

1.01 Izvirni znanstveni članek

UDK 316.334.55:347.761(497.452)"18"

Prejeto: 19. 5. 2016

**Gorazd Stariha**

dr., arhivski svetnik, Zgodovinski arhiv Ljubljana, Enota za Gorenjsko Kranj, Savska cesta 8, SI-4000 Kranj
E-pošta: gorazd.stariha@guest.arnes.si

Občina Dovje in njeni gozdovi

IZVLEČEK

V procesu razslojevanja vaškega prebivalstva v 19. stoletju so vaščani dovške občine leta 1844 sklenili razdeliti do tedaj skupne gozdove. V predstavljenem dogajanju ob delitvi gozdov, plačevanju občinskega pastirja in sekvestraciji se po eni strani izraža enotnost vaške skupnosti najprej v odstavljanju občinskega rihtarja, potem v sklicevanju na stare običaje, zasedanjih občinskega odbora, ki so bila bolj zasedanja vaške skupnosti, nadalje v pooblastilih soobčanom, ki so jim najbolj zaupali, do enotnega in vsesplošnega upora cele občine oblastnim organom, ko so hoteli zaščititi skupno lastnino. Po drugi strani pa je opazen nastop novega »duha časa«, ko vaški povzpetniki, tako kot povsod, niso bili več zadovoljni s starim izenačevalnim povprečjem, kar najbolj kaže želja po razdelitvi skupne lastnine in boj za čim večji delež. V takšnih razmerah so seveda izgubljali veljavo tudi stari običaji, vezani na enakopravno skupnost.

KLJUČNE BESEDE

Dovje, Mojstrana, 19. stoletje, občinska paša, sekvestracija, občinski rihtarji, vaški župani, gospodstvo Loka, fužina Sava

ABSTRACT

THE DOVJE MUNICIPALITY AND ITS FORESTS

During the process of stratification of the village population in the 19th century the inhabitants of the Dovje Municipality decided in 1844 to divide what had previously been common forests. The described developments surrounding the division of forests, the reimbursement of the municipal shepherd and the sequestration reveal, on the one hand, the unanimity of the village community in deposing the village mayor and judge, invoking old customs, municipal council or rather village community sittings, granting authorisations to most trusted fellow villagers, as well as a united and general revolt of the entire municipality against the authorities to protect their common property. On the other hand, the same period witnessed the first visible signs of the new "zeitgeist", when the village social climbers, just like everywhere else, began to show a growing discontent with the old equalising average, which was best expressed in the desire to divide common property and the scramble for the greatest possible share. Such conditions undoubtedly also led to the diminishing value of old customs that epitomised equal community.

KEY WORDS

Dovje, Mojstrana, 19th century, common grazing, sequestration, municipal judges, village mayors, Loka seignior, Sava ironworks



 S U M M A R Y

The Dovje Municipality and its forests

In 1844 the inhabitants of Dovje and Mojstrana decided to divide what had previously been previously common forests into individual properties. In the desire to accelerate the stratification of the village community they were unanimous, but the implementation of the aforementioned decision proved more complicated when their long standing, government-appointed village mayor and judge fell out of favour with the local inhabitants and was arbitrarily deposed. The deposition met with the approval of a vast majority of villagers (the collected signatures of house masters), but to the chagrin of the nobility, which regarded this act as a breach into their domain of power.

The division of forests was brought to a halt in the revolutionary year of 1848 and later hindered by sequestration. The old village community and customs that had been practiced since “time immemorial” began to crumble. The first sign was most certainly the desire to divide the common forest, whereas the embittered former village mayor and judge refused to drive his cattle to common grazing and take care of the municipal shepherd, as had been customary since “time immemorial”. Soon he surrounded himself by an ever growing circle of malcontents who were determined to break with the old tradition. Eventually, the distraught current mayor summoned all municipal councillors and other local notables to establish that the customary common grazing was still mandatory for everyone, a position which was also upheld by the state government.

The next blow to the municipal or rather village community was the sequestration of municipal forests, stripping the municipality of the right to freely dispose of them. The municipal authorities, refusing to tolerate this situation any longer, cut down the trees and burned charcoal for the account of the

municipality, but the sequestration administration confiscated it and auctioned it off to the Sava Mining Company. This caused a major uproar in the local community, which gathered en masse and prevented the Sava Mining Company from taking the coal. The village leadership faced judicial penalty for the revolt, but of course petitioned to the righteous emperor.

After the sequestration the inhabitants of Dovje and Mojstrana continued with the division of forests and mutual relations. Accusations flew in all directions, but in the end everything returned to the way it was before—as stereotypical as it may sound—with the rich and the powerful taking the biggest piece of the pie.

The presented developments surrounding the division of forests, the reimbursement of the municipal shepherd and the sequestration reveal, on the one hand, the unanimity of the village community in deposing the village mayor and judge, invoking old customs, municipal council or rather village community sittings (even well into the period of elected municipal councils after 1851), granting authorisations to most trusted fellow villagers, as well as in a united and general revolt of the entire municipality against the authorities to protect their common property.

On the other hand, the same period witnessed the first visible signs of the new “zeitgeist”, when the village social climbers, just like everywhere else, began to show a growing discontent with the old equalising average, which was best expressed in the desire to divide common property and the scrambling for the greatest possible share. Such conditions undoubtedly also led to the diminishing value of old customs that epitomised equal community.

Amid such developments, mayors were also able to acquaint themselves with the side-effects of democracy: one the one hand, with the capriciousness of villagers (and their discontent with every single mayor) and on the other, with their own personal transformation once they grew comfortable sitting in power.