

ŽELJKO SAVANOVIĆ

University of Banja Luka, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of History

ORCID iD: 0009-0000-2615-783X

zeljko.savanovic@ff.unibl.org

GOAT FARMING IN THE VRBAS BANOVINA

Abstract: The aim of the paper is to analyze goat farming in the Vrbas Banovina based on published and unpublished sources and available literature. In certain areas of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, goat farming was a major branch of stockbreeding. The portion of the population that did not have enough land to sustain a cow was able to successfully keep two to three goats. For the poorer population in the country, goats were the most significant domesticated animals, and they provided a substantial income. The paper compares the number of goats in certain European countries, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, its banovinas, and the districts of the Vrbas Banovina. It also focuses on the lives of the people, the traits of the domestic Balkan goat, goat breeds, goat housing and feeding, stockbreeding trends, goat diseases and restrictions on keeping goats.

Keywords: goat, goat farming, stockbreeding, Vrbas Banovina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kingdom of Yugoslavia, Europe.

1. Introduction

Animal husbandry has been practiced in the Vrbas Banovina for centuries, which is confirmed by various archaeological studies of stilt house settlements in Ripac and Donja Dolina. Based on the remains of animal bones found in these locations, it appears these people predominantly bred pigs, sheep, and goats, along with a small number of cows and horses.¹ The feudal system in the area predated the arrival of the Ottomans and continued in a somewhat altered form throughout the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian periods. It followed the principle that dependent peasants (serfs) were only expected to provide local representatives of the Ottoman Empire with a percentage of their income earned from husbandry but not from stockbreeding. This contributed to an increase in the number of livestock.² Keeping a large number of livestock was, to a large extent, the result of centuries-long political instabilities in the Balkans. For the inhabitants, livestock was

¹ Stipčević 1989: 109.

² Šerić 1949: 5.

their most valuable form of property.³

In the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, domesticated animals were bred in the Vrbas Banovina in extensive conditions, very much like they were during the Ottoman Empire and the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. The varieties bred were mostly primitive and slow-growing, resistant to diseases and malnourishment, and able to thrive in poor living conditions. Many stockbreeders kept larger numbers than their financial circumstances allowed them to. Animals were given fodder in stables only during the winter season. For major stockbreeders, extensive farming was the most logical way to exploit natural resources. Without this type of production, the stockbreeding industry in the Vrbas Banovina would have been virtually inconceivable.⁴ Many families living in rural areas managed to satisfy all their needs through stockbreeding.

2. Population Data and Agricultural Production in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia the Vrbas Banovina

The period following the First World War (1914–1918) in Europe saw the formation of several new states, one of which was the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, which had a surface area of 248,666 km² and a population of 12,055,715, according to the 1921 census. In 1929, the country was renamed the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and the 1922 administrative division of territory into thirty-three counties was replaced with a division into nine provinces called banates (*banovina*) with the City of Belgrade as a separate administrative unit. The Vrbas Banovina and the Drina Banovina were in the center of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia.⁵

According to the 1931 census, the population of Yugoslavia at that time was 13,934,038. The Vrbas Banovina had a surface area of 18,917 km² (7.64% of the country's total area) and a population of 1,037,382 (7.44%), the majority of whom were Serbs (57.9%). With a birth rate of 41.11% and a 20.66% natural increase, the Vrbas Banovina was at the forefront in Yugoslavia and farther afield, followed by the Drina Banovina.⁶ Following the Cvetković–Maček Agreement of 1939, the districts of Derventa and Gradačac were separated from the Vrbas Banovina and adjoined to the newly formed Banovina of Croatia.⁷

The population was primarily engaged in agriculture. The 1931 census data shows that 76.58% of the population in Yugoslavia was involved in agriculture and 88.16% in the Vrbas Banovina earned their livelihoods from forestry and fishing.⁸ Over fifty percent of Yugoslavia's GDP during the interwar period came from agriculture. A third of this came from stockbreeding, which on average also made up a quarter of all Yugoslav exports.⁹

³ Đurđević 1934: 958.

⁴ Krstić 1938: 44, 47, 52.

⁵ Petranović 1988: 31–32, 190.

⁶ *Definitivni rezultati popisa stanovništva od 31. marta 1931. godine, Prisutno stanovništvo, broj kuća i domaćinstava*, 1937: 11; *Definitivni rezultati popisa stanovništva od 31. marta 1931. godine, Prisutno stanovništvo po veroispovesti*, 1938: 4, 110.

⁷ Vojinović 1997: 149

⁸ *Definitivni rezultati popisa stanovništva od 31. marta 1931. godine, Prisutno stanovništvo po glavnim zanimanjima*, 1940: 7–8.

⁹ Aleksić 2002: 21, 26–27.

3. Goat Farming in Europe and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia

Goat farming was a major branch of stockbreeding in specific areas of Yugoslavia. The population kept goats primarily for producing milk and dairy, meat, skin, goat hair, and manure, and it was much less concerned with by-products such as suet, horns, and hooves. Goat cheese, used mostly on homesteads, is lower in fat than cheese made from sheep or cow milk. Goat hair was used to make clothing items, because such garments are more water resistant than those made of wool. In addition, goat hair was used to make various textile items, including different kinds of sacks and bags, horse clothing, and rugs.¹⁰ Goatskin was used to preserve cheese, sour cream, and butter, and kidskin was used for transporting wine, fresh cheese, lard, and other items saturated with fat.¹¹

Country	Year	Total number of goats	Number per km ²	Number per 1000 people
Austria	1923	382,100	4.56	58.4
Bulgaria	1920	1,331,900	12.91	261.9
Czechoslovakia	1925	1,244,700	8.69	85.6
Denmark	1926	24,000	0.62	7.6
France	1925	1,377,900	2.51	34.5
Greece	1923	3,674,000	26.20	668.0
Italy	1918	3,082,600	9.94	76.0
Yugoslavia	1925	1,810,700	6.38	132.0
Hungary	1926	48,600	0.64	7.0
Germany	1926	3,483,800	8.03	59.8
Netherlands	1921	272,300	7.95	36.6
Norway	1926	290,300	0.85	99.6
Portugal	1925	1,557,700	16.20	248.6
USSR	1925	3,883,100	0.40	20.4
Romania	1925	493,600	1.67	29.4
Spain	1924	3,803,800	7.53	174.7
Sweden	1920	113,000	0.29	21.9
Switzerland	1921	330,000	7.99	84.2

Table 1. Numbers of goats in individual European countries according to data from the Rome International Institute of Agriculture¹²

Yugoslavia was among the top countries in Europe in terms of the overall number of goats, the number of goats per square kilometer, and number per 1,000 people. In the years after the Second World War, the country with the most goats in Europe was the USSR

¹⁰ Vukosavljević 1983: 139–140; Ćeranić 1984: 9.

¹¹ Nimac 1940: 120, 129–130.

¹² Lakatoš 1929: 37.

(3,883,100), which was followed by Spain (3,803,800), Greece (3,674,000), Germany (3,483,800), Italy (3,082,600), and then Yugoslavia (1,810,700). The countries with the most goats per square kilometer were Greece (26.20), Portugal (16.20), Bulgaria (12.91), Italy (9.94) and Czechoslovakia (8.69), which was also the only country with more goats than sheep. These were followed by Germany (8.03), Switzerland (7.99), the Netherlands (7.95), Spain (7.53), and Yugoslavia (6.38). Yugoslavia was in the fourth place with 132 goats per 1,000 people. In this metric, Yugoslavia was behind Greece (668), Bulgaria (261.9) and Portugal (248.6).

Banate	Number of goats	Number per 1 km ²	Percentage per banate	Percentage per breed	Number per 100 people
Drava Banovina	9,972	0.63	0.53	1.34	0.86
Drina Banovina	145,948	5.24	7.80	8.07	9.19
Danube Banovina	33,669	1.08	1.80	1.38	1.39
Morava Banovina	212,815	8.36	11.37	9.18	14.42
Littoral Banovina	232,432	11.83	12.42	12.86	25.01
Sava Banovina	52,172	1.29	2.79	2.45	1.89
Vardar Banovina	663,928	18.11	35.47	18.92	41.05
Vrbas Banovina	126,055	6.66	6.74	8.75	11.71
Zeta Banovina	394,401	12.72	21.07	18.17	41.47
Belgrade	226	0.60	0.01	1.67	0.08
Total	1,871,618	7.56	100.00	10.18	13.11

Table 2. Parallel overview of the number of goats in the banates in 1932.¹³

Compared to other countries in Europe, goat farming was quite developed in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, although it was much less significant than sheep farming.¹⁴ In the 1929 – 1938 period, there was an average of 10,759,949 goats and sheep per year in Yugoslavia. Of this total, 1,868,078 does, bucks, and kids made up 17.4%, whereas

¹³ *Statistički godišnjak 1932, 1934: 94–96.*

¹⁴ Lazić 1999: 115.

8,891,871 sheep, rams, and lambs made up 82.6%. During the same period, the annual exports were 14,787 kids, 17,029 bucks, 20,312 does, 417,664 lambs, 70,743 rams, and 70,638 ewes, for a total of 611,173 head. Goats accounted for 8.5% of exports, but sheep made up the lion's share with 91.5%.¹⁵ Goat exports were not at all substantial, which is why the financial benefit of goat farming was much lower than in other branches of stockbreeding. The largest buyer was Greece, and export to other countries was negligible.¹⁶

According to Table 2, which shows the distribution of goats in Yugoslavia in 1932, the highest number of goats were in the and predominantly mountainous southern areas of the country, where the poorest part of the population lived on the karst. Goat farming as an economic branch is an indicator of the cultural state of affairs and possibly unemployment among part of the Yugoslav population. When colonists came from underdeveloped areas into the flatlands of Vojvodina, they brought along their goats, which did not flourish in the new environment.¹⁷ There, goats were kept mainly by toll collectors, railway guards, workers at the industrial companies in towns, and the poor.¹⁸ In 1932, the Vardar Banovina had the most goats with 663,928, 18.11 per km², and 41.05 goats per 100 people. The Zeta Banovina was second with a total of 394,401 goats and 12.72 per km², and it had the highest number of goats per 100 people at 41.47. The Vardar Banovina was home to more than a third of all the goats in the country. The Vardar and Zeta banates combined contained 56.54% of all the goats in the country. The Littoral Banovina was third with 232,432 goats. The Drava Banovina had the least with a total of only 9,972, followed by the Danube Banovina (33,669), the Sava Banovina (52,172), and the Vrbas Banovina (126,055). According to data from 1932, goats made up 8.75 percent of all livestock in the Vrbas Banovina. The highest percentages were found in the Vardar Banovina (18.92%), the Zeta Banovina (18.17%) and the Littoral Banovina (12.8%), and the lowest in the Drava Banovina (1.34%) and the Danube Banovina (1.38%).

However, there were significantly more goats and other livestock in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia than was recorded during the local livestock census. Even in the Ottoman period, livestock owners obscured the actual numbers of all their animals to avoid paying grazing fees and livestock taxes,¹⁹ and they continued to do so during the Austro-Hungarian period. After the first Austro-Hungarian census of 1879, many peasants talked of hiding half their livestock in the woods before the enumerators arrived. Some of them hid all of their livestock and had no animals registered.²⁰ This practice continued in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia as well. Agricultural experts from the Vardar and Zeta Banovinas believed the number of goats to be much higher in actuality.²¹ There was more livestock in the Vrbas Banovina, and according to estimates, the number of sheep was a third higher in 1929 than what the official statistics indicated.²²

¹⁵ *Poljoprivredna godišnja statistika 1935, 1936*: 140; *Poljoprivredna godišnja statistika 1939, 1940*: 156.

¹⁶ Lazić 1999: 115.

¹⁷ Perušić 1940: 578.

¹⁸ Belić 1995: 35.

¹⁹ Pelagić 1953: 62; Hadžibegić 1960: 90.

²⁰ Šerić: 1953: 36.

²¹ Perušić 1940: 574.

²² ARS, ZDIL, Dosije ing. Milana Jankovića, br. dos. 83/3, Milan Janković, Stanje i unapređenje ovčarstva u Vrbaskoj banovini, Banja Luka, 1929–1930.

4. The Goat Population in the Vrbas Banovina

According to the Austro-Hungarian livestock census conducted in 1895, there were 1,447,049 goats in Bosnia and Herzegovina.²³ The 1910 census, however, indicated a reduced number of livestock with only 1,393,068 goats. The main reason for this was that the first was conducted in the spring (April 22–May 22) when the number of livestock is highest due to new births. The second was conducted in the autumn (October 10–November 10) when it was at its lowest²⁴ due to sales and household meat consumption. When the First World War broke out, Austro-Hungary conscripted a large number of men to serve on the frontline or as auxiliary staff. Conscription led to a shortage of men in the agricultural workforce and a consequent decrease in yields. The military administration requisitioned and purchased livestock and fodder, which resulted in a reduction in the amount of livestock and poorer farming.²⁵ In the eastern parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which witnessed fighting during the war, livestock almost disappeared.²⁶ The number of goats and other farm animals decreased, which is confirmed by the first livestock census in the newly formed Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, conducted in 1921. At that time, there were 118,108 kids, 372,981 does, and 38,344 bucks, for a total of 529,433.²⁷

District name	Kids under the age of one	Does and bucks	Total
Banja Luka	3,985	11,822	15,807
Bihać	898	5,914	6,812
Glamoč	3,000	5,500	8,500
Gradačac	409	642	1,051
Gradiška	149	466	615
Gračanica	806	1,851	2,657
Grahovo	2,535	10,788	13,323
Dvor	377	1,123	1,500
Derventa	104	219	323
Doboj	85	185	270
Dubica	88	208	296
Jajce	3,935	9,601	13,536
Ključ	3,050	6,920	9,970
Kotor Varoš	2,106	5,219	7,325
Krupa	1,802	4,535	6,337
Maglaj	1,081	1,397	2,478

²³ *Die Landwirthschaft in Bosnien und der Hercegovina*, 1899: 368–369; *Rezultati popisa marve u Bosni i Hercegovini od godine 1895*, 1896: 29.

²⁴ Šerić 1953: 68–71.

²⁵ Šehić 1991: 46–47.

²⁶ Sušić 1938: 358.

²⁷ *Rezultati popisa domaće stoke od 31. januara 1921*, 1927: 3, 156–157.

Mrkonjić Grad	1,899	5,224	7,123
Novi Grad	497	981	1,478
Petrovac	1,444	7,135	8,579
Prijedor	632	1,063	1,695
Prnjavor	568	872	1,440
Sanski Most	1,221	4,638	5,859
Teslić	493	5,289	5,782
Cazin	336	768	1,104
Total	31,500	92,360	123,860

Table 3. Number of kids under the age of one and totals of does and bucks in 1935.²⁸

According to agricultural statistics for the year 1935 (Table 3), the total number of goats in the Vrbas Banovina was 123,860, of which 31,500 were kids under the age of one and the remaining 92,360 were does and bucks. The Banja Luka district had the most goats, followed by the districts of Jajce and Grahovo, with the fewest goats in the districts of Dobož, Dubica and Derventa. In the Vrbas Banovina, there were 103,929 goats in 1930, 127,719 in 1931, 126,055 in 1932, 123,162 in 1933, 118,711 in 1934, 123,860 in 1935, 135,587 in 1937 and 136,037 in 1938.²⁹ The number of goats never dropped below 100,000.

5. Goat Breeds in the Vrbas Banovina

The most prevalent breed of goat in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and on the Balkan Peninsula was the Balkan goat. Most of the year it lived from grazing and browsing, and during the winter it was fed hay and oak leaf fodder. They weighed an average of thirty-five kilograms and were covered in long, thick, rough, sleek fur that was most often reddish or gray but could also be black, chestnut, brown, spotted, or white. Females yielded around 300–400 grams of shorn hair and males up to a kilogram. In higher terrains, both males and females had horns that bent backward, while in lower terrains, the females could be horned or polled (hornless). Females birthed one kid at a time. Mountain goats, which lived on the sparsest terrain, yielded an average of up to 150 liters of milk annually, including milk suckled by the kid (around 35 liters). The lowland goats were calmer, tamer, better fed than the goats in the mountains because they were kept closer to the homestead and therefore yielded more milk (200–250 liters).³⁰ There were several known varieties of the Balkan goat: the Soko Banja, Herzegovina, Dalmatia and Gulijan.³¹

The importance of goat farming in the past in Yugoslavia is reflected in the many placenames derived from the local words for goats (*koza, jarac*). Many of these placenames persist to this day in what was once the Vrbas Banovina: Kozara, Kozarac, Kozaruša, Kozica,

²⁸ *Poljoprivredna godišnja statistika 1935, 1936*: 116–118.

²⁹ *Poljoprivredna godišnja statistika 1935, 1936*: 118; *Statistički godišnjak 1937, 1938*: 128–129; *Statistički godišnjak 1938-1939, 1939*: 180–181

³⁰ Đurđević 1934: 957–958; Belić 1967: 686–689; Čeranić 1984: 15; Franić 1987:10; Garić Petrović 2022: 100.

³¹ Belić 1995: 35.

Kozin, Jarice, and Jarčište, among others. Goats were usually given names derived from their coloring, body parts, similarities to other objects, their features, out of fondness, etc. Goats were reported to be more intelligent than sheep, and they quickly learned their names.³²

In Bosnia and Herzegovina efforts were made during the Austrian period to improve the Balkan goat's milk yield by crossing it with the Angora goat, although it is possible that some individuals had acquired the Angora goat during Ottoman rule. In 1896, twenty-six Angora does were imported from the Angora Vilayet and kept as purebreds at the agricultural station in Livno, while bucks were crossed with local does.³³ However, the animals that resulted from this crossbreeding did not prove to be favorable.³⁴

After the First World War, Angora goats were imported to Herzegovina and kept at the Gacko Agricultural Station. Their only advantage over the domestic goat turned out to be better-quality hair. They had a lower milk yield, and their weight was not greater.

Before the First World War, the Saanen goat was imported to the lowlands of Herzegovina from the Saanental Valley in the Swiss canton of Bern. It was well-accepted due to its high milk yield.³⁵ The Saanen was imported to Bohinj in modern-day Slovenia, where its breeding was encouraged for milk production during the summer when the cows were out grazing in the mountains.³⁶ Improvements in the domestic goat with the introduction of the Saanen, which provided very good hybrids when crossed with the domestic goat, was continued after the First World War. The government in the Vardar Banovina encouraged breeding of the Saanen as an attempt to replace the domestic goat rather than improve it.³⁷ Its high milk yield made it very welcome in the suburbs of large Yugoslav cities, where some working-class families kept them for milk.³⁸ Just before the Second World War, the Saanen accounted for 2–3% of all goats in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. There were also some hybrids of the Balkan goat and high-milk-yield goats, but these were mainly Saanen. No new blood was introduced, which resulted in inbreeding. This caused the Yugoslav Saanen to be less developed with a weight of around 45 to 50 kilograms. It yielded around 500 liters of milk on average.³⁹

The cross between the lower terrain Balkan goat and the Saanen produced the domestic white goat, which is quite similar to the Saanen but smaller and lighter, weighing on average between 35 and 45 kilograms. Most are polled with short, white, shiny coat. They mainly birth two kids at a time and yield around 450 liters of milk.⁴⁰

The Vrbas Banovina also worked on popularizing the Saanen and crossbreeding it with the domestic Balkan goat to achieve the highest possible milk yield.⁴¹ In addition to good domestic goats, a few Saanen could be seen here and there in the districts of the Vrbas

³² Sušac:1939: 199

³³ *Die Landwirtschaft in Bosnien und der Hercegovina*, 1899: 137; Šerić 1953: 47.

³⁴ Janković, Džuverović 1938: 52.

³⁵ Balić 1930: 55.

³⁶ Belić 1995: 35.

³⁷ Jovanović 2011: 326.

³⁸ Hrvoj 1929: 126; Janković, Džuverović 1938: 52; Belić 1995: 91.

³⁹ Čeranić 1984: 13.

⁴⁰ Franić 1987: 10; Čeranić 1984: 14.

⁴¹ ARS, KBUVB, III–6, dok. br. 34, O stočarstvu Vrbaske banovine, Banja Luka 1930.

Banovina.⁴² The Saanen was introduced in the Banja Luka district in 1926, when three goats were imported from Switzerland. This continued in the town of Banja Luka and the surrounding settlements, and a decade later they could be found in nearby places, including Bukvalek, Slatina, Pavlovac, and others. In 1936, around twenty goats were shipped from the Banja Luka district to the Jajce district. They were sold there for between 150 and 350 dinars,⁴³ which was substantially higher than the average price of the mainly domestic Balkan goats that were exported. That same year, 14,494 goats were exported for 1,897,800 dinars at an average of 130.9 dinars per goat.⁴⁴

At its annual meeting held in April 1936, the Banja Luka Poultry Selection Cooperative decided to expand the cooperative's activities to include breeding the Saanen and taming rabbits. The cooperative started working more closely with breeders in the town and the nearby settlements of Bukvalek and Lauš.⁴⁵ Good breeders had "excellent female specimens, but lacked a good male necessary for diversifying the gene pool,"⁴⁶ so they asked the Poultry Selection Cooperative to obtain one for them.⁴⁷ The Alliance of Serbian Agricultural Cooperatives obtained a breeding buck and a doe, and delivered them to the Poultry Selection Cooperative in Banja Luka.⁴⁸

6. Living conditions and nutrition for goats in the Vrbas Banovina

In the mountainous areas of the Vrbas Banovina, where peasants lived mostly from livestock, the stables were fairly good. The abundance of construction materials there allowed for most structures to be built with logs, high thresholds, and few, if any, windows. Most often, they had two levels, with large animals housed on the bottom level with the upper level reserved for small livestock (sheep and goats) during the winter. Small livestock would climb to the top level using a wooden ramp with slats for climbing. The stables were roofed with wooden shingles.⁴⁹ In lower terrain, stables were built out of wickerwork or boards, and most commonly roofed with reeds. Goats would sometimes be housed with other domestic animals in the cellar underneath a residence, which was usually a dark, damp, unventilated space.⁵⁰

Reports submitted to the Vrbas Banovina Department of Agriculture by the district administration and district veterinarians indicate where in individual districts of the Vrbas Banovina livestock was housed and what it was fed. In the Kulen Vakuf district outpost, livestock was "held in rooms with no light or air, in knee-high mud."⁵¹ In the Jajce district,

⁴² AJ, 67–25–203, Godišnji izvještaj veterinara sreza Sanski Most za godinu 1932.

⁴³ ARS, KBUVB, III–10, dok. br. 710, Sresko načelstvo Banja Luka, KBUVB, Banja Luka, 14. 9. 1936.

⁴⁴ *Poljoprivredna godišnja statistika 1939*, 1940: 156.

⁴⁵ ARS, KBUVB, III–10, dok. br. 710, Živinarsko-seleksijska zadruga Banja Luka, KBUVB, Banja Luka, 14. 9. 1936.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, Sresko načelstvo Banja Luka, KBUVB, Banja Luka, 14. 9. 1936.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, Živinarsko-seleksijska zadruga Banja Luka, KBUVB, Banja Luka, 14. 9. 1936.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, Živinarsko-seleksijska zadruga Banja Luka, KBUVB, Banja Luka, 7. 11. 1936.

⁴⁹ ARS, ZDIL, Dosije ing. Milana Jankovića, br. dos. 83/3, Milan Janković, Stanje i unapređenje ovčarstva u Vrbaskoj banovini, Banja Luka, 1929–1930; Popović 1940: 69–71.

⁵⁰ Šmalcelj 1947: 83

⁵¹ AJ, 67–25–203, Godišnji izvještaj veterinara sreske ispostave Kulen Vakuf Gavre Andjukića za godinu 1932.

“livestock is fed straw, cornstalks, tree fodder, and some hay.” At the end of winter, the poor ranchers would “run out of dry food, and then let their livestock roam the fields and thickets to browse and survive until the first spring grazing.”⁵² More often than not, stables were merged with the houses where children lived. They were a sort of basement—cramped, dark, unventilated, and with no channels for draining slurry manure. If stables were freestanding, they were usually primitively built out of logs. In the summer, the livestock would graze in the pastures, and eat hay, straw, and cornstalks in the winter. There was usually not enough food, especially in winter.⁵³ Stockbreeding was quantitatively well-developed in the Donji Vakuf district outpost, but not as much qualitatively because the “local farmer aims to have as much livestock as possible, regardless of its quality or the available amount of food.” Over the winter, they were fed “very sparsely, and in the spring, when the food runs out, they are driven out into barren pastures to find their own food by searching in thickets and depleted pastures.”⁵⁴ In the Bosanski Brod district outpost, “livestock is kept in enclosures, since not all farmers have stables. Consequently, livestock care is poor, and food is scarce.” Floods caused food shortages. The livestock grazed in poor submerged pastures.⁵⁵ Stables in the Gračanica district were “in most cases cramped, dark wickerwork structures lined with loam, and often merely wickerwork covered in reeds or sedge.” They were “most often with no bedding.” Half of the farmers expected their livestock to “find their main food in the spring and summer by grazing along the main roads, while in the winter, the main sources of food are hay and cornstalks.”⁵⁶ The Glamoč district farmers usually kept more livestock than they needed, without providing proper nourishment, adequate care, or comfortable housing for the animals. In addition to pastures, livestock grazed in agricultural fields, specifically on the stubble left untilled after the harvest. In winter, the livestock was herded home, where it spent the winter in small stables with hay and straw. There were very few purpose-built stables for livestock since most stables were located beneath residences.⁵⁷ In the Prijedor district, the stables “were built unhygienically, low and small, with little light and air, no flooring and no drainage canals.” They were built of “poor-quality material and without an attic, so it was too warm and humid in the summer, and too cold in the winter.”⁵⁸ In the Maglaj district, “the livestock is poorly fed, spends most of the time in poorly built stables, with wickerwork or rarely board walls, small, without light, cold, covered with reeds, and occasionally with boards or tiles.”⁵⁹

The farmers with little livestock mainly put them out to graze near their houses or in the surrounding woods. Goats would usually browse in the hedges, thickets, and forests,

⁵² ARS, KBUVB, III-6, dok. br. 698, Sresko načelstvo u Jajcu, KBUVB, Stanje poljoprivrede za godinu 1939, Jajce, 27. 12. 1939.

⁵³ AJ, 67-25-203, Godišnji izvještaj sreskog veterinara Jajačkog sreza Slavka Kostića za godinu 1932, Jajce, 3. 5. 1933.

⁵⁴ ARS, KBUVB, III-6, dok. br. 698, Sreska ispostava Donji Vakuf, KBUVB, PO, Godišnji izvještaj o stanju poljoprivrede i radu poljoprivrednog referenta, Donji Vakuf, 17. 1. 1940.

⁵⁵ AJ, 67-25-203, Izvještaj veterinara sreske ispostave Bosanski Brod Josipa Stupara za godinu 1932.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, Godišnji izvještaj sreskog veterinara Gračaničkog sreza Mate Bartolovića za godinu 1932.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, Godišnji izvještaj sreskog veterinara sreza Glamoč dr Novaka Varenike za godinu 1932.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, Godišnji izvještaj sreskog veterinara Prijedorskog sreza Pere Kovačevića za godinu 1932.

⁵⁹ ARS, KBUVB, III-6, dok. br. 698, Sresko načelstvo Maglaj, KBUVBPO, Godišnji izvještaj o stanju poljoprivrede i vremenskih prilika na teritoriji Maglajskog sreza za 1939. godinu, Maglaj 10. 1. 1940.

and they were also put out with other livestock to graze in pastures, reaped meadows, and in the fields after the harvest. Along with their villages, farmers also kept their livestock in the mountains. Over the summer, farmers in the Glamocko polje plain mainly used their mountain plots for housing their livestock and household members who would gather feed and collect animal products.⁶⁰ The more well-off peasants had stables, huts, and a barn in the mountains. Herdsmen lived in the stables with no huts. While up in the mountains, the herdsmen were regularly supplied with food from the permanent settlement.⁶¹ During the winter, livestock in the mountains was usually only accompanied by herdsmen and collectives that had more members and more livestock.⁶²

The lack of water presented the greatest challenge in summer for both people and livestock while up in the mountains. In places without active springs or wells, water would be collected in spring when the snow melted and during summer showers in puddles that formed in natural depressions with homogenous soil bottoms that could retain water over longer periods of time. Stockbreeders would collect snow in holes in the karst located on sun-exposed slopes, tamp it down, and cover it with a thick layer of straw or hay. Wealthier stockbreeders built cisterns and would occasionally dig wells.⁶³

Goats were mainly grazed with other kinds of livestock on the mountains surrounding the town of Glamoč, as opposed to the Vlasic mountain, where only sheep, an occasional head of cattle, a horse, and some pigs would be grazed, accompanied by the necessary number of shepherd dogs. Offspring would never be grazed.⁶⁴ Earlier on, goats were a far more familiar sight, and there were more of them.⁶⁵

7. Medical Treatment for Goats in the Vrbas Banovina

Two of the main features of the domestic Balkan goat are its hardiness and extraordinary resistance to disease, which compensates for its somewhat lower output of meat and milk in comparison to other breeds.⁶⁶ Goats are mostly prone to scabies and fascioliasis. They can also become infested with ticks, which can spread disease. On rare occasions there were outbreaks of anthrax and foot-and-mouth disease. In the Ključ district, forty-five goats were reported to have died from anthrax in 1933, and another five in 1934.⁶⁷ In 1935, twenty-nine were reported in the Sanski Most district, followed by twelve cases in the Banja Luka district in 1936.⁶⁸ Additional cases also were reported in other districts of the Vrbas Banovina as well.⁶⁹ Sometimes they would fall victim to rabies or snake bites. Farmers would provide first aid during births of kids and castrations of bucks. The usual

⁶⁰ Popović 1940: 68–69.

⁶¹ Milojević 1923: 36–37.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 14–18.

⁶³ Popović 1940: 141.

⁶⁴ Filipović 1927: 33.

⁶⁵ Popović 1963: 107.

⁶⁶ Marković 1945: 4–5.

⁶⁷ „Borba protiv crnog prišta”, *Vrbaske novine*, 7. 7. 1936, 2; Šerić 1949: 26–31; Popović 1940: 65.

⁶⁸ Šute 2010: 199–200.

⁶⁹ „Borba protiv crnog prišta”, *Vrbaske novine*, 7. 7. 1936, 2.

treatment was bleeding the ears, whereby a farmer would make a tiny cut at the tip of one of the animal's ears using a knife or razor and then tap it with a stick to encourage bleeding. Prayers and chants were also sometimes used.

In 1934 the Department of Veterinary Epidemiology was established in the Vrbas Banovina under the auspices of the Institute for Hygiene in Banja Luka to deal with infectious diseases among livestock, which had reached pandemic levels. In 1935, four veterinarians were employed at the Royal Administration in the Vrbas Banovina along with twenty-three county veterinarians and two city veterinarians in Banja Luka and Donji Vakuf.⁷⁰ When there were major outbreaks, livestock markets were closed and the movement of diseased livestock was banned in the afflicted counties.⁷¹ Fearing these measures, peasants would not report cases of diseased animals, and only in rare cases would they seek professional assistance. Accounts by district veterinarians confirm this. In the Glamoč district, no one would call a veterinarian unless "the animal was valuable or there was an epidemic." For more well-to-do families, the loss of a single animal was not of much significance. When this was the practice of the better-off, then, "in the opinion of those less privileged, it was unbecoming to seek help in certain cases." Those who did would "stick out like a sore thumb" in the community.

In more remote settlements, castrations were performed by the farmers themselves.⁷² In the district of Prijedor, peasants would simply wait for the diseased animal to recover. Every village had "not only one quack in this regard. It seems all of them are experts in the field. They ask each other for advice, try just about anything, and when it is of no use, they eventually turn to a veterinarian for help."⁷³ According to a report by a veterinarian in the Sanski Most district, "people today are still, due to their ignorance and backward ideas, under the delusion that magical rituals" were worth more than assessment and treatment offered by a veterinarian. As a result, a farmer would visit a veterinarian so he could "write down something for him on a piece of paper,"⁷⁴ even though he had his animal had been examined and prescribed proper medicine. "Quackery is a widespread business" in the Ključ district. Livestock were treated "according to traditional methods of bleeding, [which was the case] for all breeds of animals." If an animal had difficulty with poor digestion or was underweight, "they trim a third eyelash and they cut convex parts of mucous membrane with cartilage." If the animal was bitten by a snake, they would "blow tobacco smoke around it. If there is swelling, there is hellebore. Apart from this, there is a conviction that inscriptions, witchcraft, and quackery yield results."⁷⁵ Medications were expensive for them, so it was understandable that they would turn to "quacks for treatment. Only if there is serious disease or injury do they seek out a veterinarian."⁷⁶ In the hillier areas of the Vrbas Banovina, peasants would keep sick animals in the house with them during fall and winter

⁷⁰ Bahtijarević 1935: 559.

⁷¹ ARS, KBUVB, III-6, dok. br. 660, Sresko načelstvo u Kotor Varošu, KBUVBPO, Kotor Varoš, 31. 7. 1939.

⁷² AJ, 67-25-203, Godišnji izvještaj sreskog veterinara sreza Glamoč dr Novaka Varenike za godinu 1932.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, Godišnji izvještaj sreskog veterinara Prijedorskog sreza Pere Kovačevića za godinu 1932.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, Godišnji izvještaj sreskog veterinara sreza Sanski Most za godinu 1932.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, Godišnji izvještaj sreskog veterinara Ključkog sreza za godinu 1932.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, Godišnji izvještaj sreskog veterinara Derventskog sreza Ibrahima Pajzetovića za godinu 1932.

until they recovered.⁷⁷ In some districts, anthrax was not limited to livestock. It also spread to people who consumed their flesh, which occasionally resulted in death. In 1940, along with goats and other animals, cases were also recorded of children in the Glamoč district who had contracted foot-and-mouth disease by drinking water from puddles.⁷⁸

According to the Animal Health Law of July 14, 1928, every municipality was required to arrange for a dumpsite for animal carcasses.⁷⁹ Many peasants failed to follow the regulations, which resulted them being disposed of in remote sites,⁸⁰ tossed into ravines, buried, or even being left unburied.⁸¹

8. Legislation Stipulating the Number of Goats kept per Homestead

Raising and feeding goats required little effort and very small amounts of money because goats could find food virtually anywhere.⁸² People with small lots could not keep cows, but they were able to raise two to three goats.⁸³ With the exception of two kilograms of salt per year, there were no other expenses required.⁸⁴ Every farmer, very much like every forest expert, was aware that goats fed on trees and brush. Goats bit off any buds, leaves, and young branches from a tree it could reach. “If a new branch springs from a browsed tree and a goat bites it off again, the tree will soon lose its vitality and begin to dry out.” Extensive browsing resulted in large areas of thickets. Due to constant “biting off, trees lose their ability to grow strong, new branches” and turn into thick shrubbery with many undeveloped branches. Damage to the woods was caused not only by goats but by herdsmen as well. “Those tips that are out of reach for a goat are cut by the herdsman with his axe. He does this to provide as much fodder for his goats to browse as possible.” Preparing sheaves of branches for sustenance throughout the winter also inflicted damage to the woods.⁸⁵ These sheaves were made by pruning branches of deciduous trees, mostly fir, ash, oak, and beech. The bare branches would be stacked near barns where the cattle would spend the cold season.⁸⁶ In the mountainous areas of the Vrbas Banovina (Vlasic, Imljani, Klekovaca, Vitorog), livestock would be offered sheaves of coniferous trees prior to hay, which was officially forbidden.⁸⁷

To protect the forests, reductions in the number of goats began during Austro-Hungarian rule. The tax system they inherited from the Ottoman Empire did not differentiate between sheep and goats, and taxes were the same for both and for the rest of the farm

⁷⁷ „Selo”, *Otadžbina*, 26. 12. 1936, 2.

⁷⁸ „Borba protiv crnog prišta”, *Vrbaske novine*, 7. 7. 1936, 2; Popović 1940: 65.

⁷⁹ ARS, KBUVB, III-2, dok. br. 112, Banja Luka, 28. 11. 1930.

⁸⁰ AJ, 67-25-203, Godišnji izvještaj sreskog veterinara Gračaničkog sreza Mate Bartolovića za godinu 1932.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, Godišnji izvještaj veterinara sreske ispostave Kulen Vakuf Gavre Andjukića za godinu 1932.

⁸² *Ibid.*, Godišnji izvještaj sreskog veterinara sreza Glamoč dr Novaka Varenike za godinu 1932.

⁸³ „Krava malog čovjeka”, *Vrbaske novine*, 3. 11. 1937, 3.

⁸⁴ Vukosavljević 1983: 139.

⁸⁵ ARS, ZDIL, Dosije ing. Milana Jankovića, br. dos. 83/3, Milan Janković, Stanje i unapređenje ovčarstva u Vrbaskoj banovini, Banja Luka, 1929-1930; Nenadić, Petračić, Levaković, Škorić 1930: 504; Veseli 1938: 228.

⁸⁶ Šerbetić 1938: 197; Šmalcelj 1947: 64.

⁸⁷ ARS, ZDIL, Dosije ing. Milana Jankovića, br. dos. 83/3, Milan Janković, Stanje i unapređenje ovčarstva u Vrbaskoj banovini, Banja Luka, 1929-1930.

animals. No tax was paid on kids and lambs up to the age of one.⁸⁸ Taxes on goats were increased to discourage the population from keeping goats and encourage keeping sheep instead. In Herzegovina and in some districts in Bosnia, households were permitted to keep up to ten sheep per household tax-free.⁸⁹

The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, however, opted for a more sinister approach to the issue.⁹⁰ The Decree of the Central Government for Bosnia and Herzegovina of August 15, 1879, stated that “sheep and goats are banned from grazing in densely populated forests.” These dense forests were made up of tree communities with intertwined canopies and little sunlight. Here these densely populated forests included coniferous forests, all mixed coniferous and deciduous forests, all long life-cycle forests, and all middle and short life-cycle forests found in karst and steep terrains acting as protective forests. This was a valid norm until the Law on Forestry was introduced on December 21, 1929, which stipulated that goats were forbidden from grazing in forests. The law made an exception for underdeveloped areas where the practice was allowed due to economic reasons. If an official request was made by municipal representatives, first-instance administrative authorities were entitled to allow poorer families who were obliged to pay no more than fifty dinars in direct taxes to graze goats in forests to support themselves. No grazing was allowed in protective forests, torrential zones, or forests under protection to replenish their stands to prevent browsing goats from causing damage. The Law on Forestry was amended by the Ministry of Forests and Mines on July 20, 1930, with the introduction of a rulebook for grazing goats in forests, which extended the existing ban to torrential zones and stipulated in more detail the exact number of goats allowed per family and areas designated for grazing. The law forbade “grazing for trade or financial gain.”⁹¹ Following a proposal by the line minister, the Council of Ministers issued a new decree on goat farming in 1935, which required the number of goats be gradually decreased to one goat per family member by March 1939. According to the plan, goat farmers were required to reduce the ratio to 3:1 by March 1936, 2:1 by March 1937 so the goal could be achieved. This decree did not sanction kids up to the age of one year, and it stipulated that only one buck was permitted for every ten does. From March 1939, only individuals obliged to pay no more than one hundred dinars direct tax per year were allowed to farm goats. By a decision of the Council of Ministers, the Minister of Forests and Mines was authorized to set the tax for grazing goats. Those who failed to follow the decree or disregarded orders issued by the governing authorities would be fined anywhere from fifty to three thousand dinars or sent to prison for a period of five to thirty days.⁹² Despite the law, goat farmers continued to secretly graze their animals in forests, but they were often caught by gamekeepers and forced to pay fines.⁹³

How goats and other types of livestock were fed in the Vrbas Banovina depended on

⁸⁸ Hadžibegić 1960: 64.

⁸⁹ *Rezultati popisa marve u Bosni i Hercegovini od godine 1895*, 1896: 20.

⁹⁰ Janković, Džuverović 1938: 52.

⁹¹ „Pravilnik o puštanju koza u šume”, *Službene novine Kraljevine Jugoslavije*, 13. 9. 1930, 1811–1812.

⁹² „Uredba o držanju koza”, *Službene novine Kraljevine Jugoslavije*, 28. 6. 1935, 352; „Krava malog čovjeka”, *Vrbaske novine*, 7. 11. 1937, 3; Dubić 1978: 147.

⁹³ „Krajiški pejzaži”, *Službeni list Vrbaske banovine*, 28. 7. 1932, 7.

the area designated for grazing on land owned by the state.⁹⁴ Every effort was made to reduce the number of goats throughout a major part of what was then Yugoslavia proved to be unsuccessful. Despite the legislation regulating the issue being complete and straightforward, the issue of goats remained unresolved.

Table 4. Number of goats in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in the 1929–1939 period

Year	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934
Number of goats	1,803,574	1,731,430	1,928,224	1,871,618	1,871,158	1,881,126

Year	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
Number of goats	1,895,905	1,905,993	1,901,363	1,890,386	1,866,131

While the number of major livestock breeds steadily increased between 1929 and 1939, those of goats remained rather variable. The number of horses increased 11.68% from 1,140,343 to 1,273,503, donkeys 15.9% from 106,117 to 123,060, cows 13.22% from 3,728,038 to 4,224,596, pigs 30.98 from 2,674,800 to 3,503,564, and of sheep 31.26% from 7,735,957 to 10,153,831. The number of goats, however, increased only 3.47% from 1,803,574 to 1,866,131.

In 1930 (Table 4), it reached its lowest (1,731,430), only to reach its highest the following year (1,928,224). The data shows the authorities had failed to significantly reduce the numbers through legislative means: There was a slight increase in 1936 instead of the reduction stipulated by the decree issued in 1935. There was an almost imperceptible reduction in the following year, but the overall figures for 1935 to 1939 reveal a meager 2.09% decrease with 1,866,131 goats in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia at the end of this period.⁹⁵ If the hidden and unreported goats had been included, it would be reasonable to assume the number would have exceeded 2,000,000.

9. Conclusion

This study shows that, on the whole, agricultural production was the primary industry in the Vrbas Banovina and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. During the interwar period, its share of the country's GDP was over 50%, with the farming industry responsible for one-third of this. A major branch of this was goat farming. According to statistics from 1932, the Vrbas Banovina was below the Yugoslav average in terms of total number of goats, number per km², and per one hundred inhabitants. Even though goat farming was not of

⁹⁴ Sedmak 1939: 234.

⁹⁵ *Statistički godišnjak 1938-1939*, 1939: 180–181; *Statistički godišnjak za 1940*, 1941: 170–171.

much significance for the Vrbas Banovina, it did represent a major supplementary source of income for many homesteads—and for some it was the only one. Poor townfolk and those with little land and no resources to sustain a cow would choose to keep a goat or two. For many, products such as meat, milk, cheese, or sour cream were the most important food sources, apart from bread.

The dominant variety of goat in the Vrbas Banovina was the Balkan goat, but there were also Saanen and hybrids between the two. The main properties of the Balkan goat are its extraordinary resistance to diseases, its stamina, and its ability to move over rugged terrains for a long period of time, as well as its adaptability to poor living conditions and lack of food, which were present in its natural environment for most of the time. It made an excellent use of meager pastures in areas lacking water, its yield of meat, milk, and number of kids increased as soon as it came across more abundant grazing fields.

Goats were grazed in orchards and hedges, in pastures, in reaped meadows and in fields after the crops had been harvested. In addition, they ate buds, leaves, and saplings in forests, which resulted in the emergence of thickets. Goats were considered a major pest, regardless of its value for homesteads. In 1935, in order to protect forests from goats, the authorities in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia tried to introduce legislation to reduce their number. These measures ultimately failed, and the numbers remained relatively constant, as demonstrated by data collected in 1939.

REFERENCES:

Unpublished Sources:

Arhiv Jugoslavije (AJ), Beograd, Fond Ministarstva poljoprivrede.

Arhiv Republike Srpske (ARS), Banja Luka,

Fond Kraljevske banske uprave Vrbaske banovine (KBUVB), Poljoprivredno odjeljenje (PO).

Zbirka dosijea istaknutih ličnosti. (ZDIL)

Published Sources:

Definitivni rezultati popisa stanovništva od 31. marta 1931. godine, Prisutno stanovništvo, broj kuća i domaćinstava, Knjiga I, Beograd: Državna štamparija Kraljevine Jugoslavije, 1937.

Definitivni rezultati popisa stanovništva od 31. marta 1931. godine, Prisutno stanovništvo po veroispovesti, Knjiga II, Beograd: Državna štamparija Kraljevine Jugoslavije, 1938.

Definitivni rezultati popisa stanovništva od 31. marta 1931. godine, Prisutno stanovništvo po glavnim zanimanjima, Knjiga IV, Sarajevo: Državna štamparija, 1940.

Die Landwirtschaft in Bosnien und der Hercegovina, Sarajevo: Landesdruckerel, 1899.

Poljoprivredna godišnja statistika 1935, Beograd: Ministarstvo poljoprivrede, 1936.

Poljoprivredna godišnja statistika 1939, Beograd: Ministarstvo poljoprivrede, 1940.

Rezultati popisa domaće stoke od 31. januara 1921, Beograd: Direkcija državne direkcije u Beogradu, 1927.

Rezultati popisa marve u Bosni i Hercegovini od godine 1895, Sarajevo: Zemaljska vlada za Bosnu i Hercegovinu, 1896.

Statistički godišnjak 1932, Knjiga IV, Beograd: Državna štamparija Kraljevine Jugoslavije, 1934.

Statistički godišnjak 1937, Knjiga VIII, Beograd: Državna štamparija, 1938.

Statistički godišnjak 1938-1939, Knjiga IX, Beograd: Državna štamparija, 1939.
Statistički godišnjak 1940, Knjiga X, Beograd: Državna štamparija, 1941.

References:

- Aleksić, D. *Privreda Srbije u Drugom svetskom ratu*, Beograd: Institut za noviju istoriju, 2002. (Serbian Cyrilic)
- Bahtijarević, F. „Veterinari u Bosni i Hercegovini 1910. i 1935.” *Veterinaria*, XXIV, 3–4, 1935, 557–560.
- Balić M. „Stočna stanica u Gacku”, *Agronomski glasnik*, 2, 1930, 52–57.
- Belić, J. „Koza”, u: M. Josifović (ur.) *Poljoprivredna enciklopedija*, 1, Zagreb: Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod, 1967, 686–690.
- _____. *Stočarstvo u Jugoslaviji od njenog nastanka do raspada 1991*, Beograd: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 1995. (Serbian Cyrilic)
- Ćeranić, V. *Kozarstvo*, Beograd: Ekonomski biro, 1984.
- Dubić, S. „Poljoprivreda Jugoslavije između dva rata”, *Socijologija sela*, 61/62, 1978, 140–149.
- Đurđević, D. „Poljoprivreda Vrbaske banovine”, *Glasnik Jugoslovenskog profesorskog društva*, XIV, 10–12, 1934, 953–958.
- Filipović, S. *Planina Vlašić i mljekarstvo na njoj*, Beograd: Ministarstvo poljoprivrede i voda, 1927.
- Franić, I. *Gajenje koza*, Beograd: Nolit, 1987.
- Garić Petrović, G. *Stočarstvo Srbije od 1978. do 1912. godine*, Beograd: Istorijski institut, 2022.
- Hadžibegić, H. „Porez na sitnu stoku i korišćenje ispaša”, *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*, VIII–IX, 1960, 83–109.
- Hrvoj, D. „Razvoj stočarstva u hrvatskim zemljama”, *Napredak*, 1930, 1929, 119–126.
- Janković, M. Džuverović, J. „Stočarstvo i stočarska proizvodnja u Bosni i Hercegovini”, u: *Bosna i Hercegovina kao privredno područje*, Sarajevo: A. Koen, E. Džikovski i A. Sunarić, novinari, 1938, 49–63.
- Jovanović, V. *Vardarska banovina 1929–1941*, Beograd: Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije, 2011. (Serbian Cyrilic)
- Krstić, Đ, *Agrarna politika u Bosni i Hercegovini*, Sarajevo: Bosanska pošta, 1938. (Serbian Cyrilic)
- Lakatoš, J. *Privredni almanah Jugoslovenskog Lloyd*, Zagreb: Jugoslovenski Lloyd, 1929.
- Lazić, M. *Poljoprivredna proizvodnja Kraljevine Jugoslavije*, Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, 1999. (Serbian Cyrilic)
- Marković, D. *O sanskoj kozi*, Beograd: Iproz, 1945. (Serbian Cyrilic)
- Milojević, B. *Kupreško, Vukovsko, Ravno i Glamočko polje*, Beograd: Srpska kraljevska akademija, 1923. (Serbian Cyrilic)
- Nenadić, Đ. Petračić, A. Levaković, A. Škorić, V. „Paša koza u šumama, Izvještaji”, *Šumarski list*, 12, 1930, 503–506.
- Nimac, F. „Čobanovanje, Život i tradicije pastira dalmatinske zagore na bosanskim planinama”, *Etnografska istraživanja i građa*, II, 1940, 102–130.
- Pelagić, V. *Istorija bosansko-hercegovačke bune*, Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1953. (Serbian Cyrilic)
- Perušić, A. „Koza i šuma”, *Šumarski list*, 12, 1940, 573–591.
- Petranović, B. *Istorija Jugoslavije 1918–1988, Prva knjiga, Kraljevina Jugoslavija 1914–1941*, Beograd: Nolit, 1988.
- Popović, C. „Stočarska kretanja u Bosni i Hercegovini”, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja u Sarajevu*, XVIII, 1963, 105–119.
- Popović, J. „Ljetni stanovi na planini Hrblijini i Krugu”, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Kraljevine Jugoslavije*, LI – 1939, Druga sveska, 1940, 61–92.
- Sedmak, B. „Privredne prilike u Bosni i Hercegovini”, *Pregled*, Knjiga XV, 1939, 229–238.
- Šmalcelj, I. *Malo ovčarstvo*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1947.

- Stipčević, A. *Iliri*, Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1989.
- Sušac, I. „Imena koza” *Napredak*, 1940, 1939, 199–201.
- Sušić, V. „Trgovina stokom u Bosni i Hercegovini”, u: *Bosna i Hercegovina kao privredno područje*, Sarajevo: A. Koen, E. Džikovski i A. Sunarić, novinari, 1938, 357–360.
- Šehić, N. *Bosna i Hercegovina, 1918–1925*, Sarajevo: Institut za istoriju u Sarajevu, 1991.
- Šerbetić, A. „Razvoj šumarstva u Bosni i Hercegovini”, u: *Bosna i Hercegovina kao privredno područje*, Sarajevo: A. Koen, E. Džikovski i A. Sunarić, novinari, 1938, 163–205.
- Šerić, H. *Istorijski osvrt na razvoj stočarstva u Bosni i Hercegovini*, Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1953.
- _____. *Istorijat veterinarstva u Bosni i Hercegovini*, Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1949.
- Šute, I. *Slogom slobodi!, Gospodarska sloga 1935–1941*, Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2010.
- Veseli, D. „Zaštita šuma i pošumljavanje”, u: *Bosna i Hercegovina kao privredno područje*, Sarajevo: A. Koen, E. Džikovski i A. Sunarić, novinari, 1938, 221–229.
- Vojinović, P. *Vrbaska banovina u političkom sistemu Kraljevine Jugoslavije*, Banjaluka: Filozofski fakultet, 1997. (Serbian Cyrilic)
- Vukosavljević, S. *Istorija seljačkog društva III*, Beograd: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 1983. (Serbian Cyrilic)

Periodicals:

Otadžbina

Službeni list Vrbaske banovine

Službene novine Kraljevine Jugoslavije

Vrbaske novine

ЖЕЉКО САВАНОВИЋ
Универзитет у Бањој Луци
Филозофски факултет, Одсек за историју

КОЗАРСТВО ВРБАСКЕ БАНОВИНЕ

Резиме

Послије Првог свјетског рата у Европи је формирано више нових држава, међу којима и Краљевина Срба, Хрвата и Словенаца. Ова држава је 1929. године преименована у Краљевину Југославију, а административно-територијална подјела на 33 области, установљена је 1922. године и замијењена подјелом на девет бановина и управу града Београда. Врбаска бановина је заједно са Дринском бановином чинила средиште Краљевине Југославије. Становништво се углавном бавило пољопривредом, чији је удио у укупном националном доходу Југославије износио за цијели међуратни период више од 50%. Од овог процента око $\frac{1}{3}$ припадала је сточарству.

Важну грану сточарства у појединим дијеловима Југославије чинило је козарство. Југославија је 1932. године имала 1.871.618 коза. Највише их је било у јужним, већином планинским крајевима државе, са најсиромашнијим живљем. Тада се у Врбаској бановини налазило 126.055 коза, што је процентуално износило 6,74% свих коза у држави. Срез Бања Лука имао је највише коза, затим срезови Јајце и Грахово, а најмање срезови Добој, Дубица и Дервента.

О важности козарства у прошлости на подручју Југославије говоре географски називи добијени по козама. Многи од њих припадали су територији Врбаске бановине: Козара, Козарац, Козаруша, Козица, Козин, Јарице, Јарчиште и други. Доминантна врста козе у Врбаској бановини је домаћа балканска коза, а заступљене су још санска и мелези санске и домаће баканске козе. Главна карактеристика домаће балканске козе је изузетна отпорност на болести и издржљивост, што надомјешћује слабији принос у месоу и млијеку у односу на друге расе. Становништво без довољно земље није могло да прехрањује краву, али је било у стању да то чини са двије до три козе. Веома је корисна животиња за најсиромашније терене, допирући свуда гдје ни једна друга животиња не може и гдје нема довољно хране ни за овце. Не само шумским стручњацима, већ и сваком сељаку било је познато како се коза исхрањује у шумама и шикарама, првенствено пуповима, лишћем и младицама са дрвећа. Штету шумама наносили су и власници коза припремањем лисника за прехрану коза преко зиме.

Покушај власти да законским мјерама знатно смањи број коза није успио, што показују статистички подаци. Умјесто да 1936. године буде мање коза, као што је прописано Уредбом о држању коза донијетом 1935. године, њихов број мало се и повећао. Незнатно смањење наступило је 1937. године. У периоду од 1935. до 1939. године број коза смањено за само 2,09%. Југославија је 1939. године још увијек имала 1.866.131 козу.

Кључне речи: коза, козарство, сточарство, Врбаска бановина, Босна и Херцеговина, Краљевина Југославија, Европа.