

**VI.
TRINAEST TEZA
SA ZAKLJUČKOM**

Makar i živ,
ne vraćaj se osramoćen iz boja.
Afganistanska narodna uzrečica

TRINAEST TEZA

1. Stav vrhovništva Republike Hrvatske prema Bosanskoj Posavini 1992. god. je bio - ne imati jedinstvenu, cjelovitu, principijelnu, dosljednu, transparentno oblikovanu i javno obznanjenu politiku, kako bi se nakon sveukupnog *potkusurivanja* u BiH i uvida u konačni *šićar*⁷⁵³, moglo reći - bio je to maksimum u odnosu na konstelaciju snaga, kako međunarodnih, tako i onih na bojištu.
2. Sukladno *toj i takvoj* politici vrhovništva, ratna strategija je bila neprincipijelna, nagodbenjačka, *šićardžijska*, o čemu, između ostalog, svjedoči srpsko-hrvatsko dogovoreno vodoravno presijecanje Bosanske Posavine, kako Republika Srpska ne bi okomito presječena bila, a time i poražena.
3. Zbog *te i takve* strategije, operativne aktivnosti zapovjednika Slavenskog bojišta, general bojnika Petra Stipetića, bile su hendikepirane i palijativne.
4. Zahvaljujući palijativnoj *operatici* zapovjednik Operativne grupe „Istočna Posavina“, pukovnik Vinko Štefanek, taktičke planove je improvizirao, a njihovu realizaciju - *de iure* zapovijedao, a *de facto* molio.
5. Zapovjednik Operativne zone Osijek, brigadir Vinko Vrbanac, nije dovoljno uspješno radio ono što je trebao - „osiguravao ljude i sredstva“, a još manje uspješno je radio ono što uopće nije trebao - izdavao borbene zapovijedi u OG „Istočna Posavina“.
6. U pojedinim fazama borbi predstavnici vrhovništva su opstruirali sustav rukovođenja i zapovijedanja.
7. Sporazumom Boban-Karadžić od 06. svibnja 1992. godine u Grazu i temeljem njega povlačenjem HV iz prostora *koridora* - hrvatsko-muslimanske snage su se osjećale izdanim.
8. Gubitkom *koridora* hrvatsko-muslimanske snage su izgubile povjerenje u strategiju vrhovništva, te sustav rukovođenja i zapovijedanja, a posljedično, i borbeno samopouzdanje, zbog čega je u Bosanskoj Posavini već tada (26. lipnja 1992.) izgubljeno i ono što je vrhovništvo htjelo sačuvati - Odžak i Bosanski Brod.

⁷⁵³ Šićar - tur. 1. dobit, dobitak, korist; 2. plijen, lovina; 3. blago, imutak; šićardžija - tko trči za šićarom, lakomac, tko u svemu traži zaradu; šićariti - koristiti se, zarađivati, uspješno trgovati. (Klaić, n.d. str. 1273)

9. Politički dezorganizirana, malobrojna, nedostatno opremljena, nekompetentno vođena, te porazima obeshrabrena, hrvatsko-muslimanska vojska je sve više ratovala iz iracionalnog inata i individualne slobodoljubivosti, a sve manje zbog prvotnog kolektivnog domoljublja i jedinstvene borbe za slobodu zavičaja.
10. Velikosrpski indoktrinirana, višestruko brojnija i opremljenija, početnim uspjesima ohrabrena, nakon „teške borbe“ i „velikih gubitaka“, ponajviše zahvaljujući fanatičnom vođi, pukovniku, Slavku Lisici - VRS je osvojila i Bosanski Brod.
11. Zahvaljujući prvenstveno 108. i 3/3. „A“ br. HV, te 101. br. HVO, Bosanski Brod i cijeli mostobran su sredinom svibnja 1992. god. stavljeni pod nadzor hrvatsko-muslimanskih snaga i držani sve do početka listopada 1992. - unatoč izričitoj zabrani i opstrukcijama vrhovništva.
12. Oraška enklava je ostala pod kontrolom HVO zahvaljujući odsudnoj obrani branitelja, ali i zbog toga što general VRS, Ratko Mladić - nije dopustio pukovniku Slavku Lisici da „*glavnim snagama napadne Tuzlu, a pomoćnim snagama Orašje*“.
13. Iako je cjelovita Bosanska Posavina izgubljena na bojištu, iako su najveći gubitelji Posavljaci i borci, krivci za to nisu oni, nego njihovi nalogodavci - političari.

ZAKLJUČAK

1. Politika

Niti prije rata niti tijekom rata Hrvatska nije imala jedinstvenu, cjelovitu, principijelnu, i dosljednu politiku prema Bosanskoj Posavini. A ako i jeste, to ni domaćoj ni međunarodnoj javnosti nije obznanila.

Danas u svojoj punini vidljiva, ondašnja politika nije niti mogla biti obznanjena, jer, po svim pozitivnim međunarodnim propisima i civilizacijskim dosezima - bila je nelegalna, nelegitimna i necivilizirana. Po sadržaju je bila arhaična, a po formi - protuzakonita.

Do priznanja BiH, velikohrvatska i velikosrpska politika su se udružile u namjeri da tu jugoslavensku republiku „rasture“. Poslije priznanja BiH, velikosrbi i njihovi hrvatski plagijatori, zajednički su odlučili to rasturanje odložiti - stvaranjem „država u državi“.

Kada se ne obznani politički stav oko nekog pitanja, onda je (javni) politički stav ono što *ad hoc* odluči „učitelj i vođa“ odnosno, još gore, njegovi „pobočnici“. Naknadno je uvijek moguće glorificirati rezultate „te i takve“ politike, jer nisu mjerljivi, odnosno usporedivi.

Kako je politika zanimanje u kojem pojedinac može zapovjediti neka se nekome oduzme život, što više, za to izvršitelja i odlikovati, sasvim je sigurno da su, u nedostatku jasne i svima poznate politike, neki ljudi tijekom rata bili mali „bogovi“. Imali su moć drugima razoriti dom i oduzeti život, predstavljajući svoje postupke neminovnim, jer su, ko biva, u funkciji oživotvorenja nacionalnih, odnosno ideoloških interesa. Njihove ratne ovlasti su uglavnom konzumirane po principu obrnute proporcionalnosti - što primitivniji, gluplji i vlastohlepniji vođa, to veće i nepotrebnije ljudske žrtve i razaranja, i obrnuto.

Da je Hrvatska imala razumnu, u skladu s civilizacijskim dosezima prihvatljivu i javno obznanjenu politiku prema Bosanskoj Posavini, ona nikada ne bi pala u ruke velikosrpskim ekspanzionistima.

Tlapnje o tome kako je bio rat, te kako se ništa nije znalo, kako niti međunarodna zajednica nije imala jedinstvenu, jasnu i principijelnu politiku prema BiH, pa kako da ju ima Hrvatska, ni za vrijeme rata nisu bile kredibilne, a pogotovo ne danas. Naime, Hrvatska *državotvorna* politika je morala imati kristalno jasan i javno obznanjen stav o svakoj varijanti raspleta u BiH. Morala je imati jedinstven, cjelovit i konzistentan, a ne nejedinstven, necjelovit i nekonzistentan odnos prema BiH.

Prema mom mišljenju, temeljni, nedvojbeni hrvatski politički postulati su svoje izvorište trebali imati u sljedećim političkim stavovima:

- Prvo, Bosna i Hercegovina je Hrvatskoj susjedna i prijateljska, samostalna, neovisna, demokratska, višenacionalna etc. država triju konstitutivnih i jednakopravnih naroda (i drugih dakako), koji će odnose u državi rješavati demokratskim putem, nakon što se zajedničkim snagama (napadnute RH i

BiH) obrane od istog agresora - „Srbije i Crne Goru, odnosno Savezne Republike Jugoslavije ...“⁷⁵⁴

- Drugo, republika Hrvatska nema pretenzija prema dijelovima BiH, niti se sa Srbima o tome dogovara. Svoje vojno prisustvo u BiH Hrvatska ne krije, i koristi ga za obranu od okupacije, kako svog, tako i BiH teritorija, a ne za poticanje domicilnog stanovništva na odcjepljenje od BiH i pripojenje RH, odnosno stvaranje „države u državi“.
- Treće, postratno unutrašnje uređenje BiH i teritorijalnu podjelu lokalne uprave i samouprave odredit će njeni građani, vodeći se načelima demokracije i ravnopravnosti sva tri konstitutivna naroda, „*oslanjajući se na poštovanje dostojanstva, slobode i jednakosti ... vođeni ciljevima i načelima Povelje Ujedinjenih naroda ...*“⁷⁵⁵
- Četvrto. Hrvatska država neće „blagosloviti“ nikakvo unutrašnje uređenje i podjele bez suglasnosti ovlaštenih predstavnika hrvatskog naroda iz BiH, a kamoli ga nametati, protivno volji tog naroda.⁷⁵⁶

Glede Bosanske Posavine, hrvatska politika se morala temeljiti i na sljedećim načelima:

- Prvo, Bosanska Posavina je prostor suverene i nama susjedne Bosne i Hercegovine, većinski nastanjen hrvatskim i bošnjačkim narodom, koji su nakon višestranačkih demokratskih izbora legalno i legitimno formirali koalicijsku vlast u osam općina.
- Drugo, pokušaju li velikosrbi, uz pomoć JNA i dobrovoljačkih postrojbi, nasilnim putem rušiti legalnu vlast, hrvatska država će, temeljem Ustavnih odredbi RH, svim raspoloživim, a po međunarodnom pravu dopustivim sredstvima, javno, pomoći da se ta legalna i legitimna vlast očuva.
- Treće, pokušaju li velikosrbi, uz pomoć JNA i srpskih paravojnih formacija izvršiti okupaciju prostora Bosanske Posavine, te ga etnički očistiti, hrvatska država i Hrvatska vojska će, temeljem hrvatskog Ustava, Sporazuma o prijateljstvu i suradnji RH i BiH i međunarodnih konvencija, javno, učiniti sve kako bi zajedno s BiH patriotima, spasila domicilno stanovništvo od pogibije, a prostor od okupacije.

⁷⁵⁴ Predsjedništvo Republike Bosne i Hercegovine, (Broj: 02-011-343/92, od 04. svibnja 1992. godine) i Savjet sigurnosti Ujedinjenih nacija, (Rezolucija broj 752 od 18. svibnja 1992. godine) su utvrdili tko je agresor u BiH.

⁷⁵⁵ Ustav Bosne i hercegovine, www.ccbh.ba

⁷⁵⁶ Negativne posljedice potpisivanja Daytonskog mirovnog sporazuma (Dayton Peace Agreement) osjećaju svi građani BiH, a posebno Hrvati. Naime, njima sporazum nije nametnut samo od međunarodne zajednice (ma što to tada i tamo bilo) nego i od Predsjednika RH, dr. Franje Tuđmana, koji je Sporazum odobrio - unatoč protivljenju (tada i tamo u Daytonu) zakonitog zastupnika Hrvata iz BiH, Krešimira Zubaka

- Četvrto, bude li Hrvatska napadnuta s teritorija BiH, ona će, svim raspoloživim snagama, učiniti sve kako bi napadača (ma tko on bio) potisnula *van puškometa* od granice, etc.

Međutim, hrvatsko vrhovništvo je, u odnosu prema (BiH) Bosanskoj Posavini, politički *petljalo*. Nikad nije Posavljacima reklo za ostvarenje kojih političkih ciljeva ih potiču i pomažu?

- **Za Posavinu u okviru Banovine Hrvatske, odnosno, za odcjepljenje iz BiH i pripojenje Hrvatskoj;**
- **Za Posavinu kao konfederalnu (federalnu) jedinicu u okviru BiH;**
- **Za unitarnu BiH sa „Domom naroda“.**

Dr. Zdravko Tomac pak tvrdi kako je „*dr. Franjo Tuđman, kao državnik, ako je želio uspjeti, morao voditi nekoliko politika*“.⁷⁵⁷ (sic!)

„*Tuđmanova strategija sastojala se od javne i tajne politike i od više opcija ovisno o okolnostima i raspletima koje će nametnuti međunarodna zajednica, ali i rezultati u ratu... Bio je uvjeren da je u pravu i da će nadigrati i Slobodana Miloševića i Aliju Izetbegovića i međunarodnu zajednicu...*“⁷⁵⁸ Kako ih je „nadigrao“ - zna se. Zahvaljujući „toj i takvoj“ politici:

- 18. studenog 1991. god. institucionaliziran je hrvatski separatizam u BiH - „uspostavom Hrvatske zajednice Herceg Bosna“.
- 06. svibnja, 1992. god. Boban i Karadžić su (Muslimanima iza leđa) potpisali „neprincipijelan“ sporazuma, kojim se Srbima prepustio *koridor* u Bosanskoj Posavini. Tim se sporazumom agresora i neprijatelja pretvorilo u prijatelja, a žrtvu i saveznika u neprijatelja.
- 08. svibnja, 1992. god. glavni zapovjednik HVO, general Ante Roso, na prostoru „Hrvatske zajednice Herceg Bosna“, legalne postrojbe TO BiH, proglasio je „nelegalnim“. Muslimani i drugi (HOS-ovci) koji nisu „poštovali zapovijed“, bili su „razbijeni“. Bio je to početak službenog distanciranja najvećeg dijela organiziranih Hrvata od središnje vlasti u Sarajevu.
- 11. svibnja 1992. god. Pomoćnik ministra unutarnjih poslova RH (tajnik HDZ⁷⁵⁹) Perica Jurić, je formiranjem HVO-a („u podrumu SO Slavonski Brod“⁷⁶⁰) de facto suspendirao legalnu i legitimnu vlast u Bosanskoj Posavini. Vlast koja je Zagrebu bila prijateljska, a Sarajevu lojalna.
- 24. lipnja 1992. god. povučena je HV iz *koridora*, a da tamošnji branitelji i narod nisu prethodno izvješćeni kako se trebaju povući na dogovorenu crtu

⁷⁵⁷ Zdravko TOMAC, Predsjednik, protiv krivotvorina i zaborava, Zagreb, Slovo M, 2004., Str. 289-290.

⁷⁵⁸ Isto

⁷⁵⁹ Prema kazivanju (autoru, 18.07.2009.) tada, tamo i tako izabranog Predsjednika HVO-a Bosanske Posavine, Vinka Begića.

⁷⁶⁰ Isto

razgraničenja, radi osiguranja „kompaktnosti prostora i komunikacija.“ Time su zapravo hrvatsko-muslimanske snage Modriče i Odžaka - izdane.

- 03. srpnja 1992. god. Predsjednik HZHB, Mate Boban je, „zabivši Muslimanima nož u leđa“, proglasio osnivanje „države u državi“. Time je završeno institucionalno stvaranje preduvjeta za otvoreni rat s Muslimanima.
- 14. srpnja 1992. god. (gubitkom Odžaka) hrvatsko-muslimanske snage Bosanske Posavine su definitivno izgubile povjerenje u politiku i strategiju vrhovništva, te sustav rukovođenja i zapovijedanja, a posljedično i borbeno samopouzdanje.
- 06. listopada 1992. god. hrvatsko-muslimanske snage su izgubile „Bosanski Borod i cijeli mostobran“.
- Bosanskohercegovački Hrvati su, od uvaženog konstitutivnog naroda i žrtve, putem dvosmislene Zajednice (Republike) „Herceg Bosna“, pretvoreni u kolaboracionistu „jednog od agresora na BiH“ i nacionalnu manjinu.
- Srpska država je prešla Drinu, Tinju, Bosnu, Ukrinu i Vrbas, te svojim vrhom izbila u neposrednu blizinu zamišljene velikosrpske granice: Virovitica, Karlovac, Ogulin, Karlobag - na rijeku Unu.

2. Strategija

Kako Hrvatska nije, ni prije, ni tijekom rata imala jedinstvenu, cjelovitu, principijelnu, dosljednu, transparentno oblikovanu i javno obznanjenu politiku prema Bosanskoj Posavini, njena *politička strategija* u tom prostoru je bila - neprincipijelnost i nedosljednost.

“Tom i takvom“ strategijom prema Bosanskoj Posavini (i BiH u cjelini) hrvatsko vrhovništvo, je htjelo *šićariti*, naknadno to pravdajući kako se nije znalo u kom će pravcu ići rasplet rata. Hoće li BiH uopće opstati kao suverena država (unatoč priznanjima, pa i Hrvatskom) jer, eto, i međunarodna zajednica je također, na razne načine, dijelila BiH (Josea Cutileiro, Carl Bildt, Cyruse Vance, David Owen, Thorvald Stoltenberg i dr.)?! Ako bi BiH i opstala, nije se znalo hoće li država biti unitarno ustrojena ili će doći do unutrašnje entitetske podjele - na republike, kantone...

Budući se „ništa nije znalo“, Hrvatska se pravdala kako nije niti mogla imati kristalno jasnu, principijelnu i dosljednu političku strategiju prema BiH, pa prema tome i prema Bosanskoj Posavini, što je dakako notorna neistina. Naime, neprincipijelna, nedosljedna i netransparentna politička strategija prema Bosanskoj Posavini i BiH u cjelini, savršeno je odgovarala „učitelju i vođi“, predsjedniku RH, dr. Franji Tuđmanu. Nime, njegova osobna neprincipijelnost i nedosljednost prema BiH posljedica je njegova romantičarskog političkog odnosa prema tom geografskom prostoru.

Koristeći Tuđmanovu „naivnu“ državotvornu romantičnost prema BiH, neki njegovi politički, vojni i gospodarski „pobočnici“ su, u stilu gospodara života i smrti, provodili *ad hoc* političke, gospodarske i vojne akcije, koje su Posavljake dovele tamo gdje jesu - u kapitalističke ralje ratnih profitera, van domovine i zavičaja.

Kako je politička strategija bila neprincipijelna i nedosljedna, niti vojna nije mogla biti drugačija. Vojska, kao „drugo sredstvo“, samo oživotvoruje politiku svo-

jih osnivača. Budući je osnivač Hrvatske vojske - politički petljao, jedno mislio, drugo govorio, a treće zapovjedao, morao je vlastitu vojsku kao samostalnu silu, djelomično onesposobiti. Vrhovništvo je moralo iz vojske izuzeti nekoliko njenih *zanatskih alata*, kako bi njome moglo manipulirati, pa kada je „politički nužno“, i onesposobiti ju, a pri tome ne snositi konzekvence. Zbog toga je, što je krajnji *nonsense*, odlučeno kako se iz ingerencije HV izuzimaju: informativno-politička djelatnost, personalna uprava, obavještajna služba, vojna policija, i snabdijevanje (logistika), te se stavljaju u izravnu nadležnost Ministarstva obrane. Dakle, Hrvatska vojska je upravljala i zapovijedala „golim“ trupama. Bilo je to osiguranje pretpostavki za nejedinstveno vođenje i zapovijedanje Hrvatskom vojskom. Posljedica je obično prepoznavana u sintagmi „dvostruka linija zapovijedanja“.

Kako je „dvostruka linija zapovijedanja“ bila ozakonjena, njeno negiranje je u onoj mjeri apsurdno koliko i negiranje postojanja bilo kojeg drugog zakona iz tog doba.

3. Operatika

U nedostatku jedinstvene, cjelovite i konzistentne vojne strategije za Bosansku Posavinu, Zapovjedništvo Slavonskog bojišta nije dobilo nikakvu konkretnu i jasnu *strategijsku zadaću*. Kako nije bilo strategijske zadaće, general Petar Stipetić i njegov tim u IZM GSHV u Đakovu su bili operativno hendikepirani. Naime, nisu mogli izraditi profesionalan i vojnički svima jasan, *operativni plan* za borbene operacije u OG „Istočna Posavina“. Kao posljedica toga, operativne su aktivnosti zapovjednika Slavonskog bojišta bile palijativne, a kada je htio učiniti nešto konkretno, na svoju ruku (npr. presjeći *koridor*), bio je smijenjen!

4. Taktika

Izostankom operativnih planova od pretpostavljenog zapovjedništva (IZM GSHV Đakovo) Zapovjedništvo OG „Istočna Posavina“ je bilo prinuđeno taktičke planove improvizirati i u skladu s njima izdavati borbene zapovijedi. Međutim, taktički planovi bi bili benigni problem, da nije bilo onih problema koji su za svaku vojsku, maligni. Naime, poslije gubitka *koridora*, Zapovjedništvo OGIP je na taktičkoj razini imalo, osim VRS, četiri neprijatelja koja je moralo pobijediti ako je željelo zadržati kontrolu nad cjelovitom Bosanskom Posavinom: narušenu subordinaciju, demotiviranost vojnika, nedostatnost postrojbi i kroničnu nestašicu MTS-a.

- Prvo, sa subordinacijom nije bilo problema samo u OGIP. Bio je to problem HV-a u cjelini, poglavito zbog izuzimanja osnovnih poluga upravljanja i zapovijedanja „iz ruku“ GSHV (personalna uprava, informativni i obavještajni poslovi, vojna policija, i snabdijevanje) i njihovo stavljanje u ingerenciju Ministarstva obrane. Time su, pored strateških i taktički učinci HV-a bili u izravnoj ovisnosti o Ministarstvu obrane (Šušak, Praljak, Čermak, Lucić, Perković ...), a ne GSHV, njegovom IZM u Đakovu i OG „Istočna Posavina“ (Tus, Stipetić, Štefanek ...). O statusu bojišta i analogno tome njegovoj snabdjevenosti trupama i MTS-om nije odlučivao GSHV, nego Ministarstvo

obrane. Tako npr. Ministar obrane Gojko Šušak, u svojoj „Uputi“ od 07.07.1992. god., izričito navodi kako „nije dozvoljeno ni jednom zapovjedniku slanje ili upotreba Hrvatske vojske izvan granica Republike Hrvatske, (a) svi koji to učine bez izričite zapovijedi Vrhovnog zapovjednika snosit će posljedice za svoje postupke“, dok načelnik GSHV službeno tvrdi kako je „*potrebno bojevo angažiranje postrojbi HV u obrani Bosanskog dijela Posavine, a poradi obrane i zaštite stanovništva i cjelovitosti granica RH.*“

- Drugo, vratiti izgubljeni moral borcima mogao je samo onaj zbog koga su ga izgubili: vrhovništvo. A što radi, za moral boraca zaduženi šef IPD-a, general Slobodan Praljak? On nenajavljeno i neovlašteno, iza leđa Zapovjedništva OGIP, dolazi na bojište i „savjetuje“ zapovjednika brigade kako „*postoji mogućnost da im četnici dođu iza leđa ili da mogu ostati u okruženju, te bi najbolje bilo da se povuku*“. Dakle, opstruira i demotivira.
- Treće, popunjavanje postrojbi ljudstvom u izravnoj je korelaciji s drugim problemom. Naime, nemotivirani i demoralizirani borci ne idu rado „u boj“. Posebice ako tu demotiviranost pothranjuje i njihov ministar obrane javnim obznanjivanjem kako „nije dozvoljeno ni jednom zapovjedniku slanje ili upotreba Hrvatske vojske izvan granica Republike Hrvatske“.
- Četvrto, za snabdijevanje OGIP bili su, prije svih, zaduženi pomoćnik ministra obrane, general Ivan Čermak i pomoćnik zapovjednika 108. br. za logistiku, pukovnik Pavo Sočković, obojica od posla „rastrgani“. Naime, pored obveza snabdijevanja HV i HVO, Čermak je dio svojih intelektualnih i fizičkih kapaciteta angažirao na izravno održavanje veze s VRS i Srbima u Banja Luci,⁷⁶¹ dok se Sočković iscrpljivao dodatnim aktivnostima u naoružavanju Muslimana i Hrvata BiH. Posljedično, Operativnoj grupi „Istočna Posavina“ kronično su nedostajala materijalno-tehnička sredstva (oružje, oruđe, streljivo...), a VRS (unatoč međunarodnom *embargu*) nije ostala bez goriva i maziva.

5. Snabdijevanje

„Operativna zona Osijek i njeno zapovjedništvo bili su *servis* za OG 'Istočna Posavina', a kasnije i za zapovjedništvo Slavenskog bojišta, čija se temeljna zadaća ogledala u tome da se osiguraju ljudi i sredstva za uporabu u zoni odgovornosti OG 'Istočna Posavina'“. Tako glasi prva rečenica *Izvjешća o padu Bosanske Posavine*, brigadir Vinka Vrbanca, Zapovjednika OZ Osijek, upućenog nadređenima, Operativnoj upravi GS HV 12.10.1992. godine, nakon pada Bosanskog Broda.

Kako je brigadir Vrbanac vršio svoju „temeljnu zadaću“ vidljivo je iz dokumentacije OZ Osijek i OGIP. Pored kroničnog nedostatka streljiva, u borbenom poretku (30.09.1992. u 7,00 sati), na jednom kilometru crte bojišta bilo je 78, a trebalo je biti 130 boraca. Odnosno, iako je „na prvoj crti“ ukupno trebalo biti 3000 boraca, bilo ih je 1800, a pet dana kasnije, prije početka izvlačenja postrojbi 108. br. HV iz borbe-

⁷⁶¹ Po kazivanju generala Petra Stipetića, autoru.

nog poretka - 1.489, odnosno, 64 borca na jedan km. Dakle, pola od potrebnog broja boraca za obranu, a šest puta manje od potrebnih za napad.

Ako zbog objektivnih razloga (nadređenih) nije mogao profesionalno korektno vršiti svoju „temeljnu zadaću“, trebao je demonstrativno (ili samozatajno), u svakom slučaju, časno, odstupiti (neke njegove kolege bi to jedva dočekali), a ne svoju nemogućnost u izvršavanju „temeljnih zadaća“ nadomještatati neovlaštenim „petljanjem“ u borbena zapovijedanja, izdavanjem alibi zapovijedi.

U svakom slučaju, niti je mogao, niti je smio, teatralno patetično, karijeristima svojstveno, nadređenima završiti svoje Izvješće rečenicom kako se on „osobno smatra odgovornim, a kao vojak postišen i popljuvan, jer nismo izgubili Brod u krvi i znoju već u bezglavom povlačenju.“

Brigadir Vinko Vrbanac je ovom, zadnjom, poentirajućom rečenicom svog Izvješća o gubitku Bosanskog Broda pokazao kako je bio:

- *lažno skroman*, jer, za gubitak Bosanskog Broda on formalno ne može biti „odgovoran“, budući nije bio zapovjednik borbenih operacija, tj. nije bio ovlašten borbeno upotrebljavati postrojbe
- *lažno ponosan*, jer, nije bio borbeni, nego logistički zapovjednik, nije bio „vojak“ borac, nego pozadinac, „komadant“, pa se kao „vojak“ ne može ni osjećati „postišeno i popljuvano“. „Postišen“ se mogao osjećati jer, kao najviši logistički Zapovjednik bojišta, nije zadovoljio u „temeljnoj zadaći...osiguranja ljudi i sredstava“. „Popljuvan“ se mogao osjećati od „vojaka“ boraca koji na bojištu nisu osjetili izvršenje njegove „temeljne zadaće“ pa su se i zbog toga morali povući. Međutim, brigadir Vrbanac se ne referira na ono za što se referirati treba, nego se referira kao pseudo ratnik, vitez čak, iako mu se pretpostavljeno zapovjedništvo, tražeći izvješće, nije obratilo kao ratniku i vitez, nego kao „logističaru“.
- *nemoralno lažljiv*, jer su HV i HVO „Bosanski Brod i cijeli mostobran“ u doslovnom i prenesenom smislu, zaista „izgubili u krvi i znoju“, o čemu, na žalost, svjedoči oko 2000 smrtno stradalih i 10.000 ranjenih boraca
- *nekolegijalno lažljiv*, jer, HV i HVO nisu „Bosanski Brod i cijeli mostobran“ napustili „u bezglavom povlačenju“, nego u borbi, postupno i organizirano, budući od brigadira Vrbanca danima nisu dobivali očekivanu popunu crte bojišta pješčakim postrojbama i materijalno tehničkim sredstvima.

6. Zapovijedanje

Pored izostanka jedinstvenih, cjelovitih i konzistentnih stratejskih i operativnih planova, te zadovoljavajuće logistike, zapovjednik Operativne grupe „Istočna Posavina“ imao je i problem sa subordinacijom u zapovijedanju postrojbama. Vidljivo je to iz činjenice kako su neke važne zapovijedi zapovjednika OGIP, pukovnika Vinka Štefaneka morale biti supotpisane od strane zapovjednika Slavenskog bojišta, generala Stipetića, a nekada niti to nije bilo dovoljno, jer je očito postojala tzv. „dvostruka linija zapovijedanja.“ Po jednoj liniji (Tus, Stipetić, Štefanek, Sorić ...) su funkcionirale jedne - pisane, a po drugoj (Šušak, Praljak, Čermak, Basarac ...) druge - nepisane zapovijedi.

Primjerice, general Čermak „uvezuje linije“, a general Praljak „savjetuje“ zapovjednika 157. br. HV - da se povuče. Brigadir Basarac pak, „nije htio od brigadira Štefaneka primati zapovijedi, te je samoinicijativno odlazio u Zagreb na konsultacije“, kako sam kaže, „zna se gdje“.

Osim toga, iako je cijeli prostor *sandžaka* „Bosanska Posavina“ organizacijski, kadrovski, materijalno i taktički bio u „nadležnosti“ OG „Istočna Posavina“ sa sjedištem u Slavonskom Brodu, svaka od osam posavskih općina je bila *kadiluk*⁷⁶² za sebe.

Suprotno mišljenju Načelnika GS HV, generala Antona Tusa, kako je „potrebno bojevo angažiranje postrojbi HV u obrani Bosanske Posavine“, ministar obrane Gojko Šušak je javno obznanio „Uputu“ kako „nije dozvoljeno ni jednom zapovjedniku slanje ili upotreba Hrvatske vojske izvan granica Republike Hrvatske“. Zbog toga su konačnu odluku o uporabi postrojbi u Bosanskoj Posavini donosili zapovjednici upotrebljivanih dijelova postrojbi i borci - dragovoljno.

Dakle, pripadnici Hrvatske vojske koji su ratovali u Bosanskoj Posavini, činili su to dragovoljno, pa su se često, sukladno tome, i ponašali - samoupravno.

Tako npr. samo u prvoj polovici rujna 1992. godine, mjesec dana prije gubitka Bosanskog Broda, devet postrojbi se ponaša samovoljno:

- 02.09.1992. god. 1. satnija 2. domobranske bojne Slavonski Brod odbija izvršiti postavljenu joj zadaću.
- 04.09.1992. god. - cijela 157. br. HV (Slav. Brod) bez odobrenja se izvlači sa bojišta Bosanske Posavine.
- 05.09.1992. god. - po dobivanju zapovijedi za zaposjedanje linija obrane 157. br. HV (Slav. Brod) odbija ići u dodijeljenu joj zonu odgovornosti.
- 08.09.1992. god. - u kasnim večernjim satima 153. br. HV (Velika Gorica) samovoljno, bez znanja nadređenog zapovjedništva napušta borbene položaje i povlači se za oko tri kilometra od zadanih položaja „jer je na njima sigurnija“.
- 11.09.1992. god. - oko 22.00 sata TG-137 (Duga Resa) napušta svoje položaje.
- 13.09.1992.god. - bez odobrenja sa svojih položaja se izvlače TG-150 (Črnomerec-Zagreb) i TG-137 (Duga Resa).
- 14.09.1992. god. - oko 03,30 sati 500-600 ljudi u 20 kamiona iz sastava TG-137 vrše pritisak na vojnu policiju na savskom mostu, koja ih, da bi izbjegla incident, propušta preko mosta i oni odlaze u Donje Andrijevce. U poslijepodnevnim satima odlaze u Dugu Resu.
- 14.09.1992. god. - oko 22,55 sati samovoljno se s linije obrane izvlači 204. br. HV (Vukovar) i odlazi u svoju bazu.
- 14.09.1992. god - TG-123 (Požega) odbija izvršiti dobivenu zapovijed za izvršenje borbenih zadaća u Bosanskoj Posavini.

⁷⁶² *Kadiluk* je „sudsko i upravno područje u Osmanskom Carstvu“ (<http://hjp.srce.hr>), a Kadija je upravitelj te upravne jedinice. Poznata je narodna „Kadija (te) tuži, kadija (te)vilajet sudi“.

Nitko od zapovjednika postrojbi, koji su u stvari kršili vojničku svetinju, zapovijed pretpostavljenih, nije bio sankcioniran, dapače, većina ih je bila unaprijeđena. General Pavle Miljavac, do načelnika GSHV odnosno ministra obrane RH. (sic!)

Time je još licemjernije smjenjivanje zapovjednika 108. br. HV-a, pukovnika, Stanislava Sorića, čija se postrojba, zbog beznadne situacije uzrokovane krivnjom politike i drugih postrojbi, organizirano povukla iz borbenog poretka.

7. Izdaja

Zahvaljujući nemoći bosansko-hercegovačke središnje vlasti iz Sarajeva, sloboda nesrpskog življa na prostoru Bosanske Posavine, naročito u početku rata, ovisila je isključivo o hrvatskoj državi i njenoj politici prema tom prostoru. A vrhovništvo (koje bi Bosansku Posavinu rado vidjelo, do početka rata, u neovisnoj *Banovini*, a nakon početka rata, kao sastavni dio Hrvatske „konstitutivne i suverene jedinice“ u BiH) pretjerano se bojalo JNA i srpskih snaga, tvrdeći kako „*koridor* nije moguće obraniti.“⁷⁶³

Zbog „stalnih međunarodnih pritisaka na RH“ i „odnosa vojnih snaga na terenu“, Hrvatsko vrhovništvo se odlučilo na *šićardžijsku* politiku, vidljivu i u Sporazumu Boban - Karadžić. A upravo taj sporazum je bio početak kraja i po mnogima - izdaja. Nakon pada cjelovite bosanske Posavine, bilo je malo onih koji se nisu tako i osjećali - izdanima.

Gore od same izdaje, bilo im je poniženje. A poniženo se osjećao i Zapovjednik 101. br. HVO-a, Zlatko Hrkač - Đigi, 07. listopada, 1992. godine, suznih očiju sjedeći u dnu stepeništa na ulazu u sjedište 108. br. HV ('Jasinjska' uprava Vinogorje), nakon što mu njen logističar, pukovnik Pavo Sočković, nije dopustio ulazak u zapovjedništvo.⁷⁶⁴

Dakle, do tragedije (nesrba) Posavljaka nije došlo 06.10.1992. u Bosanskom Brodu, nego pet mjeseci prije, 06.05.1992. god. u Grazu. Naime, toga dana je u tom gradu, Predsjednik HZ HB, Mate Boban, hrvatskim borcima i saveznicima Muslimanima „iza leđa“, uz naputak-suglasnost vrhovništva, s Predsjednikom Republike Srpske, Radovanom Karadžićem, potpisao sporazum kojim je dogovoreno vodoravno presijecanje Bosanske Posavine, kako Republika Srpska ne bi okomito presječena bila. Time je Republici Srpskoj osiguran život, a „hrvatsko-muslimanskoj“ Bosanskoj Posavini, smrt.

Bio je to prvi dokaz kako je vrhovništvu Bosanska Posavina bila moneta za potkusurivanje u *državotvornom šićarenju*, i to na crti politike koja je imala za cilj „dokrajčiti sve pretenzije na stvaranje veće islamske države u srcu Europe.“

Budući je to zapravo bila izdaja hrvatskih nacionalnih interesa, nitko od odgovornih političara nije se usudio borcima reći javno ono što je dogovoreno tajno, već su svojim licemjernim nečinjenjem i dvosmislenim izjavama, pustili da se, unatoč

⁷⁶³ Tvrdnja je predsjednika RH dr. Franje Tuđmana, po kazivanju autoru, svjedoka Zdravka Tomca, tadašnjeg potpredsjednika Vlade nacionalnog jedinstva RH.

⁷⁶⁴ Autor je bio svjedok tog tužnog događaja.

nevidenoj hrabrosti i žrtvi Posavljaka, na bojištu dogodi „*spontano*“, ono što je u Grazu *skontano*.⁷⁶⁵

Od izdaje gore je poniženje koje su borci doživjeli na bojištu. Naime, dok su Srbi, u skladu s dogovorom, pripremali veliku ofanzivu na *koridor*, HV je iz tog prostora povlačila svoje postrojbe. Prepušteni sami sebi, od pretpostavljenih zbuñjivani i dezinformirani, malobrojniji i slabije naoružani, hrvatsko-muslimanski borci (HVO) su bili lak plijen. Pretvoreni su u gubitnike koji ne zaslužuje vojničko poštovanje. Dakle, poniženi su.

Afganistanska narodna poslovice „Makar i živ, ne vraćaj se osramoćen iz boja“, tih dana je, u svoj svojoj punini živjela u ogromnoj većini Posavljaka.

Da je vrhovništvo braniteljima Bosanske Posavine reklo: Povucite se na liniju dogovorenu sa Srbima (iako bi oni to teško podnijeli), izostalo bi nepotrebno poniženje i još važnije - tolike žrtve.

8. Moral

Zbog načina na koji je VRS osvojila *Koridor* hrvatsko-muslimanske snage su izgubile povjerenje u politiku i vojnu strategiju vrhovništva, te sustav rukovođenja i zapovijedanja, a posljedično i borbeno samopouzdanje.

Nema tih okolnosti niti djelatnosti u kojima je potrebnije međusobno povjerenje od međusobnog povjerenja vojnika i zapovjednika - vojske u ratu (od vojnika do vrhovnog zapovjednika). Kad se u vojsci, tijekom borbenih operacija, izgubi međusobno povjerenje i poštovanje, dolazi do gubitka morala i raspada sustava.

A atmosfera u kojoj su ratovali hrvatski i muslimanski borci u Bosanskoj Posavini (politička i vojna neprincipijelnost i nedosljednost, te ratno profiterstvo, hijenske pljačke, prizemna borba za vlast, dezerterstvo bez konzekvenci...), bili su plodno tlo za bujanje malodušnosti, nepovjerenja u vlastite snage i sumnje u pobjedu.

Osim toga, hrvatsko-muslimanske snage u Bosanskoj Posavini (HVO) nisu imale kolektivni nego individualni motiv za pružanje otpora agresoru. Branili su vlastiti *prag* i *ognjište*, a ne *dom* i *domovinu*. Posljedica je to izostanka jedinstvene, cjelovite, principijelne, dosljedne, transparentno oblikovane i javno obznanjene hrvatske politike prema Bosanskoj Posavini. Politike koja bi bila motivirajuća garancija svakom *borcu u rovu*, kako njegova borba, i ako pogine, neće biti uzaludna.

Kako nije bilo nikakve, a kamoli motivirajuće politike *za dom i domovinu*, gubitkom *praga* i *ognjišta* borci su gubili motiv za daljnju borbu.

Očito i sam svjestan toga, general za moral i domoljublje, Slobodan Praljak, je predlagao novac kao supstitut za patriotizam. Angažiranje plaćenika umjesto domoljuba. (sic!)

9. Dvostruki kriteriji

Nakon poraza koje su hrvatsko-muslimanske snage pretrpjele tijekom borbi za: *Koridor* (26.06.1992.), Modriču (28.06.1992.), Plehan (01.07.1992.), Derventu (04.07.1992.) i Odžak (14.07.1992.), te načina na koji je do tih poraza dolazilo i

⁷⁶⁵ *Kontati*- brojiti, zbrajati, računati. Vladimir Anić i Ivo Goldstein, Riječnik stranih riječi, Zagreb, Novi Liber, 2005. str. 725

„vrabcima na grani“ je bilo „jasno“ kako će pasti i Bosanski Brod - samo je pitanje dana. Ta općeprihvaćena „spoznaja“ je, s jedne strane, unijele apatiju u hrvatsko-muslimanske snage, a s druge, još više pojačala otpor pripadnika HV-a prema odlasku na bojište u Bosansku Posavinu. Jer, hrvatska država je materijalno, politički i javno, drugačije tretirala borce koji su se borili u „zoni B“ ili „interesnoj zoni“ (kako je prijetvorno⁷⁶⁶ nazivana Bosanska Posavina) od onih koji su se borili na hrvatskim ratištima. Npr. službeno se krilo gdje su i kako stradali, a o javnim pohvalama za vojne uspjehe, nagradama i odlikovanjima nije moglo biti ni govora, jer „hrvatska vojska nije bila u BiH“. Posljedično, Zapovjedništvo OG „Istočna Posavina“ je kronično imalo manjak vojnika-pješaka, a često se, za uvođenje postrojbe jačine jedne satnije (130 boraca) na crtu bojišta, istu moralo sastavljati od više različitih postrojbi iz različitih mjesta Hrvatske. Karakterna, zavičajna, vojno-obrazovna, ratno-iskustvena itd. heterogenost borbene grupe je unaprijed predodredila umješnost, izdržljivost, međusobno povjerenje i zajedničku vjeru u uspjeh operacije.

Kako se nigdje tako dugo nije ginulo kao u Posavini, kako se niti jedno bojište nije manje vrednovalo od bosansko-posavskog, kako niti na jednom bojištu vojno-politički ciljevi nisu bili tako mistični kao u Bosanskoj Posavini, čudo je da ih je i toliko bilo i da su i toliko izdržali - ma od kuda bili.

10. Odnos snaga

Brojno stanje srpskih snaga je „variralo zbog sukcesivnog uvođenja jedinica ...“, te se kretalo od 40.800 na početku, do 54.660 nakon završetka 1. etape operacije *Koridor '92*“.

I hrvatske snage (HVO i HV) su varirale: Najviše ih je bilo uoči operacije *Koridor*, oko 20.000, a najmanje uoči pada Bosanskog Broda, oko 5.000 boraca, u borbenom poretku, na bosansko-brodskom i oraškom bojištu.

Zadnjih sedam dana borbi za Bosanski Brod i cijeli mostobran, srpske snage su (prema izjavi zapovjednika tog pravca, generala VRS, Slavka Lisice) angažirale „10.000 do 15.000 boraca“. Njegov kolega, zapovjednik glavnog pravca proboja *koridora*, general Novica Simić, tvrdi kako se u sastavu TG-3 VRS (koji su osvojili Bosanski Brod) borilo 10.843 borca.

Međutim, ni general Lisica ni general Simić, kada je borba za Bosanski Brod u pitanju, ne iznose točne podatke. Naime, iz njihovih vlastitih pisanih dokumenata proizlazi kako je u kontinuiranom pritisku i izravnom napadu na Bosanski Brod, u posljednjih sedam dana, sudjelovalo 19.960 boraca VRS.

S druge strane, hrvatsko-muslimanske snage (HV i HVO) su, na 23 km „crte“, u borbenom poretku za obranu Bosanskog Broda, imale manje od 2500 boraca. Zadnja dva dana 1564 borca. Na jedan kilometar njih 68, iscrpljenih i frustriranih. Neravnopravnost se nije izražavala samo u broju boraca, nego i u nerazmjernoj nadmoći VRS u avio-topničko-oklopnoj vatrenoj moći.

⁷⁶⁶ *Prijetvoran* - licemjeran (podmukao, podal), dvoličan, neiskren, lažan, himben, prevaran, Riječnik Hrvatskog jezika, Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, Zagreb, Školska knjiga, 2000. god. str. 968.

Politički i vojno izdana, malobrojna, nedostatno opremljena, nekompetentno vođena, besciljna i porazima obeshrabrena hrvatsko-muslimanska vojska je sve više ratovala iz iracionalnog inata i individualne slobodoljubivosti, a sve manje zbog prvotnog kolektivnog domoljublja i jedinstvene borbe za slobodu zavičaja. Posljedično, sve više je bila obeshrabrena, razbijena, samoupravna, a sve manje samouvjeren, jedinstvena i monolitna. Zbog toga je imala nerazmjerno veće ljudske i materijalne gubitke od velikosrpski indoktrinirane, fanatično i kompetentno vođene, višestruko brojnije i opremljenije, te početnim uspjesima ohrabrene, Vojske Republike Srpske.

Zbog svega toga, Zapovjedništvo OG „Istočna Posavina“ je, za 189 dana borbi, izgubilo dva prosječna borbena poretka, oko 12.000 ljudi. Svaki dan je ginulo jedanaest, a ranjeno 53 boraca!

11. Heroji, a ne kukavice

Zahvaljujući prvenstveno 108. i 3/3. „A“ br. HV-a, te 101. br. HVO-a, „Bosanski Brod i cijeli mostobran“ su sredinom svibnja 1992. god. stavljeni pod nadzor hrvatsko-muslimanskih snaga i kontrolirani sve do početka listopada 1992. god. - unatoč opstrukcijama vrhovništva.

Dakle, ne samo da ove tri brigade nisu „uzrok gubitka Bosanskog Broda i cijelog mostobrana“, ne samo da nisu „samovoljno, bez prisile od strane neprijatelja, te opravdanih razloga, napustile bojište“, nego one nisu niti „najizravnije utjecale na takav razvoj situacije“. Ove tri brigade nisu bile ni taktički povod, a pogotovo ne strateški uzrok za pad cjelovite Bosanske Posavine. Pripadnici ove tri brigade su heroji, a ne kukavice.

12. Orašje

Nakon pada Bosanskog Broda oraška enklava je ostala pod kontrolom HVO-a zahvaljujući odsudnoj obrani branitelja, ali i zbog toga što „glavni“ VRS, general Ratko Mladić, nije dopustio osvajanje tog prostora. Ovo se može zaključiti iz razvoja događaja na bojištu i svjedočenja generala VRS, Slavka Lisice i Novice Simića.

Po osvajanju Bosanskog Broda, borci TG-3 VRS i njihov Zapovjednik Lisica - „dobili su krila“. „Hoćemo na Orašje, hoćemo Orašje! skandirali su borci“. Želeći im udovoljiti, Lisica je, telegramom od generala Ratka Mladića zatražio: „Molim glavni štab VRS da sve snage u koridoru Doboj - Modriča - Bijeljina stavi pod komandu Taktičke grupe - 3, (dakle njegovu) kao i Bijeljinski korpus. (...) Glavnim snagama napadam Tuzlu, a pomoćnim snagama Orašje.“

Idući dan „osmog oktobra 1992. godine (telefonom)“ Mladić je Lisičin „predlog o angažovanju snaga u koridoru“, odbio.

Za „nagradu“, jer je „luđak“ osvojio Bosanski Brod, te želio napasti Orašje i Tuzlu, „unaprijeđen“ je u zapovjednika OG Doboj, a potom je postavljan za „komandanta Školskog centra Vojske Republike Srpske u Banjaluci“, da bi 1994. god. bio „penzionisan.“

Budući da je poznato kako je general Ratko Mladić zapovjedaio vojskom koja je počinila genocid u Srebrenici, očito je njegovo odbijanje prijedloga pukovnika Lisice

da „napadne Orašje,“ posljedica prijašnjih „dogovora“ dva vrhovništva i vlastitih prioriteta, a ne njegova straha ili milosrđa.

13. Krivci

Kako je hrvatska politika (zbog samovolje Brođana) samo djelimično uspjela ispuniti dogovor iz Graza (da Srbima osigura *koridor*), Srbi su odlučili tolerirati „ludog“ *komandanta* Lisicu te ga pustiti da (suprotno dogovoru) osvoji i Bosanski Brod.

Iznenadeno, uvrijeđeno i poniženo hrvatsko vrhovništvo je trebalo, sukladno veličini poraza, odgovarajućeg *Pedra*, budući samima nije padalo na pamet priznati krivicu i snositi konzekvence. *Pedro* je trebao odgovarati pred hrabrim, napaćenim i izbjeglim posavskim narodom, koji se nakon ogromnih ljudskih žrtava i materijalnih gubitaka, poražen i ponižen, našao u izbjeglištvu bez igdje ičega.

Najbezbolnije je bilo optužiti tri legendarne brigade; one koje su sedam mjeseci, uz ogromne žrtve, sprečavale imperijalističku okupaciju Bosanske Posavine; one kojima je posavski narod „do groba“ zahvalan za sve što su činili za njih; one koje Posavljaci nikako nisu mogli osuditi i prezreti, kao što bi osudili i prezreli političke *šićardžije* i ratne profitera - da ih je netko prokazao.

Iako je cjelovita Bosanska Posavina izgubljena na bojištu, iako su najveći gubitelji Posavljaci i vojnici, krivci za to nisu oni, nego njihovi političari. Jer, „politika rađa, priprema i vodi rat; ona ubire rezultate pobjede ili snosi posljedice poraza.“

Dakle, uspješna politika vodi uspješnom, a „rđava politika vodi rđavom ishodu rata.“ Ishod rata u Bosanskoj Posavini najbolje govori o kakvoći politike koja ga je vodila.

THIRTEEN THESES

1. The attitude of *the high command* of the Republic of Croatia towards Bosanska Posavina was - to not have an integral, unified, principled, consistent, transparently formed and publicly proclaimed policy so that after a total (comprehensive) "*pruning*" of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BH) it could be said - it was the maximum, considering the constellation of forces, both international and those in the battlefield.
2. In accordance with the policy of *the high command*, the war strategy was two-faced, unprincipled, negotiating, compromising, *spoils-oriented*⁷⁶⁷, which is all proven by the arranged horizontal division of Bosanska Posavina, so that Republika Srpska (Republic of Srpska) would not have to be divided vertically and in that way defeated.
3. As a result of such a strategy, the operational activities conducted by General Major Petar Stipetić, Commander of the Slavonia battlefield, were limited and palliative.
4. Due to the palliative *operations* the Commander of the Operational group "Eastern Posavina", Colonel Vinko Štefanek improvised tactical plans and in order to implement them he was *de jure* commanding, while *de facto* begging.
5. The Commander of the Osijek Operational zone, brigadier Vinko Vrbanac, was not successful enough in doing what he was supposed to do - "ensuring manpower and resources" and even less successful in doing what he was not supposed to - command the OG "Eastern Posavina".
6. In certain phases of the battles *the high command* obstructed the system of leadership and command.
7. The Croatian-Bosniak forces were betrayed by the Boban-Karadžić Agreement made in Graz on 6th of May 1992, on the basis of which the CA withdrew from the area of the *Corridor*.
8. By losing the *Corridor*, the Croatian-Bosniak forces lost their confidence in the policy and strategy of *the high command*, as well as in the system of leadership and command, consequently losing their combat confidence, which resulted in that already then (on 26 June 1992) what *the high command* wanted to preserve in Posavina was lost.

⁷⁶⁷ Spoils-booty, plunder, loot, profit, benefit, advantage; "spoiler"- greedy person, who wants to make money, trade dishonestly

9. Politically and militarily disorganized, outnumbered, insufficiently equipped, incompetently led and discouraged by defeats, the Croatian-Bosniak Army waged war more out of an irrational spite and individual love for freedom, much less out of the original collective patriotism and a united fight for the freedom of their homeland.
10. The Army of Republika Srpska (ARS), indoctrinated by the Greater-Serbia ideology, several times more numerous and equipped, encouraged by its successes, after a “heavy battle” and “big losses” subdued Bosanski Brod too, mostly thanks to their fanatical leader, Colonel Slavko Lisica.
11. Thanks primarily to the 108th and 3/3rd "A" brigades of the CA, as well as to the 101st brigade of the Croatian Defence Council (CDC), Bosanski Brod and the entire bridge-head in mid-May 1992 were put under the supervision of the Croatian-Bosniak forces and kept all the time until the beginning of October 1992 - despite the explicit obstructions of *the high command*.
12. The enclave of Orašje remained under the control of CDC thanks to the crucial defence of its combatants, but also because General Ratko Mladić had not allowed Colonel Slavko Lisica “to attack Tuzla with his main forces, Orašje with his auxiliary forces”.
13. Although the integrity of Bosanska Posavina was lost in the battlefield, although the biggest losers were the Posavina people and the combatants, the fault is not on them but on their commanders - politicians.

CONCLUSION

Policy

Not even before the war did Croatia have a unified, principled and consistent policy towards the region of Bosanska Posavina. Even if it did, it had not declared it to the international public.

Fully evident today, the policy of those times could not be declared because, in comparison to all positive international regulations and civilized achievements, it was illegal, illegitimate and uncivilized. By its content it was archaic, by its form-against the law.

Before the recognition of BH, the Greater-Croatia and the Greater-Serbia policies joined together in order to “tear apart” that Yugoslav republic. After the recognition, the Greater-Serbs and their Croatian plagiarists together decided to postpone that “tearing apart”- by creating “a state within a state”.

When a political attitude regarding a certain issue is not declared, then the (public) political attitude becomes what is *ad hoc* decided by “the teacher and the leader” that is, even worse, by his “aides-de-camp”. It is always possible subsequently to glorify the results of the “policy”, such as it was, because they are not measurable, that is, comparable.

Since politics is an occupation in which an individual can command somebody to take somebody else’s life, moreover, that somebody be decorated for that, it is absolutely certain that due to the absence of a transparent policy known to everybody, some people were little “gods” during the war. They had the power to destroy other people’s homes and take their lives, presenting their acts as inevitable because they *seemingly* were in the function of making national, that is ideological interests, come true. Their authority during the war was mainly consumed on the principle of inverse proportion - the more primitive, stupid and hungry of power the leader was, the more numerous and unnecessary human casualties and destructions were, and vice versa.

If Croatia had had a sensible policy towards Bosanska Posavina, in accordance with civilized achievements and if it had been clearly declared, Posavina would have never fallen into the hands of the Greater-Serbia imperialists.

Illusions about there having been a war, about nothing having been known, about the international community not having a unified, clear and principled policy towards BH, that consequently Croatia could not have it either, were not plausible even during the war, especially not nowadays. Namely, the Croatian *nationally-constructive* policy had to have a crystal-clear and publicly declared opinion about each variant of the outcome in BH. It had to have a united, integral and consistent instead of a disunited, non-integral and inconsistent attitude towards BH. The fundamental and unambiguous postulates of Croatia should have had their source in the following political attitudes:

- Firstly, Bosnia and Herzegovina is to Croatia a neighbouring, friendly, independent, democratic, multi-ethnic etc. country, a community of three constituent and equal nations (and other nations too), who will solve their relations in their county in a democratic way, after they have with their common forces (of RC and BH) defended themselves from the same aggressor- “Serbia and Montenegro, that is the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia...”⁷⁶⁸
- Secondly, the Republic of Croatia does not have any aspirations towards parts of BH, nor does it negotiate with Serbs about that. Its military presence in BH it does not hide, but uses it for the defence of both its own territory and that of BH, not to encourage the local population towards secession from BH and then to annex it to Croatia, that is, to form a “state within a state”.
- Thirdly, the post-war internal organization of BH and the territorial division of the local administration and self-government will be determined by its citizens, guided by the principles of democracy and equality of all the three constituent nations “relying on the respect of dignity, freedom and equality ... led by the goals and principles of the United Nations Charter ...”⁷⁶⁹
- Fourthly, the Croatian state will not “give its blessing” to any internal organization and division without consent of the authorized representatives of the Croatian people from BH, even less to impose them if contrary to the will of that nation.⁷⁷⁰

As for Bosanska Posavina, the Croatian policy should have been founded on the following principles too:

- Firstly, Bosanska Posavina is a region of a sovereign and neighbouring country of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in which the Croatian and Bosniak peoples are a majority, who after the multi-party elections legally and legitimately formed a coalition government in eight of their municipalities.
- Secondly, if Greater-Serbs try, with the assistance of the Yugoslav Peoples’ Army (YPA) and volunteer chetnick troops, to violently overthrow the legitimate government, Croatia will, based on the regulations of the Croatian Constitution, using all resources at its disposal, publicly help to preserve that legal and legitimate government.

⁷⁶⁸ The Presidency of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina (No. 02-011-343/92 of 4 May 1992) and the United Nations Security Council (Resolution No.752 of 18 May 1992) established who was the aggressor in BH.

⁷⁶⁹ The Constitution of Bosnia-Herzegovina, www.ccbh.ba

⁷⁷⁰ The negative consequences of the Dayton Peace Agreement have been felt by all the citizens of BH, particularly Croats. Namely, that agreement was not only imposed on them by the international community (whatever that was there and then) but also by the President of the Republic of Croatia, dr. Franjo Tuđman, who approved the agreement, despite the opposition (then and there in Dayton) by the legitimate representative of the BH Croats, Krešimir Zubak.

- Thirdly, if Greater-Serbs try, with the assistance of the YPA and chetnicks, to occupy the region of Posavina and to cleanse it ethnically, the Croatian state and the Croatian Army will, based on the Constitution, the Agreement of Friendship and Co-operation between BH and RC and on international conventions, publicly do everything in their power to save the local population from peril and the area from occupation, together with Bosniaks.
- Fourthly, if Croatia is attacked from the territory of BH, it will with all its forces do everything in order to push the assailant (whoever it is) *at gun's length* from the border.

Unfortunately, in relation to (BH) Bosanska Posavina the Croatian *high command* politically *meddled*.

It never said to the Posavina people the achievement of which political goals they were encouraging and helping them for:

- **Posavina within the Dominion of Croatia, that is, to have it secede from BH and annex to Croatia;**
- **Posavina as a confederate (federal) constituency within BH**
- **A unitary BH with as a “Home for Peoples”.**

Dr. Zdravko Tomac on the other hand claims that “dr. Franjo Tuđman, as a statesman had to have several policies if he wanted to succeed.”⁷⁷¹ (sic!)

*“The Tuđman strategy consisted of public and secret policies and a number of options, depending on circumstances and outcomes imposed by the international community, but also by the results of the war... He was convinced that he was right and that he would outplay both Slobodan Milošević and Alija Izetbegović, the international community as well...”*⁷⁷² To what extent he “outplayed” them has been known ever since.

Thanks to the policy, such as it was, the following events took place:

- On 18 November 1991 the Croatian separatism in BH was institutionalized—the Croatian Community of Herzeg-Bosnia was established.
- On 6th May 1992 Boban and Karadžić signed (behind the Bosniaks’ back) the unprincipled Agreement through which the Bosniaks lost the *Corridor* to Serbs. That agreement turned the aggressor and enemy into a friend while the victim and ally were turned into enemies.
- On 8th May 1992, the Chief Commander of the Croatian Defence Council, General Ante Roso, declared the legal troops of the Territorial Defence of BH “illegal” on the territory of the Croatian Community of Herzeg-Bosnia. Bosniaks and others (the Croatian Defence Forces primarily) who did not “obey the command” were “crushed”. It was the beginning of the official di-

⁷⁷¹ Zdravko TOMAC, President, against Forgeries and Oblivion, Zagreb, Slovo M, 2004, pp. 289-290

⁷⁷² The same source.

stance of the largest number of organized Croats from the central authorities of BH in Sarajevo.

- On 11 May 1992 the deputy of the Minister of Internal Affairs (secretary to HDZ (Croatian Democratic Union),⁷⁷³ Perica Jurić, formed the CDC “in the basement where the Defence Forces of Slavonski Brod were located⁷⁷⁴” and *de facto* suspended the legal and legitimate government in Bosanska Posavina. It was the government that was friendly to Zagreb and loyal to Sarajevo.
- On 24 June 1992 the CA was withdrawn from the *Corridor*, without the combatants and the people living there having been informed about the withdrawal to the agreed demarcation line so that “the compactness of the area and communications” could be ensured. What this really meant was that the Croatian-Bosniak forces of Modriča and Odžak were betrayed.
- On 3 July 1992, the President of the Croatian Community of Herzeg-Bosnia, Mate Boban, “stabbing Bosniaks in the back”, proclaimed “a state within a state”. This laid the foundations for institutionalized pre-requisites needed to start an open war with Bosniaks.
- On 14 July 1992 (having lost Odžak) the Croatian-Bosniak forces of Posavina definitely lost their confidence in the policy and strategy of *the high command*, as well as in the system of leadership and command, and consequently their own combat confidence.
- On 6 October 1992 the Croatian-Bosniak forces lost control over “Bosanski Brod and the entire bridge-head”.
- Through the ambiguous Community (Republic) of “Herzeg-Bosnia” the Bosnia-Herzegovina Croats were from a respected constituent people and victim turned into a collaborator of “one of the aggressors against BH” and into a national minority.
- The Serbian state crossed the Drina, Tinja, Bosna, Ukrina and Vrbas Rivers and with its peak penetrated in the vicinity of the envisioned Greater-Serbia borders: Virovitica, Karlovac, Ogulin, Karlobag - onto the Una River.

2. Strategy

As Croatia even before the war did not have a unified, integral, principled, consistent, transparently shaped and publicly declared policy towards Bosanska Posavina, its *political strategy* in that territory was without principles and without consistence. Through such a “strategy” towards Bosanska Posavina (and towards BH as a whole) the Croatian *high command* wanted to obtain even more *war spoils*, subsequently justifying themselves they had not known which direction the war would take. Would BH survive at all as a sovereign state (despite the recognitions, including the one from Croatia) because, there it was, even the international community had, in many ways, divided BH (Jose Cutileiro, Carl Bildt, Cyrus Vance, David Owen,

⁷⁷³ According to the account (given to the author on 18 July 2009) of the elected President of the Croatian Defence Council in Bosanska Posavina, Vinko Begić.

⁷⁷⁴ The same source.

Thorvald Stoltenberg and others)?! Even if BH was to survive, it was not known if the state would be unitarily organized or if there would be an internal division into entities - into republics, cantons...

Since “nothing was known”, Croatia justified itself that it could not have a crystal-clear, principled, and consistent political strategy towards BH, consequently towards Posavina, which naturally is notoriously untrue. The unprincipled, inconsistent and non-transparent political strategy towards Posavina and BH as a whole was perfectly suitable to “the teacher and the leader”, President of the Republic of Croatia, dr. Franjo Tuđman, because of his own unprincipled and inconsistent policy towards BH.

Using the Tuđman “naive” nationally-constructive romanticism towards BH, some of his political, economic and military “aides-de-camp”, in the style of masters of life and death, conducted political, economic and military activities *ad hoc*, which brought the Posavina people where they were- into the capitalist jaws of hyenas of war, out of their country and homeland.

Since the political strategy was unprincipled and inconsistent, the military policy could not be any different. The army, as a “secondary means” only brings the policy of its founders to life. Since the founder of the Croatian Army politically meddled-thought one thing, said another thing - and commanded a third thing- he had to partially disable his own army from being an independent force. *The high command* had to exclude from the Army some of its “*craftsmanship tools*” so that it could manipulate them and, when it was “politically inevitable”, even disable them, while not taking any consequences. Because of that, it was decided, which makes no sense, that the authority of the General Headquarters of the CA did not apply to: information and political activity, personnel administration, intelligence service, military police and procurement (logistics) and they were put under the direct authority of the Ministry of Defence. Therefore, the Croatian Army had only “bare” troops at their disposal. This laid a strong basis for a disunited leadership and command over the Croatian Army. The consequence is usually recognized in the idiom “a double line of command”.

3. Operations

Having no unified, integral and consistent military strategy for Bosanska Posavina, the Command of the Slavonia battlefield did not get any concrete and clear *strategy task*. As there was no strategy task, General Stipetić and his team in Field Headquarters of the CA in Đakovo were operationally “handicapped”. They could not elaborate a professional *operational plan*, militarily clear to all, intended for combat operations within the OG “Eastern Posavina“. As a result, the operational activities of the Commander of the Slavonia battlefield were palliative, and when he wanted to do something concrete, in his own way (e.g. cut the *Corridor*), he was dismissed!

4. Tactics

Since there were no operational plans from the superior command (FHQCA Đakovo) the Command of the OG “Eastern Posavina“ was forced to improvise tactical plans and give combat commands accordingly. However, the tactical plans would have been a benign problem if there had not been those problems that were malignant for any army. After the *Corridor* had been lost, the OG EP, besides the Army of Republic of Srpska, had four enemies at the tactical level that it had to beat if it wanted to keep the control over the united Bosanska Posavina: disturbed subordination, de-motivation among soldiers, lack of troops and a chronic shortage of MTR.

- Firstly, subordination was not a problem only in the OG EP. It was a problem of the CA as a whole, especially because the basic levers of leadership and command had been taken away “from the hands” of GHQCA (personnel administration, intelligence jobs, military police, procurement) and had been submitted to the authority of the Ministry of Defence. By doing so, apart from strategic effects, tactical effects of the CA were in direct dependence on the Ministry of Defence (Šušak, Praljak, Čermak, Lucić, Perković...), instead of on FHQ in Đakovo and OG EP (Tus, Stipetić, Štefanek...). Thus, the Minister of Defence, Gojko Šušak, in his “Instruction” of 7 July 1992 explicitly states that “no commander is allowed to send or deploy the Croatian Army outside the borders of the Republic of Croatia (and) whoever does so without an explicit command given by the Commander-in-Chief will take the consequences for their actions.” At the same time, the Head of the GHQCA officially claims
- that “there is no need to engage the CA troops for the defence of the Bosnian part of Posavina in order to defend and protect the population and integrity of the Republic of Croatia.”
- Secondly, to restore the lost morale among the combatants was the task only of the ones who had lost it: *the high command*. But what was Slobodan Praljak, the Chief in charge of the morale of the combatants doing? In an unannounced and unauthorized way, he entered the battlefield behind the back of the Command of the OGEP, and “informed” the commander of the brigade that “there is a possibility for chetnicks to approach them from the back or that they can get surrounded so it would be best to withdraw”. Thus, he obstructs and de-motivates.
- Thirdly, replenishing the troops with manpower was directly related to another problem. De-motivated and demoralized combatants do not gladly “go to war”, particularly if that de-motivation is fed even by their Minister of Defence who publicly declares that “no commander is allowed to send or use the Croatian Army outside the borders of the Republic of Croatia”.
- Fourthly, the procurement of the OG EP was, before anybody else’s, the obligation of the assistant of the Minister of Defence, general Ivan Čermak and the assistant of the Commander of the OG EP of the 108th brigade for procurement, Colonel Pavo Sočković, both “torn apart” by work. Namely, besides the obligation of procurement for the CA and CDC, Čermak engaged some

of his intellectual and physical capacities to directly maintain the ties with the ARS and chetnicks in Banja Luka⁷⁷⁵, while Sočković exhausted himself by additional activities of arming the Bosniaks in BH. Consequently, the Operational group of Eastern Posavina chronically lacked material and technical resources (weapons, tools, ammunition...) while the ARS (despite the international embargo) did not even run out of fuel or lubricants.

5. Procurement

"The Osijek Operational Zone and its Command headquarters were the *service* to the OG "Eastern Posavina", later even to the Command of the Slavonia battlefield, whose fundamental task was to ensure the manpower and resources that could be used within the responsibility zone of the OG "Eastern Posavina". That can be read in the first sentence of the *Report on the Fall of Bosanska Posavina*, written by the brigadier Vinko Vrbanac, Commander of the Osijek Operational Zone, addressed to his superiors, Operational Administration of GHQCA on 12th October 1992, after the fall of Bosanski Brod.

In what manner brigadier Vrbanac was doing his "fundamental task" is evident from the documentation of the Osijek OZ and the OGEP. Apart from the fact that there was a lack of ammunition, the combat formation (on 30 September 1992 at 7.00 a.m.) was such that on each kilometre of the frontline there were 78 men instead of 130. This is to say that although there should have been 3000 men "first in line on the frontline", there were 1800, five days later, before the withdrawal of troops of 108th brigade of the CA- 1489, that is, 64 combatants a kilometre. Therefore, there was half of the needed number of combatants for defence, six times fewer than needed for a charge.

If he could not, due to objective reasons (his superiors), professionally do his "primary duty", he should have in a demonstrative way (or keeping it to himself), but in any case, in an honourable way, submitted his resignation (some of his colleagues would have liked to see that), instead of compensating for his disability in executing his "fundamental tasks" by unauthorized "meddling" into combat commands, giving alibi commands.

In any case, he could not and he should not have, in a theatrical and pathetic way, so specific of career-ridden individuals, finish his Report to his superiors with a sentence that he "felt personally responsible, and as a soldier ashamed and spat at, because we had not lost Brod in sweat and blood but in a headless withdrawal."

With this last sentence, the culmination of his report on the fall of Bosanska Posavina, brigadier Vinko Vrbanac showed that he was:

- *falsely modest*, because he cannot formally be "responsible" for the fall of Bosanska Posavina since he was not the Commander of combat operations, that is, he was not authorized to use the troops in combat,
- *falsely proud*, because he was not a combat but a procurement officer, he was not a "soldiering" fighter but a background "*commandante*" so that as a

⁷⁷⁵ According to the account given to the author by General Petar Stipetić.

“soldiering fighter” he cannot feel “ashamed and spat at”. “Ashamed” he could feel because as the highest-ranking commander of the battlefield he did not meet the needs of the “fundamental duty...to secure the manpower and resources”. He could feel, “spat at” by “simple soldiers” who on the battlefield did not feel his “primary duty” being done and they therefore had to withdraw. However, brigadier Vrbanac does not address the issues he should address but refers to himself as a pseudo-warrior, even a knight, although his superior commander, asking for a report, did not address him as a warrior and a knight, but as a procurement officer.

- *immorally deceitful* because the CA and CDC had literally and metaphorically lost “Bosanski Brod and the entire bridge-head” “in sweat and blood” which can unfortunately be proven by 2.000 dead and 10.000 wounded combatants,
- *deceitful to his comrades*, because the CA and CDC did not abandon Bosanski Brod and the entire bridge-head in a “headless withdrawal“, but in combat, in a gradual and in an organized way, since they had not for days received from brigadier Vrbanac the expected replenishment of the battle line with infantry troops or material and technical resources.

6. Commanding activity

In addition to the lack of unified, integral and consistent strategic and operational plans as well as of satisfactory procurement, the Commander of the OG “Eastern Posavina“ had a subordination problem concerning commands given to the troops. It is obvious from the fact that some important commands of the Commander of the OG EP, colonel Vinko Štefanek, had to be co-signed by the Commander of the Slavonia battlefield, General Stipetić, sometimes even that was not sufficient because there obviously was the so-called a “double line of command“. One line (Tus, Stipetić, Štefanek, Sorić ...) gave one kind of commands-the written ones while the other (Šušak, Praljak, Čermak, Basarac...) gave another kind of commands- the unwritten ones.

For instance, General Čermak “connects the lines” in the battlefield while general Praljak “advises” the Commander of the 157th brigade of the CA to withdraw. On the other hand, brigadier Basarac “did not want to take commands from brigadier Štefanek and so went to Zagreb for consultations on his own initiative”, as he himself puts it “you know where”.

In addition, although the entire territory of Bosanska Posavina was, from the organizational, personnel, material and tactical point of view under the “authority” of the OG "Eastern Posavina" with the headquarters located in Slavonski Brod, each municipality was a “*cadi province*”⁷⁷⁶ for itself.

Contrary to the opinion of the Chief of the GHQ of the CA, general Anton Tus, who thought that it was “necessary to engage the troops of the CA in the defence of

⁷⁷⁶ A “*cadi province*” was a judicial and administrative area in the Ottoman Empire (<http://hip.srce.hr>) and a “*cadi*” was the head of that administrative unit. Familiar to everybody is the saying: “The *cadi* accuses you, the *cadi* condemns you.”

Bosanska Posavina”, the Minister of Defence, Gojko Šušak, publicly declared the “Instruction” that “no commander was permitted to send or deploy the Croatian Army outside the borders of the Republic of Croatia”. Because of that, the final decision about the deployment of troops in Posavina was made by commanders of the parts of troops already deployed as well as by the combatants - voluntarily.

Therefore, the members of the Croatian Army who did wage war in Posavina were doing that as volunteers so that they often behaved accordingly - conducting their own self-government.

Due to such a situation, in the first half of September 1992, a month before the fall of Bosanski Brod, nine troops acted wilfully:

- On 2 September 1992 the 1st company of the 2nd Homeland Army of Slavon-ski Brod refuses to do the task it was given.
- On 4 September 1992 the entire 157th brigade of the CA (Slavonski Brod) withdraws from the Posavina battlefield without authorization.
- On 5 September 1992 the 157th brigade of CA, on having received the com-mand to take the defence lines refuses to move into the assigned zone of responsibility.
- On 8 September 1992, in the late evening hours, the 153rd brigade of the CA (Velika Gorica) wilfully, without the knowledge of their superior comman-ders, leaves the battlefield positions and withdraws by around three kilomet-res from the assigned positions because they “are feeling safer there”.
- On 11 September 1992, around 10 p.m., the TG-137 (Duga Resa) leaves its positions.
- On 13 September 1992, without authorization, the TG-137 (Duga Resa) and TG-150 (Črnomerec-Zagreb) withdraw from their positions.
- On 14 September 1992, around 3.30 a.m., 500-600 men in 20 trucks within the TG -137 put pressure on the military police on the Sava River bridge, which, in order to avoid an incident, let them pass across the bridge and they leave for Donji Andrijevci. In the afternoon that same day they leave for Duga Resa.
- On 14 September 1992, around 10.55 p.m. 204th brigade of the CA (Vuko-var) wilfully withdraw from the defence line and they leave for their base.
- On 14 September 1992 - TG-123 (Požega) refuses to execute the command to do their combat assignment in Bosanska Posavina.

None of the commanders of the troops, who were *de facto* breaking the military sanctity, the command of their superiors, were sanctioned. Contrary to that, they were promoted- General Pavle Miljavac into the Chief Commissioner of the GHQ of the Croatian Army, that is, into the Minister of Defence to the Republic Of Croatia. (sic!).

This makes the dismissal of the commander of the 108th of the CA, Colonel Stanislav Sorić, whose troop, due to the hopeless situation caused by the policy and by other troops, withdrew in an organized way, even more hypocritical.

7. Betrayal

Due to the powerlessness of the Bosnia and Herzegovina central authorities from Sarajevo, the freedom of non-Serb population on the territory of Bosanska Posavina, especially at the beginning of the war, depended exclusively on the Croatian state and its political plans regarding that area. But *the high command* (who before the war would have gladly seen Posavina in an independent *Dominion*, and after the war as a part of the “constituent and sovereign entity” within BH) was excessively fearing the YPA and Serb forces, claiming that the “*Corridor* could not be defended.”⁷⁷⁷

Because of “constant international pressures on the Republic of Croatia” and “the ratio of military forces in the field“, the Croatian *high command* opted for *spoils-gaining* policy, evident within the Boban-Karadžić Agreement. That agreement specifically was the beginning of an end and, according to many - a betrayal. After the fall of the unified Bosanska Posavina, few were those who did not feel that way-betrayed.

Worse than the betrayal itself was the humiliation. That is exactly how the Commander of the 101st brigade of CDC, Zlatko Hrkač - Đigi, felt on 7 October 1992., with tears in his eyes sitting at the bottom of the staircase at the entrance of the headquarters of the 108th brigade of the CA (Administration Office of "Jasinje" in Vinogorje), after their procurement officer, Colonel Pavo Sočković, had not allowed him to enter the headquarters.⁷⁷⁸

Therefore, the tragedy that came on (non-Serb) Posavina people did not take place on 6th October 1992 in Bosanski Brod, but five months later, on 6th May of 1992, in Graz. Namely, on that day the President of the Croatian Community of Herzeg-Bosnia (CCHB), Mate Boban “behind the back” of the Croatian combatants and their Bosniak allies, following the instructions of - with the consent of *the high command*, signed the Agreement with the President of Republic of Srpska, Radovan Karadžić, the agreement which divided Bosanska Posavina horizontally so that Republika Srpska would not have to be divided vertically. By doing that, Republic of Srpska was brought to life while the “Croatian-Bosniak” Posavina was doomed to death. It was the first piece of evidence that to *the high command* Bosanska Posavina was a currency for pruning within the framework of *nationally-constructive war spoils* and in line with the policy that would “make an end to all the ambitions of creating a Greater-Islamic state in the heart of Europe.”

Since it was betrayal of the Croatian national interests, not one of the responsible politicians dared to tell the combatants publicly what had been arranged secretly. Instead of that, hypocritically doing nothing and giving ambiguous statements, despite the unprecedented courage and sacrifice of the Posavina people, in the field they let “*spontaneously*” happen what in Graz was *schemed deviously*.⁷⁷⁹

⁷⁷⁷ The statement of the President of Croatia, dr . Franjo Tudman, according to the account given to the author by a witness, Zdravko Tomac, who was at that time the vice-president of the Government of National Unity of Croatia.

⁷⁷⁸ The author was a witness to that sad event.

⁷⁷⁹ Scheme-count, add, calculate, plan secretly.

Worse than treason was the humiliation that combatants experienced in the battlefield. While the Serbs, in accordance with the Agreement, were preparing a big offensive on the *Corridor*, the CA was withdrawing its troops from that area. Left on their own, confused and misinformed by their superiors, fewer in numbers and less armed, the Croatian-Bosniak combatants (CDC) were an easy target. They were turned into losers who did not deserve military respect. Therefore, they were humiliated.

An Afghani saying "Even if you stay alive, do not come back humiliated from the battlefield" was very much felt those days among a vast majority of the Posavina people.

If *the high command* had said to the defenders of Bosanska Posavina: "Withdraw to the line agreed upon with the Serbs" (although they would have reluctantly received that withdrawal command), the unnecessary humiliation would have been avoided - and numerous casualties as well.

8. Morale

Because of the way in which the Army of Republic of Srpska had conquered the *Corridor*, the Croatian-Bosniak forces lost confidence in the policy and military strategy of *the high command*, the system of leadership and command as well, which consequently led to the loss of confidence in combat.

There are no other circumstances nor activities in which mutual confidence is more necessary than in the one between a soldier and a commander - in an army at war (from a simple soldier to the highest commander). When mutual trust and respect are lost during combat operations, combat morale is lost and the system falls apart.

The atmosphere and the circumstances in which the Croatian-Bosniak combatants in Bosanska Posavina waged war (politically and militarily unprincipled and inconsistent, war profiteering as well, with many hyenas of war, worldly fight for power, deserters taking no consequences ...), were a fertile soil for the growth of discouragement, mistrust in their own forces and doubt in victory.

Besides that, the Croatian-Bosniak forces in Posavina (CDC) were not collectively, but individually motivated for resistance against the enemy. They were defending their own "*doorstep*", not "*the home and the homeland*". This was the consequence of the lack of a unified, integral, principled, consistent, transparent, clearly-declared Croatian policy towards Posavina, a policy that would have been a motivating guarantee to each combatant in trenches that their battle, even if they got killed, would not be in vain.

As there was no policy, even less a motivating policy for "*the home and homeland*", by losing "*the doorstep*" combatants were losing their motive for further battle.

Obviously aware of that, Slobodan Praljak himself, general for morale and patriotism, suggested money as a substitute for patriotism, engagement of mercenaries instead of patriots. (sic!)

9. Double standards

After the defeats and losses that the Croatian-Bosniak forces suffered during the battles for: the *Corridor* (26/06/1992), Modriča (28/06/1992) Plehan (01/07/1992) Derventa (04/07/1992) and Odžak (14/07/1992) it was clear to everybody that the fall of Bosanski Brod was - only a matter of time, that is, days. That generally accepted “understanding” on one hand brought about apathy among the Croatian-Bosniak forces while on the other hand it strengthened the resistance of the soldiers of the CA against the leaving onto the battlefield in Bosanska Posavina because the Croatian state materially, politically and publicly treated the combatants from the “B zone“ or “interest zone“ (as was Bosanska Posavina treacherously⁷⁸⁰ called) in a way different from the one reserved for those who fought on the Croatian battlefields. Thus, it was officially concealed where and how they got killed while the public praises for military successes, awards and decorations were out of question since “the Croatian Army was not present in BH“. As a result, the Command of the OG “Eastern Posavina“ chronically lacked infantry soldiers and in order to bring a troop as big as a company (130 men) to the frontline, it had to combine several different troops from different places in Croatia. Abounding in character, homeland-originated, militarily educated, war-experienced and heterogeneous, this combat group was in advance meant to display skilfulness, endurance, mutual trust and common faith in the success of the operation.

As nowhere else people were dying for so long as in Posavina, as no other battlefield was so poorly valued than the one of Posavina, as in no other battlefield were the military and political goals more unclear than in Posavina, it is a wonder that there were as many people and that they endured so long- no matter where they came from.

10. Manpower ratio

The numbers of the Serb forces “varied due to successive replenishments with new units... and were around 40.800 men at the beginning up to 54.660 after the end of the 1st stage of the operation “*Corridor 1992*”

The Croatian forces (the CA and the CDC) varied too. Their numbers were highest (on the Bosanski Brod and Orašje battlefields) at the wake of the *Corridor* operation- around 20.000, lowest at the wake of the fall of Bosanski Brod, around 5.000 combatants.

During the last seven days of battles for Bosanski Brod and the entire bridge-head (according to the statement of the commander of that combat line, General Slavko Lisica) the Serb forces engaged

“from 10.000 to 15.000 combatants“. His colleague, commander of the main direction for the charge through *the Corridor*, General Novica Simić, claims that within TG of RSA (which took Bosanski Brod) there were 10.843 men.

However, when the battle for Bosanski Brod is in question, neither General Lisica nor General Simić provide accurate data. It can be concluded from their own written

⁷⁸⁰ Treacherously- hypocritically (sneakily, deviously), insincerely, falsely, deceitfully.

documents that the continuous and direct charge on Bosanski Brod during the last seven days was made by 19.960 combatants.

On the other hand, the Croatian-Bosniak forces (the CA and the CDC) had fewer than 2500 combatants on 23 kilometres of their defence line. On the last two days of the battle, there were 1564 men- 68 of them a kilometre, exhausted and frustrated. The inequality was not obvious only in the number of combatants but in the disproportionate superiority of the ARS in terms of aviation, artillery and armoured firepower.

Politically and militarily betrayed, outnumbered, insufficiently equipped, incompetently led, aimless and discouraged by defeats, the Croatian-Bosniak Army waged war more out of an irrational spite and individual love of freedom, less out of the original collective patriotism and a united fight for the freedom of the homeland. Consequently, it was more and more discouraged, scattered, self-governing, less confident, united or monolithic. Due to that, it had disproportionately bigger human and material losses than the Greater-Serbia-indoctrinated, fanatically and competently led, several times more numerous and equipped, by-initial-successes-encouraged Army of Republic of Srpska.

As a result of all that, the Command of the OG „Eastern Posavina“ within 189 days of combat lost (official data) more than an entire combat formation - 7.511 combatants among whom 1.261 got killed (40 men daily - seven dead, 33 wounded).

11. Heroes, not cowards

Thanks primarily to the 108th and 3rd /3rd „A“ brigades of the CA, as well as to the 101st brigade of the CDC, “Bosanski Brod and the entire bridge-head” in mid-May of 1992 were placed under the supervision of the Croatian-Bosniak forces and controlled until the beginning of October 1992- despite the obstructions on the part of *the high command*.

Therefore, these three brigades did not “lead to the loss of Bosanski Brod and the entire bridge-head“, they did not “of their own free will, without having been forced by the enemy, and without justified reasons leave the battlefield“, they did not even “have a most direct effect on the development of events“. These three brigades were neither a tactical motive nor a strategic cause of the fall of Bosanska Posavina. The vast majority of the combatants in these three brigades were heroes, not cowards.

12. Orašje

After the fall of Bosanski Brod, the enclave of Orašje remained under the control of the CDC because the “head“ of the ARS, general Ratko Mladić, had not allowed the occupation of that territory. This can be concluded from the sequence of events on the battlefield and on the basis of the testimonies given by the ARS generals, Slavko Lisica and Novica Simić.

After the occupation of Bosanski Brod, the combatants of TG-3 RSA and their Commander Lisica “got wings“. “We want to take Orašje, we want Orašje!” chanted the combatants. Wanting to please them, Lisica sent in a telegram to general Ratko Mladić : “I need the GHQ of the ARS to put all the forces in the Doboj - Modriča -

Bijeljina corridor under the command of the tactical group 3 (that is, his own group) as well as the corps from Bijeljina. /.../ With our main forces I am attacking Tuzla while with additional forces I am attacking Orašje.“

The following day, on the 8th of October 1993 (by telephone) Mladić refused the proposal made by Lisica “to engage their forces in the Coridor”.

As a “reward” to that “lunatic“ for having taken the town of Bosanski Brod and having wanted to attack both Orašje and Tuzla, he was “promoted” into a Commander of the Doboj OG and then appointed “the Commander of the School Centre of the ARS in Banja Luka“ and “retired” in 1994.

Since it has been known that Ratko Mladić commanded an army that committed genocide in Srebrenica, it is obvious that his refusal of the proposition made by colonel Lisica to “attack Orašje“ was a consequence of previous “agreements“ between two *high commands*, not of his fear or mercifulness.

13. Culprits

Since the Croatian policy (due to the self-will of the Brod people) only partly fulfilled the Graz Agreement (to secure the *Corridor* for the Serbs), Serbs decided to tolerate the “crazy“ *commandante* Lisica and to let him (contrary to the Agreement) take Bosanski Brod too.

The surprised, offended and humiliated Croatian *high command*, in accordance with the seriousness of the defeat, needed an adequately *usual culprit* since they themselves did not even dream of admitting guilt and bearing the consequences. *The usual culprit* should have been held responsible before the courageous and suffering refugee population of Bosanska Posavina who after huge human casualties and material losses found themselves in refuge without a thing.

It was most painless to accuse the three legendary brigades; the ones who for seven months, with enormous sacrifices, prevented the imperialist occupation of Posavina; the ones to whom the people of Posavina have been grateful (“till their dying days”) for all the things they did for them; the ones who the Posavina people could not accuse or despise in any way, as they would have accused and despised all the politicizing and profiteering hyenas - if somebody had proscribed them.

Although an integral Bosanska Posavina was lost in the battlefield, although the biggest losers are the Posavina people and the combatants, they are not the culprits, but their politicians are since “politics gives rise to, prepares and wages a war; it collects the results of victory or takes the consequences of a defeat.”

Thus, successful politics leads to a successful outcome of war while “bad politics leads to a bad outcome of war.“ The outcome of the war waged in Bosanska Posavina tells everything about the quality of politics that waged it.