation with regional characteristics, fine restaurants and gastronomy, traditional wine villages).

Other research points to the fact that vine cultivation and wine production technology are directly linked to cultural heritage and that wine tourism shares similar characteristics with cultural tourism, because "people who participate in wine tourism and gastronomy essentially participate in cultural tourism" (Williams and Kelly, 2001; Croce and Perri, 2010).

The product development of wine tourism includes direct cooperation between protagonists from two sectors: tourism and viticulture/oenology. The best way to explain this is seeing wine tourism as having three fundamentals: wine trails, scenery and family heritage.

According to Hall (2003), there are three types of wine tourists: "wine lovers", "business tourists" and "wine tourism inquisitives".

For Taylor, Berber and Deale (2010) wine tourism is a new form of promotion of the target destination and is based on its sustainable development. Participants in wine tourism are aware of its effects on the environment, but they also work towards positive changes in terms of environment protection of the wine tourism destination.

The literature regarding wine tourism research is focused on two points: a) the appeal of the wine tourism destination and the factors regarding the creation of its attractiveness; b) who is the wine tourist and what are his experiences with wine tourism.



In the wine market which is dominated by big producers who are being aided – controlled – by an equally strong distribution – wholesale network, there are also countless smaller winemakers. Smaller winemakers, especially those in newer up-and-coming regions, need local markets and wine cellar sales, so they can build-up their brand and increase wine sales and profit (Tomljenović, 2006).

Many already established or newer tourist regions in development, especially wine cellars and their owners, try to recreate the success of famous wine regions and ultimately achieve some of the benefits that the likely future development of wine tourism brings (Tomljenović, 2006).

Based on the theoretical knowledge, this paper is trying to determine the entrepreneurial potential of wine producers and their partnership with the main carriers of tourist development with the goal of long-term development of wine tourism in the wine regions of Dalmatia and the Pelješac peninsula.

### **2.3. Analysis**

At first glance, this paper about wine tourism seemed like an easy task to translate, because it was not only fairly interesting, easy to grasp, but also had very few unknown or new words. However, upon a more detailed reading some problems regarding the translation process occurred.

Before delving any deeper into the analysis of the translation and my problems concerning it, I would like to mention that this paper has been shortened due to the page limit whilst writing my thesis, thus the translated text is not presented, nor translated in its entirety.

The first problem that I encountered whilst translating this paper were the sentences themselves. As the original text was in Croatian, according to the rules of the Croatian language, the sentences were overly long, at least in comparison to the English language, and needed to be broken up. The most difficult part about breaking up the sentence was doing it correctly, all the while taking care not to lose the original meaning of the sentence, thus not mistranslating it. An example of such breaking up would be the following sentence: “*Ovakav oblik vinskog turizma je istodobno oblik ponašanja potrošača-turista, uspostavlja se poseban oblik tržišta vina, strategija koja razvija destinaciju u odnosu na atrakcije i doprinosi obrazovanju nositelja ponude vinskog turizma pri čemu se uspostavlja direktna prodaja njihovih proizvoda potrošačima-turistima na mjestu proizvodnje.*” In order to properly translate this sentence, I had to separate the first clause from the second one, because when translated, the sentence has to be coherent and understandable, which is not the case if it is directly translated from Croatian, which favors long sentences, into English. Taking all this into account, I have broken up and translated the sentence into the following two: “*This form of wine tourism views the tourist simultaneously as a consumer and establishes a special kind of wine market*” and “*It is a strategy that lets the destination further expand upon its attractions and the education of the hosts, through which a direct sales channel is being created between their products and the consumers – tourists at the place of production.*”

When it comes to other problems during translation, there are words from the “wine vocabulary” featured in this article. Much like the article about economy and finances, this one requires usage of particular winery terms, which are a part of that branch of tourism and gastronomy. One of them is *sortiment* that I, at first, translated as *assortment*. This would be the correct translation if it was not for the fact that *sortiment* is used as a synonym for *sorta* so in this

case the appropriate translation is *variety*. Another example of the wine vocabulary is *crna sorta Plavac mali* that I translated as *black variety Plavac mali*. However, in the English language there are only four wine varieties: white, red, sparkling and rosé. *Black wine* is actually not one of the varieties, but only a name for the very dark red wine that tends to look black. Taking that into consideration, the proper translation would be *red variety Plavac mali*.

Another problem in the process of translation that one could overlook has to do with words that are similar, but have different meaning. In the Croatian language these are *vinograd* and *vinogorje*. If one does not do proper research on the exact meaning of these terms, they could mistranslate the whole sentence. According to Hrvatski jezični portal *vinograd* is *zemljište zasađeno vinovom lozom*<sup>14</sup> while *vinogorje* refers to *gorje zasađeno vinogradima*.<sup>15</sup> Taking these explanations into account, it is only right to translate *vinograd* as *vineyard* and *vinogorje* as *wine country*. When it comes to the English language, words that one needs to be careful about are *vine* and *wine*. *Vine* refers to *the climbing plant that produces grapes as its fruit*<sup>16</sup> while *wine* is *an alcoholic drink that is made usually from grapes, but can also be made from other fruits or flowers*.<sup>17</sup>

Other than that, there were some minor things that I had to pay attention to. One of them is the following sentence: *U 2014. godini Dalmaciju je posjetilo 5,5 milijuna turista (42% Hrvatske) i ostvarili su ukupno 29,7 milijuna noćenja (45% Hrvatske)*. These percentages in brackets could not simply be translated as *42% of Croatia* and *45% of Croatia*, but I had to work out the meaning of these numbers and what the author wanted to emphasize with them and translate it as

---

<sup>14</sup> [http://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search\\_by\\_id&id=f19uURR%2F&keyword=vinograd](http://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=f19uURR%2F&keyword=vinograd)

<sup>15</sup> [http://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search\\_by\\_id&id=f19uURR%2B&keyword=vinogorje](http://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=f19uURR%2B&keyword=vinogorje)

<sup>16</sup> <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/vine>

<sup>17</sup> <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/wine>

follows: *In 2014 Dalmatia was visited by 5.5 million tourists (42% of Croatia's tourist total) and realized a total of 29.7 overnight stays (45% of Croatia's tourist total).*

To conclude this analysis, I would like to say that the article itself is not complicated, however one needs to pay attention to the aforementioned winery terms and be a little more careful about some sentences due to the lack of clarity and occasional mistakes made by the author in the original text.

### **3. POLITICAL TEXT TRANSLATION**

#### **3.1. Introduction**

The following article is a political and economic text that focuses on German elections and the most recent crisis, more precisely the bank-debt crisis and what could be its main cause, while also touching upon some of the misconceptions regarding this crisis.

#### **3.2. Translation**

POLITICAL PROCESSES: GERMAN ELECTIONS 2013

The political economy of the German parliamentary elections

Kristijan Kotarski

Since the beginning of the crisis, Germany has been acting more and more as a genuine European economic superpower and further supplementing its economic position through its strong political performances and ever-growing political profile.

The European sovereign or banking debt crisis?

The past three years have completely warped the way the citizens of the European Union view the most successful example of regional economic integration in the world after World War II. Citizens have never based the legitimacy of the integration on ballots, but rather on concrete economic benefits resulting from it. The current crisis is much more severe than the simple business cycle fluctuation during the post-WWII recession and occurs in the context of the

problematic European institutional architecture, which does not even have sufficient supplies of diffused legitimacy for such situations, or applicable solutions, which would satisfy all the stakeholders.

A major contributor to the crisis can be found across the Atlantic, the American mortgage market crash of 2008. The narrative that the European banks, which had lost a considerable amount of their investments, were the victims of a whim of the deregulated financial market of the USA is extremely problematic. Martin Hellwig, the director of the Bonn Maxx-Planck Institute for public goods and coauthor of “The Banker’s New Clothes”, points out that the European problem lies in the enormous capacity of banks whose desire to further increase their profit impelled them to make risky investments, even investing in American securities. After saving numerous European banks with the taxpayer’s money, immediately after the crash of the Lehman Brothers, the situation seemed to be stabilizing, but a chain reaction had already begun. Because of the losses in the capital base of leading German and French banks in the first wave of the crisis, debt liquidation has already started on the periphery, or, to put it into simpler terms, they stopped giving out new loans to banks from countries on the periphery of the Eurozone in order to stabilize the capital base of the creditor’s banks. The halt in private capital inflow to economies heavily reliant on the refinancing of existing commitments and new expenditure marked the beginning of turbulent times. After the escalation of the crisis in 2010 with the first bad news from Greece, a “chain reaction” began and all the other countries on the periphery that are unable to pay back their public debt were affected by it.

At the same time it is important to clear up some misconceptions, because on the European periphery the banking-debt crisis is still being presented strictly as a consequence of the fiscal irresponsibility of the PIIGS nations, that is, as a sovereign debt crisis. It goes without saying that

countries such as Greece have been discovering creative ways to bypass the budget restriction rules imposed by the Stability and Growth Pact, which were occasionally ignored even by the economic powerful Germany. Certainly, this argument deserves due attention, but is also a part of a larger picture. After taking a deeper look into the European economy in the years preceding the crisis and considering some basic facts, it becomes clear that in the period between 2000 and 2011 the combined assets of the top 15 EU based banks have increased from 7 000 to 20 000 billion EUR, which is an increase from 43% to 150% of the EU's GDP.

In addition to that, the combined assets of the top 8 000 financial institutions in the EU in the year 2011 amounted to 46 000 billion EUR, which is equivalent to 370% of the EU's GDP. According to the calculations of the British Barclays bank, the top 15 EU banks had a combined leverage of 28:1, which goes hand in hand with the thesis that the credit expansion has gotten out of hand and that the banks were not adequately limited by their reserve ratio and discount rate, as postulated by the theory of conventional monetary multiplication.

The bank assets and debt increased at the same time because in the current monetary system the majority of the money stems from the expansion of bank loans, and just a fraction (bank-notes and coins) results from the operations of the central bank, which creates money in the name of the sovereign and registers the difference in manufacturing costs and face value as "profit" of the sovereign or seigniorage. Since the beginning of the 1980's the combined debt of non-financial corporations, nations and households in the western world has doubled from 160% to 320% of their total GDP.

Several reasons exist for such an expansion of debt, but the main one is the agreement between the financial and political elite, a sort of "Faustian bargain", according to which banks are given

carte blanche in their business activities and the political elite gets loans for political purposes and public consumption. In a system where the majority of the money is based on debt and in which debt is always larger than the grand total of money in circulation, a change in sentiment and a halt in the refinancing of debt and/or credit expansion encourage a destructive dynamic of balance sheet recession. The weak position of banks after the popping of the financial bubble poses a problem to the fiscal position of the state, which is involved in the salvaging of failed financial institutions. The burden of the debt entails a raise in taxes and a decrease in expenditure, which in turn lowers the aggregate demand. The drop in the aggregate demand weakens the production in the real sector, which consequently deleverages the private non-financial sector and the demand for new loans decreases, which again weakens the financial sector. After the wave of bankruptcies, financial institutions have decreased the loan supply and implemented a higher risk premium because of the uncertainty. Non-financial institutions, which were not affected by the first wave of bankruptcies, are lowering their credit demand and decelerating their investment activities. The state's tax revenues and the price of issued government bonds have been decreasing, which in turn weakens the position of the financial sector that has a sovereign debt in its balance sheet (undercapitalization).

#### Germany's position in the crisis

After the burst of the dotcom bubble in the year 2000 in the USA, the aftermath of the crash even reached Germany, the future headquarters of the Eurozone. As the expansionary fiscal policies (The Stability and Growth Pact) could not be applied and Germany's economy was declining, in the year 2003 the ECB decided to lower the interest rate to 2%. This move did not have the desired effect, but it did, looking at it from today's perspective, play a fatal role in the genesis of the crisis, because of the mass influx of cheap capital, mostly German and French, to the



periphery nations of the Eurozone. After that, following the years after the crisis outbreak, the story of the successful German export model came into being. Since the beginning of the crisis, Germany has been acting more and more as a genuine European economic superpower and further supplementing its economic position through its strong political performances and transparent political profile.

Many superficial observers, deceived by the selective choice of certain economic indicators such as the unemployment and export rates, predict a continuation of the high economic conjuncture, Germany's political hegemony of the EU and a desire to imitate the German economic model, whose dynamism should break the archaic economic structures on the periphery of the EU. The decline in the unemployment rate from 11,2% (2004) to 5,3% (May 2013), combined with the average surplus rate of the current account balance of 4,7% from the 2000 to 2012, seems impressive. But, under the guise of success lie many vulnerabilities of the German economic model.

The first cause of these vulnerabilities stems from the assumption that a trade surplus is sustainable on such a level and that it is even extremely desirable. While this may be true of small and open economies with only a few million citizens, that is not the case for a country the size of Germany, because every surplus is reflected in someone else's deficit. It is hard to maintain a high export performance in a problematic external environment surrounded by an ever growing number of countries facing a decline in growth, which also includes emerging markets (BRICSM). Simultaneously, the opportunity cost of such a model is the negligence of the aggregate demand of the domestic market via the suppression of unit labor costs below the productivity rates to increase competitiveness when compared to main trading partners. This model generates an increase in income inequality and weakens the investment capital of the

domestic economy. It is also important to note that the net exports of a country represent its savings rate, which, instead of being invested into the domestic infrastructure and additional facilities, goes towards purchases of goods and services on credit. Data from the Bundesbank and the Bank for International Settlements shows that the ratio between Germany's market demand and receivables towards foreign countries and GDP is 5:1, while China, as the second largest exporter, has a ratio of only 1:1. Renate Ohr from the University of Göttingen sees this as a cause of the weakening of the infrastructure (roads, railways, education, research and development), which in the long run hinders the potential growth. An even bigger danger lies in the inability to collect receivables from debtors or charging fees to third parties.

The cumulative of German surpluses between the year 2000 and 2012 and the claims towards foreign countries is 600 billion EUR less than the cumulative listed as apparent loss. The German model is also problematic because of the rise in income inequality. Between 2000 and 2012 the Gini coefficient rose from 0,26 to 0,29. Although it is not as alarming as the rise in the USA or Great Britain, it does showcase a trend which could exacerbate in the future. Two factors are of importance for the clarification of this occurrence. According to the data of Germany's Federal Statistical Office, between 2000 and 2011 the income from wages rose by 19% and the income from capital by 50%. It is clear that keeping the wages below the productivity rate has contributed to the rise in income inequality (the decline in progressivity of the tax system should also be accounted for). The second factor is the anti-crisis policy which has been applied since 2010, whose consequences are yet to be seen. The export model financed by German capital through buyer credit implies vulnerability of the creditors. But the focal point of the anti-crisis policy is that almost all market demands of the private financial sector on the periphery have turned into public claims, which are being vouched for by the German and European taxpayers.

Simply put, the biggest exporters and the private financial sector have charged the majority of their receivables, while the taxpayers will probably not charge their receivables and will remain in debt to financiers of various “rescue umbrellas” such as the EFSF and the ESM. If the tax pressure in the following few years surpasses the wage increase from the years of the export boom, then it becomes an additional element which further exacerbates the income distribution, because the benefits of the boom period are narrowly concentrated, but the expenses are widely distributed in space and time. Contrary to popular belief about the money transfer from German taxpayers to “lazy Greeks”, a transfer to German and French financial institutions, which provided financing to Greece and other countries on the periphery, has taken place. The other side of the coin is the unequal distribution of wealth according to which Germany takes the first place in Europe, because the top 10% of its citizens possess 59,2% of wealth. Wealth expressed in money and other liquid assets marks an increase from 1.751 to 4.992 billion EUR in the period between 1991 and 2013. Although, according to a study conducted by the ECB, the wealth of the German household measured by median is small compared to that of the Italian and the Spanish, it stems from the size of the household as a measurement unit (German households have fewer members) and suggests that the divergence of the median and the arithmetic mean of wealth point towards a significant inequality.

### **3.3. Analysis**

Before I start with the analysis of the text, I have to mention that I translated only the first five pages.

In comparison to the first text, this one was far more challenging and complex and needed more revision. The vocabulary needs to be adapted to this particular type of text in order to get a more accurate and precise translation. When it comes to these types of articles, it is always wise to look up some of the Croatian meanings of words and then proceed to search for the best English equivalents.

The first example of such a word can be found right at the beginning and it is *hegemon* (“*Od početka krize Njemačka sve više djeluje kao istinski europski ekonomski hegemon...*”). At first I made a mistake of translating it into *hegemony*, but after doing a bit of research I found the correct equivalent. According to Hrvatski jezični portal *hegemon* is *onaj koji provodi vlast u obliku hegemonije, onaj koji u hegemoniji ima izrazito moćnu vlast u odnosima neravnopravnosti*.<sup>18</sup> This definition helped in searching for the right equivalent which ended up being *hegemon*, meaning that the Croatian word is a loan taken from the English language, while *hegemony* refers to *the position of being the strongest and most powerful and therefore able to control others*.<sup>19</sup> However, I opted for *superpower* because it is one of the synonyms of *hegemon* that is a lot easier for readers to understand without the need for further research.

The complexity of the text at hand is evident through some of the words that are not usually used in everyday speech such as *kapric* (“*puke žrtve kaprica dereguliranih financijskih tržišta*”), translated as *whim*, *aktiva* (“*kombinirana aktiva 15 vodećih banaka*”), translated as *assets*, *nominalna vrijednost emisije* (“*razliku u trošku proizvodnje i nominalne vrijednosti emisije*”), translated as *face value* and many more.

---

<sup>18</sup> [http://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search\\_by\\_id&id=fV5vXhI%3D&keyword=hegemon](http://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=fV5vXhI%3D&keyword=hegemon)

<sup>19</sup> <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/hegemony>

Another aspect of the translation I had to be careful about was finding the English equivalents of the names such as those of banks and pacts. For example there is a book *Bankarevo novo ruho*, originally known as *The Banker's New Clothes*, *Pakt o stabilnosti i rastu*, translated as *Stability and Growth Pact*, *Banka za međunarodna poravnanja*, translated as *Bank for International Settlements* and *Njemački savezni zavod za statistiku* that had to be translated as *Germany's Federal Statistical Office*. Finding the right translation of the names such as these is of great importance because one needs to presuppose that the reader of the translation might be interested in finding more information about, for example, a certain bank. However, if the translator did not do his research and did not choose the original name of the bank, then the reader would be deprived of information.

There was another substantial problem that I came across in this text and that is the abundance of phrases in quotation marks. In this case I could translate them word for word, ending up with a literal translation and that is acceptable only if it is clear what the expression stands for or if it can be interpreted with the help of the surrounding text. The first one can be found in the sentence “...s prvim lošim vijestima iz Grčke ubrzo nastaje „efekt zaraze“ te su krizom zahvaćene i ostale zemlje periferije...”. This is an example in which literal translation *infection effect* would not work because there was a better and more understandable solution that I opted for and that is *chain effect*. The second one is in the sentence “...to jest svojevrsan „faustovski pakt“ prema kojemu banke dobivaju slobodnije ruke u poslovanju...”. In this case I did some research and found out that the expression already exists in the English language and it is *Faustian bargain*. The third one is in the sentence “...ostat će dužni financijerima raznih „spasilačkih kišobrana“ kao što su EFSF-a i ESM-a.” Here I chose the literal translation *rescue umbrellas* because an already accepted English equivalent does not exist and because I felt like it

was the best option in this case. The last one is in the sentence “*Suprotno javnom narativu o transferu novca njemačkih poreznih obveznika „lijenim Grcima“, posrijedi je...*” and I resolved it the same way as the previous one, meaning that the translation is *lazy Greeks*.

The last problem that I would like to mention has to do with the sentence structure in the Croatian language. In the Croatian language, one can omit a verb while still maintaining the same meaning of the sentence. The perfect example for this is the sentence “*Nadaleko je poznato da su zemlje poput Grčke pronalazile kreativne načine da zaobiđu pravila proračunskog ograničenja Pakta o stabilnosti i rastu, koji je povremeno ignorirala čak i ekonomski moćna Njemačka.*”, more precisely the part *pravila proračunskog ograničenja Pakta o stabilnosti i rastu*. Between the words *ograničenja* and *Pakta* one could add a verb, however the sentence still has sense if it is kept like this. On the other hand, in the English language this is not the case so I had to add something in order to make the sentence understandable, ending up with the sentence “*It goes without saying that countries such as Greece have been discovering creative ways to bypass the budget restriction rules imposed by the Stability and Growth Pact, which were occasionally ignored even by the economic powerful Germany.*”

To conclude this analysis, I would like to say that this was the trickiest translation that I had to do. It was comprised of long complicated sentences and unknown words and expressions that I had to be careful about. Also, I had to adapt my vocabulary in order to make the text sound more formal and adapt to the theme of politics and economics.

## **4. TRANSLATION OF A TEXT ABOUT THE JEWISH EMIGRATION**

### **4.1. Introduction**

This article touches upon the still very sensitive topic of Jewish people in World War II. More precisely, it focuses on the topic of the Jewish emigration from Croatia after World War II. It was interesting to read some of the facts about the survivors and those affected by the war, whether they were killed or managed to survive and then decided to leave in hope of finding a better life.

### **4.2. Translation**

Marica Karakaš Obradov

The Croatian Institute of History, Zagreb

The Jewish emigration from Croatia after World War II

Introduction

According to the population census of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia from 1931, a total of 68,405 Jews lived in Yugoslavia at the time. The number of Jews increased due to natural growth, but also because of all the refugees fleeing from the European countries affected by Nazism through Yugoslavia. According to estimates, shortly before the beginning World War II between 75,000 and over 80,000 Jews lived in Yugoslavia. The number of Jewish refugees on Yugoslav territory before World War II is estimated to have been between 2,000 and 5,000 people. Out of this total

of the Jewish population residing in Yugoslavia, according to further estimates, between 23,000 and 26,000 Jews lived on Croatian territory and around 14,000 on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Some authors suggest that 39,500 Jews lived on the territory of the ISC (the Independent State of Croatia), that is, 25,000 in Croatia and 14,500 in Bosnia and Herzegovina respectively.

Jews from the Yugoslav territories, including those from the Croatian and Bosnian and Herzegovinian ones which formed the ISC, saved themselves primarily by escaping to the territories under the rule of the Kingdom of Italy, which did not only include the Apennine peninsula, but also all the territories annexed or occupied by it, and afterwards to Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey and other countries. Besides those who escaped and those who survived interment, concentration and military prison camps, there were also Jews who survived the war on the very territory of the occupied Kingdom of Yugoslavia. For instance, in the ISC the Jews who survived were those that had got the status of “honorary Aryans” because, according to the authorities of the ISC, the Croatian people were indebted to them. Also a minority of Jews was saved through so-called mixed marriages, some were Christianized, and thus under the protection of the Catholic Church, or they were highly educated doctors, engineers, etc., to whom the ISC bestowed “Aryan rights”. One should also mention a larger group of Jewish doctors who, together with few family members, managed to save themselves, because they were sent to the Bosnian Institute for the containment of endemic syphilis in Banja Luka. Another way to survive was joining the partisans, especially as medical personnel, but also as civilian refugees. Although the partisans accepted Jews, they were often looked down upon and some were even suspected of being British spies, because educated Jews spoke many languages, including English.

Estimates of the number of Yugoslav and Croatian Jewish survivors



There have been significant deviations in previous research in terms of the number of Jewish World War II survivors on Yugoslav territory. Some estimates refer only to the Yugoslav territory, some only to the territory of the ISC, and some only to Croatia or Bosnia and Herzegovina. In addition to those about the territorial scope, many uncertainties also arise in the listing of the ways the Jews were rescued. Rescue via escape is the most talked about method and because of that it is assumed that those who survived through other methods were not included in the count. The number of survivors on the Yugoslav territory is estimated to be between 10,000 and 16,000 people and between 9,000 and 12,000 on the territory of the ISC. Likewise, some sources and literature list only the survivors from smaller areas (some region or city, for instance) or they refer only to those who escaped or came back from concentration, internment or military prison camps, or even to those who survived in so-called mixed marriages. The following paragraphs give insight into some sources, authors and their estimations on the number of Jewish survivors.

The Chief Rabbi of Yugoslavia, Isak Alkalaj, stated, in a letter to the representative of the Vatican in the USA in March 1943, that 15,000 of “our Jews”, namely Yugoslav Jews had fled Yugoslavia. The same number of Jews who had taken “shelter” was reported by the president of the Association of Yugoslav Jews in the USA in his letter to the embassy of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in Washington.

A similar estimate was made by Slavko Goldstein in 1988, who stated that between 15,000 and 16,000 Yugoslav Jews survived World War II.

At the first presentation about the Jewish Yugoslav victims of World War II at the first European postwar assembly of the Jewish World Congress, which was held in August 1945 in Paris, David Alkalaj stated that “in the best-case scenario” between 10,000 and 12,000 Jews had survived.

In 1998, Milan Ristović also estimated that there were about 12,000 Jewish Yugoslav survivors, mostly from the territory of the ISC, who managed to escape to Italy, Hungary and Bulgaria. According to this, it may be concluded that the number of survivors is even greater, because it does not factor in the Jews who escaped to the territories that the Kingdom of Italy had annexed and occupied.

Slavko and Ivo Goldstein have stated in 2001 that the number of 12,000 Jews, which was estimated by Ristović, from the territory of the ISC was “significantly exaggerated” and suggested that it would be “somewhat more accurate” if it included around 5,000 Jews who had fled to the “Italian occupation zones” from the territory of the ISC, that is, to the territory that the Kingdom of Italy not only had occupied, but also annexed.

In 2004 Ivo Goldstein stated that 11,589 Jews from the territory of the ISC had survived the war, 4,000 of which were from the Bosnian and Herzegovinian territory; 5,250 from southern Croatia, Slavonia, Srijem and Dalmatia, and 2,339 Croatian and Bosnian and Herzegovinian Jews awaited the end of the war as members of the partisan forces.

In 2011 Esther Gitman stated a smaller number, according to which around 9,500 Jews from the territory of the ISC survived the Holocaust. She also presented the information that 2,455 Jews had returned to Sarajevo in the period between 1945 and 1952, not counting in those (around 200 people) who had refused to sign up with the Jewish community of Sarajevo. Among the uncounted Jews were also those who were part of the postwar structural authorities and lived in

Belgrade. Some of them even changed their last names and “distanced” themselves from Jewish institutions and their Jewish identity.

In 1980 Jaša Romano presented the number of Jews in certain areas before the war and the number of victims of war in these areas, thus enabling us to identify the number of survivors through this information. According to him, there were around 5,000 survivors from the territory of Croatia, Slavonia and Srijem, around 4,000 in Bosnia and Herzegovina and 252 in Dalmatia.

A summarized list containing the names of 3,289 Jews, who returned to their municipalities across all Croatian cities, was presented by Melita Švob in 1997. According to her, 85 of them returned to Čakovec, 38 to Dubrovnik, 22 to Đakovo, 22 to Lovran, 39 to Karlovac, 8 to Našice, 33 to Opatija, 304 to Osijek, 10 to Požega, 185 to Rijeka, 16 to Slavonski Brod, 175 to Solin, 54 to Varaždin, 35 to Vinkovci, 23 to Virovitica, 5 to Vrpolje, 23 to Vukovar, 1333 to Zagreb, and 879 came back later, which adds up to 2,212 survivors in cities. The author stresses that not all places to which the Jews returned had been listed, because there were “only a few survivors” left.

Back in 1952, Samuel Pinto published the number of Jewish victims in BiH on the basis of the collected data and records of the State Commission for the Investigation of Crimes Committed by Occupiers and their Supporters for BiH. Out of about 14,000 Jews from the territory of BiH, around 2,500 survived the war. They were mostly Jews from Sarajevo, 1,537 of them. From that total, 1,277 came back from exile and 40 survived the war in Sarajevo, 277 were children, 556 women and 494 men. About 100 of them stayed in Italy, around 120 migrated to Palestine and around 40 moved to the USA. There were 150 Jewish survivors from the Sarajevo district (Bugojno, Rogatica, Travnik, Visoko, Višegrad, Zenica, Žepče); 115 from the Mostar district (MOstar, Konjic); 100 from the Banja Luka district (Banja Luka, Bihać, Bosanski Brod, Jajce,

Prijedor, Sanski Most) and around 150 of them survived from the Tuzla district (Bijeljina, Bosanski Šamac, Derвента, Doboj, Gračanica, Gradačac, Kladanj, Modriča, Vlasenica, Zvornik). According to the same territorial principle, S. Pinto released a muster list of 7,505 Jewish victims of war from Sarajevo and the summery data for 3 100 Jewish victims from the aforementioned districts. Among the 3,300 remaining Jews (the difference between the estimated total of 14,000 Jews and the estimated total of 10,600 victims), the number of survivors is significant, which was later backed-up by research.

In 1981 Slobodan Milošević only stated the number of 4,500 Jewish Yugoslav refugees in the Italian occupational area, 2,000 of which were in the First zone, 2,000 in the Second zone and the rest in Montenegro and Kosovo.

As an example of the publication of data for individual cities, I will provide the number of Jewish survivors from Koprivnica, which has not been documented by Melita Švob in her aforementioned book. Hence, 30 Jews from Koprivnica had survived the war in mixed marriages or they came back from concentration, interment and military prison camps.

Future research, primarily at the level of cities, will surely contribute to the determining of the number of Jewish victims and survivors, as well as draw attention to the solidarity, especially that of individuals, towards the persecuted Jews. However, it will have no significant impact on the already painted picture of the extent of casualties of the Jewish people on the Croatian and Bosnian and Herzegovinian territory during World War II.

The postwar Jewish emigration from Croatia to Palestine/Israel

After the war, the remaining Jewish survivors had a choice between staying in Yugoslavia, which was on its way towards communism through the “people’s democracy”, or moving to Palestine,

later on Israel. The decision about staying in Croatia or moving to Palestine/Israel, paired up with the fact that many had lost their family members and that their property had been taken away from them during the war and not returned, had a massive impact on the attitude of the Yugoslav Jewish individual towards religion, Zionism and the communist ideology.

In the eyes of the new Yugoslav state, Jews were equal to the rest of the population, therefore all of their property had been affected by the nationalization conducted on the basis of numerous regulations and laws: “The decision on the conversion of enemy property into government property, on public administration of the property of absentee owners, which has been forcefully taken from them by the occupational authorities” from the 21<sup>st</sup> of November 1944, “The law on the treatment of property left behind by their owners in times of occupation and property taken from them by the occupiers and their supporters” from the 24<sup>th</sup> of May 1945, “The law on the nationalization of private and commercial enterprise” from the 5<sup>th</sup> of December 1946 and its amendment from the 29<sup>th</sup> of April 1948, “The law on the amendments to the Yugoslav citizenship law” from the 1<sup>st</sup> of December 1948. Yugoslavia’s conversion of private property to the so-called public sector has been marked as the second largest conversion of its kind in the Central European area, right after the Czechoslovakian one. During wartime, houses of wealthy Jews were often alienated and appropriated by politicians and military officials. After World War II, the houses changed tenants, who were often people in power, but had different worldviews.

The restrictions imposed upon all religious groups within the Yugoslav territory had also affected the Jewish religious community. The political and ideological measures implemented in Yugoslavia after the war resulted in the Union of the Jewish religious municipalities changing its name to the Union of Jewish municipalities, in the September of 1952. The new name was not only in accordance with the new Yugoslav society, but also with the new Union, which was

already a “religious union of atheists”, because the Jewish believers were among the first to leave for Palestine/Israel.

Some of the Jews who had fled the Yugoslav territory during the war were repatriated after it ended while some did not want to return. The Jewish survivors from the Croatian territory returned mostly to Zagreb, where a shelter and help were organized by the Jewish municipality. Some of them, who had found shelter in Switzerland, did not repatriate immediately, because they wanted to go to Italy first, where they had stored their belongings, mostly clothes, money and jewelry. These Jews were supposed to be repatriated through Milano and Trieste back to Yugoslavia.

### **4.3. Analysis**

Just like with the first two texts, I translated only the first five pages due to the page restriction in this B.A. thesis.

As opposed to the first translation, this one was easier because the vocabulary is a lot simpler and most sentences are not as complicated, even though there were some that needed more revision. For example: “*Zatim, spasio se manji dio Židova u tzv. miješanim brakovima i neki pokršteni Židovi za koje se osobito zauzimala Katolička crkva te obrazovani Židovi, liječnici, inženjeri i sl., kojima su vlasti NDH dodijelile „arijevsko pravo“.*” The part of the sentence that took time to get right is “*...neki pokršteni Židovi za koje se osobito zauzimala Katolička crkva*”. At first I translated it as *Also a minority of Jews was saved through so-called mixed marriages, Christianization, for which especially the Catholic Church stood up*, which did not work out because it implied that Christianization had something to do with mixed marriages, or that it was

one and the same thing. Besides that, the phrase *for which especially the Catholic Church stood up* also sounds terrible and out of place in the English language. After some thinking, I decided to go with the following translation: “*Also a minority of Jews was saved through so-called mixed marriages, some were Christianized, and thus under the protection of the Catholic Church*”. This new translation makes it clear that a part of the survivors got into mixed marriages and another part underwent Christianization, because of which they got under the protection of the Catholic Church, thus making the translation a lot easier to understand.

The mistakes that are very easy to make in the process of translation include some words that sound similar in the Croatian and English language. An example of such a word is in the sentence “... *te je neposredno prije Drugoga svjetskoga rata, prema procjenama, na području Jugoslavije živjelo...*”. In the Croatian language, *procjena* has a synonym *špekulacija* or *spekulacija* that is used very often. Because of that, my first choice of translation for the word *procjena* was *speculation*. However, *speculation* turned out to be the a poor choice, so I opted for the word *estimate*, which is much better suited as an English counterpart for the Croatian word *procjena*.

Subsequently, in the sentence “*Česti su bili primjeri da su kuće dobrostojećih Židova za vrijeme rata otuđene i prisvojene od strane tadašnjih političkih i vojnih uglednika.*”, the word *otuđiti* has two English equivalents, *estrangle* and *alienate*, and one needs to be careful when choosing which one to use. According to the Collins dictionary, *estrangle* means “*to separate or live apart from (one’s spouse)*”<sup>20</sup> or to “*antagonize or lose the affection of (someone previously friendly)*”<sup>21</sup> while *alienate* has similar meaning (“*to cause to become indifferent, unfriendly*”)<sup>22</sup>,

---

<sup>20</sup><https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/estrangle>

<sup>21</sup>*ibidem*

but in legal vocabulary it means “to transfer the ownership of (property, title, etc) to another person”.<sup>23</sup> Taking those definitions into account, I opted for *alienate* because the word refers to houses.

Another problem ensued whilst translating the following sentence: “*Na srednjoeuropskom području, poslije Čehoslovačke, u Jugoslaviji je zabilježen najveći prijelaz privatnog vlasništva u tzv. javni sektor.*”. In my first attempt at translating the aforementioned sentence, I translated it as follows: “*Right after Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia has marked the biggest conversion of private property to the so-called public sector, in the whole Central European area.*” Although at first glance it may seem passable, this translation leaves much to be desired. The main problem with this sentence is that it is vague in the way it describes Yugoslavia’s conversion, as the reader cannot be sure if the said conversion is the second biggest in the Central European area, or if it occurred right after Czechoslovakia’s conversion. This could lead to some confusion concerning the text and thus was immediately reformulated to clear up potential problems. The new translation *Yugoslavia’s conversion of private property to the so-called public sector has been marked as the second largest conversion of its kind in the Central European area, right after the Czechoslovakian one* makes it clear that the said conversion was in fact the second largest of its kind in the Central European area and not that it happened shortly after the Czechoslovakian one.

While translating, one has to be careful of the double-edged meaning some words can have depending on the context. The word *prihvat* in the sentence *Preživjeli Židovi s hrvatskog područja vratili su se ponajviše u Zagreb gdje je bio organiziran prihvat i pomoć pri Židovskoj općini* could mean *reception*, but that would be wrong, because a reception would refer to a

---

<sup>22</sup><https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/alienate>

<sup>23</sup>*Ibidem*



formal event held for welcoming someone<sup>24</sup>, which is clearly not the case in this scenario. The proper translation would be *shelter*, as seen in the proper translation *The Jewish survivors from the Croatian territory returned mostly to Zagreb, where a shelter and help were organized by the Jewish municipality*, because the refugees were given protection and taken care of.

To summarize, although it was not the hardest text to translate, it still proved to be a challenge. With numerous statistics, the translator faces the challenge of writing a coherent translation without much repetition of the same words starting each sentence. Besides that, there is always the problem of translation long Croatian sentences into English, whereby they can easily lose their original meaning if the translator is not careful enough or does not know how to properly break them up.

---

<sup>24</sup><https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/reception>

## **5. TRANSLATION OF A TEXT ABOUT EMIGRATION FROM RIJEKA TO AMERICA**

### **5.1. Introduction**

The last text touches upon the history of Rijeka and its importance as a port from which the emigrants travelled to America. It mentions the development of different industries and explains the preparation that took place in order to make Rijeka one of the most important ports in history.

### **5.2. Translation**

Rijeka and its surroundings in the European and Croatian transatlantic emigration from 1880 to  
1914

During the spring months of 2009, in the City Museum of Rijeka, a very interesting, educational and well attended exhibition was held under a short, yet symbolic name – Merika. The subtitle of the exhibition clarified that it was about the *Emigration from Central Europe to America 1880-1914*. The visitors of the exhibition were presented with the genesis and the documented history of European emigration flows towards North America, in which Rijeka and its port played a major role. At the same time, the museum staff, together with the curator M. Sc. Ervin Dubrović as the author and editor, presented the public with an extensive and visually rich monograph which bears the same name. This is the reference point that aims to enable us to get a glimpse into the ties and relationships between Rijeka as an industrial port city and its more immediate

and distant surroundings, a highly agricultural and economically poor area, from which its citizens migrated across the Atlantic.

The second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century is the period of the beginning and development of the industrialization of Rijeka. Industrial facilities, such as the sugar refinery and tobacco factory, paper mill, torpedo factory (metal foundry), oil refinery, tannery, soap factory, ice house, slaughterhouse and mills were being opened and helped shape Rijeka into an industrial city. At the same time, its location allowed it to become Croatia's leading port and achieve remarkable results in terms of seafaring and trade, which took place in the port basin. In accordance with this, many supporting facilities had been built that, in the service of industrial production, seafaring and trade, reflect the architectural styles of the time in which they were built. Add in the introduction of the railway (1873), which, alongside the Carolina and Louisiana road, connected Rijeka with the inland and the construction of the railway station building, and we get a much clearer picture of Rijeka as an industrial port center of the Northern Adriatic. All these changes were a clear indicator that Rijeka had become the city with the most industrial facilities in the whole Croatia at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The political and administrative situation of Rijeka was such that it was, together with its county, under direct control of the central Hungarian authorities and established as a *corpus separatum* or the Hungarian coast (*Litorale hungaricum*). It was the Hungarian government, in cooperation with the past mayors, with its plan of building Rijeka into a modern port that started to transform the city and expand it towards the sea. Major construction projects began with the purpose of transforming Rijeka into a port and industrial center. The coast was filled from the delta of the Rječina river all the way to Kantrida, for the purpose of building quays and port warehouses (in the period between 1900 and 1914 the Metropolis building, the longest structure ever built in Rijeka, was built), as well as

railway warehouses, piers and docks. The city got electric lighting, a water supply and a sewage system, an electric tram operating in the city center and magnificent palaces, theatres, pavilions, market places, parks and gardens that bear witness, during the transition from the 19<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> century, to a modern and urban sophisticated city, which served the function of industrial development, as well as port trafficking and trade. Almost in the shadows of the aforementioned industrial momentum and merchant shipping inertia that the city experienced at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, a process was taking place on the outskirts of Rijeka, which completely contradicts its economic reach. Even though it was the only Hungarian port until the 1880's, in terms of trade and traffic, Rijeka was still a small port. The ships that sailed through the port were owned by the Ungaro-Croate society and used for coastal navigation. They were sailing ships that connected Rijeka with the nearby places and the Kvarner islands, transporting rather small numbers of passengers and quantities of goods. The big momentum in the modernization of seafaring in Europe, particularly in the west (Great Britain, France, The Netherlands, Belgium), the south (Italy) and in Central Europe (Germany), manifested itself through the introduction of modern and big steamships, urging the Hungarian government to make quick and essential changes. They occurred when the Hungarian government decided to abandon the port at the delta of the Rječina River (Fiumara – Dead canal) and build a new one with the intention of strengthening the coastal voyaging through the introduction of transoceanic voyages. The new main port, that is, its central port basin, was located more to the west, towards the city centre. The extant sailing was supported through the building of closer located piers and berths, while farther away located piers enabled the docking of deep draft steamships. The largest shipping company of the time, the Hungarian Adria steamship company (Royal Hungarian Sea Navigation Company »Adria« Limited-Fiume, founded in 1882), maintained shipping lines with leading French and British ports, as well as transoceanic lines with Brazillian ports Pernambuco, Bahia, Santos and Rio de

Janeiro intact. This South American line was primarily used for freight transportation, but already during the end of the century, individuals from Rijeka and its surroundings used it to emigrate, first to Brazil, afterwards to Argentina and finally to all the other South American countries, in order to work on farms or to set out to the unknown in search of gold. These first economic migrants were a foreshadowing of a process that would become a phenomenon across almost all of Europe in the period between the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century up until the beginning of the First World War. The European migration across the Atlantic to North and South America and to Australia started during the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It was a massive and carefully organized enterprise that drastically changed the socio-political and especially economic reality of the time, but which would also equally drastically change the social characteristics of the area that was its end goal. The first mass migration started in Ireland in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The overpopulated, poor and agricultural Ireland experienced an economic shock that would force its citizens into exodus, as the only way for salvation from starvation. Potato crops, as the primary agricultural product and staple, catastrophically failed between 1846 and 1847 and encouraged the migration of the Irish to England, from where they went, via England's leading port Liverpool, to North America, more precisely to the United States of America. In order to understand the extent of the Irish emigration, it is enough to present the information that as a consequence of it, the Irish population shrank from 8 to 3 million. It was the beginning of the biggest and best documented transoceanic migration in human history. It was a migration of colossal proportions, which in the period of a hundred years (1815-1915), from the end of the Napoleonic Wars to the beginning of World War I, reached multimillion figures. Great Britain had 11,4 million emigrants, Italy 9,9 million, Ireland 7,3 million and Central Europe, where the Croats lived together with other nations within the borders of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, had 5 million. The emigration from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy during the

period between 1871 and 1915 also reached figures in the millions. During the aforementioned period 4,383,000 people emigrated from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. The majority of the Austro-Hungarian emigrants (2,191,734) went to the United States of America, where they made up 27,9% of the total European emigrants in that North American country. The rest of the Austro-Hungarian routes led to Canada (167,969 emigrants), Argentina (355,507 emigrants), Brazil (64,360 emigrants), the remaining South American countries (6,544 emigrants), Australia (4,097 emigrants), Africa (1,771 emigrants) and Asia (109 emigrants). The consequences of such mass emigration from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy were deleterious to its economic vitality, because the majority of emigrants were working age population, mostly men, who were also eligible for military service, which also had a negative impact on the Monarchy's population and military power. The state, on the other hand, was not ready to stop or alleviate the population drain through legislation. Although the state did not approve of emigration, it appears that it tacitly approved of it or even encouraged it through its lack of interference. A comprehensive law on emigration was not passed until the end of the Monarchy, but an old emigration patent brought forth by the Emperor Franz Joseph I in 1832, according to which emigration was legal, but came with a loss of one's citizenship and receiving the status of a foreigner was still in force. Therefore, emigration did not mean the loss of the ownership rights, which benefited the emigrants. In 1867 the emigration patent was partially modified and supplemented by the proclamation of freedom of movement, which was restricted only in the case of military service. But, that regulation did not stop army conscripts who massively disobeyed it and easily crossed the border of the Monarchy towards the New World. Up until 1880, when Europe was struck by a great economic crisis, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was not the focal point of European emigration. Up until then, the ones leaving were mostly Austrian citizens from the Austrian part of the Monarchy, who lived near Austrian (Wien, Innsbruck, Feldkirch) and Swiss (Basel, Buchs)

railway junctions and through them they would continue their journey to North German ports (Bremen, Bremerhaven, Hamburg) or to the French, Belgian, Dutch or English Atlantic ports. This was an emigration whose numbers reached up to a few thousands yearly and Dalmatia was the place of its inception. However, the situation changed drastically once under the influence of an economic crisis, which reached its peak in 1880, when the number of emigrants suddenly rose to 20,000 per year and never fell. In the year 1892 50,000 people emigrated and in 1904 the number rose to 100,000. The Hungarian part of the Monarchy did not lag behind the Austrian one; in fact, the economic backwardness was like a tailwind to those who were faced with the choice of either staying in their homeland or going into the unknown and chose the latter. In the aforementioned demographic trends, one of the starting points towards a happier transoceanic future was Rijeka, which played a part in the Central European, or more precisely Austro-Hungarian, exodus a bit later than the already established European ports such as Hamburg, Bremen, Bremerhaven, Rotterdam, Antwerp, Le Havre, Cherbourg, Liverpool, Southampton and Genoa. Rijeka's port was a shelter for mainly Hungarian emigrants brought by countless migration agencies, bankers, representatives of shipping companies and thousands of »canvassers« who visited even the most remote villages in order to encourage emigration. It is almost fascinating how elaborate their actions and organization were, bypassing all legal limitations and easily coordinating transportation services between Central Europe and even the most far-flung places in the American West at the same time. At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the first immigration agencies started operating, such as Mašek i drug or Compagnie Général Transatlantique, which took its passengers to Le Havre, and the agency belonging to Konstantin Teodorović, which directed the emigrants towards Antwerp and other Atlantic ports. They had their headquarters in the suburbs of Rijeka, such as Sušak or Kantrida, and not in the city centre, because the authorities did not take too kindly to them. Some agencies like the one in

owned by G. B. Cargnelli secretly and illegally took immigrants to Genoa, because they were young men and subject to conscription. The increasing number of emigrants, which mainly included people from nearby areas in the beginning, was proving to be a challenge for Rijeka as a city, as a new transit point and as a starting point for emigrants towards the west. In 1903 the first migrants arrived to Rijeka via the railway routes and continued their journey from there towards the Atlantic (Le Havre) and Italian (Genoa) ports. These were groups of several dozens or a few hundred people, mostly from coastal areas, who had decided to set out and try to find a better future far away from their homeland. At the time, Rijeka played the role of a transit centre through which the migrants only passed, without staying. However, as the number of migrants increased exponentially, the Hungarian government started viewing Rijeka and its port as a place from which the transatlantic voyagers could directly set sail for North America. Because of that, it was necessary to set a few ground rules. First, the local steamship company Adria had to provide steamships for the transportation of emigrants, either by renting them or by building new ones. The heads of the Adria company resorted to renting the steamships and thus signed a contract with one of the biggest steamship companies in Europe, Cunard Line from Liverpool. With that, the English company became a part of the Adriatic market, getting involved in this lucrative transportation business. Regardless of the fact that this steamship coalition bore the name Cunrad-Adria, the reality was that the transportation of emigrants from Rijeka to North America, more precisely to New York, was run exclusively under Cunrad's patronage, while Adria served as an agent and performed other brokerage services and was actually Cunrad's representative in Hungary. Moreover, under the contract that had been concluded in 1904, between the Hungarian government and Cunrad, it had been decided that all emigrants from "countries of the holy crown of Hungary" were obliged to sail with Cunrad's line from Rijeka, and in return Cunrad would pay 10 krona per passenger from the Hungarian part of the monarchy



to the Hungarian government, for the so-called emigration fund. The end total becomes clearer once you have another element of the contract in mind. The Hungarian government guaranteed Cunrad 30,000 passengers a year, and in case there was a lack of passengers, the government would have to pay 100 krona compensation per person. The aforementioned quota was abolished in 1907 on the insistence of the American government. Rijeka's return line to North America began operating on the 20<sup>th</sup> October 1903, when Cunrad's steamship Aurania set sail from New York, with 349 passengers on board, and returned to Rijeka, to everyone's delight, on the 10<sup>th</sup> November. Four days later, that same steamship departed from Rijeka for New York with 53 passengers on board.

### 5.3. Analysis

Just like in the first three translations, the original text, as well as the translation, encompass only the first few pages of the original text, due to the page restriction of this B.A. thesis.

One of the first problems I encountered whilst translating this text was in the sentence *Urod krumpira kao osnovne poljoprivredne kulture i životne namirnice katastrofalno propada 1846.-1847. godine*. The phrase *poljoprivredne kulture* was translated wrong as *agriculture*, instead of *agricultural product*. The mistake happened because I thought of *poljoprivredne kulture* as an *agrikultura*, which in hindsight did not make a lot of sense. Rather than try to view *poljoprivredne kulture* as agriculture itself, I found more success when I translated it as a product of agriculture. Furthermore, *životne namirnice* has also proved to be a tad problematic to translate and turned out to be *food supply* in the first draft of the translation, which was, of course, wrong.

What I did not notice at first was the word *osnovne* standing before it, which somewhat altered its meaning, taking it from just some food supply, to being a staple food in many households. Lastly, I also had a minor struggle with *katastrofalno propada*, translating it at first as *catastrophically withering away*, thinking that it would be the right translation, for it was only natural to assume that the destruction of a plant could be translated as it withering away. Later on I realized that *catastrophically failed* was a far more accurate description of the situation, because the potatoes did not wither away because of unconventional or bad farming methods, but they were destroyed by a disease, thus *failed* serves as a far superior translation than *wither away*.

Besides trying to break up complex sentences, one must also combine sentences while translating to make the translation aesthetically pleasing. One such instance occurred with the sentences *Prvoga svjetskog rata, doseže višemilijunske brojke. Iz Velike Britanije iseljava tada 11,4 milijuna ljudi, iz Italije 9,9 milijuna, iz Irske 7,3 milijuna, a iz Srednje Europe 5 milijuna ljudi. Upravo je Srednja Europa prostor na kojem su među ostalim narodima obitavali Hrvati, živeći unutar granica Austro-Ugarske Monarhije.* The problem occurred while trying to translate these two sentences separately, instead of trying to combine them, because the end result just seems like the second sentence is completely out of place. To solve this problem, I have inserted the second sentence into the first one, which was possible because the first one lists statistical facts about Central Europe, among many others, which is also the topic of the second sentence, thus they have some innate synergy, allowing them to be combined. The end result of such a translation is *Great Britain had 11,4 million emigrants, Italy 9,9 million, Ireland 7,3 million and Central Europe, where the Croatians lived together with other nations within the borders of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, had 5 million* making for a much smoother reading experience for the reader.

Other than the aforementioned problems, I have encountered common hurdles, such as words in the Croatian vocabulary, which have no direct, or in this case any translation in the English language. The first one was the term *iseljeničke kuće*. Having never heard of such a term, it was a hard task to translate it. After doing some research I was still stuck, as it turned out that the term is almost non-existent in the Croatian language, and thus would be a real problem to translate into English. At first I tried a direct translation into English, using the term *emigration homes*, which was of course as bad as it sounds. After some thinking, I came to the realization that these *iseljeničke kuće* were acting as some sort of middle man, connecting potential emigrants with transportation agencies, and thus I decided to go with the English translation *migration agencies*, as it fairly accurately described their role during that period of mass emigration.

Another instance of such a problem would be the Croatian term *receptivna točka*. The term does not have its roots in the Croatian language, but also has no one-to-one translation into English. After a failed attempt at trying to translate it as a *receptive point*, it was brought to my attention that the term does not exist in the English language and I needed to come up with something more fitting. A *receptivna točka* would be a place welcoming migrants from afar and offering them a place to rest, while they prepare themselves for the long journey ahead to a brave new world. Taking this into account, I decided that *shelter* was a much more fitting translation, as Rijeka really was just a brief stop for many migrants and not a final destination.

To summarize, the fourth text was not all that difficult, but it had its problems, which kept me fairly occupied while trying to translate it to the best of my abilities. It had its fair share of common problems, which occur when translating from Croatian into English, such as breaking up sentences and maybe even shortening them, but the biggest ones were some terms used, which

have no direct translation into the English language, nor are they frequently used in Croatian. It may seem as if the author made these terms up, but the task of a translator still is to make the text readable and comprehensive and thus he has to find ways to replace those terms with better suited ones.

The translation of this text has really helped me in the sense that it made me do more research about the target text at hand and also dig for the meaning of some of the terms used in it, thus improving my information gathering skills.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, doing these translations demanded more effort than I initially thought it would. The thematic differences of each text demanded an expansion of the vocabulary on my part, so as to do the original text justice. In the first text I had to delve into the “winery vocabulary”, learning to differentiate the different types of wine, for instance, while the second one posed a real challenge with the abundance of economics and business terminology. Each text had something unique to it and it was up to me to establish what it was and how I would approach the translation from there. Besides differentiating something like the degrees of formality of a text, I had to take numerous other factors into account. Whilst translating, one has to be aware not only of the type of text he or she is translating, but also has to take certain context into account, like who the author is, when the text was written and who it was written for. A translator cannot have the same approach to translating a news letter article, as they would use with a scientific paper and vice versa. If the translator does not pay attention, a mistranslation can easily occur.

After finishing the translations, I can safely say that writing this paper has helped me immensely by further improving my language skills, and all that what I have learned about translating will surely benefit me greatly in my future academic career, as well as in life.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

### **Books:**

Roger T. Bell, Christopher Candlin: Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice (Applied Linguistics and Language Study), 1991, Addison Wesley Publishing Company. Available at:  
<https://libgen.is/book/index.php?md5=B3C4D09AB576693080B78E60B0CB7811>

Željko Bujas, Veliki hrvatsko-engleski riječnik (Biblioteka riječnici I leksikoni), 1999, Globus,  
Available at:

<https://libgen.is/book/index.php?md5=BD55907FB2AC1FB76CC830D5A89488CE>

### **Websites:**

<https://translationjournal.net/journal/41culture.htm>

<https://glosbe.com/en/hr>

<https://dictionary.cambridge.org>

<http://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search>

<https://www.collinsdictionary.com>

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A

#### 1. Uvod

Turizam na prostoru hrvatske obale Jadrana, a time i Dalmacije, opterećen je izrazitom koncentracijom turističkog prometa u mjesecu srpnju i kolovozu. Produženje turističke sezone nastoji se ostvariti inoviranjem turističke ponude – uvođenjem novih turističkih proizvoda. Jedan od proizvoda je i turizam vina – vinski turizam. Prirodni uvjeti i milenijska tradicija uzgoja vinove loze i proizvodnje vina stvaraju izuzetne mogućnosti za razvoj vinskog turizma i obogaćivanje turističke ponude na prostoru Dalmacije.

Turisti traže autentična i jedinstvena iskustva pri posjeti određene turističke destinacije. Turist posjetom područja gdje se uzgaja vinova loza i organizira konzumacija vina stupa u neposredni kontakt s kulturom domaćina, razmjenjuje pozitivna iskustva s ljudima, upoznaje kulturne aktivnosti, atraktivnosti i ukupne vrijednosti turističku destinacije. Razvoj vinskog turizma doprinosi pozicioniranju i prepoznatljivosti određenog turističkog područja i što stvara konkurentsku prednost .

Među raznim proizvodima koji se mogu podržati kao razvojni prioritet dalmatinskog turizma spada i vinski turizam zbog nekoliko razloga. Prvo, u Dalmaciji postoji duga tradicija uzgoja vinove loze i proizvodnje vina, a što je zadnjih desetljeća u stalnom porastu. Na dalmatinskoj obali i otocima vino je glavni izvor prihoda za mnoge obitelji a uzgoj vinove loze i proizvodnja grožđa i vina su ugrađeni u lokalni dalmatinski stil života i dio je “lokalnog osjećaja” (“sence of place”). U interesu je turizma da se sačuva lokalna tradicija i ekonomski održivi razvoj. Drugo,

vinari su već investirali u razvoj osnovne infrastrukture u koju mogu primiti posjetitelje i sa skromnom pomoći javnog sektora ovaj proizvod može vrlo brzo dostići visoke tržišne pozicije. Treće, vinski turizam se smatra kao proizvod koji je usklađen s trenutnom potražnjom na tržištu u smislu da su turisti sve više u potrazi za autentičnim i jedinstvenim iskustvom na turističkoj destinaciji. Lokalna hrana i vino stvara priliku da turisti upoznaju ljude koji proizvode te proizvode. To omogućava zadovoljenje potreba turista za autentičnošću i iskustvom koje žele spoznati posredstvom vinskog turizma. Konačno, vino se često povezuje s posebnim osobinama i ukusom (taste) turističke destinacije, a poslovne aktivnosti u vinskom turizmu preduvjet su za privlačnu sliku odredišta.

Razumijevanje motivacije i poduzetničke orijentacije kao i spoznaja o potencijalima vinarija je prvi korak prema razvoju učinkovitosti strategije vinskog turizma. Visoko značenje proizvoda sunca i mora i koncentracija turističke potražnje u dva ljetna mjeseca na uskom obalnom pojasu i otocima Dalmacije i tradicionalna proizvodnja vina, koja je u međuvremenu osuvremenjena, iziskuje značajnije iskorake i na području razvoja vinskog turizma.

Dalmacija može poslužiti kao poseban primjer destinacije za istraživanje vinskog turizma. Cilj ovog rada je istražiti profil vinarija koje posluju na području Dalmacije. Predmetno istraživanje nastavak je istraživanja dalmatinskog vinskog turizma koje je provedeno 2011. godine. U ovom istraživanju, koje je provedeno 2014. godine, primjenjuje se ista metodologija i postupak anketiranja nositelja ponude vinskog turizma Dalmacije kao i 2011. godine. Međutim, cilj predmetnog istraživanja je utvrditi i određene promjene koje su se dogodile u razdoblju od četiri godine u vinskom turizmu Dalmacije. Kako bi se još bolje spoznala aktualna problematika vinskog turizma Dalmacije provedeno je 2014. godine i istraživanje na području vinogorja poluotoka Pelješca. Vinogorje poluotoka Pelješca jedno je od najreprezentativnijih područja sa



proizvodnjom vina i organizacijskim modelom vinskog turizma u Dalmaciji. U radu se nastoji potvrditi, kao prvo: poduzetnički potencijal sudionika vinskog turizma Dalmacije i Pelješca; i drugo: identifi cirati elemente politike razvoja turizma vinskih cesta koje bi trebale biti u skladu s poduzetničkim potencijalom u stvaranju posebnog proizvoda dalmatinskog turizma.

## 2. Dalmacija regija – destinacija – vinskog turizma

Prema Getz i Brown (2006) i Tomljenović i Getz (2009) vinska regija je područje gdje se pravi najbolje vino i “to su posebna mjesta, čak i magična”. Vinska regija je područje ruralnog kraja i u neposrednoj je vezi sa posjetiteljima – potrošačima vina čija zabava, gastronomija, krajolik i aktivnosti u prirodi su temelj za poticaj budućeg razvoja.

Hall (2003) navodi da se za vinsku regiju upotrebljavaju pojam “ turističko područje” a što opisuje kombinaciju fizičkog, kulturnog i prirodnog okruženja, a to daje svakoj regiji određenu privlačnost kao destinacije za vinski turizam.

Razvoj destinacije vinskog turizma sadrži atrakcije, usluge, obrazovanje ugostiteljskih djelatnika, infrastrukture, organizacije razvoja i marketinškog plana. Specifičnosti vinske regije kao vinskog proizvoda sadrži vinske teme posjetitelja i interpretativne centre, vinska naselja, vinske ture, razgledavanje i ture vinskom zemljom-zemljom vina (Getz, 2000).

Ovi “proizvodi” su kombinacija posebnog razvoja koji se odnosi na vinarije ili javne investicije u vinski turizam, kao što je program mijenjanja imidža i funkcije centra servisa-usluge da postane “vinsko selo” (Getz i Brown, 2006.; Tomljenović i Getz, 2009).

Dalmacija je, kao vinska i turističke regija, smještene na središnjem dijelu hrvatske obale na istočnom dijelu Jadran (Slika 1).

Južno hrvatsko primorje ili Dalmacija izdužen je primorski pojas, oko 400 km dužine i do 70 km širine u središnjem dijelu. Prostire se na površini od 11 960 km<sup>2</sup> ili 21% površine Hrvatske. Na prostoru Dalmacije živi oko 855 000 stanovnika, ili 20% populacije Hrvatske. U dalmatinskom akvatoriju nalazi se 926 otoka, otočića, hridi i grebena ili 78% njihovog broja u Hrvatskoj. Zapremaju 1770 km<sup>2</sup>, a to je 58% površine svih hrvatskih otoka, odnosno 15% površine Dalmacije. Kopneni obalni pojas Dalmacije dug je 1200 km, što je gotovo 2/3 hrvatske kopnene obale.

Proizvodnja vina na području Dalmacije ima milenijsku tradiciju što dokazuju i nalazi vinskih posuda (amfora i čaša za vino) i sačuvani srebreni i bakreni novac grčkog grada Pharosa (Stari Grad na otoku Hvaru) iz III st. Pr. Krista odnosno pronađeni novac grada Isse (Visa) s likom amfora i grozda iz 385. godine prije Krista. Najznačajnija sorta ovog područja je plavac mali crni koji je nastao u davnoj prošlosti križanjem autohtonih dalmatinskih sorti kaštelanskog crljenka (u svijetu poznatijeg kao zinfandela) i dobričića.

Razdoblje od polovine XIX. do početka prvog desetljeća XX. stoljeća naziva se razdobljem velikog procvata dalmatinskog vinogradarstva i vinarstva. Naime, u to je vrijeme u Dalmaciji bilo pod vinogradima oko 68.000 ha, s godišnjom proizvodnjom većom od 600.000 hl vina, od čega se više od 2/3 izvozilo.

Dalmacija kao vinogradarska podregija dijeli se na područja: Sjeverna Dalmacija, Dalmatinska zagora, Srednja i Južna Dalmacija. Na prostoru Sjeverne Dalmacija pod vinogradima je oko 3600 ha (SLJRH, 2013). Ovo područje najpoznatije je na tržištu po dvije autohtone sorte vina s posebnih položaja a to su primoštenski crni babičić i bijeli oklajski debit.

Na području Dalmatinske zagore pod vinogradima je oko 2000 ha (SLJRH, 2013). Uz tradicionalni sortiment ovog područja (debit, plavina, trnjak, hrvaština) najzastupljenija je kujundūša iz koje se proizvodi istoimeno bijelo vino.

Područje Srednje i Južne Dalmacija obuhvaća najveći broj (12) vinogorja Dalmacije. Sedam vinogorja je na otocima: Mljet, Korčula, Lastovo, Vis, Hvar, Brač i Šolta. Pet vinogorja je na njenom kopnenom dijelu Kaštela – Trogir, Split – Omiš – Makarska, Neretva, Konavle i Pelješac). Na ovom području pod vinogradima je 4450 ha (SLJRH, 2013), a najpoznatije je crna sorta plavac mali. Ta sorta osnova je proizvodnji vrhunskih hrvatskih crnih vina poput dingača, postupa, zlatan plavca i plavca pharos. Udio bijelih sorti u sortimentu područja za ostaje u odnosu na crne. Tu spadaju vugava (Vis), pošip i grk (Korčula), malvasija dubrovačka.

Turizam na prostoru Dalmacije ima kraću povijest nego vino. Počeci turizma sežu u sredinu 19. stoljeća. Međutim, glavni turistički razvoj na području Dalmacije počinje u drugoj polovici 20. stoljeća. Na prostoru Dalmacije dnevno može boraviti 407 tisuće turista od čega u hotelima 57 tisuća, kampovima 60 tisuća, obiteljskom smještaju 270 tisuća i 20 tisuća u marinama.

U 2014. godini Dalmaciju je posjetilo 5,5 milijuna turista (42% Hrvatske) i ostvarili su ukupno 29,7 milijuna noćenja (45% Hrvatske) (www.mint.hr). Pelješac kao posebna destinacija vinskog turizma predmet je ovog rada zbog toga što osim stoljetne tradicije uzgoja vinove loze je upravo prvo hrvatsko vino sa zaštićenim zemljopisnim porijeklom koje je proizvedeno 1961. godine kao Dingač berbe na Pelješcu. Pelješac je drugi najveći poluotoku Hrvatskoj, dugačak je 65 km. Površina Pelješca je 952 km<sup>2</sup>. Na području Poluotoka Pelješca evidentirano je 14 tisuća smještajnih kapaciteta, a 2014. godine poluotok je posjetilo 160 tisuća turista koji su ostvarili 1,2 milijuna noćenja (DSZ HR – Informacija 1540 / 2015.) Na području poluotoka Pelješca

registrirana je 51 vinarija (Šundrica, str. 27). Na poluotoku djeluje i čak šest udruga vinara, a organizirana je i tematska cesta na kojoj se nalazi osam vinarija.

Glavni motivi dolaska turista u Dalmaciji (Tomas 2011) su pasivni odmor i opuštanje 75%, zabava 44%, nova iskustva i doživljaji 24%, gastronomija 22% i kulturne znamenitosti i događanja 7%. S obzirom na broj turističkih posjetitelja i vrste motiva zbog čega turisti dolaze na prostor Dalmacije, vinski turizam može biti značajni razlog za posjetu i boravak turista na prostoru Dalmaciji.

### 3. Vinski turizam

Vinski turizam, kao poseban turistički proizvod, zauzima sve značajnije mjesto u turističkoj ponudi mnogih turističkih destinacija i zemalja. Povijesno gledano, vinski turizam datira iz sredine devetnaestog stoljeća, kada su sudionici Grant Tour putovan ja na trasi svojih putovanja posjetili vinograde i degustirali vina.

Vino i turizam su prirodni partneri. Sa ekonomskog stajališta vino i turizam su odraz konkurentnosti određene destinacije (Tomljenović, 2006).

Definicija i koncept “vinski turizam” nije rezultat jedinstvenog pristupa. Većina definicija “vinski turizam” odnosi se na iskustva i motive putnika-turista. Tako je vinski turizam posjeta vinogradima, vinarijama, vinskim festivalima i izložbama koje se organiziraju sa svrhom rekreacije (Johnson, 1997).

Za Hall, Sharples, Cambourne i Macionis (2000) vinski turizam je posjeta vinogradima, vinarijama, vinskim festivalima i vinskim izložbama, pri čemu degustacija vina i/ili doživljaj atrakcija vinogradarske regije predstavljaju primarne motive posjete.

Kao drugi oblik specijalnog interesa turista-sudionika vinskog turizma – navodi se da posjetitelji vinskih regija razlikuju se u činjenici koje vino i koja vinarija je centralno mjesto njihove odluke o putovanju. (Charter i Ali-Knight, 2002; Gati i Maroni, 2004).

Uključujući elemente marketinga “vinski turizam je putovanje povezano sa privlačnošću vinarija i vinogradarskih područja, vrsta marketinške niše i prilika za direktnu prodaju za industriju vina” (Getz, 2000).

Također, Getz kroz ovu definiciju ukazuje da su mnoge nedovoljno razvijene zemlje krenule u razvoj vinskog turizma u kojem su vidjele šansu za obnavljanje svojih vinograda i poboljšanje ekonomske situacije vinorodnih područja (Getz, 2000).

Zapravo on zasniva tezu na obostranoj koristi i međusobnoj interakciji koja se ogleda u povećanju prodaje vina, edukacije posjetilaca, privlačenje novih tržišnih segmenata, valoriziranju drugih prirodnih i kulturnih vrijednosti, dok u destinaciji povećava broj posjetitelja, razvija novi imidž destinacije i konačno donosi prihode. Isti autor naglasak stavlja na tri glavna nositelja vinskog turizma, to su: proizvođač vina, turistička agencija (koja prezentira destinaciju) i turist-potrošač. Ovakav oblik vinskog turizma je istodobno oblik ponašanja potrošačaturista, uspostavlja se poseban oblik tržišta vina, strategija koja razvija destinaciju u odnosu na atrakcije i doprinosi obrazovanju nositelja ponude vinskog turizma pri čemu se uspostavlja direktna prodaja njihovih proizvoda potrošačima-turistima na mjestu proizvodnje.

U mnogim se područjima vinski turizam pojavio kao jedan od najvažnijih proizvoda ruralnog turizma (Marques, 2006). Razvoj vinskog turizma nosi sa sobom brojne prednosti ruralnih destinacija na pojedinačnoj i zajedničkoj razini, uključujući porast prodaje vina u vinarijama, povećavajući imidž destinacije i povećavajući broj turista (Brunori i Rosi, 2000; Getz, 2000;

Hall, Sharples, Cambourne i Macionis, 2000). Razvoj vinskog turizma zavisi o politici i programu vladinih agencija, destinacijske marketing organizacije, turističke organizacije i nezavisnih poduzetničkih aktivnosti (Tomljenović i Getz, 2009).

Ista istraživanja ukazuju da bitni elementi u iskustvu vinskog turizma su “mješavina” (amalgam) osnovnog vinskog proizvoda (gostoljubivost i srdačnost domaćina vinarije prema posjetiteljima, znanje osoblja vinarija o vinu, vinski festivali), privlačnost destinacije (atraktivan krajobraz i povoljni klimatski uvjeti, umjerene cijene smještaja, lakoća dobivanja informacija, uhodano tržište) i proizvod kulturnog turizma (poseban smještaj sa regionalnim obilježjima, dobri restorani i gastronomija, tradicionalna vinska sela).

Druga istraživanja ukazuju na činjenicu da uzgoj vinove loze i tehnologija proizvodnje vina su neposredno povezani s kulturnom baštinom pri čemu vinski turizam dijeli slična svojstva kulturnom turizmu, jer “ljudi koji su sudionici turizma vina i gastronomije u suštini su i sudionici kulturnog turizma” (Williams i Kelly, 2001.; Croce i Perri, 2010).

Razvoj proizvoda vinskog turizma uključuje neposrednu suradnju između protagonista iz dva sektora : turizma i vinogradarstva/ vinarstva. To se može obrazložiti na taj način što ponuda vinskog turizma ima tri temeljne dimenzije: vinske ceste, krajolik i obiteljsko nasljeđe (Prikaz 2.).

Prema Hall (2003) postoje tri vrste vinskog turizma: “ljubitelji vina”, “zanimanje vinski turizam” i “znatiželjnik vinskog turizma”.

Za Taylor, Barber i Deale (2010) vinski turizam je novi oblik promocije destinacije i utemeljen je na održivom razvoju destinacije. Sudionici vinskog turizma spoznali su činjenicu o vinskom

turizmu kao potrošaču okoliša ali oni utječu i na pozitivne promjene u politici zaštite okoliša na destinaciji vinskog turizma.

Literatura o istraživanju vinskog turizma usmjerena je na dva detalja: a) privlačnost destinacije vinskog turizma i čimbenici oblikovanja njihovih atraktivnosti; b) tko je vinski turist i koja su njegova iskustva iz vinskog turizma (Getz i Brown, 2006).

Na tržištu vina gdje dominiraju veliki proizvođači koji su potpomognuti – kontrolirani – jednako tako snažnom distribucijskom – veleprodajnom mrežom nasuprot njih su brojni mali vinari. Malim vinarima, posebno u novim rastućim regijama, potrebno je lokalno tržište i prodaja u podrumima, da izgrađuju svoj brand i povećavaju prodaju i dobit od prodaje vina (Tomljenović, 2006).

Mnoge već afirmirane ili nove turističke regije u razvoju a posebno vinski podrumi i njihovi vlasnici nastoje ponoviti uspjeh poznatih vinskih regija i konačno ostvariti određene prednosti koje donosi izgledni budući razvoj vinskog turizma (Tomljenović, 2006).

Temeljem teoretskih spoznaja u radu se nastoji utvrditi poduzetnički potencijal proizvođača vina i njihovo partnerstvo sa glavnim nositeljima turističkog razvoja u cilju dugoročnog razvoja vinskog turizma na području vinske regije Dalmacije i vinogorja poluotoka Pelješac.

Source: <https://hrcak.srce.hr>

## **APPENDIX B**

## POLITIČKI PROCESI: NJEMAČKI IZBORI 2013.

Politička ekonomija njemačkih parlamentarnih izbora

Kristijan Kotarski

Od početka krize Njemačka sve više djeluje kao istinski europski ekonomski hegemon, a svoju ekonomsku poziciju polako dopunjava sve jačim političkim nastupom i sve vidljivijim političkim profilom

Europska dužnička ili bankarsko-dužnička kriza?

Posljednje tri godine promijenile su način na koji građani Europske unije gledaju na najuspješniji primjer regionalne ekonomske integracije u svijetu nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata. Građani nikad nisu legitimnost integracije izvodili iz ubacivanja listića u biračku kutiju nego iz konkretnih ekonomskih koristi proizvedenih njome. Sadašnja je kriza mnogo dublja od jednostavnog kolebanja poslovnog ciklusa u vrijeme recesije nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata, a događa se u kontekstu problematične europske institucionalne arhitekture koja nema ni dostatnu zalihu difuzne legitimnosti za takva stanja niti primjenjiva rješenja koja bi zadovoljila sve aktere.

Velik dio uzroka krize treba tražiti preko Atlantika, u slomu američkoga hipotekarnog tržišta 2008, ali je krajnje problematičan narativ da su europske banke, koje su izgubile značajan dio ulaganja, bile puke žrtve kaprica dereguliranih financijskih tržišta SAD-a. Martin Hellwig, ravnatelj bonskog Instituta Max-Planck za javna dobra i suautor knjige Bankarevo novo ruho, ističe da u Europi postoji problem prevelikog kapaciteta banaka koje je želja za povećanjem profita tjerala u sve rizičnija ulaganja, pa i u ulaganja u američke vrijednosnice. Nakon



spašavanja niza europskih banaka novcem poreznih obveznika neposredno nakon kraha Lehman Brothersa izgledalo je da će se stanje stabilizirati, ali je lančana reakcija već bila pokrenuta. S obzirom na gubitke u kapitalnoj osnovici vodećih njemačkih i francuskih banaka u prvom valu krize, počela je likvidacija dugova na periferiji ili, jednostavno, prestali su se odobravati novi krediti bankama u državama na periferiji eurozone kako bi se stabilizirale kapitalne baze banaka kreditora. Prestanak priljeva privatnog kapitala ekonomijama duboko ovisnima o refinanciranju postojećih obveza i nove potrošnje označio je početak turbulentnih vremena. Nakon zaoštavanja krize 2010. s prvim lošim vijestima iz Grčke ubrzo nastaje „efekt zaraze“ te su krizom zahvaćene i ostale zemlje periferije koje ne mogu otplaćivati svoj javni dug.

Važno je pritom raščistiti neke zablude, jer se bankarsko dužnička kriza na europskoj periferiji još uglavnom prikazuje kao isključiva posljedica fiskalne neodgovornosti zemalja PIIGSa, dakle kao dužnička kriza. Nadaleko je poznato da su zemlje poput Grčke pronalazile kreativne načine da zaobiđu pravila proračunskog ograničenja Pakta o stabilnosti i rastu, koji je povremeno ignorirala čak i ekonomski moćna Njemačka. Zacijelo, i taj argument zaslužuje dužnu pozornost, ali je dio šire slagalice. Nakon što se zaviri pod poklopac europskoga ekonomskog motora u godinama uoči krize i pokušaju povezati osnovne činjenice, vidljivo je da je od 2000. do 2011. kombinirana aktiva 15 vodećih banaka sa sjedištem u EU-u povećana sa 7.000 na 20.000 milijardi eura, a to je skok sa 43 na 150 posto BDP-a EU-a.

Osim toga, kombinirana aktiva 8.000 vodećih financijskih institucija EU-a 2011. iznosila je 46.000 milijardi eura, što je ekvivalent 370 posto BDP-a EU-a. Prema izračunu britanske banke Barclays, 15 vodećih banaka EU-a imalo je 2011. polugu 28:1, što govori u prilog tezi da se kreditna ekspanzija previše otela kontroli i da banke nisu bile adekvatno ograničene stopom

obveznih rezervi i diskontnom kamatnom stopom, kako to postulira teorija konvencionalnoga monetarnog multiplikatora.

Usporedno s rastom aktive banaka rasli su i dugovi, budući da u postojećemu monetarnom sustavu najveći dio novca nastaje ekspanzijom bankovnih kredita, a samo je manji dio (papirni novac i kovanice) rezultat operacija središnje banke koja u ime suverena stvara novac, a razliku u trošku proizvodnje i nominalne vrijednosti emisije bilježi kao „zaradu“ suverena ili seignorage. Od početka 1980-ih ukupna zaduženost nefinancijskih poduzeća, država i kućanstava u zapadnim zemljama udvostručila se sa 160 na 320 posto BDP-a.

Nekoliko je uzroka takve ekspanzije dugova, ali je glavni pogodba financijske i političke elite, to jest svojevrsan „faustovski pakt“ prema kojemu banke dobivaju slobodnije ruke u poslovanju, a politička elita kredite potrebne za političke svrhe i financiranje javne potrošnje. U sustavu u kojemu se najveći dio novca zasniva na dugu i u kojemu su dugovi uvijek veći od količine novca, promjena sentimenta i prestanak refinanciranja dugova i/ili izostanak nove kreditne ekspanzije potiču razornu dinamiku bilančne recesije. Slaba pozicija banaka nakon prsnuća financijskog mjehura problematizira fiskalnu poziciju države koja je angažirana u akciji spašavanja posrnutih financijskih institucija. Veći teret duga implicira povećanje poreza i smanjenje rashoda, što smanjuje agregatnu potražnju. Pad agregatne potražnje slabi proizvodnju u realnom sektoru ekonomije, a posljedično se razdužuje privatni nefinancijski sektor pa pada potražnja za novim kreditima, a to opet slabi financijski sektor. Nakon vala bankrota financijske su institucije zbog neizvjesnosti smanjile ponudu kredita i ugradile u njihovu cijenu višu premiju rizika.

Nefinancijska poduzeća koja nisu bila pogođena prvim valom bankrota smanjuju potražnju za kreditima te se usporava investicijska aktivnost. Padaju porezni prihodi države i cijene izdanih

državnih obveznica, što povratno slabi položaj financijskog sektora sa suverenim dugom na svojim bilancama (podkapitaliziranost).

### Njemačka pozicija u sklopu krize

Nakon pucanja dotcom mjehura 2000. u SAD-u, efekt prsnuća mjehura prenio se i na Njemačku kao stožer buduće eurozone. Kako se nije mogla primijeniti ekspanzivna fiskalna politika (Pakt o stabilnosti i rastu) i kako je njemačka ekonomija slabjela, ECB 2003. spušta kamatnu stopu na dva posto. Takav potez nije postigao ciljani učinak, ali je, gledano iz današnje perspektive, imao kobnu ulogu u genezi krize zbog masovnog priljeva jeftinog kapitala, najviše njemačkoga i francuskog, u periferne zemlje eurozone. Nakon toga nastaje priča o uspješnome njemačkom izvoznom modelu koja traje u godinama nakon izbijanja krize. Od početka krize Njemačka sve više djeluje kao istinski europski ekonomski hegemon, a svoju ekonomsku poziciju polako dopunjava sve jačim političkim nastupom i sve vidljivijim političkim profilom. Mnogi površni promatrači, zavedeni selektivnim odabirom određenih ekonomskih indikatora poput stope nezaposlenosti i izvoza, prognoziraju nastavak visoke ekonomske konjunktore, političku hegemoniju Njemačke u EU-u i poželjnost oponašanja njemačkoga ekonomskog modela, čija bi dinamičnost trebala razbiti arhaične ekonomske strukture na periferiji EU-a. Pad stope nezaposlenosti s 11,2 (2004) na 5,3 posto (svibanj 2013), zajedno s prosječnom stopom suficita tekućeg računa bilance plaćanja od 4,7 posto između 2000. i 2012, djeluje impresivno. No ispod površine uspjeha kriju se mnoge ranjivosti njemačkoga ekonomskog modela.

Prvi uzrok ranjivosti proizlazi iz pretpostavke da se stalno može održavati trgovinski suficit na takvoj razini i da je to čak iznimno poželjno. Dok to može vrijediti za male i otvorene ekonomije s nekoliko milijuna stanovnika, teško da vrijedi za zemlju veličine Njemačke, jer se svaki suficit

zrcali u nečijem deficitu. Visoke izvozne performanse teško je zadržati u problematičnome izvanjskom okruženju sve većeg broja zemalja suočenih s usporavanjem rasta, uključujući i tržišta u nastajanju (BRICSM). Istodobno, oportunitetni trošak usvajanja takvog modela jest zanemarivanje agregatne potražnje na domaćem tržištu kroz potiskivanje jediničnih troškova rada ispod stope produktivnosti kako bi se povećala konkurentnost u odnosu prema glavnima trgovinskim partnerima. Taj model generira povećanje dohodovne nejednakosti i slabi investicijski kapacitet domaće ekonomije. Potrebno je napomenuti i da neto-izvoz zemlje predstavlja njezinu stopu štednje koja, umjesto ulaganja u domaću infrastrukturu i popratne sadržaje, odlazi na financiranje kupaca dobara i usluga na kredit. Podaci Bundesbanke i Banke za međunarodna poravnanja pokazuju da je omjer između njemačkih potraživanja i dugovanja prema inozemstvu i BDP-a 5:1, dok je u Kini kao drugoj velikoj izvoznici samo 1:1. Renate Ohr sa Sveučilišta Göttingen u tome vidi razlog slabljenja infrastrukture (prometnice, željeznice, obrazovanje, istraživanje i razvoj), što dugoročno smanjuje potencijalni rast. Još veća zamka krije se u nemogućnosti naplate potraživanja od dužniku ili naplati na teret treće stranke.

Kumulativ njemačkih suficita od 2000. do 2012. i potraživanja prema inozemstvu manji je za 600 milijardi eura od kumulativa što se vodi kao evidentan gubitak. Njemački je model problematičan i zbog porasta dohodovne nejednakosti. Od 2000. do 2012. Ginijev koeficijent povećao se s 0,26 na 0,29. Premda njegova vrijednost nije alarmantna u usporedbi sa SAD-om i Velikom Britanijom, ipak govori o trendu koji bi u budućnosti mogao biti još izraženiji. Dva su čimbenika važna za objašnjenje te pojave. Prema podacima Njemačkoga saveznog zavoda za statistiku, od 2000. do 2011. dohodak iz nadnica porastao je 19 posto, a dohodak od kapitala 50 posto. Očito je držanje nadnica ispod stope produktivnosti pridonijelo rastu dohodovne nejednakosti (tome treba pribrojiti i smanjenje progresivnosti poreznog sustava). Drugi je čimbenik protukrizna politika od

2010. čije bi se posljedice mogle vidjeti tek u budućnosti. Izvozni model financiran njemačkim kapitalom kroz kreditiranje kupaca implicira ranjivost vjerovnika. No bit protukrizne politike čini to što su se gotovo sva potraživanja privatnoga financijskog sektora od periferije pretvorila u javna potraživanja za koje jamče njemački i europski porezni obveznici. Pojednostavnjeno, najveći izvoznici i privatni financijski sektor naplatili su najveći dio svojih potraživanja, dok porezni obveznici vrlo vjerojatno neće naplatiti svoja potraživanja i ostat će dužni financijerima raznih „spasilačkih kišobrana“ kao što su EFSF-a i ESM-a. Ako porezni pritisak sljedećih godina nadmaši porast nadnica iz godina obilježenih izvoznim boomom, onda je to dodatan element koji pogoršava raspodjelu dohotka, jer su koristi iz razdoblja rasta usko koncentrirane, a troškovi široko raspodijeljeni u prostoru i vremenu. Suprotno javnom narativu o transferu novca njemačkih poreznih obveznika „lijenim Grcima“, posrijedi je značajan transfer njemačkim i francuskim financijskim institucijama koje su kreditirale poslove s Grčkom i ostalim perifernim zemljama. Druga je strana kolajne krajnje nejednaka raspodjela bogatstva po kojoj Njemačka zauzima prvo mjesto u Europi, jer „gornjih“ deset posto stanovnika raspolaže s 59,2 posto bogatstva. Bogatstvo izraženo u novcu i ostalim likvidnim sredstvima bilježi od 1991. do 2013. rast od 1.751 na 4.992 milijarde eura. Premda je prema studiji ECB-a veličina bogatstva njemačkih kućanstva mjerena medijanom mala u usporedbi s Italijom i Španjolskom, to proizlazi iz veličine kućanstva kao jedinice analize (kućanstva u Njemačkoj imaju manje članova) i sugerira da divergencija medijana i aritmetičke sredine bogatstva ukazuje na značajnu nejednakost.

Source: <https://hrcak.srce.hr>

## **APPENDIX C**

**Marica Karakaš Obradov**

*Hrvatski institut za povijest, Zagreb*

### **Iseljavanje Židova iz Hrvatske nakon drugoga svjetskog rata**

#### **Uvod**

Prema popisu stanovništva Kraljevine Jugoslavije iz 1931. u Jugoslaviji bilo je 68.405 Židova. Broj Židova se povećao prirodnim prirastom ali i izbjeglicama koji su bježali iz europskih zemalja zahvaćenih nacizmom preko Jugoslavije te je neposredno prije Drugoga svjetskoga rata, prema procjenama, na području Jugoslavije živjelo između 75.000 do preko 80.000 Židova. Broj izbjeglih Židova koji su se zatekli na jugoslavenskom području prije početka rata procjenjuje se od 2000 do 5000 osoba. Od ovog ukupnog broja Židova u Jugoslaviji na hrvatskom području, također prema procjenama, prije početka Drugoga svjetskog rata živjelo je između 23.000 i 26.000 Židova, a na bosansko-hercegovačkom području oko 14.000 Židova. Neki autori navode I procjenu da je na području NDH (teritorij sastavljen od hrvatskih i bosansko-hercegovačkih dijelova) bilo 39.500, odnosno u Hrvatskoj 25.000, a u Bosni i Hercegovini 14.500 Židova.

Židovi s jugoslavenskog područja, pa tako i hrvatskog i bosansko-hercegovačkog koji su tvorili NDH, spasili su se prvenstveno jer su izbjegli na područja pod vlašću Kraljevine Italije, i to ne samo na Apeninski poluotok, nego i na područja koja je Kraljevina Italija anektirala ili okupirala, potom u Mađarsku, Bugarsku, Tursku i drugdje. Osim onih koji su izbjegli i onih koji su preživjeli internacijske, koncentracijske i vojne zarobljeničke logore bilo je i onih Židova koji su uspjeli preživjeti rat na samom području okupirane Kraljevine Jugoslavije. Primjerice, na području NDH spasili su se oni Židovi koji su dobili položaj „počasnih arijevac“ jer su na razne načine, prema mišljenju vlasti NDH, zadužili hrvatski narod. Zatim, spasio se manji dio Židova u tzv. miješanim brakovima i neki pokršteni Židovi za koje se osobito zauzimala Katolička crkva te obrazovani Židovi, liječnici, inženjeri i sl., kojima su vlasti NDH dodijelile „arijevsko pravo“. Uz njih bi trebalo spomenuti i veću grupu židovskih liječnika, uz manji dio članova obitelji, koji su se uspjeli spasiti, jer su poslani u Bosnu u Zavod za suzbijanje endemijskog sifilisa u Banja Luci. Također je jedan od načina spašavanja bio i odlazak u partizane, osobito kao sanitetsko osoblje, a bilo je i primjera da se partizanima pridružilo i civilno židovsko stanovništvo kao izbjeglice. Iako su partizani prihvaćali Židove, bilo je i slučajeva da se tijekom rata s podozrenjem gledalo na pristupanje Židova partizanskom pokretu, a neke su sumnjičili da su britanski špijuni, budući da su obrazovani Židovi uglavnom poznavali više jezika, pa i engleski.

### **Procjene o broju preživjelih jugoslavenskih i hrvatskih židova**

U dosadašnjim istraživanjima znatna su odstupanja u broju Židova s područja Jugoslavije koji su preživjeli Drugi svjetski rat. Neke procjene odnose se na jugoslavensko područje, neke samo na područje NDH, a neke samo za Hrvatsku ili samo za Bosnu i Hercegovinu i sl. Osim

teritorijalnog opsega, nejasnoće se javljaju i kod navođenja načina spašavanja. Većinom se govori o spašavanju bijegom pa se nameće pretpostavka da oni koji su preživjeli na druge načine nisu ubrojani. Broj preživjelih s jugoslavenskog područja procjenjuje se na od 10.000 do oko 16.000 osoba, a s područja NDH od 9000 do oko 12.000 osoba. Isto tako, u nekim izvorima i literaturi navode se podaci o preživjelima samo za manja područja (primjerice neku regiju ili grad) ili se podatak o broju preživjelih odnosi samo na one koji su izbjegli ili se vratili iz koncentracijskih, internacijskih ili zarobljeničkih logora ili pak preživjeli u tzv. miješanim brakovima. U nastavku se navode neki izvori te neki autori i njihove procjene.

Vrhovni rabin Jugoslavije Isak Alkalaj, u pismu iz ožujka 1943. predstavniku Vatikana u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama navodi broj od 15.000 „naših Jevreja“, odnosno jugoslavenskih, koji su izbjegli iz Jugoslavije. Isti broj Židova koji su se „sklonili“ navodi i predsjednik Udruženja jugoslavenskih Židova u SAD-u u svom pismu poslanstvu Kraljevine Jugoslavije u Washingtonu.

Sličnu procjenu navodi i Slavko Goldstein 1988. procjenjujući da je 15.000 do 16.000 jugoslavenskih Židova preživjelo Drugi svjetski rat.

U izlaganju o stradanju jugoslavenskih Židova tijekom Drugoga svjetskog rata na prvoj poslijeratnoj europskoj skupštini Svjetskog židovskog kongresa, koja se održala u kolovozu 1945. u Parizu, David Alkalaj iznio je podatak da je preživjelo u „najboljem slučaju“ 10.000 do 12.000 Židova.

Milan Ristović 1998. iznosi sličnu procjenu od oko 12.000 preživjelih jugoslavenskih Židova, većinom s područja NDH, koji su uspjeli pobjeći u Italiju, Mađarsku i Bugarsku. Iz ovoga bi se



moglo zaključiti da je broj preživjelih i veći jer u njegovim procjenama nisu obuhvaćeni Židovi izbjegli na područja koje je Kraljevina Italija anektirala i okupirala.

Slavko i Ivo Goldstein objavili su 2001. godine da je „znatno pretjeran“ broj od

12.000 Židova koji iznosi Ristović i to većinom s područja NDH te navode da je broj od 12.000 „donekle približniji“ ako je u njega pribrojano i oko 5000 Židova koji su pobjegli u „talijansku okupacijsku zonu“ na području NDH, odnosno na područja koja je Kraljevina Italija ne samo okupirala nego i anektirala.

Ivo Goldstein 2004. navodi da je s područja NDH preživjelo rat 11.589 Židova, od kojih je na bosanskohercegovačkom području preživjelo 4000; u sjevernoj Hrvatskoj, Slavoniji, Srijemu i Dalmaciji 5250, a u partizanima je kraj rata dočekalo 2339 Židova iz Hrvatske i Bosne i Hercegovine.

Esther Gitman 2011. navodi nešto manju brojku i prema njoj je oko 9500 Židova s područja NDH preživjelo Holokaust. Ona donosi i podatke da se u Sarajevo, u razdoblju od 1945. do 1952., vratilo 2455 Židova, ne računajući one Židove (oko 200 osoba) koji su odbili poslije rata prijaviti se Židovskoj općini u Sarajevu. Među neubrojene preživjele Židove spadaju i oni koji su bili uključeni u poslijeratne strukture vlasti i živjeli u Beogradu. Dio njih je promijenio i prezimena te su se „odmaknuli“ od židovskih institucija i identiteta.

Jaša Romano je 1980. navodio broj Židova na pojedinim područjima prije rata i broj stradalih s tih područja te se iz tih podataka mogu iščitati procjene o preživjelima. Prema njegovim

navodima, na području Hrvatske, Slavonije i Srijema preživjelo je oko 5000, u BiH oko 4000 i s područja Dalmacije 252 Židova.

Melita Švob 1997. donosi sumarni popis od 3289 Židova po gradovima u Hrvatskoj koji su se 1946. vratili u svoje općine. Prema njenim navodima, u Čakovec se vratilo 85 Židova, u Dubrovnik 38, u Đakovo 22, u Lovran 22, u Karlovac 39, u Našice 8, u Opatiju 33, u Osijek 304, u Požegu 10, u Rijeku 185, u Slavonski Brod 16, u Solin 175, u Varaždin 54, u Vinkovce 35, u Viroviticu 23, u Vrpolje 5, u Vukovar 23, u Zagreb 1333, a kasnije još 879, što je ukupno 2212 preživjelih Židova u gradovima. Autorica naglašava da u popisu nisu navedena sva mjesta u koja su se Židovi vratili jer ih je bilo tek „nekoliko preživjelih“.

Samuel Pinto je još 1952. objavio rezultate o stradanjima Židova u BiH na temelju prikupljenih podataka i zapisnika Zemaljske Komisije za istraživanje zločina okupatora i njihovih pomagača za Bosnu i Hercegovinu. Od oko 14.000 Židova s područja BiH prije rata preživjelo je oko 2500. Pretežno se radilo o Židovima iz Sarajeva, njih 1537 Židova. Od toga ih se 1277 vratilo iz izbjeglištva, a 40 ih je preživjelo rat u Sarajevu. Među njima je bilo 227 djece, 556 žena, 494 muškaraca. Oko 100 ih je ostalo u Italiji, oko 120 se iselilo u Palestinu i oko 40 odselilo u SAD. Iz sarajevskog okruga (Bugojno, Rogatica, Travnik, Visoko, Višegrad, Zenica, Žepče) preživjelo je 150 Židova; iz Mostarskog okruga (Mostar, Konjic) 115; iz banjalučkog okruga (Banja Luka, Bihać, Bosanski Brod, Jajce, Prijedor, Sanski Most) oko 100 osoba i iz tuzlanskog okruga (Bijeljina, Bosanski Šamac, Derventa, Doboj, Gračanica, Gradačac, Kladanj, Modriča, Vlasenica, Zvornik) oko 150. Prema istom teritorijalnom načelu, S. Pinto objavio je poimenični popis 7505 stradalih Židova iz Sarajeva te sumarne podatke od oko 3100 stradalih Židovima u navedenim okruzima. U skupini preostalih 3300 Židova (razlika između procjene ukupnog broja Židova od

14.000 i procjene broja stradalih od oko 10.600) znatan je i broj preživjelih, što su kasnija istraživanja i potvrdila.

Slobodan Milošević 1981. navodi samo podatak od oko 4500 izbjeglih jugoslavenskih Židova na talijansko okupacijsko područje, od toga 2000 u Prvu zonu, 2000 u Drugu zonu, a ostatak u Crnu Goru i na Kosovo.

Kao primjer objavljivanja podataka za pojedine gradove navodim broj preživjelih Židova iz Koprivnice, a za koju Melita Švob, u ranije spomenutoj knjizi, ne navodi podatke. Dakle, iz Koprivnice je preživjelo 30 Židova pretežno iz miješanih brakova ili su se vratili iz koncentracijskih, internacijskih i vojnih zarobljeničkih logora.

Zasigurno će nova istraživanja, većinom na razini gradova, pridonijeti utvrđivanju broja stradalih i preživjelih Židova te ukazati na solidarnost, osobito pojedinaca, prema progonjenim Židovima. No neće se bitno promijeniti već sada jasna slika o razmjerima stradavanja židovskog stanovništva na hrvatskom i bosansko-hercegovačkom području tijekom Drugoga svjetskog rata.

### **Poslijeratno iseljavanje židova iz Hrvatske u Palestinu/izrael**

Nakon rata preživjeli Židovi suočili su se s odlukom ostati u Jugoslaviji koja je preko „narodne demokracije“ krenula putem komunizma ili otići u Palestinu, kasnije Izrael. Odluke o ostanku u Jugoslaviji ili odlasku u Palestinu/Izrael, uz osnovnu činjenicu da su brojni ostali bez članova obitelji i da im imovina oduzeta tijekom rata većinom nije vraćena, bitno je određivao odnos pojedinaca iz jugoslavenske židovske zajednice prema vjeri, cionizmu i komunističkoj ideologiji.

U novoj jugoslavenskoj državi Židovi su pred državom i zakonom bili izjednačeni s ostalima pa je time i njihova imovina obuhvaćena nacionalizacijom koja se provodila na osnovi više uredbi i zakona: „Odluka o prijelazu u državno vlasništvo neprijateljske imovine, o državnoj upravi nad imovinom neprisutnih lica i o sekvestru nad tom imovinom, koju su okupatorske vlasti prisilno otuđile“ od 21. studenog 1944., „Zakon o postupanju sa imovinom koju su vlasnici morali napustiti u toku okupacije i imovinom koja im je oduzeta od strane okupatora i njegovih pomagača“ od 24. svibnja 1945., „Zakon o nacionalizaciji privatnih i privrednih poduzeća“ od 5. prosinca 1946. i njegove izmjene i dopune od 29. travnja 1948., „Zakon o izmjenama i dopunama Zakona o državljanstvu FNRJ“ od 1. prosinca 1948. godine. Na srednjoeuropskom području, poslije Čehoslovačke, u Jugoslaviji je zabilježen najveći prijelaz privatnog vlasništva u tzv. javni sektor. Česti su bili primjeri da su kuće dobrostojećih Židova za vrijeme rata otuđene i prisvojene od strane tadašnjih političkih i vojnih uglednika. Poslije Drugog svjetskog rata promijenile su stanare na sličnim položajima samo drugoga političkog svjetonazora.

Ograničenja koja su nametana svim vjerskim skupinama na jugoslavenskom području nisu u potpunosti zaobišle niti židovsku vjersku zajednicu. Političke i ideološke mjere provedene poslije rata u Jugoslaviji doveli su do toga da je u rujnu 1952. promijenjen i naziv Savez jevrejskih veroispovednih opština u Savez jevrejskih opština. Novi naziv bio je ne samo u skladu s novim jugoslavenskim društvom nego i novim stanjem u Savezu koji je tada već bio „vjerska zajednica ateista“ jer su Židovi vjernici među prvima otišli u Palestinu/Izrael.

Dio Židova koji je izbjegao tijekom rata s jugoslavenskog područja repatriran je poslije rata, a dio ih se nije želio vratiti. Preživjeli Židovi s hrvatskog područja vratili su se ponajviše u Zagreb gdje je bio organiziran prihvata i pomoć pri Židovskoj općini. Neki koji su se sklonili u Švicarsku nisu se odmah repatrirali jer su prvo željeli otići u Italiju gdje su pohranili imovinu, a radilo se

većinom o odjeći, novcu i nakitu. Ovi Židovi trebali su biti repatrirani preko Milana i Trsta u Jugoslaviju.

Source: <https://hrcak.srce.hr>

## **APPENDIX D**

Rijeka i riječka okolica u europskom i hrvatskom transatlantskom iseljavanju od 1880. do 1914.

godine

Tijekom proljetnih mjeseci 2009. godine u Muzeju grada Rijeke bila je postavljena zanimljiva, poučna i vrlo dobro posjećena izložba kratkog, ali znakovitog naziva – Merika. U podnaslovu izložbe stajalo je pojašnjenje Iseljavanje iz Srednje Europe u Ameriku 1880.-1914. Posjetiteljima izložbe prezentirana je geneza i dokumentirana povijest europskih iseljeničkih tokova prema Sjevernoj Americi u kojima je jednu od važnijih uloga imala Rijeka i njena luka. Istom prilikom, djelatnici Muzeja na čelu sa kustosom mr. sc. Ervinom Dubrovićem kao autorom i urednikom predstavili su javnosti opsežnu i slikovnim materijalom bogatu istoimenu monografiju. Upravo je ona referentna točka ovoga rada koji nastoji proniknuti u veze i odnose između Rijeke kao industrijsko-lučkog grada u razvoju njene bliže i dalje okolice kao izrazitog agrarnog i siromašnog gospodarskog prostora sa kojega stanovništvo emigrira preko Atlantika. Druga polovica XIX. stoljeća razdoblje je početaka i razvoja industrijalizacije Rijeke. Otvaraju se industrijski pogoni i tvornice koji preoblikuju Rijeku u industrijski grad kao što su rafinerija

šećera i tvornica duhana, tvornica papira, tvornica torpeda (ljevaonica metala), rafinerija nafte, tvornica kože, tvornica sapuna, ledara, klaonica, paromlini. Ujedno joj njezin položaj omogućuje da se preobrazi u vodeću hrvatsku luku i ostvaruje zavidne rezultate u pomorstvu i trgovini koja se odvija PUN15\_za tisak.indd 149 13.09.2010. 16:56 Povijest u nastavi 150 preko lučkog bazena. Sukladno tome, grade se brojni prateći objekti koji u službi industrijske proizvodnje, pomorstva i trgovine odražavaju graditeljske stilove svoga vremena. Kada se tome pridoda dolazak željeznice (1873.), koja je uz već postojeće ceste, Karolinu i Lujzijanu povezivala Rijeku sa unutrašnjošću, te gradnja zgrade željezničkog kolodvora dobivamo potpuniju sliku Rijeke kao važnog lučko-industrijskoga središta sjevernog dijela Jadrana. Sva ova gibanja i mijene grada koje su se pokazivala na njegovom obličju i vizurama jasno su pokazivala da je Rijeka postala početkom XX. stoljeća grad sa najbrojnim tvorničkim pogonima među tadašnjim hrvatskim gradovima. Političko-upravni položaj Rijeke određen je tako da je grad zajedno sa svojim kotarom pod izravnom upravom središnjih ugarskih tijela, te formiran kao corpus separatum ili Ugarsko primorje (*Litorale hungaricum*). Upravo je ugarska vlada kroz svoj plan o izgradnji Rijeke kao moderne luke počela, u suradnji sa tadašnjim gradonačelnicima koji donose urbanističke planove, provoditi preoblikovanje grada i njegovo širenje prema moru. Počinju veliki građevinski poduhvati u službi vizije da Rijeka postane lučki i industrijski centar. Nasipava se obala od ušća Rječine do Kantride za gradnju gatova te lučkih skladišta (od 1900. do 1914. godine gradi se Metropolis, najduža zgrada ikada podignuta u Rijeci) kao i željezničkih skladišta, grade se lukobrani i pristaništa, grad dobiva električnu rasvjetu, vodovod i kanalizaciju, gradskim središtem prometuje električni tramvaj, a vелеbne palače u samom središtu grada, hoteli, kazalište, paviljoni, tržnice, parkovi i perivoji svjedoče da na prijelazu iz XIX. u XX. stoljeće pred sobom imamo moderan i urbanistički profinjen grad koji je potpuno u funkciji industrijskog razvoja te lučkog prometa i trgovine. Gotovo u sjeni prethodno navedenog industrijskog zamaha i

trgovačko-pomorske inercije koju grad doživljava potkraj XIX. stoljeća odvija se proces koji dotiče Rijeku po njenim rubnim dijelovima, a koji je u potpunosti u suprotnosti sa njenim gospodarskim dosezima. Naime, Rijeka je kao jedina ugarska luka sve do 80-tih godina XIX. stoljeća u robno-trgovačkoj razmjeni i prometu ipak mala luka. Brodovi koji prometuju lukom su u vlasništvu društva Ungaro-Croate i namijenjeni su obalnoj plovidbi. Radi se o jedrenjacima koji povezuju Rijeku sa bližom okolicom i kvarnerskim otocima, prevozeći relativno malim kapacitetima podjednako ljude i robni teret. Veliki zamah modernizacije pomorskog prometa koji se u Europi, napose u njenim zapadnim (Velika Britanija, Francuska, Nizozemska, Belgija), južnim (Italija) i srednjoeuropskim zemljama (Njemačka) manifestira uvođenjem modernih i velikih parobroda navodi ugarsku vladu na brze i neophodne promjene. One nastaju u trenutku kada mađarska vlada odlučuje napustiti luku na ušću Rječine (Fiumari – Mrtvom kanalu) i graditi novu s namjerom da se dotadašnja obalna plovidba pojača brodskim linijama za prekooceanske plovidbe. Nova glavna luka, odnosno njen središnji lučki bazen, smješta se zapadnije, prema gradskom središtu. Gradnjom bližih pristaništa i vezova održava se postojeća plovidba, dok se gradnjom udaljenijih vezova omogućuje dostupnost parobrodima dubljeg gaza. Najveći tadašnji riječki prekooceanski brodar, Ugarsko parobrodarsko društvo Adria (Royal Hungarian Sea Navigation Company »Adria« Limited-Fiume, osnovana 1882. godine) održava trgovačke linije s vodećim francuskim i britanskim lukama te prekooceansku liniju s brazilskim lukama Pernambuco, Bahia, Santos i Rio de Janeiro. Ova južnoamerička linija namijenjena je prije svega teretnom prijevozu, ali njom već krajem stoljeća odlaze pojedinci iz Rijeke i riječke okolice, ponajprije u Brazil, a potom u Argentinu i ostale zemlje Južne Amerike, da rade na farmama ili se upućuju u daleki svijet tražeći zlato. Ovi prvi gospodarski emigranti najava su procesa koji je postao svojevrsni fenomen gotovo cijele Europe u razdoblju druge polovice XIX. stoljeća pa do početka Prvoga svjetskog rata. Migracija Europljana preko Atlantika prema Sjevernoj i Južnoj

Americi te prema Australiji počela je u drugoj polovici XIX. stoljeća. Radi se o masovnom i pomno organiziranom poduhvatu koji je svojim posljedicama dalekosežno mijenjao tadašnju europsku društveno-političku, a napose gospodarsku stvarnost, ali će podjednakim intenzitetom mijenjati ista društvena obilježja prostora koji su mu bile završne točke. Prva masovna migracija počinje u Irskoj polovicom XIX. stoljeća. Prenaseljena, siromašna i poljoprivredna Irska tada doživljava gospodarski udarac koji će njeno stanovništvo natjerati na egzodus kao jedini spas od smrti uzrokovane glađu. Urod krumpira kao osnovne poljoprivredne kulture i životne namirnice katastrofalno propada 1846.-1847. godine i potiče migraciju Iraca prema Engleskoj, odakle se većina preko vodeće engleske luke Liverpoola uputila prema Sjevernoj Americi, točnije Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama. Kako bismo shvatili razmjere irske emigracije dovoljno je podastrijeti podatak da se tada irsko stanovništvo smanjilo od osam na tri milijuna žitelja. Bio je to početak najveće i najpotpunije dokumentirane prekoceanske migracije u ljudskoj povijesti. Migracija je to kolosalnih razmjera koja u stogodišnjem razdoblju (1815.-1915.), dakle od završetka Napoleonovih ratova do početaka Prvoga svjetskog rata, doseže višemilijunske brojke. Iz Velike Britanije iseljava tada 11,4 milijuna ljudi, iz Italije 9,9 milijuna, iz Irske 7,3 milijuna, a iz Srednje Europe 5 milijuna ljudi. Upravo je Srednja Europa prostor na kojem su među ostalim narodima obitavali Hrvati, živeći unutar granica Austro-Ugarske Monarhije. Iseljavanje iz Austro-Ugarske Monarhije u razdoblju od 1871. do 1915. godine poprimilo je također milijunske razmjere. Naime, u spomenutom razdoblju iz Austro-Ugarske Monarhije je iselilo 4,383.000 ljudi. Najveći dio austrougarskih emigranata (2,191.734) odlazi u Sjedinjene Američke Države, gdje čine 27,9% ukupnog europskog iseljništva u tu sjevernoameričku državu. Ostali pravci austrougarske emigracije idu prema Kanadi (167.969 emigranata), Argentini (355.507 emigranata), Brazilu (64.360 emigranata), ostalim državama Južne Amerike (6.544 emigranata), Australiji (4.097 emigranata), Africi (1.771 emigrant) i Aziji (109 emigranata). Posljedice takvog



masovnog iseljavanja iz Austro-Ugarske Monarhije bile su štetne za njezinu gospodarsku vitalnost budući da najveći broj emigranata čini radno sposobno stanovništvo među kojim prednjače muškarci, koji su vojno sposobni, pa svojim odlaskom negativno utječu i na brojnost i spremnost njezine vojske. Država, pak, sa svoje strane nije spremna zakonskom regulativom zaustaviti odljev stanovništva ili ga barem ublažiti. Premda službeno ne prihvaća emigraciju, država ju, čini se, prešutno odobrava ili čak svojom nedjelotvornošću i potiče. Naime, cjelovit zakon o iseljavanju nije donesen do kraja Monarhije nego je vrijedio stari iseljenički patent cara Franje I. iz 1832. godine prema kojemu je iseljavanje bilo legalno, ali uz gubitak državljanstva i dobivanja statusa stranca. Dakle, iseljavanje nije značilo gubitak prava vlasništva što je bila olakotna činjenica i išla je na ruku iseljenicima. Iseljenički patent je 1867. godine fragmentarno izmijenjen i upotpunjen proglašavanjem slobode kretanja koja se ograničavala jedino u slučaju vojne obveze. No, ta odredba nipošto nije spriječavala vojne obveznike koji su se masovno oglašavali na nju, nesmetano prelazeći granice Monarhije i odlazeći u Novi svijet. Sve do 1880. godine, kada europski kontinent zahvaća velika gospodarska kriza, Austro-Ugarska Monarhija nije središnji europski prostor iseljavanja. Do tada odlaze pretežno stanovnici iz austrijskog dijela Monarhije kojima su austrijska (Beč, Innsbruck, Feldkirch) i švicarska (Basel, Buchs) željeznička čvorišta prostorno bliža, a preko kojih nastavljaju put do sjevernonjemačkih luka (Bremen, Bremerhaven, Hamburg) ili do francuskih, belgijskih, nizozemskih i engleskih atlantskih luka. Iseljavanje je to tijekom kojega njegova brojnost doseže nekoliko tisuća ljudi godišnje, a Dalmacija je prostor njegovih početaka. Međutim, situacija se drastično mijenja kada pod utjecajem gospodarske krize, čija je zenitna točka 1880. godina, brojnost iseljenika naglo raste na 20.000 ljudi godišnje i više nikada neće pasti. Godine 1892. iseljava 50.000 ljudi, a 1904. godine čak 100.000 ljudi. Ugarski dio Monarhije ne zaostaje za austrijskim, dapače, gospodarska zaostalost bila je poput vjetra u leđa svima onima koji su između ostanka u zavičaju i odlaska u

nepoznato izabrali ovu drugu opciju. U navedenim europskim demografskim gibanjima jedna od polazišnih točaka prema sretnijoj preoceanskoj budućnosti bila je i Rijeka koja se u srednjoeuropski, preciznije austrougarski, egzodus uključuje kasnije od već tada uhodanih europskih luka kao što su Hamburg, Bremen, Bremerhaven, Rotterdam, Antwerpen, Le Havre, Cherbourg, Liverpool, Southampton i Genova. Riječka luka bila je receptivna točka uglavnom ugarskih iseljenika koje dovode brojne iseljeničke kuće, bankari, predstavnici pomorskih kompanija i tisuće »akvizitera« koji obilaze i najudaljenija sela potičući iseljavanje. Gotovo je fascinantna razrađenost njihova djelovanja i organizacija koja zaobilazi sva zakonska ograničenja, a ujedno s lakoćom koordinira usluge prijevoza između središta Europe do najudaljenijeg mjesta na američkom zapadu. Početkom XX. stoljeća u Rijeci počinju djelovati prve iseljeničke agencije kao što su agencije Mašek i drug ili Compagnie Général Transatlantique koje putnike vode u Le Havre, te agencija u vlasništvu Konstantina Teodorovića koja emigrante usmjerava prema Antwerpenu i drugim atlantskim lukama. One svoja sjedišta imaju u riječkim predgrađima, na Sušaku ili Kantridi, a ne u centru jer ih vlasti ne gledaju blagonaklono. Neke agencije poput one G. B. Cargnellia potajno i bespravno odvođe iseljenike u Genovu budući da se radi o mladićima koji podliježu vojnoj obvezi. Sve veći promet iseljenika koji se u početku odnosio na stanovništvo uglavnom iz obližnjih krajeva stavljaio je pred Rijeku kao grad i novo tranzitno čvorište, te pred riječku luku kao polaznu emigracijsku točku prema zapadu, nove i veće zahtjeve. Početkom 1903. godine u Rijeku željezničkom trasom dolaze prvi iseljenici koji produžuju prema atlantskim (Le Havre) i talijanskim (Genova) lukama. Radi se o skupinama od više desetaka ili nekoliko stotina ljudi, uglavnom Primoraca, koji su svoju sretniju budućnost odlučili potražiti daleko od svog zavičaja. Rijeka je tada figurirala kao tranzitni centar kroz koji prolaze bez nužnog zadržavanja. Međutim, kako je brojnost emigranata eksponencijalno rasla, mađarska vlada je počela razmišljati o Rijeci i njejoj luci kao odredištu iz kojega će

isplovljavati prekooceanski brodovi s direktnom vezom sa Sjevernom Amerikom. Stoga je nužno bilo osigurati nekoliko pretpostavki. Prvo, domaće parobrodarsko društvo Adria moralo je osigurati parobrode namijenjene prijevozu emigranata i to gradnjom novih ili unajmljivanjem. Čelnici Adrie posežu za unajmljivanjem parobroda sklapajući ugovor sa jednom od najvećih europskih parobrodarskih kompanija, Cunard Lineom iz Liverpoola. Time se engleska kompanija uključuje na jadransko tržište u ovaj profitabilan prijevoznički posao. Bez obzira što je ova parobrodarska koalicija nosila ime Cunard-Adria, činjenica je da se prijevoz iseljenika iz Rijeke prema Sjevernoj Americi, preciznije New Yorku, odvijao isključivo pod Cunardovim patronatom, a Adria je obavljala agentske i ostale posredničke poslove, te je u stvari bila Cunardov predstavnik u Ugarskoj. Štoviše, ugovorom sklopljenim u srpnju 1904. godine između ugarske vlade i Cunarda određeno je da su svi iseljenici iz »zemalja ugarske krune« bili obvezni ploviti Cunardovom linijom iz riječke luke, a zauzvrat se prijevoznik obvezao da će ugarskoj vladi, za tzv. iseljenički fond, uplatiti 10 kruna za svakog putnika iz ugarskog dijela Monarhije. Ukupna računica postaje jasnija kada se ima u vidu još jedan element ugovora. Naime, ugarska vlada je zajamčila Cunardu prijevoz 30.000 putnika godišnje, a u slučaju da ih bude manje plaćati će mu odštetu od 100 kruna po osobi. Navedena kvota je ipak ukinuta 1907. godine na inzistiranje američkih vlasti. Riječka povratna linija prema Sjevernoj Americi počinje 20. listopada 1903. godine kada Cunardov parobrod Aurania isplovljava sa 349 putnika iz New Yorka da bi u riječku luku, na oduševljenje mnogobrojnih Riječana, uplovio 10. studenog. Četiri dana poslije isti parobrod sa 53 ukrcana emigranta isplovljava iz Rijeke prema New Yorku.

Source: <https://hrcak.srce.hr>