

FINAL REPORT ON MEDIA STUDIES: SERBIA (1950s to present)

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, Ljubljana.

National coordinator: Igor Z. Zagar, Educational Research Institute,
Ljubljana & University of Primorska, Koper

Researcher: Andrej Pinter, Science and Research Center Koper, University
of Primorska



Project report prepared for EMEDIATE, WP2: "deliverable" D4.

Project title: **EMEDIATE: Media and Ethics of a European Public Sphere from the Treaty of Rome to the 'War on Terror'**.

EU Sixth Framework Program, Specific Targeted Research Project, Priority 7: Citizens and Governance in a Knowledge-Based Society. Project no. CIT2-CT-2004-506027.

FINAL REPORT ON MEDIA STUDIES: SERBIA (1950s to present)

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, Ljubljana.

National coordinator: Igor Z. Zagar, Educational Research Institute,
Ljubljana & University of Primorska, Koper

Researcher: Andrej Pinter, Science and Research Center Koper, University
of Primorska

CONTENTS

1. General introduction to the report	5
2. The Serbian media landscape	7
2.1 Information sources on Media in the Socialist Yugoslavia	7
2.2 Media landscapes in the socialist Yugoslavia (1950s to 1990)	10
2.2.1 Press in the socialist Serbia	10
2.2.2 Radio in the socialist Serbia.....	16
2.2.3 Television in the socialist Serbia.....	20
2.3 Serbian media landscapes during the disintegration of Yugoslavia (1989 to 1991).....	22
2.3.1 Serbian press (1989-1991)	22
2.3.2 Serbian radio (1989-1991).....	25
2.3.3 Serbian television (1989-1991).....	26
2.4 Present day media landscapes in Serbia (1992 to 2005)	26
2.4.1 Serbian press (1992 until present)	27
2.4.2 Serbian radio (1992 until present)	27
2.4.3 Serbian television (1992 until present)	29

2.4.4 Word wide web in Serbia	32
3. Media studies on Serbian media (1950s to present).....	34
3.1 CEE Period 1.....	34
Excursus on a study by Arnim (1968)	34
Excursus on a conference proceedings on radio (Sijan 1968).....	36
3.2 CEE Period 2.....	38
Excursus on a report by Plavsic and Mavric (1990)	38
3.3 CEE Period 3.....	39
3.4 EMEDIATE event 1 – October 1956 in Budapest.....	41
3.5 EMEDIATE event 2 – Building of Berlin Wall	41
3.6 EMEDIATE event 3 – 1968 in Paris and Prague	41
3.7 EMEDIATE event 4 – Fall of the Berlin Wall; reunification of Germany; international refugee crisis	41
3.8 EMEDIATE event 5 – Second Gulf War.....	41
4. “European values” in Serbian media studies	42
4.1 Respect (and disrespect) of ethnic identity.....	42
“Media wars” before warfare or ethnic “homogenization”	43
Us and “the other” during the Balkan wars in 1990s.....	45
Ethnicity and Europe	50
4.2 Pluralism.....	51
Political pluralism of the Serbian media in the early socialism.....	51
Political pluralism of the Serbian media towards the end of the socialist era.....	52
Pluralism of ethnic expression.....	52
Pluralism after the disintegration of Yugoslavia	55
4.3 Objectivity of media	56
Objectivity of news after the break with Cominform	56
Objectivity and the disintegration of socialism.....	57
Objectivity, political pluralism, and the public.....	59
5. Concluding comment.....	61
References:	63
Appendix 1	70
Serbian media and media studies before 1950s	70
Appendix 2.....	79

Socialist conceptions of journalism, mass media, and public opinion ...	79
Appendix 3	89
Legal regulation of mass media in the socialist Yugoslavia	89
Journalists in socialism	97
Foreign correspondents	106
Appendix 4	108
Comparative data on media landscapes in the socialist Yugoslavia	108
Appendix 5	112
Bibliography of the Serbian media studies (1950s to present)*	112
Period 1	112
Period 2	115
Period 3	116
Appendix 6	120
Selective annotated bibliography	120

FINAL REPORT ON MEDIA STUDIES: SERBIA (1950s to present)

1. General introduction to the report

EMEDIATE project is aimed to investigate the way media, ethics and values overlap in the creation of a genuine European public sphere. It is assumed that debates in public (media) offer appropriate information on concerns of the emergent transnational space of politics, culture and society. It is also assumed that these overlaps between media, ethics, and values emerge differently (with different effects, with different histories, and with different social or political connotations) in parts of Europe. One part of this international project – specifically, the work-package W2 within which the present report was prepared – was deliberately devoted to the analysis of media studies within different countries of Europe in order to provide a view on media from media and mass communication scholars which has been developing since 1950s until the present day. Media studies were analyzed in order to find out how notions of Europe, European Union, European values and so forth were discussed, negotiated and represented by the media in respective countries.

The present report focuses on one country specified by the consortium agreement: Serbia. This is a country which lies in the heart of the Balkan Peninsula at the South East of European continent. The country has had a turbulent history and still finds itself in a politically complex situation in the present time. Throughout most of the period covered in this report Serbia was a federal socialist republic of Yugoslavia; from after WW2 until 1990s. After the disintegration of the former federation, Serbian people found themselves thrown into a bloody warfare which spread in the territories of three former Yugoslav republics and one former autonomous region (i.e. Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, and Kosovo). For some time in the 1990s, also covered in this report, Serbia has been exposed to various international sanctions (diplomatic, political, and economic) and also to other restrictions. These sanctions were imposed on Serbia by the international community because, it is now clear beyond reasonable doubt, its political and military leadership continuously propagated ethnic tensions in the 1990s and also before; and because these tensions led to the use of violence. During the 1990s, Serbia was thus by the will of its leadership as well as by the popular support, involved in the use of armed forces in attempts to resolve political and ethnic conflicts. *Complexity of its history and politics should also account for the specific features of media studies in Serbia.*

Serbia is presently a constitutive part of the federal state Serbia and Montenegro and has recently expressed intentions to join the European Union. It is perhaps important to mention that other former republics of the socialist Yugoslavia (Croatia, Macedonia) also commenced these formal procedures and are thus, like Serbia, becoming foci of interest for the present day European Union.

The present report is structured in three parts with appendices. It follows closely guidelines provided by Lancaster team for the completion of D4 for individual countries. In the first part, this report (1) offers a brief introduction to the media landscapes in Serbia in the period which is covered with this project. In the second part, this report is focused on findings concerning (2) media representation of different “European values” and/or pivotal “events” and “periods of crisis” which by decision of the EMEDIATE consortium generated comprehensive, focused attention of the entire European society and thus contributed to the emergence of its common public sphere, e.g. genuflection of Brandt in Poland, revolutionary outbursts in Paris and Prague in 1968, refugee (immigration) crises and so forth. In the third part, this report offers (3) annotated bibliographies of media studies that are particularly relevant for the present topic. At the end of this report (4), further information which was extracted from Serbian media studies is included as appendices in order to enable more comprehensive understanding of a complex political situation and also complexity of the country’s media landscapes.

The main finding outlined in this report is that the notion of Europe, as well as individual European values or constitutive events for the European public sphere, received little resonance in Serbian media studies. Europe or European Union was not some recognizable abstract category, as it was in other former Yugoslav countries – in Slovenia, for instance, which was explicitly pinpointed in media studies.

Findings of this report may be limited (or partial and incomplete) due to the fact that sources required for this study were hard to locate and obtain. Existing literature was sought through various sources, including specialized libraries devoted to Slavic countries, national and university libraries (for literature from the socialist period), on-line archives as well as through interlibrary loan from different Serbian libraries. It should be noted that unpredictable responsiveness of the later made it impossible to adequately plan or to produce absolutely comprehensive coverage of the relevant Serbian media studies.

2. The Serbian media landscape

Serbian media landscapes are here outlined primarily through information from published sources. Media studies themselves were taken as vehicles of information on media in Serbia. This is consistent with the aims of the EMEDIATE project, but this method also enabled articulation of an important point with respect to the media. It was established during our research that published sources offered only incomplete insight into the Serbian media, and that in certain cases some published sources most likely distorted information on media in Serbia (see also Niksic 1982 for this crucial observation)! This point applied to all three periods covered in the report, but most specifically to the earliest and to the later parts of *period 1*, and to the early parts of *period 3*.

2.1 Information sources on Media in the Socialist Yugoslavia¹

Foreign research of mass communication system and mass media in the socialist Yugoslavia (as well as in individual republics) often cites four local sources for information on the media landscapes after WW2.

The first often mentioned source of information (1) are **publications of the Yugoslav Institute for Journalism** which was based in Belgrade (scr. *Jugoslovenski institut za novinarstvo*).² These publications appeared when media scholarship was really scarce and not very well grounded in the traditions of academic research. Publications of the Institute included historical investigations, audience studies, empirical research of news flows and so forth.

Most often cited publication of the Institute was an occasional compilation on Yugoslav media titled *Stampa, radio, televizija, film u Jugoslaviji* (eng. *The Press, Radio, Television, Film in Yugoslavia*), which appeared first in 1961. It was simultaneously released in English and in French and was intended for an international professional audience. Similar editions of the Institute, but every time with a slightly different focus, appeared also in 1964, 1965, and 1968 (see JIN 1961, JIN 1964, JIN 1965, JIN 1968).

¹ Note that this chapter is shared with the report on the Slovenian media landscapes. For obvious reasons, Slovenian and Serbian media shared legal regulation in the socialist Yugoslavia.

² This Institute was founded in 1959 with an intention to develop comprehensive media research and to document history of the mass media in Yugoslavian republics. The institute prepared publications, organized conferences and spearheaded empirical research on mass media in Yugoslavia. The work of Arnim (1968), Robinson (1977) and others relied substantially on the quantitative reports and figures published by this institute.

In 1962 a journal *Novinarstvo* (eng. *Journalism*) was founded by the Institute and was initially intended as an infrequent internal bulletin for the researchers which followed foreign experience in the realm of mass communication. After approximately three years of existence in this form, *Novinarstvo* transformed and became a prominent public forum for scholarly research of journalism, journalism history, and mass media and also a newsletter for reports on media policy.

Other important and often cited publications of the Institute include the following books *Savremena sredstva informisanja* (1960) which reprinted a series of lectures on the mass media and mass communication held during the first seminary of the Institute; *Anketa o rasprostranjenosti stampe u SFRJ* (1964) which presented results of an empirical survey on the audience of the Yugoslav printed press.

The second source (2) which enables reconstruction of the Serbian media landscape in socialism (as well as landscapes of other Yugoslav republics) was a **periodical publication of the Association of Yugoslav journalists**, *Nasa stampa*.

The third authoritative source on the media landscapes in the socialist Yugoslavia are (3) **official statistical reports of the Statistical Office** of Yugoslavia.³

For the most part, reports of the *Statistical Office of Yugoslavia* were annual and broke down mass media landscapes into familiar statistical categories, such as for instance by individual federal republics, urban/rural regions, formal definitions of the mass media from valid laws, types of publishers and so forth. Occasionally these statistical reports on mass media produced comparisons in the global context for the purpose of which various authoritative sources were cited in the reports (UNESCO, European Broadcasting UNION, World Radio and Television Handbook, etc.). Note that the present document uses only those fragments from reports of the Statistical Office of Yugoslavia which were also cited by other (published) research and are thus verified and credible.

The fourth common source researchers of the Yugoslav mass media consult for information are (4) **periodical publications of different professional associations** related to the mass media and journalism. These publications include journals like *Nasa stampa* (eng. *Our Press*), *Nas publicitet* (eng. *Our Publicity*), *Treci program* (eng. *The Third Program*), and several less systematic sources- Among these other publications one should also mention publications of the Yugoslav broadcasters, such as *Kricac* in Slovenia which was an internal newsletter of the Slovenian national broadcaster RTV Ljubljana, *Godisnjak JRT* which was an annual almanac of the Yugoslav Radio and Television and so forth.

³ Before this office was in operation in the 1950s, official statistical data on the Yugoslav press and radio were collected and published by the Government Bureau of Information (scr. Direkcija za informacije vlade FNRJ); this bureau was located in Belgrade and published annual statistical reports for the press (e.g. in 1948, it published *Statisticni godisnjak Jugoslovenske stampe za 1948 godinu*). This bureau probably succeeded the work of the Central Bureau of the Press which existed already before WW2 in Belgrade (see for instance Cumarevic 1937).

These publications were primarily aimed at the internal audiences within the broadcasters themselves but also brought out precious fragments of media activity.

Among more widely recognized sources, one should primarily mention *Nasa stampa* (eng. *Our Press*) which was started in 1951 by the Yugoslav Association of Journalists in order to cover the activities of the association but was later expanded to cover issues of the press and journalism in a widely accessible and not overly academic manner. Selective bibliography (focused on the contributions to the history of journalism) exists in the edited volume on Yugoslav contemporary journalism (Novak 1964: 421-423).

Nas publicitet (eng. *Our Publicity*) was an official bulletin of the Institute for economic propaganda and publicity which was located in Zagreb. The journal was started in 1954, but attracted merely professional readers. The journal *Treci program* (eng. *The Third Program*) was a unique publication which featured texts that were aired on the Third Program of the Radio Beograd. This was an elite intellectual and artistic radio program in which – in addition to sophisticated musical selection (classical music, jazz, folk) – polemical essays were read, round table discussions were hosted; this was a program which sponsored original cultural and artistic expression such as radio plays, short stories, novels and so forth. A selection from the contents of this program was published in the journal *Treci program*.

An authoritative bibliography of Serbian periodical publications until 1995 exists (Kisic and Bulatovic 1996). This book includes information on periodic publications in Serbian language from the first known attempts to set up a Serbian newspaper (dating from 1768) to the time when the media operated in conditions of crude warfare and political turmoil (bibliography concludes with the year 1995). This bibliography offers also an interesting historical commentary and interpretation (Misovic 1996). But this commentary on the historical development of the Serbian press is focused primarily on the prehistory, and on the 19th century, whereas it paid relatively less attention to the Serbian press 20th century. In particular, Misovic's interpretation left open many questions that refer to the printing press in Serbia after 1991.

Compared to the historical analyses of the Serbian press, little systematic and scholarly work is available on other means of mass communication. As demonstrated in this chapter, information on the Serbian mass media is scattered across various sources.

2.2 Media landscapes in the socialist Yugoslavia (1950s to 1990)

2.2.1 Press in the socialist Serbia

Within the first period of this report, press was central to mass communication in Serbia; the press represented the vehicle of public action which was the most exposed, most polemical and also the most subtle follower of the political and social change in the period. The political system in which Serbian press developed after WW2 closely linked it with political authorities. (In order to provide a more comprehensive portrait of the socialist conceptions of mass communication and mass media, a series of appendices is added at the end of this report!) During socialism, Serbian press, if compared to the press of other federal republics, was in no metaphorical sense the closest to the authorities. The portrait these early socialist media in Serbia painted was one of idealized community of people, working in concert towards the restoration of a newly founded state. The emphasis was clearly on labor, endeavor and coordinated achievement of perfection. As Niksic mentions, the media were supposed to disclose no internal conflict, no asymmetry or contradiction (Niksic 1982). Elements of the “decadent, bourgeois journalism” which for instance include “black chronicles for acts of crime, or personal narrations of “stars” from the public life, culture or sports were eliminated from the press after WW2; although Serbian newspapers before the war were ripe with tabloid news and trivia (Niksic 1982: 136). Niksic cites an article from *Knjizevne novine* where this attitude is clearly demonstrated when the author (in 1948) writes with admiration that the Serbian press “cast away crime chronicles that were always fictional and narrated. The press has done so because it became the real voice of the people, of its healthy progressive aspirations for a normal and creative life which drove criminal tendencies out of our society” (V. G. in Niksic 1982: 136).

As an illustration of how close the Serbian press was factually with the political leadership it is useful to mention another insight from Niksic. He points out that the editorial office of the central Serbian (as well as Yugoslav) political daily *Borba* was located in a building next the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (in Belgrade) and that between the two buildings a direct liaison existed, i.e. a hallway through which directive was communicated (Niksic 1982: 136). Immediately after WW2, the Serbian press was a Leninist system of political propaganda and an extension of political authorities. It was limited by political control and subjected to strict censorship.

A substantial break with older notions and practices of the press was introduced by the Cominform conflict between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia in 1948. Distantiation from the Soviet conception of the mass media as a propaganda system was expressed when the entire Yugoslav press decided to publish and extensively comment on the Soviet

accusations against the Yugoslav communists and the Yugoslav response to the allegations (Niksic 1982: 137). According to Niksic, foreign historians of the socialist press (e.g., Wolfgang Leonard) also recognized that this was a first highly controversial case from the international arena of socialist politics in which positions of the two conflicting parties were made public. The Cominform break, which involved political elites and decision-makers, was not only widely documented, but also widely publicized as a divergence point which enabled successive development of a more humane type of socialism. Central to these attempts were plans to create a more flexible and decentralized mass communication system than it was conceivable with in the Leninist theory of the media as propaganda mouthpieces. Central to these concerns was also decentralization of the mass communication system; but a kind of decentralization in which information flows were still dependent on central intelligence bodies and political elites.

After the break with Cominform, a plethora of theoretical treatises on the mass media and conceptual investigations of the political role of the media appeared in the literature. The work and the role of journalists became more popularized. Systematic projects to organize education of media personnel were started. Robinson describes this transition as a shift from Leninism to Titoism (1977: 14). This shift reflected most in the press. And this shift was also most obvious in the Serbian press, because it had been the closest to the federal politics, to the central organs of political power; furthermore, the status of Serbian press was administratively enhanced when it was defined as trans-republic press, i.e. as the press which was received by a federation-wide audience.

The shift from Leninism to Titoism in the Yugoslav mass communication policy was strongly felt in the Serbian press also because the very first attempts to explore the extent of loosened political control of the press were found in it. A discontinuity in this period, a shift from Leninism to Titoism, and a process of accelerated openness was symbolically marked with the infamous "Djilas affair". In 1952, Milovan Djilas published a series of articles in the central Serbian daily newspaper *Borba*. There Djilas argued for a full freedom of expression and democratic exchange of opinion and he also accused the communist party of nurturing bureaucratic elite which was not unlike another political party of its own. In a book which had been published just before the affair, Djilas already wrote polemically that "nowhere in proper Marxist books it stands that the proletariat of a certain country has to win in *all phases* of the struggle for communism, and yet the dogmatists – quite well paid – and bureaucrats – even better paid by themselves – claim that that is how it should be and is, because they have not been defeated" (Djilas 1951: 7). Opinion like this one led to the reaction of the political authorities, despite the fact that Djilas just became the second-strongest politician (after Tito) not only in Serbia, but also in the entire Yugoslav federation.

That the change in media landscapes, in formal regulation of the media and in political perspective on the role of the media was most clearly expressed in the Serbian press was also due to the mere quantity of the printed media in Serbia. For an illustration on the asymmetrical share of the Serbian press in the entire Yugoslav media landscape in the 1950s, a fragment cited by Arnim (1968) seems informative. In 1956, there existed 1,361 periodical publications in Yugoslavia. By the constitution of 1946, Yugoslavia was divided into 6 federal republics and 2 autonomous regions. From this angle, it is easy to see how far ahead of the other republics the Serbian press was. According to Arnim, the numbers for 1956 were the following:

- Serbia **599** periodical publications registered in 1956; out of which
 - the city of Beograd (capital of the Republic of Serbia) **442** periodical publications registered in 1956
 - Inner Serbia (scr. *Uza Srbija*; the region without its capital which expands South of Belgrade along with the Danube river) **58** periodical publications registered in 1956
 - Vojvodina (an autonomous region North of Serbia, capital Novi Sad, on the Hungarian border) **85** periodical publications registered in 1956
 - Kosovo (an autonomous region South of Serbia, capital Pristina) **14** periodical publications registered in 1956
- Croatia **374** periodical publications registered in 1956
- Slovenia **194** periodical publications registered in 1956
- Bosnia and Herzegovina **111** periodical publications registered in 1956
- Macedonia **63** periodical publications registered in 1956
- Montenegro **20** periodical publications registered in 1956

Arnim argues that these figures were coextensive with the proportions between levels of literacy which were recorded in individual parts of Yugoslavia and their geographical size. According to Arnim's data, in Slovenia 1,8 % of illiteracy was recorded in the 1950s, in Croatia 12,1 %, in Montenegro 21,7 %, in Serbia 21,9 %, in Macedonia 24,5%, and in Bosnia and Herzegovina as much as 32,5 % (Arnim 1968: 47).

Under the socialist regime, Serbian population was able to select from a number of daily newspapers which represented one of the main sources of information. The most important among these were two central daily newspapers *Borba* and *Politika* which were linked closely to the political apparatus of the socialist state and the

communist party.⁴ A set of other newspapers for Serbian audience included *Vecernje Novosti*, *Sport*, *Dnevnik*, and *Privredni pregled*. Daily newspapers in languages of the two ethnic minorities which were officially recognized in the Yugoslavian constitution were also available: *Magyar szó* in Hungarian and *Rilindija* in the Albanian language.

Serbian audience was also able to select from a variety of weekly newspapers. Among these the official statistical records for the year 1963 include the following newspapers: *Nin*, *Komunist*, *Rad*, *4 Jul*, *Narodna Armija*, *Pobjeda*, and *Jedinstvo*.

A number of weekly newspapers in Serbia served official ethnic minorities, as for instance in 1963 *Dolgozok* (eng. *The Worker* from Novi Sad in Vojvodina was published in Hungarian), *7 Nap* (eng. *Seven Days* from Subotica in Vojvodina was also published in Hungarian), *Libertatea* (eng. *Freedom* from Vrsac in Vojvodina was published in Rumanian), *Hlas Ludu* (eng. *The People's Voice* from Backi Petrovac in Vojvodina was published in the Slovak language), *Bratstvo* (eng. *Brotherhood* from Nis was published in the Bulgarian language), and *Ruske Slovo* (eng. *Russian Word* from Ruski Kerestur in Vojvodina was published in the Ukrainian language).

Below some general information about central Serbian current affairs press (dailies and weeklies) which were published during the EMEDIATE project period 1 is offered.

- ***Borba*** (eng. *The Fight*). The history of *Borba* started in 1922 when it was set up in Zagreb as a weekly bulletin of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. The journal was banned in 1929 by the King Alexander and then reappeared in Belgrade in 1941 as a newspaper for the members of the National Liberation Army. After WW2 it continued as a daily newspaper of the Union of Yugoslavian Communists. Since 1954 *Borba* was owned and published by the Socialist labor union of Yugoslavia and had the status of a central daily newspaper which, unlike the rest of the dailies, transcended regional boundaries and borders of individual republics. It was published in Cyrillic alphabet in Belgrade (the Serbian edition) and in Latin alphabet in Zagreb (the Croatian edition); both had separate but closely connected and interdependent redaction boards. Between 1953 and 1959 the editorial board of *Borba* was also formally linked to one of the two central Slovenian daily newspapers *Ljudska pravica*. *Borba* was considered the most important daily newspaper in the socialist Yugoslavia. Its circulation varied: in 1949, *Borba* reached a record number of 700,000 copies; in 1962, the circulation was at 172,000 (see Arnim 1968: 227-228; 228, fn. 1).
- ***Politika*** (eng. *Politics*). This daily newspaper from Belgrade also existed before WW2. It was founded as a family enterprise in 1904 by Ribnikar brothers (just a year after the military coup against Obrenovic and the reinstatement of the Karadjordjevic rule in

⁴ According to Arnim, it is possible to compare the two dailies to the media landscape in Moscow. Arnim interestingly argues that *Borba* can be compared to the journal *Pravda*, whereas *Politika* appears much like *Izvestija* (Arnim 1968: 109).

Serbia). Before WW2, *Politika* aimed at intellectual readership and looked up in the sense of editorship to the French press culture and tradition. The journal was not formally linked to any political party but maintained a progressive liberal perspective on current affairs. After WW2, the journal reappeared in 1944 as a publication of the popular front, but the publisher was reorganized in 1952 into the publishing house *Politika*. Arnim notes in his study that *Politika* was still represented in several official and semi-official statistical annals or bulletins as a publication of the Socialist labor union of Yugoslavia (Arnim 1968: 109). In 1962, *Politika* circulated at 297,000 copies; in 1966 it fell to 278,000 copies (see Arnim 1968: 228; fn. 1).

- ***Vecernje novosti*** (eng. *The Evening News*). This daily newspaper was started by the notorious publisher *Borba* in Belgrade as an information and entertainment newspaper. Its boulevard character was possible after the new regulation of the press in the 1950s and aimed to supplement *Borba* as an economically viable enterprise. It only had a Serbian edition, but it was circulated in the majority of large urban centers.
- ***Dnevnik*** (eng. *Daily*). *Dnevnik* was the main local daily newspaper of the autonomous region of Vojvodina and was published in Cyrillic alphabet in Novi Sad. The journal was originally set up (under the name *Slobodna Vojvodina*; eng. *Free Vojvodina*) in the year 1941 as a newspaper of the partisan resistance and continued after 1944 as a general daily newspaper of the region. It was renamed in 1951 and reorganized as a publication of the Socialist labor union of Vojvodina.
- ***Magyar szó*** (eng. *Hungarian Word*). A newspaper of the Hungarian minority from Novi Sad, a capital of the autonomous republic of Vojvodina, which published daily in the Hungarian language. After 1950s, the newspaper was owned and published by the Socialist labor union of Vojvodina. Its circulation varied from 46.000 in 1951, to 16.000 in 1954, to 31.000 in 1963.
- ***Rilindija*** (eng. *Rebirth*). A daily newspaper in Albanian language which was published in Pristina the capital of the autonomous republic of Kosovo south of Serbia.
- ***Privredni pregled*** (eng. *The Economy Survey*). A newspaper which was published 6 days a week in Belgrade by the publisher with the same name. It featured news, reports and commentary on domestic and foreign economy. Its circulation in 1963 was about 13,000 copies per day.
- ***Nin*** (short for *Nedeljne informativne novine*, eng. *Weekly Information Newspaper*). A weekly newspaper from Belgrade which was published by the publishing house *Politika*. In 1963 its circulation was about 130,000 copies.

- **Komunist** (eng. *The Communist*). A weekly publication of the Communist Union of Yugoslavia which was simultaneously published in Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian, and Macedonian edition. The journal had three interconnected redactions; one in Belgrade for the Serbian (in Cyrillic) and Croatian (in Latin) edition, one in Ljubljana for the Slovenian edition, and one in Skopje for the Macedonian edition. Its total circulation in 1963 was 190,000 copies.

Several local newspapers were published weekly in Serbian cities (the information is from 1963), among which one could list: *Beogradska nedelja* (from Belgrade; eng. *The Belgrade Sunday*), *Becejske novine* (from Becej, eng. *The Becej Newspaper*; published also articles in the Hungarian language), *Bratstvo* (from Nis; eng. *Brotherhood*; a weekly in the Bulgarian language), *Cacanski glas* (from Cacak, eng. *The Voice of Cacak*), *Glas Podrinja* (from Sabac, eng. *The Voice of Podrinje*, Podrinje is a geographical term for the region around the river Drina), *Ibarske Novine* (from Kraljevo, eng. *Newspaper of Ibar*; Ibar is a river in South Eastern part of Serbia), *Napred* (from Valjevo, eng. *Forward*), *Nas glas* (from Smederevo, eng. *Our Voice*), *Nasa rec* (from Leskovac, eng. *Our Word*), *Narodne novine* (from Nis, eng. *National Newspaper*), *Pancevac* (from Pancevo, eng. *The Pancevan*), *Rec naroda* (from Pozarevac, eng. *The People's Word*), *Sloboda* (from Pirot, eng. *Freedom*), *Slobodna rec* (from Vranje; eng. *The Free Word*), *Somborske novine* (from Sombor, eng. *The Newspaper of Sombor*), *Sremske Novine* (from Sremska Mitrovica; eng. *The Newspaper of Srem*; Srem is a geographical region around Sremska Mitrovica), *Suboticke novine* (from Subotica, eng. *The Newspaper of Subotica*), *Svetlost* (from Kragujevac, eng. *The Light*), *Timok* (from Zajecar, Timok is a river in Serbia), *Tribina* (from Novi Sad, eng. *Tribune*), *Vesti* (from Titovo Uzice, eng. *News*), and *Zrenjanin* (from Zrenjanin) (cited from SG 1964, also confirmed in Arnim 1968: 129).

In 1963, 5 local biweekly journals were available to the Serbian audience. They included *Glas komune* (from Apatin, eng. *The Voice of the Commune*), *Kikindska komuna* (from Kikinda, eng. *The Commune of Kikinda*), *Lim* (from Priboj; Lim is a river in Serbia), *Nasa komuna* (from Smederevska Palanka; eng. *Our Commune*), and *Polimlje* (from Prijepolje; Polimlje is a region around the Serbian river Lim) (cited from SG 1964, also confirmed in Arnim 1968: 129).

Other popular newspapers in Serbia included *Ilustrovana politika* (eng. *The Illustrated Politika*) from Belgrade which was published weekly by the publishing house Politika and circulated (in 1963) in about 310,000 copies; *Sport i svet* (eng. *Sport and World*) from Belgrade which was published weekly by the publishing house Borba and targeted (according to the statistical reports for 1963) about 210,000 sport fans; *Politikin Zabavnik* (eng. *Politika's Entertainment Almanac*) which was an illustrated amusement and entertainment weekly published by the publishing house Politika and which circulated (in 1963) in about 185,000 copies. A wide circulation was also characteristic of the official newspaper of the Yugoslavian Socialist Youth Union titled *Mladost* (eng. *Youth*) which was (in 1963) published from Belgrade in about 73,000 copies weekly. In about 55,000 copies circulated the Serbian monthly newspaper for children *Zmaj* (eng. *The Dragon*).

Arguably, Serbia was the center of the press system in the socialist Yugoslavia. This was obvious from the mere quantity of the printed publications that were published in Serbia (or in Belgrade more specifically) and also by other indicators, such as location of mass media and journalism infrastructure. The Yugoslav Institute of Journalism (scr. *Jugoslovenski institut za novinarstvo*) was located in Belgrade. In Belgrade several key professional journals were also published, such as *Novinarstvo* and *Nasa rec*. The two central Serbian daily newspapers had a slightly different and also better position than dailies from other Yugoslav republics; Arnim argues that the two central Serbian dailies *Borba* and *Politika* were trans-regional (Ger. *überregionale*) or central dailies for all Yugoslav federal republics and even compares them to the Soviet counterparts from Moscow, *Pravda* and *Izvestija* (Arnim 1968: 109).

The asymmetry which substantially favors Serbian part within the general press system of the socialist Yugoslavia can be seen through presentation in the table below which offers percentages of journalists working in different Yugoslav republics.

TABLE 1. YUGOSLAV JOURNALISTS BY REPUBLICS (IN 1968)

Federal Republic	Percentage
Serbia	51 %
Slovenia	11 %
Croatia	20 %
Bosnia and Herzegovina	9 %
Montenegro	2 %
Macedonia	7 %

Source: Association of Yugoslav Journalists (cited in Robinson 1977: 95).

Moreover, journalists were predominantly from the ethnic majorities even in the individual federal republics themselves. (Further information on the socialist conception of journalism is also included in appendices!) Robinson, for instance, mentioned that “it was difficult, until the late 1960s, to find coherent accounts in the Serbian press about the conditions in the Autonomous republic of Kosovo-Metohija” (Robinson 1977: 106).

2.2.2 Radio in the socialist Serbia

Radio broadcasting started in Serbia in 1924. Other parts of the old Kingdom Yugoslavia followed afterwards (in Zagreb radio broadcasting started in 1926; in Ljubljana in 1928; the Macedonian Radio Skopje,

however, started only in 1941). These first attempts to set up a system of timely information broadcasts were sponsored by the state so that already in the old Yugoslavia, and well before WW2, the few radio stations in the country depended substantially on state regulation. As Markovic reports, the Yugoslav Ministry of Postal Service and Telegraphy controlled all economic and legal matter related to radio broadcasting (Markovic 1990: 4). Not only were there strict regulations of radio broadcasting but also of receiving radio programs. There were, for instance, strict regulations on permits for the possession of radio receivers, an elaborate system of radio subscription and so forth (Markovic 1990: 5). Due to tense international situation before WW2, Serbian radio (as well as radio in other parts of Yugoslavia) was in fact transformed from "a medium of culture, popular values, and light entertainment into a medium of aggressive nationalistic propaganda which promoted war" (Markovic 1990: 6).

Serbian radio during WW2 was mainly a subversive information medium which was powerful in the hands of partisan resistance movement. Radio programs were broadcast from the liberated territories in Yugoslavia and aimed both at domestic and foreign audience. Resistance radio broadcasts from Yugoslavia were followed abroad by military and civil society (Markovic 1990: 6).

In the final stages of WW2 and immediately after the ceasefire, radio stations in Yugoslavia rapidly spread. In 1944, *Radio Beograd* was restarted. Soon radio stations in other parts of Yugoslavia followed, such as Dubrovnik, Cetinje, and Skopje. In May 1945, radio stations were established or reestablished in Sarajevo, Osijek, Zagreb, and Ljubljana, as well as in Maribor, Ajdovscina, Prizren. After the Cominform crisis in the late 1940s, a new wave of radio stations was set up in Rijeka, Koper, Novi Sad, Nis, Bitola, Zajecar and many other cities. Typical for the post WW2 economy in Yugoslavia, the radio network within the federation expanded with fervor and unquestioned enthusiasm (further data on post-war reconstruction of Yugoslav radio network also in Markovic 1990).

Since 1950s, radio broadcasting was regulated by the Council for science and culture of the Yugoslav government. In 1952, after the so-called Cominform crisis, a federal board for broadcasting was set up and also a federal network of broadcasters *Jugoslovenska radiodifuzija* which later became *Jugoslovenska radiotelevizija* (JRT).

According to the The Law on Broadcasting Stations, which was passed in 1955, radio broadcasting was defined as a public service. Legal sanctions were envisaged in cases of deviation from the acceptable broadcasting; the sanctions were envisaged in the same way as in the case of the press, i.e. by prohibition to broadcast after a controversial program had been legally sanctioned in court (Markovic 1990: 16).

Annual reports published by the Yugoslav national broadcaster *JRT* enable to view in retrospective incredible speed with which radio became central information source in the socialist Yugoslavia.

TABLE 2. GROWTH OF POSTWAR RADIO IN THE SOCIALIST YUGOSLAVIA⁵

	1939	1947	1955	1963	1971
REGISTERED RADIO RECEIVERS	155,113	233,309	592,100	2,277,649	3,489,361
NUMBER OF CITIZENS PER 1 RADIO RECEIVER	100	70	30	8	6
PROGRAMMING TIME (in hours)	14,547	N.A.	70,538	119,402	232,937
spoken	7,313	N.A.	26,077	41,784	87,969
music	7,234	N.A.	44,461	77,618	144,968

Source: Data from annual reports of *JRT*; also cited in Markovic (1990: 8-9).

By the late 1960s, radio became the leading source of information on current affairs and international relations. Average data above show a steady growth and rapid expansion of radio as a means of mass communication in the country. There were, however, quite substantial differences in this development between individual republics. Most of them were linked to the economic development and infrastructure.

Records from the year 1971, published in an annual report of the national broadcaster *JRT*, indicate the following discrepancy in terms of the number of citizens per one radio receiver.

- Slovenia – 3 citizens per one (registered) radio receiver,
- Croatia, Vojvodina – 4,
- Montenegro – 8,
- Bosnia and Herzegovina – 9,
- Kosovo – 24!⁶

Markovic also mentions that averages reached in the early 1970s by the most advanced Yugoslav republics match standards from developed European democracies; interestingly, Markovic also points out, the reach

⁵ It is sometimes cautioned that data on the number of registered radio receivers differs from the actual number. It was a common practice that citizens did not to register their receivers, thus dodging subscription and fee (see Mercun 1968, Markovic 1990)!

⁶ Markovic (1990) does not mention data for Serbia!

of the printed press lags well behind European numbers (Markovic 1990: 8)!

By the early 1970s, radio became the central information, culture, entertainment, and news medium in the socialist Yugoslavia. The network of stations was territorially dispersed and decentralized. Minority language programming was also already established (i.e. in Albanian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Italian, Roma, Romanian, Turkish etc.).

For the most part, major radio stations (located in capitals of individual republics) developed 3, some also 4, parallel programs. Their structure mirrored European tradition. The first radio program was thus a universal, cultural and general information program. The second radio program aired lighter, entertaining contents. Third programs on Yugoslav radio stations were more ambitious and intellectually more demanding and were oriented towards science, arts and elite culture. Several major stations also developed a fourth program as urban radio.

In the 1980s divergence in access to broadcast communication between different republics increased. Serbian radio addressed areas with most equipped media audiences (Belgrade), and areas with the lowest rates of access to the broadcast media in the entire Yugoslav federation (Kosovo, Montenegro). Official statistics from 1988 showed these discrepancies from the perspective of the number of households which had registered radio receivers. The highest proportion at the time was found in Slovenia with 89 % of households. The lowest share of households who possessed registered radio receivers and thus paid subscription fees was found in Montenegro – 57,5 % (Markovic 1990: 34).

2.2.3 Television in the socialist Serbia

Television developed most rapidly in the 1960s. Some quantitative and descriptive data on the growth of postwar television in Yugoslavia may perhaps outline this rapid development more clearly.

TABLE 3. GROWTH OF POSTWAR TELEVISION IN THE SOCIALIST YUGOSLAVIA⁷

	1959	1963	1967	1971	1975
REGISTERED TV RECEIVERS	12,000	211,657	1,002,194	2,057,238	3,076,000
NUMBER OF CITIZENS PER	3,518	90	19	10	6,5

⁷ It is sometimes cautioned that data on the number of registered television receivers differs from the actual number (see also footnote 8). This methodological warning is important because it was a common practice that citizens tended not to register their television sets due to the fact that registration meant subscription and payment (see Markovic 1990).

1 TV RECEIVER					
PROGRAMMING TIME (in hours)	1,586	2,088	5,529	9,250	13,369

Source: Data from annual reports of *JRT*; also cited in Markovic (1990: 12).

The most notable development in the late 1960s and early 1970s was integration of the Yugoslavian broadcasting union into the European production network. Federal broadcasting authorities managed to join the powerful European association of broadcasters (EBU/UER). The implication of this association was that a notable quota of programming relied on international exchange. Television thus served as a credible and widely accessible window to the world outside the country's borders. In 1972, as Markovic details, Yugoslav broadcasters received 400 foreign television programs through various forms of exchange or purchase. 337 of those programs were received through the EBU network. This number translates into 27,864 minutes of programming (Markovic 1990: 11).

In the 1980s, as already mentioned above, divergence in access to the broadcast media increased. Serbian television addressed areas with most equipped media audiences (Belgrade), and areas with the lowest rates of access (Kosovo). Official statistics from 1988 recorded that 77,5 % of Slovenian households possessed television sets; in contrast, 52,5 % of households in Kosovo possessed registered television sets (Markovic 1990: 34).

On the other hand, technological development pushed media landscapes further steps forward. Prospective liberalization of mass communication and media in the late 1980s caused introduction of several novelties. The Yugoslav broadcasting association *JRT*, which was based in Belgrade, was faced with numerous initiatives to share its primary public good – television broadcasting frequencies. Pleas for their use came from private enterprises (such as *Studio B* from Belgrade, *Kanal A* from Ljubljana, *Istarska radiotelevizija* from Rijeka, a prospective federal network YUTEL and so forth).⁸

⁸ New means of communication were also explored by the end of the EMEDIATE Period 1. According to Markovic (1990), *Televizija Beograd* set up a company, in association with certain Canadian investors, in order to explore potentials to broadcast via satellite.

2.3 Serbian media landscapes during the disintegration of Yugoslavia (1989 to 1991)

After socialism, media landscapes in Serbia were confusing. In the early 1990s, a sweep of new and private media was ushered in by the fall of communist politics. Soon after, the country found itself at war, while the turbulent events from the designated period (1989-1991) were found immediately prior to the armed warfare. Several authors noted that early 1990s saw a crisis of political and social life in Serbia (Dzuverovic 1994: 18). This crisis reflected in the media and it was hardly independent from the media themselves. Interesting accounts on the complex linkage between Serbian politics, society and the media in the designated period may be found in a volume edited by Nebojsa Popov for CEU Press (Popov 2000). Some of the views which authors present in this priceless volume address the role of the political press in the formation of a politically pluralist society (Nenadovic 2000), the transformation of the electronic broadcasting in the early 1990s, especially after the introduction of new legal regulation of radio and television (Veljanovski 2000).

Perhaps the most important general change which was introduced in this period was linked to the transformation of the state/public system of mass communication. As Dzuverovic described, in a relatively short time, pluralization of politics was coexistent and parallel to the multiplication of mass media. Novel media entered the landscape, including "(a) independent private media, (b) newspapers of political parties as well as other party-related media production, (c) independent radio and television broadcasters, (d) independent film production, (e) commercial production of audio and video material, accompanied by increased uses of all forms of 'new media' and (g) classical state channels of public communication" (Dzuverovic 1994: 19). The second change was related to the increased pressure on information (state control, censorship and propaganda) which resulted from the emergence of warfare as well as introduction of international sanction against the country.

2.3.1 Serbian press (1989-1991)

The period between 1989 and 1991 was a complex and turbulent one for the Serbian press. With the introduction of political pluralism new media emerged, new media legislation was in preparation, newspapers started to produce more commercial outlets, and by 1991 the imminent interethnic conflict, especially conflict between Serbs and Croats (as well as between different ethnic groups in Bosnia), escalated to the point that media already resorted to extremely violent rhetoric.

Politika (Belgrade)

Before the spread of electronic media, the press was the central means of mass communication in Serbia. *Politika*, pivotal daily newspaper for current affairs from Belgrade, was considered the primary public forum and an accepted medium of public address (Nenadovic 2000: 537).

Political controversies in the country primarily reflected in the media output and the people who manned them. A strong protest took place in the spring of 1990, when a group of about 60 journalists of *Politika* publicly criticized the fact that their newspaper fixed and falsified reports from meetings of the opposition political parties (Curgus Kazimir 2000: 91). Furthermore, the period in question was a turbulent one for the journalists in the Serbian press. Curgus Kazimir (2000) reports that journalists of the central daily newspaper *Politika* "wrote a new chapter" in its history when they organized a series of protests and demonstrations in March 1991. Also in March 1991, an influential column from *Politika* was terminated by its editors, a column which bore a title "echoes and reactions" (Curgus Kazimir 2000: 91). Among other achievements of the protests and turbulences from this time, Curgus Kazimir mentions that the protesting journalists set up a new "independent" trade union (2000: 90). In April 1991, journalists of *Politika* also organized a direct vote for their own editor-in-chief.

Curgus Kazimir also mentions that these journalists' protests, the "happening of the people in journalism" as he calls it, preceded the phase of "patriotic journalism" which was established in the forthcoming years.

By the end of 1991, as Pavicevic (2000) explains in retrospect, the Serbian press was already a propaganda machine aimed to stir tensions and advocate aggressive policy of the administration. According to the analyses of newspaper contents in 1991, the pivotal daily newspaper *Politika* was the medium through which the dominant ideology was being articulated. According to the analysis of Pavicevic, *Politika* most frequently employed argumentative rhetorical strategies in its articles in order to become as persuasive as possible. Curgus Kazimir also points out that information as a genre was being replaced or at least marginalized by political commentary in *Politika* (2000).

Rhetorical strategies were used so as to best serve the interests of the political leadership. Pavicevic mentions that the articles of *Politika* in 1991, the reasons to support claims presented by the authors were either (1) legal-political (in 76,3 % of the analyzed articles), or (2) historical (32,2 %), or social (20,3 %); see Pavicevic (2000: 74).

Another similar analysis traced tangentially the sources of news in *Politika* and compared the share of foreign news agencies to the shares of TANJUG (Curgus Kazimir 2000: 95).

TABLE 4. NEWS AGENCIES AS SOURCES OF TEXTS (DAILY *POLITIKA*; 1991)

Source of articles	Number of articles	Percent
Not from news agency	2085	75,3 %
TANJUG	675	24,4 %
REUTERS	1	0 %
FRANCE PRESSE	2	0,1 %
AFP	3	0,1 %
AP	1	0 %
Other agencies	2	0,1 %

Source: Curgus Kazimir (2000: 95).

At the time, *Politika* was published in an average circulation of about 160,000 copies. During the most turbulent periods, circulation reached about 180,000 copies.

It is possible to get an even more detailed overview of the structure of *Politika* by inspecting the representation of different genres in the articles. Below are results from the analysis of Curgus Kazimir (2000).

TABLE 5. STRUCTURE OF *POLITIKA* BY GENRES (1991)

Genre	Number of articles	Percent
News	254	9,2 %
Reports	534	19,3 %
Notifications	59	2,1 %
Commented reports	501	18,1 %
Stories	75	2,7 %
Interviews	51	1,8 %
Round tables	5	0,2 %
Statements	399	14,4 %
Surveys	2	0,1 %
Reports with statements	490	17,7 %
Other informative genres	28	1,0 %
Commentaries	145	5,2 %
Editorials	6	0,2 %
Glosses	3	0,1 %
Portraits	7	0,3 %
Pamphlets	10	0,4 %
Essays	4	0,1 %
Feuilletons	62	2,2 %

Articles	66	2,4 %
Other interpretative genres	15	0,5 %
Letters from readers	37	1,3 %
Political advertisements	6	0,2 %
Photographs	2	0,1 %
Photo-stories	8	0,3 %

Source: Curgus Kazimir (2000: 95).

It is perhaps important to conclude this excursus on *Politika* with a summarizing retrospective which should remind that *Politika* transformed from a central public forum of the socialist Serbia, to a platform for the nascent civil society, and then back to the infamous mouthpiece of official politics. This retrospective summary was well put by A. Nenadovic.

“It is also important to keep in mind the totality of all relevant domestic and outside circumstances in which *Politika*, promoted to its role as the champion of professional independence, turned out to be both a silent prisoner and a vocal proponent of collective innocence; that is of national autism. We should not forget that the plunge of *Politika*’s famous professionalism took place at the time of the collapse of Eastern European ‘Communism’, the tearing down of the Berlin Wall, the end of the Cold War and other past evils. The beginning of a democratic resistance, of human rights and civil liberties was being celebrated, prepared for or promised nearly everywhere. Why was it that *Politika*, as ‘the newspaper’ without rival in history in this part of the world, as an institution of special importance, chose just that moment to fall into the arms of the power and ideology which recoils from those who think differently and cannot stand independent media? How great was the role of outside pressure, supported by autocratic absolutism; and how great was the internal journalistic weakness? Finally, was not the defensive potential of *Politika*’s professionalism irreparably weakened by the purges carried out in *Politika* in previous periods?” (Nenadovic 2000: 561)

2.3.2 Serbian radio (1989-1991)

Systematic information is not available.⁹

⁹ An erudite commentary on the transformation of radio broadcasting can be found in a study by Veljanovski (2000). The problem is, however, that his analysis assumes a great deal of information and insight into the media landscape, but provides none itself! Veljanovski discusses mainly radio broadcasting through RTS. One of the main points he

2.3.3 Serbian television (1989-1991)

The designated period combines the socialist and post-socialist period in Serbia. Socialist state broadcasters *RTV Beograd*, *RTV Novi Sad*, and *RTV Pristina* were central television broadcasters before 1990. Simultaneously, in the late 1980s ideas appeared concerning independent broadcasting. Thus, new, commercial broadcasters appeared soon after 1990. Perhaps the most important among these was NTV Studio B which produced an alternative television program Studio B. Serbian television audience was also able to receive television programs via satellite.

In 1991, a new public broadcaster *RTS (Radio and Television Serbia)* was administratively formed (*Scr. Radiotelevizija Srbija*). This new broadcaster was legally and technically achieved as a merger of all three state broadcasters from socialism which operated in the Serbian territories, i.e. *RTV Beograd*, *RTV Novi Sad*, and *RTV Pristina*. The merge was instituted with a new *Law on Radio and Television* (passed by the Serbian parliament on July 31st 1991).

2.4 Present day media landscapes in Serbia (1992 to 2005)

The impact of warfare on media landscape in Serbia was, of course, substantial and detrimental. These extreme conditions did not contribute to the consolidation of the new media landscape. Quite the reverse happened. One media researcher argues that Serbian media operated in extreme conditions after armed conflicts broke out and links his analysis also to the geo-political situation in Europe and elsewhere in the world.

“Escalated warfare caused many casualties and floods of hundreds of thousands of refugees. This, in turn, brought convoys of humanitarian aid and rescue in order to more or less successfully remedy the shortage and famine of the civil citizenry. All this was accompanied with a strengthened diplomatic pressure of the world super powers on the Republic of Yugoslavia and an unbelievable propaganda of the global

wishes to make is that *Radio Beograd* was much less obedient to the political elites than its television counterpart (Veljanovski 2000).

A further study also exists concerning local population in Priboj as an audience for a local radio station (see Plavsic and Mavric 1990).

media against Serbs. The whole situation is spiced up with the presence in the small Adriatic Sea, by the international standards, of strong armed vessels and nuclear-engine aircraft carriers of the world super powers. Also existent were fortifications of the blockade control in terms of police and custom reinforcements on the Serbian borders, constant threat to oversee the traffic on the river Danube (which was later put in effect) and hermetic sealing-off of the entire country. (...) In addition, in domestic politics genuine struggle for power escalated. Election campaign started. In fact, preparations are being made for the final combat on the municipal, republic and federal level.” (Vukovic 1994: 31).

2.4.1 Serbian press (1992 until present)

Verifiable and credible data for this most recent period are rather difficult to secure. Simic seems a credible source on the structure of the printed landscape in Serbia in 2000. According to his information, in the year 2000, 2443 newspapers and magazines were registered in Serbia. There were 21 daily newspapers and a range of publications that include more specialized press from the realms of economy, science, arts, ecology, sports, as well as education, popular culture, entertainment and so forth. Despite substantial political changes in this period, politics still preserved substantial influence on the leading newspapers. It is often argued that dailies like *Borba*, *Jedinstvo* and *Dnevnik* express opinions of the governmental coalition as the Serbian government preserved quite direct editorial control (through editorial boards) over these dailies; also close to the governmental positions are, it is argued, three further and important dailies, *Politika*, *Politika Ekspres*, *Vecernje novosti* (Simic 2000: 98). Critical views on the governmental policies are usually linked with privately owned *Blic*, *Nasa borba*, *Demokratija*, *Dnevni telegraf* and *Gradzanin*.

2.4.2 Serbian radio (1992 until present)

Radio broadcasters were numerous and wide-spread already during socialism. In the period after the disintegration of the socialist Yugoslavia, radio remained a dispersed and variegated mass medium. Systematic and reliable data, however, on the Serbian radio landscape are not easy to find.

According to the data of a survey of a sample from Serbian population, the five central radio stations had the following audience characteristics.

TABLE 6. TRUST IN SERBIAN RADIO AND AUDIENCE SHARES (IN 1995)

	Trust in	Trust in	Trust in	Trust in	Trust in
--	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

	Radio Beograd	Studio B	Radio Novi Sad	Radio B-92	Radio Politika
Audience of RADIO BEOGRAD	94,6 %	2,5 %	0,2 %	2,1 %	0,6 %
Audience of STUDIO B	4,5 %	90,3 %	0,7 %	3,7 %	0,7 %
Audience of RADIO NS	7,7 %	3,8 %	80,8 %	3,8 %	3,8 %
Audience of RADIO B-92	4,3 %	6,4 %	0 %	85,1 %	4,3 %
Audience of RADIO POLITIKA	4,4 %	8,9 %	0 %	2,2 %	84,4 %
	Audience share Radio Beograd	Audience share Studio B	Audience share Radio Novi Sad	Audience share Radio B-92	Audience share radio Politika
	94,6 %	2,5 %	0,2 %	2 %	0,6 %

Source: Milivojevic (1995: 207).

It is perhaps interesting to add that Milivojevic also reports on Serbian radio audience for three international broadcasters *BBC*, *Radio Free Europe*, and *Voice of America*.

TABLE 7. TRUST IN SERBIAN RADIO AND AUDIENCE SHARES (IN 1995)

	BBC RADIO	RADIO FREE EUROPE	VOICE OF AMERICA
Audience (in %)	6,76 %	2,63 %	8,19 %

Source: Milivojevic (1995: 209).

The situation in the late 1990s has undoubtedly changed substantially. Little information, however, is available for this period. In a small book by Simic (2000) is used as a reference for the radio landscape in the most recent period. In 2000, Serbian audience had access to 334 radio and 149 television programs were broadcast in Serbia. The main problem of media landscape at that time was yet unfinished transition from a system of state owned media to the commercial enterprises. Although the last

medium of mass communication that was instituted by the state was registered in 1992, the transformation of ownership proceeded slowly. Only after 1998, when a law on information was passed, this transformation begun to proceed more rapidly. According to several analysts, by the year 2000 just slightly more than 50 percents of the mass media in Serbia were no longer owned by the state, but by individuals, organizations, associations or parties (Simic 2000).

2.4.3 Serbian television (1992 until present)

When once armed conflict broke out in the former Yugoslav republics (Croatia; Bosnia and Herzegovina), Serbian television was unable to consolidate and adapt naturally to the new setting. The initiated passage from the state/public system of mass communication was paused and remained only formal. In fact, organs of the state were able to maintain strong hold and control over television broadcasting. New commercial broadcasters who appeared after the break-down of communism (such as *NTV Studio B*, *TV Politika*) were unable to solidify their position with the audience and to accumulate further resources in technology, economy and personnel.

New commercial broadcasters attempted to differentiate from the national broadcaster in the sense that they provided alternative angles on current affairs, and political as well as social processes. This distantiation is clearly visible from differences in topics which two pivotal broadcasters covered in their central daily newscasts in 1992.

TABLE 8. COVERAGE OF TOPICS ON TELEVISION IN SERBIA (1992)

TOPIC	RTS (in %)	NTV Studio B (in %)
The world and Yugoslavia	8,3	18,8
Bosnia and Herzegovina (including Republika Srpska)	8,3	18,5
Croatia and Srpska Krajina	1,1	3,3
International affairs	4,8	5,2
Economy, sanctions against Yugoslavia	10,5	3,4
Standard of living	-	1,9
Generally on elections	3,6	2,5
Yugoslav elections	0,7	3,6
Serbian elections	40,2	29,0
Montenegrin elections	1,1	1,1

Refugees and assistance	3,6	1,4
Activities of federal authorities	4,3	3,6
Activities of Serbian authorities	3,3	1,4
Activities of Montenegrin authorities	-	-
Education	1,1	1,9
Health	0,4	-
Culture, science	0,8	0,6
The Church	2,2	0,3
Yugoslav Army	1,2	0,9
other	3,9	3,1

Source: Mihailovic (1994: 69).

It is perhaps interesting to note that Serbian television became the most influential medium in the 1990s! During the process of disintegration of the socialist Yugoslavia and immediately during its aftermath, the printed press was doubtlessly the bearer of the significant political influence. Arguments exist that television became the central medium due to economic reasons – it was cheaper, especially during wars, for the local population to watch the evening news than to buy a newspaper.¹⁰ Tunnard, on the other hand, mentions lack of adequate education as the primary factor for the fact that television so clearly predominates as an information source among Serbian population (Tunnard 2003).

In 1993, just after the parliamentary elections in Serbia and Montenegro, RTS broadcast three programs and covered a substantial part of the country. RTS was a public enterprise; legally, it was a public enterprise of special interest. Appointment of the managing board was the responsibility of the parliament. On the other hand, *Studio B*, was a well recognized opposition medium in 1993. *Studio B* started as a local TV station which covered only Belgrade (see Skopljanac Brunner 2000b: 227). Other television broadcasters included *Televizija Novi Sad* (formerly, in socialism, national broadcaster for the autonomous region of

¹⁰ Results of a survey in 1995 about the sources of information are indicative in this respect. Milivojevic writes that survey results, received in 1995 on a sample of Serbian citizens, show that RTS was the most frequently used medium of information. The survey question asked which was the most frequently used medium for information; 54,66 % of the respondents claimed the used most frequently television as a source of information, 18,43 % claimed it was the press, 8,68 % claimed it was radio and 6,26 % of the respondents claimed they relied most frequently on the Sunday newspapers (Milivojevic 1995).

Vojvodina); this broadcaster had a similar formal status as *RTS*, i.e. it was a public enterprise, but only regional visibility. The fourth notable television broadcaster in the period was a private enterprise *Televizija Politika*, which was a broadcaster linked to the publishing house *Politika* which was famous for its daily newspaper.

According to one researcher, the situation in the first part of 1993 was the following.

“The governing Socialist party controlled state broadcasting media, while the independent ones are closer to the opposition. Naturally, state broadcasters had at their disposal incomparably better technical and financial resources, as well as superior personnel. Visibility of *RTS* was incomparable to the visibility of, for instance, *NTV Studio B*. Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that an average citizen is more ready to believe the state media, especially when it is suggested, even with no proper evidence, that independent media are financed from abroad (and that is understood that they are treacherous).” (Vukovic 1994: 32)

According to the research of Milivojevic (1995) audience ratings of these television stations were the following:

TABLE 9. TRUST IN SERBIAN TELEVISION STATIONS AND AUDIENCE SHARES (IN 1995)

	Trust in TVS	Trust in Studio B	Trust in TV Novi Sad	Trust in TV Politika
Audience of TVS	92,3 %	3,8 %	2,1 %	1,7 %
Audience of STUDIO B	1,7 %	96,1%	0 %	2,2 %
Audience of TV NS	6,3 %	6,3 %	87,5 %	0 %
Audience of TV Politika	5,4 %	5,4 %	2,2 %	87,0 %
	Audience share TVS	Audience share Studio B	Audience share TV Novi Sad	Audience share TV Politika
	92,4 %	3,8 %	2,1 %	1,7 %

Source: Milivojevic (1995: 205).

Another interesting study of political communication in the Serbian media was located (Nedovic 1999). Her study investigates post-election coverage in the central Serbian media.¹¹

After the overthrow of the political regime of Slobodan Milosevic, the television landscape substantially changed yet again. For example, according to information from a document published on the World Wide Web 15 new television broadcasters with private funding were set up before elections all around Serbia (see Todorovic and Gredelj 2001). The list of these television stations included *TV Pi kanal* in Pirot, *TV Global* in Nin, *TV Globus* in Kragujevac, *TV S* in Uzice, *TV S* in Cacak, *TV K34* in Sombor, *TV Kikinda* in Kikinda, *TV S* in Becej, *TV Vrnjacka Banja* in Vrnjacka Banja, *TV Banat* in Vrnac, *TV S* in Varvarin, *TV IBC* and *TV Stankom* in Belgrade, and *TV BAP* in Backa Palanka (Todorovic and Gredelj 2001: 7).

At the present moment, a substantial amount of television programming is broadcast over the satellite. Broadcasting became a lucrative private enterprise. New forms of popular culture are thus being developed, such as popular music, new forms of humoristic expression and satire and so forth.

2.4.4 Word wide web in Serbia

According to Tunnard, the expansive spread of the World Wide Web and its creative use by the Serbian cyber-activists is linked to the resistance movement *Otpor* in the late 1980s (Tunnard 2003). The aim of this movement was to overthrow the political regime of Slobodan Milosevic and to mobilize the masses after a period of stifling oppression.

The World Wide Web developed as a site of struggle in 1996, when results from elections were annulled. World Wide Web was primarily used by students, intellectuals and other technically educated people. Tunnard also mentions that the World Wide Web was used as a platform for other

¹¹ The main object of this book is representation of main political actors and main political issues in the most important Serbian media between March 1998 and October 1998, i.e. after the constitution of the Serbian government (which was elected in 1997) and signing the agreement on the Kosovo issue between S. Milosevic and R. Holbrook. Four central Serbian media are selected in analysis: *Televizija Srbija*, *Radio Beograd*, *Borba* (a mainstream political daily, a "public newspaper" financed from the budget), *Politika* (also a mainstream political daily).

media, such as broadcasting in Serbian language. When in 1996 Serbian alternative radio *Studio B92* was shut down by the authorities, the broadcasters immediately found a way to air their program through a na IP server in the Netherlands (Tunnard 2003: 113).

World Wide Web was additionally used by Serbian Internet users as a vehicle of mass communication among the members of the resistance movement (e.g. *Otpor*) and for distribution of information about their activities; for instance, large-scale public protests of over 100,000 people were organized by the creative uses of the Internet (Tunnard 2003: 113).

3. Media studies on Serbian media (1950s to present)

Media studies on Serbian media are scarce. Even rarer are studies that explicitly deal with notions of Europe or events that constitute main and most turbulent political developments in Europe. This chapter offers some descriptive commentary on Serbian media studies. For a bit closer inspection some of the more relevant studies from the period are also presented.

3.1 CEE Period 1

Serbian media studies in this period are predominantly focused on the working of mass communication system and either material or legal conditions for dissemination of information.

Relatively small number of media studies is focused on media contents alone. Exceptions in this sense are Nesovic (1964), Arnim (1968), Robinson (1977), and Niksic (1982). In these studies, contents of different media are investigated either with quantitative (Arnim, Robinson) or qualitative approach (Niksic); Nesovic is not really a scholarly study. Note also that two of these were written by foreign researchers.

Rough insights into publications of the Serbian press and programs of Serbian broadcasters can be additionally obtained from official statistical records from the period (JIN 1965, JIN 1968). Some of this data is also mentioned in other, later works (e.g. Markovic 1990).

Excursus on a study by Arnim (1968)

The book contains four main parts and numerous chapters: the first part is devoted to the “external” structure of the Yugoslav press (between 1945 and 1963), the second part deals with its so-called “internal” structure, the third part deals with an overview of its development from 1945 to 1963, and the last part deals with the notorious case of Milovan Djilas. The book is also accompanied with a rich additional material such as (1) an informative time table of significant events that took place between 1945 and 1963, (2) statistical overviews, a selection of quotations from the Yugoslav politicians on the social and political roles of the press, (3) German translations of laws on the press, and (4) several graphic reproductions of the Yugoslav newspapers.

The book deals with a structural analysis of the Yugoslavian press which means that it places the press from the selected period into the framework of a unified

system. The author is more concerned with the structural (i.e. economic, formal, legal, and social and political) elements of this system than with its ideological underpinnings. The book divides its focus on the Yugoslav press as a coherent system, by separately elaborating on its "external" and "internal" structure. With the term external structure the author signifies outward conditions in which the Yugoslav press was situated in the selected period. Primarily the external structure refers to the to sociological condition of Yugoslavia between 1945 and 1963, to legal regulation of mass communication and press in particular, to the status and organization of the journalistic work, the practice of publishing and the quantitative proportions of the Yugoslav press system such as the number, targeted audience, and reach of individual Yugoslavian dailies, weeklies, monthlies and other periodicals. The term "internal" structure of the Yugoslav press refers on the other hand to the elements, organization, and outputs of the processes in which printed periodicals are produced. Thus author's discussion of the inner structure of the Yugoslav press covers the presentation of newspaper editors, redactors and correspondents; the organization and agenda of the official press agency of Yugoslavia TANJUG; as well as the structure and organization of issues in (daily) newspapers.

In addition to the external and internal structure of the Yugoslav press system, the book also presents history and/or tradition of publishing of individual ethnicities. In a systematic attempt it offers precious systematic and condensed historical overviews of the development of the press from the 18th century onwards.

The main findings (as summarized in the conclusion) which this book presents are that (1) the center of the Yugoslav press system is located in Belgrade, Serbia; that (2) the Yugoslav press system is built on a social and political system which draws only little from the publishing tradition from the times before WW2; that (3) the Yugoslav press system is well developed in 1963 but that its reach is also disproportional do the detriment particularly of the rural populations; that (4) most of the circulation (by 1963) of the press is secured by purchase in the streets (with a notable exception of Slovenia); that (5) the Yugoslav press system generates a type of journalist as a political functionary; that (6) the Yugoslav press in the selected period is mainly opinion press; that (7) the entire system is overly dependent of state financing and subsidizing; that (8) there is too much interconnection and cooperation between the journalists and political elites; that (9) the methods of Yugoslav journalism are hardly imaginable in the Western world; that (10) the foreign newspaper readership is more oriented towards the West than the East; that (11) the monopoly of TANJUG over information might cause bias in public information and awareness; that (12) centralization of information through TANJUG leads to an unhealthy unification of information; that (13) the news reports are formed to educate and influence the readers; that (14) the cultural sections of the newspapers exhibit the highest degree of diversity; that (15) the press is overly uniform; that (16) the Yugoslav press produces overly uniform information; that (17) the constitutional guarantees of the freedom of speech are often being limited; that (18) the case of Djilas showed that it was not possible to undertake "individual" journalism; and finally that (19) the progressive break in the practices of the Yugoslav press from the period of 1950/1951 was not consequentially followed afterwards and that political interference with the press limits its ability to develop further.

There is no overarching theory in this study. The book is written as a comprehensive combination of historical, sociological and economical emphases in tradition of the German classical *Publizistikwissen*. The book thus offers a historical reconstruction and uses archives and documentation analysis. It also uses quantitative methods with scarce methodological detail.

This book is immensely informative as an outside (and unbiased) source on perhaps the most turbulent period of the press system in the socialist Yugoslavia (from 1945 to 1963). The book covers the entire period from after the WW2 until the Yugoslavian constitutional reform in 1963 begun to produce effect on the mass media system. The narrative is expanded also to include the historical outline of the Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian press, as well as a briefer outline of the press history of other Yugoslavian ethnicities. One may not agree entirely today with the perspective of this book, but its program is fulfilled consistently and comprehensively. The main argument one can take from this book is that the Yugoslav press system developed in the selected period with reference to the European trends of the press, but still built on specific solutions that made it distant from the rest of Europe. One of the main bones of contentions was the role of the freedom of the press and expression which was a constitutionally guaranteed norm. It was rarely allowed to live out fully in practice. The case in point was the notorious case of Djilas in which it was made explicit that the Yugoslav press system can operate in alliance with politics only as a congruent and collectively harmonized mouthpiece of official political rhetoric. Another important point of Arnim's study was that the Yugoslav press system was substantially asymmetrical and favored Serbian presence in this system. Furthermore, it did not pay enough attention to the actual needs of the audience.

The book's main flaws are in the domain of conceptual outline of the problem and in the domain of methodological sophistication. In both areas the book is lacking. It is, on the other hand, very well documented and supplemented with relevant additional material.

Excursus on a conference proceedings on radio (Sijan 1968)

The book (Sijan 1968) contains discussion contributions by participants of the conference on Yugoslavian radio broadcasting. They were edited and shortened for publication. Compilation exhibits no particular order or structure. Authors of individual contributions are: Mirko Cepic (Radio Slovenia), Josif Curciev (Radio Skoplje), Zoran Udovicic, Jere Mrndze (Radio Zagreb), Nemanja Pavlovic (Radio Novi Sad), Aleksandar Ackovski (Radio Skoplje), Slobodan Andzelkovic, DZordze Malavrazic, Prvoslav Plavsic (Radio Televizija Beograd), Miodrag Vukmirovic, Aleksandar Mlac, Zoran Popovic, Aleksandar Avramovic, Gojko Radovanovic, Mirjana Nastic (Board for educational and children programming of Yugoslav Radiotelevision Network YRT), Dragisa Caran, Ales Jan, Gordana Rancic, Boda Markovic, Tomislav Radic, Radomir Neskovic, Zoran Pirolic, Mihajlo Tosic and Gradimir Jovanovic.

The issues covered in this volume are diverse and scattered across open questions of radio broadcasting in Yugoslavia. The conference gathered experts and practitioners from all over the country thus covering a range of issues from: organization of radio broadcasting, technology, information programs, staff and employment policies, cooperation of radio stations, regionalization of radio networks, audience and audience analyses and so forth.

This book is immensely informative about the conditions in the area of radio broadcasting in the mid 1980s in Yugoslavia. The book includes views of various experts and practitioners who address controversial aspects of the current radio broadcasting development. From the discussions, it is evident that representatives of the Serbian radio emphasize primarily questions concerning cooperation among the republics, the organization of news production, information sources as well as radio drama and education programs. Serbian radio experts also brought up the points about audiences and audience research. Among contributions to understanding Serbian media, one may also include reports about radio in the autonomous administrative regions of Kosovo and Vojvodina – there aspects of personnel education, organization of work and employment policies were emphasized. Ideas of (federal) sharing, cooperation and interconnection are highly respected and valued among representatives of the Serbian radio stations.

In retrospect, the picture of Serbian radio network presented by the discussions is one of a disoriented media system which faces many problems. It is apparent that practice and practical solutions diverge from political planning and that media systems tend to find organizational schemes that better fit the prevalent social conditions than planned political programs. Radio is affirmed as the fastest mass medium, but there was not enough emphasis on its relation to television, and even less to the press.

The following foreign radio broadcasters are mentioned in the discussions *BBC, Voice of America, Deutsche Welle, Radio Moskva, Radio Canada, Radio France International, Radio Paris, National Public Radio (USA)*.

Competition with Europe is sought in the realm of diversification of programming. BBC's model of three coherent radio programs was taken as a reference point for evaluation of the Yugoslav radio. In his discussion, DZ. Malavrazic mentions that a BBC-like scheme with three distinct radio programs has been adopted in Yugoslav radio, but much later than in the rest of Europe. "Namely, somewhere in the early 1960s, in the majority of our republics second radio programs were instituted, and almost immediately afterwards, some radio stations set up third program, which is relatively late when if we are compared to Europe, but was consistent with regards to our social development" (Siljan 1986: 34).

Means of expression were also mentioned by Malavrazic, who argued that, at the time, "no other third radio programs existed in Europe which would produce its text also in the newspaper or journal format" (Siljan 1986: 37). Indeed, this was the case in Yugoslavian radio, where a special journal titled *Treci program* (Third program) was issued on the basis of radio broadcasts (essays, commentaries, analyses and also prose, poetry, radio plays, etc). But Malavrazic took this fact as a departure for criticism. He argued that by and large the third programs of Yugoslav radio stations still dwelled in the stone-age.

Other discussants also mentioned various aspects of comparison with Europe. Radovanovic presented worse organizational structure and employment policy in Yugoslav radio (Siljan 1986: 58). Pirolic presented an emergent trend which included the rise of commercial radio, both in Europe and in the US, the result of which is development of new forms of radio programming (Siljan 1986: 76). Pirolic also mentioned the European situation where information broadcast on television compete with radio broadcasting (Siljan 1986: 76). Tomic mentioned that radio editing and news production should look up to most developed journalistic tradition in the US (Siljan 1986: 84).

Therefore, one can say that comparison with European radio was sought on the levels of organizational structure, programming, technology, editing and newsproduction.

3.2 CEE Period 2

Not many systematic studies on the Serbian media were published in this period. Furthermore not many studies were published later about the media in this interesting, transforming period. We were able to locate and draw from one such study – Markovic (1990). This one is, however, not systematic in discussing specific *contents* of Serbian media. Available information on this period is thus inadequate.

By the time of the submission of this report, the following sources on Serbian media from CEE period 2 were unfortunately unavailable:

- a study on local radio in Serbia by Lucic (1990),
- a study of the party press (various authors 1990),
- studies on reporting of Serbian dailies on the events in Kosovo by Kandic (1990) and by Slapsak (1990),
- a study on contested topics in the Serbian media discourse by Grubac (1993),
- studies on ethnic tensions between Croats and Serbians in the early 1990s (Mihailovic 1997),
- and several studies on war reporting (various authors 1991a, 1991b).

Excursus on a report by Plavsic and Mavric (1990)

This report was selected because it is characteristic of the output by the official research bodies in Serbia. This book is an important document for the prevalent perception of local radio broadcasting in the period between 1989 and 1991. As demonstrated with the study, substantial social input and civic resources were channeled to address the issue of mass communication and information systems. This work presents a case study of public attitudes towards local radio broadcasting in Serbia. It offers detailed reports of an opinion survey conducted in 1989 in the city of Priboj, during the time of deep social and political change in Serbia, as well as in Yugoslavia generally. Radio Priboj, a local broadcaster is studied as a representative case of the entire Serbian local broadcasting network. The structure of the book consists of four asymmetric parts: introduction, methodology, results and appendices. The section of results is divided into, (1) description of the survey sample, (2) amount of listening to Radio Priboj and degree of participation in radio programs, (3) knowledge about programs of Radio Priboj, (4) audience uses of information, (5) credibility of Radio Priboj, (6) attitudes towards specific programs, (7) self-

perception of radio audience, (8) formal and administrative aspects of broadcasting in Priboj – participation in plans for broadcasting reform, (9) attitudes towards Pribojske novine a local newspaper.

Main issues covered in this book are integration of radio broadcaster into the local community, shaping of a self-aware radio audience, competition and compatibility of local radio and the local press, public attitudes towards radio programs and so forth.

No particular mass media theory is used in this study. On the other hand, the study uses academic methodology but the report is professional, not scientific. It is written for a wide audience, and interpretation is limited to the reading of statistical analyses.

A substantial lack of this short book is that it offers practically no comparative insight. It asks the reader to take for granted its premise from the outset of the empirical study, namely that Radio Priboj constitutes a representative, even a paradigmatic case from the Serbian media landscape (Plavsic and Mavric 1990: 59). Similarly, the book lacks an account of changes that await Serbian broadcasters in the given period; the need for reform is mentioned but is not contextualized outside the popular preferences measured by the survey. It is important to align this point with the aim of the study to address involvement of the local audience in radio reform. The study documents a degree of popular participation in these endeavors and records a high motivation and enthusiastic readiness for change.

Europe or European values are not mentioned directly in this report. Substantial amount of attention is, however, paid on value-laden questions emergent from the transformation of socialist society and liberalization of its economy.

3.3 CEE Period 3

Media studies in period 3 are more extensive.

Several systematic studies mention Serbian media and their “contents” in the context of the present political situation; e.g. Milosevic (1995), Radojkovic, Miroslav (1993, 1996).

Several historical analyses place contemporary Serbian media in a historical perspective; e.g. Ramet (1992, 2003).

Also available in this period is systematic empirical research of media use and media coverage from local research institutes; Stojanovic (1999); Dzuverovic, Mihailovic and Vukovic (1994). In this body of work, one should also include publications of CESID, the Center for Free Elections and Democracy (Scr. *Centar za svobodu izbora i demokratiju*). In its publications *Oko izbora* – volumes 1 to 6 – which can be translated in English either as *The eye of the elections* or as *About elections* Serbian media are critically investigated from the perspective of political communication. Note: Some of these studies should be available also on the Internet!

Three further studies require mention. A comprehensive exposition of the development of the Serbian media in the 1990s in an article by Tunnard (2003), a volume by Nebojsa Popov on *The road to war in Serbia* (2000); and a volume on *Media and War* by Skopljanac Brunner (2000).

Characteristic for these studies is that they explicitly address primarily media bias and propaganda. Most of them are focused on media and their reaction to the armed violence. While Europe and EU progressed with its own international agenda, Serbian media studies from this period show how the media were immersed into local problems and the Balkan wars.

Not only are media studies in this most recent period more diverse and abundant, but are also observably more self-reflective. This point applies particularly to the studies which dealt with mass media during or after the Balkan wars. The following fragment from Curgus Kazimir is characteristic for this self-reflective attitude.

“Every analysis of a newspaper implies reviewing and examining what was published in it. (Whatever was not there, but what could have been there, is subject to another type of analysis performed subsequently – in an attempt to establish the extent of the matching of actual events and accounts thereof.) It is also a fact that the things which did appear in the press often differed from what the journalists wrote and tried to ‘push through’ the newspapers. What we have here is, actually, a specific kind of sieve that various pieces of information were put through. Whatever was stopped by the mesh, and could not get through, can only be imagined or partly reconstructed on the basis of personal files of certain journalists who were cautious enough to make a carbon copy. This good old custom – since computer technology has not made a breakthrough wither in *Politika* or in any other daily in Serbia – is rarely used.” (Curgus Kazimir 2000: 87)

For several reasons, a number of contemporary studies that deal with Serbian media, warfare and representation ethnic tensions were unavailable to the Ljubljana team by the time this report was completed. These were, among others, the following:

- a study by Mark Thompson, titled *Forging the War* (1995),
- a study by a collective of authors titled *Serbian Side of the War: Trauma and catharsis in the historical memory* (1996),
- a study by Mira Benham, titled *War Drums, War Media* (1997)
- a study by Mihajlovic on hate speech on television Belgrade (1994).

3.4 EMEDIATE event 1 – October 1956 in Budapest

No available media study focused on this event.

The only mention of this “crisis” event and its treatment in the Yugoslav media was found in a report by the International press institute from Zurich (IPI 1959). There the investigators briefly mention the following:

“On certain occasions, in particular during the Djilas affair and the Hungarian revolution, part of the Yugoslav press was able to give the impression that it enjoyed considerable editorial independence. In reality, however, it was only able to express itself with a certain freedom because the Party line was fluid at the time.” (IPI 1959: 126)

3.5 EMEDIATE event 2 – Building of Berlin Wall

No available media study focused on this event.

3.6 EMEDIATE event 3 – 1968 in Paris and Prague

No available media study focused on this event.

3.7 EMEDIATE event 4 – Fall of the Berlin Wall; reunification of Germany; international refugee crisis

No available media study focused on this event.

3.8 EMEDIATE event 5 – Second Gulf War

No available media study focused on this event.

4. “European values” in Serbian media studies

4.1 *Respect (and disrespect) of ethnic identity*

The notion of ethnic identity was a suspicious one in the socialist era. It had a complex significance and it was not easily framed in thought. By definition, the Yugoslav federation of republics was an association which emerged from a class conflict, and was also based on the idea of peaceful resolution of conflict and international cooperation. Administration of the Yugoslav federation continuously promoted slogans of brotherhood and solidarity among nations in its contacts with the population. The Federation was a Union of different ethnicities which, in political theory, strived towards a single goal – attainment of a socialist democracy and collective wellbeing. But the Federation was also a multiethnic society where its administrative units, its republics and regions, in part represented territorially conclusive ethnic societies (e.g. Slovenia) and in part a mixture of various ethnic groups (e.g. Bosnia and Herzegovina). This was often a cause of conflict. The kind of universal and humane socialism which was propagated at the federal level was furthermore in clear contrast with specific ethnic identities. Clearly, elements of ethnic expression could not be hidden or suppressed and they were given ample space in the media landscapes.

To emphasize “cultivation of ethnic identity” as a value (present in the media discourse) of a socialist state implies a two-fold grasp of the notion of value itself. South Slavic people of the Yugoslav federation were ethnically diverse and this contributed also to other differences among South Slavic ethnicities, such as cultural, linguistic, historical, social, economic, and so forth. Cultivation of ethnic identity in the media was both a positive and a negative value. In any event, it was a value which was articulated also with the help of mass communication. Historically, several ethnic identities which constituted the Yugoslav federation were asserted *through* the mass media (e.g. the modern press in the vernacular language in the 19th century)! On the other hand, ethnic identity was asserted vis-à-vis neighboring ethnicities, or in contrast to bordering territories and people. Affirmation of ethnic identity was also affirmation of the other or of the non-identity with some other ethnic group. In this respect, ethnic identity resulted in tensions and also conflicts. These tensions had also fatal consequences. There are few, for instance, who do not view dissolution of the socialist federation of Yugoslavia as an immediate outcome of intense ethnic divergence. There are many, who even say that ethnic conflict was the primary, and not merely an adjoining, factor in the disintegration of Yugoslavia.

History of the Serbian sovereignty and politics is closely tied to the printed press and mass communication. Publication and ethnicity are thus tied since the first attempts to “imagine the Serbian nation”. As first influential periodical newspapers in the Serbian language appeared during the Ottoman reign, they contributed to the affirmation of Serbian language, ethnicity and also to its political agenda. During the WW2, Serbian media played a role of the catalyst for popular resistance. They also fought a big struggle in the international arena in which they attempted to secure credibility to the resistance movement led by the communists thus marking the Serbian nation on the map of the world. In the socialist era, Serbian media were first trusted the leading role in setting up the federal information and mass communication system. They were also expected to contribute to the socialist solution of the ethnic minorities’ question, for instance the Kosovo Albanians, Hungarians in Vojvodina, and Romanians to the East of Serbia. Thus socialist politics was inseparable from ethnic concerns.

Socialist politics as well as mass media in Serbia were continuously embedded in concerns over the repression of the ethnic interest. The question of ethnic minorities was often reduced to concerns over insults to ethnic sentiments. It is impossible to omit from this report the point that ethnic concerns were central causes of the political and social dynamics in the socialist period. Unresolved tensions among ethnic groups which constituted the socialist Yugoslavia later contributed to the escalation of violence and emergence of armed conflicts. In the final instance, for several reasons, unresolved ethnic tensions led to wars. As one Slovenian researcher argues, central among these reasons was deliberate and crude manipulation with religious aspects of ethnic identity. For the former socialist Yugoslavia was not only a multiethnic state, but was also a society which included diverse religions.

“Media wars” before warfare or ethnic “homogenization”

Markovic notes that ethnic question in Serbia was a contested issue even when it was already clear that the socialist political system cannot but incorporate, quite radically, elements of political pluralism; he writes that a specific burden of the (broadcast) media was their biased involvement in the “media wars” (Markovic 1990: 33). When Markovic mentions this phrase in the 1990 it was still quite prophetic. Cruel warfare was years ahead. Political conflict escalated but remained confined to the constitutionally defined means and organs. Broadcasting media were at the time still closely linked in a formal union of broadcasters, whereas the press had been focused selectively on concerns of individual republics for decades. Media wars, as Markovic defined them, included “cases of lasting support of the media to a contested partial, quasi-ethnic interest” (1990:

33). Media wars thus extended from severe cases of information blockages to milder examples of biased reporting on ethnic issues.¹²

Public perception of the overt, as well as hidden, conflicts which were transmitted by the broadcast media seems informative. Markovic in this sense mentions a commentary of a communication scholar from the influential Serbian daily newspaper, *Borba*.

“Yugoslav press and broadcasting, which are strictly divided by republics and regions, in the recent years offer many examples of a systematic propagation of doubt, insult, and hatred among the Yugoslav nations the society is being simply suffocated by systematically encouraged and nurtured interethnic hatred... There is obviously an intention to renovate and perchance even expand contested bases for the monopoly of the political authorities, and that effects of political pluralism are paused at least for awhile and at least for a certain period of time.” (Pasic in Markovic 1990: 33-34)

The accusation of the above commentary aimed directly towards the political establishment; it was published in September 1990. In itself this commentary is a proof of the kind of troubles the authorities faced during the process of democratization (or pluralization) of Yugoslavia. On the other hand, this was not an unfamiliar point. The claim that ethnic conflict was being used by the political authorities to divert attention from inevitable political transformation and especially from articulation of alternative political platforms which foretold detrimental impact for the leading role of the communist party was widespread.

It is possible to further illustrate the social and political context in which this claim was applicable. One retrospective media study (Skopljanac Brunner 2000) cites a philosophical commentary by Popov who earlier outlined the link between politics and ethnic identity. “From the very beginning, the structure of new authorities in Serbia firmly relied on *nationalism* and *populism*,” writes Skopljanac Brunner (2000: 117). She then proceeds, with the claim of Popov that the substance of the authority’s new basis of legitimacy was the “*spiritual matrix of anti-individualism and militant nationalism* characterized by a belief in conspiracies, fear of the other (especially if foreign), hatred of differences between individuals and nations, and the readiness to remove these differences by force” (Popov cited in Skopljanac Brunner 2000: 117).

¹² It is unfortunate that Markovic lucid analysis refrains from a more detailed treatment of »media wars« in his work. He argued that such an analysis, while urgently needed, might contribute to further escalation of conflict and search of the most burning recent example (1990: 33).

According to Brankovic, in the period before wars broke out Serbian media were instrumentally used by the political elites for homogenizing the nation because the political elites themselves saw this strategy as an appropriate way to escape full-scale reforms and revolution (Brankovic 2000).

Brankovic argues in his analysis that political homogenization through the Serbian media was achieved in four ways: (1) at a symbolical level through new language and speech, (2) at the political level as explicit calls for unity, and (3) by inviting people to boycott and subvert political alternatives, as well as by (4) establishing a historical legitimacy of the aggressive political leadership under Milosevic (see Brankovic 1000: 145-152).

Us and “the other” during the Balkan wars in 1990s

Later developments confirmed the assessment presented in the previous section. There are many analysts who claim that media were the key factor in generating tensions in the first place, as well as in contributing to their escalation (e.g. Puhovski 2000, Popov 2000). Popov (2000), for instance, no more than a decade later commented similarly about escalation of ethnic sentiment to explicit hatred, violent rhetoric and calls for violent action. When war broke out, Popov suggests, all sides involved in the armed conflict used propaganda which overemphasized its own ethnicity and denigrated the other.

“It is established that on both sides /i.e. on the side of the Serbian as well as Croatian media/ there are the same frameworks of propaganda, repeating “we” are the victims, “they” are the culprits; there is no way to save “ourselves” other than by annihilating and vanquishing “them”; it is “us” who have been sanctified, while the “others” have been satanized. Each of the parties in the conflict aims to homogenize “itself” from the inside, and to crush and destroy “others”. Not only is the other “ethos” signified as the “enemy”, but also the much wider surrounding (‘Europe the bitch’) the abominable “new world order”, as well as ghostly ‘mondialism’” (Popov 2000: 10).

During the time of interethnic conflict and armed violence, media were active agency in increasing the tensions (see also Pavicevic 2000, Skopljanac Brunner 2000). Popov suggests, and this is not an uncommon practice, that contents of media which alluded to the positive valuation of ethnicity linked with a primordial desire for conquest and accumulation. Popov call this greed and argues:

“Inflammable propaganda and an aggressive ideology are connected with voracious greed. They condition each other, supplement each other

and stimulate each other. There is certain logic of the irrational present in this relationship, hardly understandable by rational logic. Namely, frequent confrontations, even the most brutal ones and even within individual nations, impose a hypothesis, about the conflicting nature of interests within every nation. However, some “secret connection” gives an unexpected integrating power to nationalism. Appealing to the “national interest” has a magical effect, despite its lack of rational determinants, and despite obviousness of the differences in interests, as well as the destructive results of the policy of national oligarchies. It seems that not only the strength of power, but also some mystical project, emotionally connects the agents to the conflicting interests” (Popov 2002: 14).

Rhetorical strategies for discriminating the other

A number of studies argue that media (especially the printed press) from the countries which found themselves involved in severe conflict or even armed warfare used recognizable strategies for addressing “the other”; such studies include (Pavicevic 2000, Hodzic 2000, Puhovski 2000, Dimitrijevic Kozic 2000). Curgus Kazimir on the other hand argues that it is not always completely clear whether the media were the cause, the symptom or a consequence of the political agenda of the elites and their conscious acting on tensions and violent outbursts of the local populations (Curgus Kazimir 2000: 103).¹³

A study by Pavicevic explains how, for instance, the discriminating rhetoric worked in the Serbian daily *Politika* (Pavicevic 2000). When it came to identifiable causes which led to the outbreak of war, *Politika* only rarely addressed them. Pavicevic found out that a mere 2 % (or 69) of all articles in *Politika* “explicitly discuss the causes of war” (2000: 74). On the other hand, about 40 times more articles was published by *Politika* where Croatian ethnicity or Croatian politics, state and its representatives figured as the evil other, the enemy (2000: 74). This, according to Pavicevic, “reveals the manner in which a pragmatic context was formed for evaluating the causes and identifying the culprits of the war in the former Yugoslav territories.” (2000: 74)

Consistent with the point above, Skopljanac Brunner (2000) mentions the following findings from her own quantitative survey.

¹³ Curguz Kazmir explicitly claims the following with respect to burdening the media for the outbreak of war. “I personally, at least when *Politika* is concerned, do not agree with the assessment that the journalists started and conducted the war. It is a serious question whether it was at all possible for them to resist the marginalization of the informative genre in relation to the commentarial one.” (2000: 106)

TABLE 10. TOPICS ABOUT WAR (*POLITIKA*; 1991)

Source of articles	Number of articles	Percent
Reasons for the war	55	3,1 %
Qualifications of the war	146	8,2 %
The war goals	40	2,3 %
War episodes and events	825	46,5 %
War personal stories	187	10,5 %
Historical background of the war	38	2,1 %
International mediation in resolving the Yugoslav crisis	263	14,8 %
Others	219	12,4 %

Source: Skopljanac Brunner (2000: 131).

In a parallel study of the Croatian daily press (which mentions also Serbian media), other rhetorical strategies and mechanisms are mentioned for discriminating the other. They are introduced through a series of questions “Why are enemy forces always ‘heavy’ but often ‘retreating’; enemy soldiers all the time ‘savage, unrestrained, undisciplined and ignoring orders’; ‘drugged’, ‘fierce’ and ‘demoralized’ (some of the attributes of the Croatian Army in the Serbian newspaper *Politika*)? Is it a crime more horrible if it is committed by ‘serbochetnikcommunist forces’ (one of the usual attributes of the enemy in the Croatian media), rather than by the ‘ordinary’ enemy?” (Kristofic 200: 77)

According to Skopljanac Brunner, there were seven main characteristics of media discourse during the warfare in the Balkans (2000: 140-143). Her findings result from a combination of quantitative and contextually-minded qualitative inquiry of the Serbian daily newspapers. According to the analysis of Skopljanac Brunner, characteristics of such discourse are evident from statements about the war and from lexical choices in the media reporting of the warfare. Among these characteristics there are included (1) emphasizing political and legal corroboration for the thesis that the war is being fought for a just cause, (2) victimization of the Serbian side in the conflict, (3) narrative-historical as well as explicitly emotional rendering of the causes for warfare, (4) mythology and reproduction of the politically consonant imagery, (5) emphasizing of historical superiority, (6) positively stereotyping Serbian defense forces, (7) vilifying the enemy and the enemy army (Croatian Armed Forces).

"Semantic guerilla warfare" (Eco)

Accounting for aggressive verbal expression, hate-speech and intolerant reporting in the Serbian media, some researchers adopted the notion of "semantic guerilla warfare" which was proposed by Eco (see Pavicevic 2000). This form of battle allegedly created a gap between "media and political spaces" (2000: 73). It was argued that "various linguistic, rhetoric and argumentative strategies were used. Various notions, as needed, had their meaning expanded until they were emptied so that, thus hollowed, they could be used in as many contexts as possible (the term 'Ustashi' had, for instance, lost its hard core of designating a war criminal from World War II, later denoting in the Serbian media every Croat who is not well disposed to Serbs), or else constricted to use in specific contexts only (this happened with the term 'Yugoslavia', which in certain environments could be used only in negative or in positive terms)" (Pavicevic 2000: 73).

The basic principle of the semantic guerilla warfare was propagation of different (renewed and additionally aggressive) usage of familiar concepts by the media. According to such analyses, the media played a role of investing familiar symbols, phrases, terms and historical events in new contexts in which exclusion of "the other", of the other ethnic group was the primary motif of communication. It should be emphasized again that these analyses show only redefinition of older symbols and concepts were already familiar from the socialist period and which received in the media novel meanings or new contexts for their usage.

It is perhaps interesting to note that the same language, symbolism, or vocabulary phenomenon was observed on all sides of the warring ethnicities and their media throughout the 1990s; thus Hodzic (2000) and Puhovski (2000) for instance mention Croatian media and so forth.

Pavicevic makes a further point that a semantic war preceded the actual war and developed parallel to it! Pavicevic's "detailed "pragmatic and semantic" analyses confirmed that conflicts between ethnicities of the former Yugoslav republics shifted vocabularies and definitions of the older uses of key symbolic referents (Pavicevic 2000: 74).

The political uses of historical and religious mythology

In a conceptual study of Jelena DZuric (2000) several interesting ideas are outlined on the role of the Serbian media in propagating aggressive mythology. This mythology, DZuric argues, was primarily based on a positive valuation of the nation and was centered on mythological and political legitimation of the nations' leader (2000: 154-156).

As DZuric argues, the main vehicle of dissemination for this invented and politically opportune mythology was the controversial daily newspaper

Politika (DZuric 2000). As already indicated in this report, aggressive symbolism was not only propagated by *Politika* through the selection of news, reporting and journalistic coverage, but primarily through various forms of commentary, including public addresses of political authorities.

It is interesting to add that by a crude turn of fate, the role of journalists again became, as it once was in the early stages of Yugoslav socialism, mobilized and obediently subordinated by the agenda of political elites.

“The fundamental feature of modern mythology is its spreading through the media, which facilitates its prompt but superficial consummation. Thus, by means of *Politika*, the ruling team could influence public opinion through information which could be modified and/or even changed, in accordance with actual ‘common’ interest. Instead of traditional oral narrators, current myth producers are literate ‘engineers of human souls’ – ‘national intellectuals’ and journalists” (DZuric 2000: 174-175).

Re-imagining the nation during the Balkan wars

The problematic pendulum which swung in public discourse on ethnicity led to the re-imagining of the Serbian nation during and after the Balkan wars. This pendulum earlier swung from the notion of transnational brotherhood in socialism, to idealizing the ethnic identity just before the socialist federation disintegrated, the pendulum which after socialism swung in Serbia from ethnic distantiation and alienating the other, back to the position of the ethnic ethos firmly on the throne of the ruling ideology. Immediately before the warfare and during armed conflicts, the nation was re-imagined in the sense that it had to build itself in a different form than the one which was left behind the Milosevic regime.

Curgus Kazimir (2000) convincingly explains:

“Attempts to throw some light on the role of *Politika* in the period 1988-1991 often overlook the fact that, in addition to purely practical political tasks – aimed at winning and reinforcement of the power of Slobodan Milosevic – the paper also performed an additional socio-psychological job, especially in the sphere of culture and historiography. Thereby the premises were realized for a long-term social orientation where the mixture of conservative nationalism and communist demagoguery were manifested in full in selective forgetfulness and a specific kind of revanchism.” (Curgus Kazimir 2000: 104-105)

The nation was again re-imagined with a series of popular protests which overthrew the Milosevic regime in the late 1990s. The notorious resistance movement *Otpor*, which also received a world-wide recognition, was in the

front of these popular activities. Again the “nation happened” on the streets of Serbian cities, just as was the case during the disintegration of Yugoslavia, and just as it was the case immediately before the outbreak of war. Mass media played an important part in these developments. Not only the press, but primarily technologically more advanced means of mass communication, such as independent radio broadcasters (Radio B 92), satellite television and internet portals. Unfortunately, systematic media studies of this period are not available!

Ethnicity and Europe

For a while during the conflicts in the former Yugoslav republics, ethnic identities were measured up in the media discourse with reference to Europe and its historic heritage.¹⁴

On the other hand, Europe was presented in the media as the bigger political community to which the problem of ethnic conflict which escalated in the Balkans historically belonged. Violent ethnic conflicts in the Balkans were often portrayed by the media as characteristic for the realm of the Central and Eastern Europe (Puhovski 2000: 42-43).

¹⁴ In his discourse analysis Hodzic (2000: 21-22) similarly found out that expression of Croatian ethnic identity in the Croatian newspapers (*Vjesnik*) was occasionally grounded in the idea that Croats constitute one of the oldest nations in Europe.

4.2 Pluralism

It is interesting that the notion of pluralism of interest in the realm of politics was close to the jargon of self-management rhetoric of socialist Yugoslavia, although the state was firmly attached to the one-party politics. Treatises of Marxists ideologues were cited as confirmation for the fact that a socialist society actually encourages diversity and plurality of opinion. Edvard Kardelj, a foremost ideologue of socialist politics as well as of mass communication system in Yugoslavia, was often credited for spelling out formal and administrative resources for a socialist society as a society based on the pluralism of interests (Lekovic 1982, Niksic 1980, Markovic 1990, etc.).

Political pluralism of the Serbian media in the early socialism

Immediately after WW2, a degree of rudimentary pluralism existed in the Serbian media. Newspapers linked to parties other than the Communist party were still published, although with difficulties. Such an example was the newspaper *Demokratija* which was linked to the Serbian Democratic Party and was edited by Milan Grol (IPI 1959: 121). This newspaper, however, existed earlier. With new legal regulation, especially with federal press law of 1946 which was in force until 1960s, it was made practically impossible to set up new media, for instance new newspapers that could be at odds with the Communist party. As IPI report also documents, “all attempts to publish such papers seem to be doomed to failure” (IPI 1959: 121).

It is interesting that the prevalent claim of the political elites was that even with the mass communication and information system without rudimentary political pluralism (i.e. without press that is owned or published by political opposition) there was ample space for the expression of diversity. This claim also appeared in public via the commentaries and treatises published in the press (daily as well as weekly and monthly). IPI report cites a claim by the Yugoslav political ideologue Mosa Pijade who argued that the early press law (from 1948) gives “almost unlimited freedom of expression through press, excluding from this liberty only quislings” (Pijade cited in IPI 1959: 121).

Explicit exclusion of alternative political platforms from the public life and from media landscapes was noted by other foreign researchers as well. This exclusion applied especially to those groups that constituted or were affiliated to the “enemy” line during the WW2 warfare, such as “Ustashi”, “Domobranci” and other politically articulate groups which Pijade called

the “quislings” in the quote above. IPI Report (IPI 1959), Arnim (1968), Robinson (1975) all mention this systematic exclusion.

Political pluralism of the Serbian media towards the end of the socialist era

Towards the end of the socialist period in Yugoslavia, it was quite clear that free speech has been already fought out comprehensively by the media themselves and by their audiences as well. Legal regulation often represented merely immaterial and irrelevant restrictions which were ran over by the current practices. In a commentary by a Serbian communication scholar, it was mentioned that legal regulation was not the main problem concerning free speech in the media. Markovic wrote persuasively that “our legal system thus far did not lack declarative norm on the freedom of the press, of the responsibility of the information sources and communicators: lacking was a serious social effort to protect these values by our courts of justice, as well as morally and professionally” (Markovic 1990: 44).

Pluralism of ethnic expression

It was consistent with the predominant political ideology that media landscapes in Yugoslavia were wide open to the expression of ethnic minorities. Not only were media in Yugoslavia published or broadcast in the official languages of the Federation (which included, Serbo-Croatian language which was spoken in Serbia, Croatia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Vojvodina, as well as in Slovenian and Macedonian languages), but they also provided platform for numerous recognized ethnic groups and minorities. Among these minority languages which were able to enter media landscape, and were actually encouraged by legal regulations to do so, one could surely include, Albanian, Bulgarian, Czech, Hungarian, Italian, Romanian, Russian, Slovak, Ukrainian, and Turkish language. While formal access to the media was guaranteed to every ethnic group or community, there was a difference, however, with respect to the material, technical and other resources on the basis of which this right could be enjoyed. In practice, some ethnic minorities, such as Kosovo Albanians, were marginalized although formally they had full access to public expression in their own language.

Furthermore, on the level of media landscapes of individual republics overt tensions appeared among different constitutive ethnicities (i.e. concerns about marginalization of Serbs in Croatia and in Bosnia, or Bosnians in Serbia, or Bosnians, Croats and Serbs in Slovenia and so forth).

In practical terms, pluralism in (and of) the media landscape meant ample opportunity to publish different views in the press. Due to the existence of

different printed media, newspapers, journals and magazines, individuals or groups were able to find available forums for their views. This fact was present especially after the 1970s when a diversity of the printed media enabled expression of views and platforms to more or less organized political fractions (e.g. the so-called MASPOK and the student strike in Zagreb in the early 1970s, or the activities Serbian academic opposition to the political domination of the Communist party and so forth).

Ramet (1992) argues that this kind of pluralism of the printed press, i.e. a pluralism of forums in which it was always possible to find a way among the Yugoslav media to make one's views public, derived in the 1970s from a two-fold phenomenon of decentralization and increased regionalization or "republicanization" (Ramet 1992: 414). This latter part of the process referred to the fact that the press increasingly focused on the audience within individual federal republics. Several empirical findings convincingly indicated since the 1970s that the "media contents of the six republics have a strong regional flavor" (Robinson 1977: 191). "People in Bosnia commonly say that local Muslims read the Bosnian republic press (*Oslobodjenje, As*), local Croats read the Croatian republic press (chiefly *Vjesnik* and *Vecernji list*), and Bosnian Serbs read the Serbian republic press (chiefly *Politika*, but also *Politika Ekspres*)." (Ramet 1992: 437)

Ramet also mentions that the two-faced process of decentralization and regionalization (of the press) in effect led to "unintended liberalization". Ramet reconstructs that "journalists have repeatedly discovered in Yugoslavia, if it proves impossible to publish something in one periodical outlet, regardless of the reason, it may be a simple matter to get it published in a different periodical: the youth press has often provided this kind of service as an 'alternative' outlet; other times is it a matter of crossing inter-republican borders and taking one's story to a periodical based in another federal unit" (Ramet 1990: 414).

Scattered attempts to find forums for political alternatives in the 1970s, albeit they were for the most part also hidden and unexpressed, were met with a strong reaction in the Yugoslav league of communists. Markovic cites a statement from a session of the federal government in Belgrade in which it was said: "Anti-selfmanagement forces in the media of information and in the society as a whole were not answered by an engaged, objective, class-based, and clearly articulated journalism. Through emphases of the false dilemmas and overdue conceptions of the relations between the press and the political structures, positions were created to fight out the struggles for sectarian and other unacceptable interests and tensions. The goal of all this was to paralyze the impact and engagement of the League of Communists in this area of activity" (LCY cited in Markovic 1990: 24).

It is not until the mid 1980s, however, that the problem of pluralism in a socialist society has been addressed in radical terms by Serbian intellectuals. Markovic mentions a book by Kostunica (who later played a

significant role in Serbian politics after socialism) which was accidentally published by a Slovenian publisher in Ljubljana (see Markovic 1990: 2).

According to a discussion by Markovic (1990), talk of political pluralism in the domain of mass communication in Serbia at the end of 20th century, as well as in Yugoslavia broadly, should be placed into the framework of ideas which were elaborated in the MacBride report to the UNESCO on a new global communication order. Markovic cites in the very introduction to his study a point that links diversity and pluralism of political opinion to the situation in Europe; for MacBride's report claimed that higher standards of communication in Europe would not lead to the dissolution of existing ideological, political, social or cultural differences among various European countries. But it was also argued in MacBride's report that pluralism of opinion or perspectives as a characteristic of the contemporary world does not preclude common struggle for peace and cooperation among nations (Markovic 1990: 1).

Vreg's opinion on pluralism was notable in the late 1960s. He argued that "although socialist democracy considers a free, autonomous and self-managing public as a prerequisite for... pluralism in politics... the media are not yet open forums for all types of discussion in Yugoslavia. Pluralism is to date more freely expressed in the sphere of social self-management than in that of politics. Unfortunately, the existing structures of the Socialist Alliance of the Working People are not assuring the articulation of differing opinions, views and interests, and thus (inhibit) the actual confrontation of alternative political concepts" (Vreg 1969: 214-215; cited also in Robinson 1977: 63).

Pluralism after the disintegration of Yugoslavia

Political pluralism became a relevant and contested notion in the Serbian media after the disintegration of Yugoslavia. It also spurred many sharp and comprehensive debates, which included arguments from all sorts of angles and positions. Characteristic for this notion was a relative scarcity of intellectual resources with which it was possible to make sense of the western imagery of pluralism. Nebojsa Popov argued reasonably that lack of experience with political pluralism also implied lack of foundational ideas with which to deal with its emergent implications (Popov 2000: 9). Unfortunately, this gap was impossible to amend as political pluralism

“Before experiencing freedom – freedom of the media, political pluralism and elections – the theory and methodology of studying these phenomena were underdeveloped in our country. These phenomena produced a shock; even more so: they were accompanied by flaming conflicts and the outbreak of war. ‘The language of hatred’ has especially attracted the attention of local and foreign researchers. Raw emotions and an increasingly sophisticated methodology mar out a complex and twisting path to the understanding of the events in which the media perform a shock” (Popov 2000: 9).

In addition to pluralization of the political arena and conceptual emphasis on pluralism, another complex parallel process took place in the early 1990s. This process was reflected in deep structural change of mass media in Serbia. After dissolution of the Yugoslavian socialist federation and with the introduction of market economy in Serbia, many new mass media (newspapers, radio and television broadcasters) suddenly appeared in Serbia. This structural change transformed Serbian media landscape from a centralized and state dependent mass communication and information system which was embedded in the one-party politics, into an economically liberalized media landscape in which new, commercial or particular interest driven media replaced were ushered in. Transformation replaced a state/public system of mass communication with a liberalized and profit-driven media landscape.

Researchers for instance noted that in the early 1990s, especially during the election campaign of 1992/1993, Serbian audience for the first time experienced political advertising on television and other forms of agitation use of the media (Dzuverovic 1994: 19).

4.3 Objectivity of media

Objectivity of news after the break with Cominform

Foreign observers and researchers often consider partiality and bias of the Yugoslav press. Few systematic and comprehensive analyses of the Serbian media during socialism exist on this topic.¹⁵ Robinson investigated selection of news in *Tanjug*, Arnim analyzed coverage of the Djilas affair, and Niksic covers reporting on the unrests in Kosovo in the early 1980s.

IPI report from 1959 also mentions several fragments concerning selection of information and reporting as examples of Yugoslav media unbiased coverage. Their analysis is not very systematic but credible. IPI argues that Yugoslav media as a whole became less biased and thus also more “objective” after the break with Cominform. IPI reporters mention two similar processes, “derussification” and “liberalization” already in the late 1950s.

“The first kind of news to become more objective in character was that concerning the United Nations. This objectivity was gradually extended to news and articles on the capitalist countries. Here a significant point was the appearance of some remarkable impartiality in several Yugoslav papers, including *Borba*, on the electoral campaign in Great Britain at the beginning of the 1950. In December 1951, the *Tanjug* News Agency and *Borba* sent a correspondent to join the anti-Communist forces in South Korea, whose reports were considered to be as conscientious as those emanating from the most conscientious of the Western journalists” (IPI 1959: 127).

The IPI report also mentions Djilas affair as a precursor to shifts in the Serbian (and other Yugoslav) media (IPI 1959: 127). On the notorious Djilas affair and its impact on media bias see also Arnim (1968).

Frequent concerns over the freedom of the press were noted in the Serbian media studies. Ramet for instance mentions that censorship was customary in Serbia (and in other republics of Yugoslavia as well) although they were not prescribed by either constitution or law but were installed by the informal pressure of the political authorities (Ramet 1992). There was no formally instituted “censorship office” in Yugoslavia; yet it was practically the case, as Ramet discovered in interviews with

¹⁵ It is unfortunate that by the time of completion of this report, we were unable to review the work by Kempers in the 1960s which was published in *Gazette* (see Kempers, Frans. 1967. Freedom of information and criticism in Yugoslavia, I. *Gazette*, 13, 1, 3-21; as well as Kempers, Frans. 1967. Freedom of information and criticism in Yugoslavia, II. *Gazette*, 13, 4, 317-336).

newspaper editors, that “before a given issue of a periodical was published, every publisher was required by law to send copies of the galley proofs to the Office of the State Prosecutor. This requirement applied to every periodical published in Yugoslavia regardless of its sponsorship, content, or intended audience” (Ramet 1992: 415).

Objectivity and the disintegration of socialism

The notion of objectivity first emerged as a contested topic in early 1990s in Serbian media studies and was linked with political, social and economic change in the country. This notion was placed explicitly in a value-laden professional discourse which drew on cases and practices which were developed in Europe and the United States. The notion “objectivity” was understood mostly as a measure of bias or, rather, of its absence. Objectivity as a value and as a characteristic of media in Serbia had little to do with epistemological concerns of mass communication. Objectivity was explained in terms of political situation and in terms of social, as well as economic change. Most importantly, objectivity was seen as a problem from the perspective of pluralized media landscape.

A typical definition of the concept for the purposes of research of newscast on television was provided by Mihailovic. He claimed that a television program can be considered unbiased if the “contents of its reports corresponds to the real events and insofar as it exhibits no particular favoritism with respect to the amount of time allotted to the use of time which political parties have at their disposal” (Mihailovic 1994: 12). Vukovic claimed that objectivity (of television) links either with aspects of professional work and ethics of journalists and producers of broadcast programs or with interests of those who own and control broadcast media (Vukovic 1994: 29).

Some media researchers even drew a conclusion that deep structural change in Serbian media, which was caused by the introduction of commercial broadcasters in the early 1990s, affected the way media were received and interpreted by their audiences. When Mihailovic (1994) discusses the notion of media “bias” and “objectivity” during the Serbian election campaign of 1992/1993, he finds it necessary to mention first viewers’ opinions (actually evaluations) on what they perceived as political bias in television newscasts. His discussion of survey results started from the premise that audience views of a possible bias is a legitimate and proper alternative to actually studying media contents Mihailovic (1994: 26-28). According to opinion polls from 1992 and in 1992, Serbian population clearly saw the two main television broadcasters, the public RTS and the commercial Studio B, as partisan. A clear majority of respondents saw RTS as favoring the president, and a clear majority of respondents saw Studio B as favoring opposition (Mihailovic 1994: 27).

Interestingly, these results are compared by the author with findings of a series of similar surveys conducted a decade earlier in France (Mihailovic 1994: 27). There is little commentary, however, from the author about the significance of this comparison. It can be interpreted that at least the case from a developed democracy highlights the downside of the situation in Serbia; i.e. its obvious lack of trust among the audience in “objectivity of television newscasts”. As it is difficult to transmit this point indirectly by describing author’s idea, a lengthy quote from Mihailovic (1994) is in order.

“Basically, it is possible to reach a conclusion on the bias in television during election campaign in two ways: one way leads to the affirmation of public opinion on the bias of television, the other way is to use analysis of television content and judgment of analysts. (...) Let us look, for now, at the opinion of citizens concerning bias. In a public opinion poll of *Centar za politoloska istrazivanja i javno mnjenje* from the end of February 1992, we found out that 18% of respondents were satisfied with the ‘objectivity’ of RTS while even 45% were not satisfied (37% were neither satisfied nor unsatisfied). In a series of French surveys from 1982 to 1984 on the question whether television favored government or the opposition, 46% to 48% percents stated that neither side is favored, 32% to 39% percents of the respondents claimed that television favors more the government, but 3% to 5% stated that television favors the right-wing politics, which was then the opposition (12% to 18% of the respondents did not have an opinion on this issue). Else, a considerable dependence of these evaluations on party affiliation was recorded. Thus for instance 26% of the communists stated that television favored the right, while among the socialists the share is merely 8%.” (Mihailovic 1994: 27-28)

At this point the commentary engages again in a discussion of popular opinion before presidential election in 1992. It is left unclear what might be the significance of experience from a developed European democracy.

In a concluding discussion at the conference on radio broadcasting in Yugoslavia, which took place in 1986, there an illustrative argument by Gradimir Jovanovic was published. “Unfortunately, I know some professional journalists who for instance learn about the memorandum of the Serbian Academy of Science from the Voice of America, because apart from a few words from the ideological committee of the Serbian central committee nothing appeared in public on that. Therefore, if we want to be persuasive, we have to take into account the sources of information. We have to take this into account in so far as we do not want to be limited in going only to the events to which we are invited that is to some boring and very unattractive and even counterproductive meetings. Instead we have to request, and I mean more aggressively, opening of the information sources so that we can be the first to inform our public about the news which attract and animate the attention of the broader public. I believe we have to ask the question of the openness of the information

sources in purely political sense in order to prove to these people who restrain information and who close the sources, because by doing so they bring damage to our public, our socialism and also to our man" (Jovanovic in Siljan 1986: 89)

In mid 1990s, when student pretests took place and the Kosovo issue was being resolved with the help of the international political and diplomatic community, the central media in Serbia were still a mixture of public and commercial ownership. For instance, *Borba*, a mainstream political daily was still property of the Serbian state and was financed from the Serbian budget. *Politika*, the other central Serbian daily, already transformed in this time from state ownership to a private enterprise. Curiously, however, in 1990s editorial boards of both newspapers included distinguished members from the coalition parties.

Objectivity, political pluralism, and the public

The notion of the public was pivotal to the political discourse on mass communication in the socialist era and, to a great extent, continued also after socialism. From the perspective of the official interpretation of Marxism in the socialist Yugoslavia, pluralism of interests was a fact, a condition *sine qua non* socialist organization of society, organs as well as branches of the political organization. In its self presentation, Yugoslav socialist politics saw itself as pluralist. Pluralism of interests was already enabled by the hierarchical organization of bottom-up transfer of political agency and motivation. In theory, Yugoslav socialism (the self-managerial kind which was an offspring from the break with Cominform) was predicated on the plurality of (labor) interests. Socialist structure of a politically articulate society was conceived as a net for collectively steering and co-orientation of diverse aspects of social life. The socialist public was, in theory, a pluralist public. Thus, the notion of objectivity or bias of the media was seen as outdated. For, the socialist media *were* the voice of the public and its plurality of interests.

The notion of the public was also explicitly connected to the debates of media scholars on pluralism after the disintegration of Yugoslavia. One strategy within which in these debates scholars argued in favor of the contested notion of the public was to outline the relationship between this notion as descriptive of a homogenous body of collective agency and the logic of political battle represented by the media. Popov, again, is credible

source of interpretation on this point for the Serbian media after the time of socialism. In 2000, Popov wrote:

“There are more media than in the old regime and they have more freedom. The former strict ban on any political parties other than the ruling one, especially on the opposition, disappeared. An infinite number of political parties emerged. There are frequent elections. There are even more of them than in countries with a developed democracy. A variety of manifestations occur one after another; prizes and recognition are given for various successes. Nevertheless, the economy (and even more intensely) standards of living are declining; culture is subordinated to ideology; isolation from the world is increasing. Just as party pluralism and elections have not taken the country over the threshold of parliamentarianism, so the multitude of media does not recognize that there is *the public* as an institution, and does not provide impartial information, freedom of speech, and control over the government” (Popov 2000: 15)

During the time in which armed resolution of tensions and conflicts was already in the air, the printed press was a significant factor in homogenizing the body politic. Curgus Kazimir also mentions that actually other means of mass communication seem relevant from the perspective of the collective political agency such as the public. He wrote “the symptoms of preparations for war are not found in the media alone. The repertoire of Belgrade theatres (1989-1990) offers many elements for the study of ways to influence the public. Anyway, the public is not a mysterious person stormed from all sides by the prophets and Messiahs. It is itself capable of acting from the shadows.” (Curgus Kazimir 2000: 107)

5. Concluding comment

It should be more or less clear from the report above that academic study of the Serbian media – unlike mass communication in Serbia itself – is a relatively underdeveloped area. There is little systematic work on how different media report current affairs to their audience, apart for studies of election campaigns and several collective attempts to unmask the critical role of media during warfare and in its aftermath.

Furthermore, information is rather scarce on how Serbian media dealt with notions of Europe, EU, European values. (It is perhaps interesting to add that the situation in Croatian media studies is not much different!)

To a certain degree, research into the history of the Serbian press reveals a contextual overlap with the Slovenian case. Importantly, there are similarities in the ways the printed press gained historical significance and social recognition in the two countries. In both cases, the first attempts to set up periodical editions emerged in the second half of the 18th century. For the Serbian language, culture and political awareness, the historical significance of the press was perhaps even higher and political impetus of the press even more accentuated than in the case of Slovenia. Historical basis for this claim is identical in Slovenia and in Serbia: the printed press, with its impact on promotion of the use of vernacular language and writing, with its close interconnection with the cultural and political life, developed before formal institutionalization of ethnically aware polity. The printed press predated constitution of nation-states on the ruins of former imperial powers.

Historically, editorial endeavors of the Serbian press matured along with the life of the early newspapers, magazines and other periodicals. It is significant that the emergence of the printed press in Serbian language (again much like in the case of the Slovenian press) links with the Central European political and social experience in the late 18th and early 19th century. The work of Vuk Stefanovic Karadzic who was firmly integrated into the intellectual developments in the Central Europe was already mentioned above. In geopolitical terms, Serbian population was dispersed and divided in several 19th century monarchies – most notably in the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires. Enthusiasts who worked in favor to promote Serbian cultural and political development were thus primarily based in the Austrian and Hungarian cities. Thus, editorial endeavors in the context of the Serbian press begun within legal, technological and also political experiences of the Habsburg monarchy.

History of the Serbian press before 1941, as well as the story of the Serbian media after WW2, was a story of struggle against political control and censorship. Since the first Serbian constitution of 1888, freedom of the press and freedom of expressing opinion were uniformly guaranteed in every subsequent constitutional document of the Kingdom of Serbia. Also unchanged was a large discrepancy between constitutional guarantees and actual situation (Niksic 1982: 45-46). The same was the case with the freedom of the press in Yugoslavia after WW1. After WW1, Kingdom of Serbia integrated with as short lived State of Slovenians, Croats and Serbs which formed after the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. With this integration, a Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians was founded which was ruled by the Karadjordevic family. The monarchy turned into a dictatorship when a notorious constitution was passed and delegated all political power to the royal government. This so-called Vidovdan constitution from 1921 (until 1929) which introduced the name Kingdom of Yugoslavia formally guaranteed free press and freedom to express in modern terms, but in reality the press was severely repressed and restricted. The Serbian press (as well as the press in other republics) was closely monitored and censored by the authorities.¹⁶

The struggle for the freedom of the press continued also after WW2. Since a much publicized political disqualification of Milovan Djilas in 1952 who propagated ideas of free expression and democratic public discussion either implicit or explicit focus on censorship and propaganda was a central concern of the Serbian media studies and critique.

Another point should be mentioned in this concluding reflection, namely a point that Serbian media studies (and this report as well) say relatively little about a discrepancy between legal regulation and actual practices in the media. For this purpose, further information on legal regulation on media in socialism is added in the appendices.

¹⁶ Niksic mentions that a further constitutional act in the Kingdom Yugoslavia from 1931 framed the matter of the freedom of the press overtly in authoritarian and undemocratic terms. This meant, Niksic believed, only that the normative proscription conformed more to the already well established practice (Niksic 1982: 47).

References:

- Amon, Smilja (1996) *Tisk in politika v Jugoslaviji. 1918-1945*. Ljubljana: FDV.
- Arnim, Gustav Adolf von (1968) *Eine Strukturanalyse der Press der Föderativen Volksrepublik Juglawien. 1945-1963*. Münster: Institut für Publizistik.
- Avramovic, Miodrag Zika (1964) Rad i organizacija Tanjuga. In: Bozidar Novak ed. *Suvremeno novinarstvo*, 263-274. Zagreb: Stvarnost.
- Bace, Mato (1964) Pregled historije jugoslavenskog novinarstva u narodnooslobodilackoj borbi. Srbija. In Bozidar Novak ed. *Suvremeno novinarstvo*, 395-398. Zagreb: Stvarnost.
- Begovic, Branko (1952) *Die Entwicklung der Presse bei den Jugoslawen von ihren Anfängen bis zum Gegenwart unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Presse in der Föderativen Volksrepublik Jugoslawien*. Dissertation thesis. München.
- Bjelica, Mihajlo (1968) *200 godina jugoslovenske stampe*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Brankovic, Srbobran (2000) Media interpretation of war as an instrument of national homogenization. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 145-152. Beograd: Argument.
- Buden, Boris (2000) "Europe is a whore". In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 53-62. Beograd: Argument.
- Bulatovic, Vukoje (1973) Pravo na informaciju. *NIN*, January 14th, 25.
- Curran, James (1991) Mass Media as the Public Sphere. In: Peter Dahlgren and Colin Sparks eds. *Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere*, 27-57. London: Routledge.
- Curran, James (1993) Mass Media and Democracy: a Reappraisal. In: James Curran and Michael Gurevitch, eds. *Mass Media and Society*, 82-117. London: Edward Arnold.
- Cacinovic, Nadezda (2000) The effects of secondary orality. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 213-222. Beograd: Argument.
- Cumarevic, Svetislav (1937) *La presse Yougoslave*. Belgrade: Bureau central de presse.
- Curgus Kazimir, Velimir (2000) The dressing of newspapers. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 97-108. Beograd: Argument.

- Dimitrijevic-Kozic, Marija (2000) Discourse analysis of the news. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 197-211. Beograd: Argument.
- DIV (1949) *Statisticni godisnjak Jugoslovenske stampe za 1948 godinu*. Beograd: Direkcija za informacije vlade FNRJ.
- Djilas, Milovan (1951) *Razmisljanja o raznim pitanjima*. Beograd: Kultura.
- Djilas, Milovan (1956) The storm in Eastern Europe. *New Leader*, November 19th 1956, 3-6.
- Dzuverovic, Borisav (1994) Lavirinti medijske galaksije. In: Dzuverovic, Mihailovic and Vukovic, *Izborna upotreba medija*, 9-20. Institut drustvenih nauka. Beograd.
- Djuric, Jelena (2000) The use of myths for creating and destroying a society. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 153-176. Beograd: Argument.
- Edelstein, Alex S. (1974) *The uses of communication in decision-making. A comparative study of Yugoslavia and the United States*. New York: Praeger.
- Falk, Alfred (1937) *Die jugoslawische Presse in Gegenwart*. Dissertation. Berlin.
- Hodzic, Alija (2000) Preoccupation with the "other". In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 19-40. Beograd: Argument.
- Hopkins, Mark W. (1970) *Mass Media in the Soviet Union*. New York: Pegasus.
- IPI (1959) *The Press in Authoritarian Countries*. IPI survey 5. Zurich: International press institute.
- JIN (1960) *Savremena sredstva informisanja*. Beograd: Jugoslovenski institut za novinarstvo.
- JIN (1964) *Stampa, radio, televizija, film u Jugoslaviji*. Beograd: Jugoslovenski institut za novinarstvo.
- JIN (1965) *Masovna komunikacija u Jugoslaviji*. Beograd: Jugoslovenski institut za novinarstvo.
- JIN (1965) *Novinar i novinarstvo*. Beograd: Jugoslovenski institut za novinarstvo.
- JIN (1968) *Tematska struktura sadrzaja jugoslovenskih listova*. Beograd: Jugoslovenski institut za novinarstvo.
- Jöthel, Erich (1938) *Die slowenische Presse*. Dissertation. University of Leipzig.
- Kisic, Milica and Branka Bulatovic, eds. (1996) *Srpska stampa 1768-1995. Istorijsko-bibliografski pregled*. Beograd: Medija centar.

- Kojic, Branko (1964) Vijest, izvjestaj, intervju, posebni stupci i rubrike. In: Bozidar Novak ed. *Suvremeno novinarstvo*, 152-188. Zagreb: Stvarnost.
- Kristofic, Branimir (2000) Through battles into the 'year of recognition'. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 77-86. Beograd: Argument.
- Kupresanin, Veljko (1960) Pregled istoriskog razvoja jugoslovenske stampe. In: *Savremena sredstva informacije*. Beograd: Jugoslovenski institut za publicistiku.
- Lekovic, Zdravk (1982) *Stampa i revolucija*. Beograd: Radnicka stampa.
- Lucic, Milan (1990) *Lokalni radio – evropska iskustva*. Sombor: IC Sombor
- Manojlovic, Ljubisa (1964) Humor i humorist u listu. In: Bozidar Novak ed. *Suvremeno novinarstvo*, 92-94. Zagreb: Stvarnost.
- Markovic, Andrija Majtenji (1990) *Politicki pluralizam i elektronski mediji*. Novi Sad: Centar za istrazivanje programa i auditoriuma.
- Markovic, Zoran (1996). The nation: victim and vengeance. In: Nebojsa Popov, ed. *The road to war in Serbia*, 587-607. Budapest: CEU Press.
- Mihailovic, Srecko (1994) Televizija u izbornoj kampanji. In: Dzuverovic, Mihailovic and Vukovic, *Izborna upotreba medija*, 21-28. Beograd; Institut drustvenih nauka.
- Mihailovic, S. et al (1997) *Rat je poceo u Maksimiru – govor mrznje u medijima*. Beograd: Medija centar.
- Milivojevic, Snjezana (1993) *Ekranizacija izbora. TV prezentacija izborne kampanje 92. u Srbiji*. Beograd: Vreme knjige.
- Milivojevic, Snjezana (1996). The nationalization of everyday life. In: Nebojsa Popov, ed. *The road to war in Serbia*, 608-631. Budapest: CEU Press.
- Milosevic, Jasna (1995) Politicki puls Srbije. Bosna, politicki lideri, mediji. *Srpska politicka misao*, 2-3, 187-212.
- Misovic, Milos (1996) "Stampa i srpsko drustvo 19. i 20. veka." In: M. Kisic and B. Bulatovic (eds.), *Srpska stampa 1768-1995. Istorijsko-bibliografski pregled*, 9-48. Beograd: Medija centar.
- Mitrinovic, Cedomil (1928) *Savremena stampa. Jubilarni zbornik*. Beograd.
- Mitrovic, Zivan (1964) Pregled historije jugoslovenskog novinarstva do drugog svjetskog rata. Srbija. In: Bozidar Novak ed. *Suvremeno novinarstvo*, 363-371. Zagreb: Stvarnost.
- Mokrov, Boro (1980) *Razvojot na makedonskiot pecat i novinarstvo. Od prvite pocetoci do 1945 godina*. Skopje.
- Momirovski, Tome (1964) Organizacija jedne RTV stanice. In: Bozidar Novak ed. *Suvremeno novinarstvo*, 239-242. Zagreb: Stvarnost.

- Nedovic, Slobodanka, ed. (1998) *Odsutne partije: slika politickog zivota Srbije u drzavnim medijima*. Beograd: CeSID.
- Nenadovic, Aleksandar (1996) *Politika in the storm of nationalism*. In: Nebojsa Popov, ed. *The road to war in Serbia*, 537-564. Budapest: CEU Press.
- Nesovic, Slobodan (1964) *Tujina in nova Jugoslavija*. Ljubljana, Beograd: DZS, Prosveta.
- Nesovic, Slobodan (1968) Borba za slobodu stame u Srbiji od 1875-1912. *Novinarstvo*, 8, 1-2, 21-26.
- Niksic, Stevan (1982) *Oslobodzenje stampe*. Beograd: Mladost.
- Novak, Bozidar (1964) *Stampa, radio i televizija u nasem drustvu*. In: Bozidar Novak ed. *Suvremeno novinarstvo*, 7-12. Zagreb: Stvarnost.
- Pavicevic, Djordje (2000) *Political discourse*. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 63-76. Beograd: Argument.
- Petkovic, Aleksandar (1964) *Novinarstvo i pravo*. In: Bozidar Novak ed. *Suvremeno novinarstvo*, 37-45. Zagreb: Stvarnost.
- Plavsic, Prvoslav (1979) *Beogradzani i zajednicki program radia*. RTV teorija i praksa, 16, 177-195.
- Plavsic, Prvoslav S. and Gordana Mavric (1990) *Lokalna radio-difuzija u novim uslovima: na primeru Radio-Priboja*. Beograd : Radio-televizija, Centar za istrazivanje programa i auditorijuma.
- Popov, Nebojsa (2000) *Media shock and comprehending it*. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 9-18. Beograd: Argument.
- Puhovski, Zarko (2000) *Hate silence*. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 41-52. Beograd: Argument.
- Radojkovic, Miroslav (1993) *Predistorija medija u postkomunistickim zemljama*. Zbornik Matice Srpske za drustvene nauke, 191-206. Matica Srpska: Novi Sad.
- Radojkovic, Miroslav (1996) *Prilog raspravi o nezavisnim medijima*. Zbornik Matice Srpske za drustvene nauke, 255-273. Matica Srpska: Novi Sad.
- Ramet, Sabrina P. (1992) *The Role of the Press in Yugoslavia*. In: Allcock et al., eds. *Yugoslavia in Transition: Choices and Constraints*, 414-414. New York: Berg.
- Ramet, Sabrina P. (2003) *Kuga nacionalizma in zapuscina vojne*. *Teorija in praksa*, 40, 4, 759-770.
- Robinson, Gertrude Joch (1977) *Tito's Maverick Media. The politics of Mass Communications in Yugoslavia*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- SG (1964) *Statisticki godisnjak SFRJ*. Beograd.

- Sijan, Rade, ed. (1986) *Jugoslovenski radio juce, danas, sutra. Nedelja jugoslovenskog radia. Izbor diskusija s okruglog stola*. Beograd: JRT.
- Skaberne, Bogomir. 1936. Die Anfänge der jugoslawischen Presse und die Bestrebungen zur sprachlichen Einheit. Dissertation. Berlin.
- Skopljanac Brunner, Nena (2000) Media strategies of constructing the image of the "other" as "enemy". In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 117-144. Beograd: Argument.
- Slapsak, Svetlana (1990) Echoes and reactions in the *Politika* daily newspaper. In: *Kosovo knot: Untie it or cut it?* The Report of the Independent committee: Beograd: Hronos.
- Sokolovic, Srdjan (1964) Ispitivanje javnog mnjenja. In: Bozidar Novak ed. *Suvremeno novinarstvo*, 198-203. Zagreb: Stvarnost.
- Stojanovic, Dragana et al. 1999. *Izmedzu etike i etiketa*. Nis: CERID.
- Skerlic, Jovan (1911) *Istorijski pregled srpske stampe*. 1791-1911. Beograd.
- Skiljan, Dubravko (2000) Semantics of war. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 177-196. Beograd: Argument.
- Timotijevic, Dusan (1963) Training of Journalists in Yugoslavia. *Training of journalists*, 5, 16, 89-92.
- Turkovic, Hrvoje (2000) The partiality and non-partiality norm in news programmes. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 223-261. Beograd: Argument.
- Tunnard, Christopher (2003) From state controlled media to the anarchy of the internet. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 3, 2, 97-120.
- Velikonja, Mitja (1996) *Bosanski religijski mozaiki*. Ljubljana: ZPS.
- Veljanovski, Rade (1996) Turning the electronic media around. In: Nebojsa Popov, ed. *The road to war in Serbia*, 565-586. Budapest: CEU Press.
- Vladimirovic, Mladen (1965) *5 vekova pisane reci*. Pozarevac: Prosveta.
- Vreg, France (2000) *Politicno komuniciranje in prepricevanje*. Ljubljana: FDV.
- Vreg, France (2001) Public Opinion in Socialism. In: Slavko Splichal, ed. *Public Opinion and Democracy*, 241-259. Cresskill: Hampton Press.
- Vukovic, Slobodan (1994) Predizborne igre medija. In: Dzuverovic, Mihailovic and Vukovic, *Izborna upotreba medija*, 29-52. Beograd; Institut drustvenih nauka.
- Zakosek, Nenad (2000) The legitimation of war. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 109-116. Beograd: Argument.

Zivotic, Radomir (1979) *Posleratna reportaza in njene stilske odlike*.
Beograd: Decje novine.

Zlender, Danilo (1963) Evolution of Public Information Media in
Yugoslavia. *Training of journalists*, 5, 16, 57-68.

Zlender, Danilo (1966) The Training of Journalists in Yugoslavia. *Gazette*,
12, 1, 35-43.

Appendices

Appendix 1

In order to understand historical dimensions of the social, political and cultural significance of the mass media in Serbia, it is important to outline also media landscapes and media studies before 1950. Comprehensive investigation of this period was not a stated goal of the EMEDIATE project, but it was necessary for the Ljubljana team to go deeper in history in order to understand certain less obvious traits observed in Serbian media studies between 1950s and present.

Serbian media and media studies before 1950s

Studies of the historical development and expansion of the Serbian media (especially of the press) reveal a complex history, entangled with political interests, personal controversies and large-scale ideological agendas. It is important to recognize that in Serbia, the social and political significance of the press develops within a charged political discourse ever since the first attempts to set up periodical press in Serbian language. Since the very beginning of the printed press in Serbian language, and afterwards as well, mass communication was inseparable from politics. The following passage from an introduction to comprehensive source of the history of the Serbian press may illustrate this point more clearly.

“The emergence of contemporary press in Europe is largely linked with the beginning of the 17th century. In this period Yugoslav nations were ruled by the conquerors from the East and from the West, which makes it understandable that ideas about setting up newspapers in national languages were not easily acceptable. Somewhat later, at the end of 18th and at the beginning of 19th century, by which time the power of Turkish empire had ostensibly decreased, the conditions for that part of the Serbian nation that lived in Austria and Hungary became to some extent bearable. In this period, educated Serbs in Vienna, Pest, and in Novi Sad, who were still in small numbers, and who were helped in their endeavors by the Serbian merchants, became the initiators and leaders of the fight for cultural renaissance among the Serbian nation in Vojvodina. Their influence was also felt among those Serbs who lived under the Turkish rule. In this period, precursors of the press and periodical literature appeared.” (Misovic 1996: 11)¹⁷

¹⁷ Serbian. »Pojava savremene stampe u Europi vezana je uglavnom za pocetak 17. veka. U to vreme jugoslovenski narodi su bili pod vlascu osvajaca sa Istoka i Zapada, pa je razumljivo sto su ideje za pokretanje listova na nacionalnim jezicima tesko prihvacene. Nesto kasnije, krajem 18. i pocetkom 19. veka, kada je snaga Otomanske imperije znatno oslabila, uslovi za ovaj deo srbskog naroda koji je ziveo u Austriji i Ugarskoj postali su nesto snosljiviji. Tada jos malobrojni skolovani Srbi u Becu, Pesti i Novom Sadu, koje su pomagali tamosnji srpski trgovci, bili su iniciatori i nosioci borbe za kulturni

Within the process of historical articulation of the Serbian ethnicity, the printed press was an influential site for the cultivation of the Serbian language, culture and political platforms. The most prominent attempt to shape the course of cultural and linguistic development was an annual almanac of the famous Serbian linguist and ethnographer Vuk Stefanovic Karadzic, who started his annual publication *Danica* in 1824 and who has also authored learned treatises on language, culture and cultural heritage. The cultural and political history of the Serbian nation is in this sense inseparable from the history of the Serbian press.

In historical terms, bibliography of the Serbian media reaches no further back than to the last decades of the 18th century. As the beginning of the Serbian press, historians cite an early attempt of Zaharija Stefanovic Orfelin from Venice to publish a newspaper in Serbian language (*Slaveno-Serbski Magazin*; note that only one issue was actually released in 1768). This attempt was located outside the Serbian territories which at the time belonged to the Ottoman empire; Belgrade and Southern Serbia formed the so called Belgrade pashaluk, an relatively self-sufficient administrative entity of the Empire. The first and somewhat lasting periodical newspapers in Serbian language appeared in 1790s. In 1791, P. and G. Markides Pulio, who were actually of Greek origin as historians are quick to point out, set up *Serbski povsednevnija novini* in Vienna. This was a political journal which lasted a year and a half and produced 183 issues. At the end of 1792, Stefan Novakovic started a journal *Slavenno-Serbskija Vjedomost* which was also published in Vienna and also developed an explicitly political agenda (Kisic and Bulatovic 1996: 53-54).

In Vienna, another notable newspaper in Serbian language appeared in the beginning of the 19th century, *Novine serbske iz carstvujusega grada Vienne* (1813; eds. D. Davidovic and D. Frusic). One of its editors, Davidovic, started in 1815 also an educational annual almanac *Zabavnik* (1815; ed. D. Davidovic). As already mentioned above, in 1824 Karadzic's *Danica* appeared in 1824 also in Vienna. This was a time, when the Serbs secured relative administrative autonomy in the Belgrade pashaluk under the aegis of the Ottoman rule. Serbian territories north of Belgrade, especially the region of Vojvodina, belonged to the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

In addition to Viennese editions, several other periodicals in Serbian language were set up in the Hungarian cities of Buda and Pest between 1824 and 1847. According to Kisic and Bulatovic (1996), these publications included *Serbska ljetopis* (1824, Buda; ed. G. Magarasevic); *Banatski almanah* (1827, Buda; ed. D. Tirol); *Serbska pcela* (1830, Buda; ed. P. Stamatovic), *Dostapametnosti* (1834, Buda; ed. P. Cvetic); *Serbski*

preporod srpskog naroda u Vojvodini. Njihov utecaj osecao se i medzu Srbima koji su bili pod turskom vlascu. To je bio period u kome su se pojavili prvi vesnici stampe i periodike na srpskom jeziku.« (Misovic 1996: 11).

narodni list (1835, Buda; ed. F. Pavlovic); *Serbske narodne novine* (1838, Pest; ed. F. Pavlovic); *Srbska novina ili magazin za hudozestvo, knjizestvo i modu* (1838, Pest; ed. A. Arnot), *Pestansko-budimskij skoroteka* (1842, Buda; ed. D. Jovanovic); *Slavjanka* (1847, Buda; ed. S. Miletic). Compared to the political focus of the early Serbian newspapers published in Vienna, the periodicals from Buda and Pest had by and large a more culturally specific, educational and literary focus. Also, they were not published as frequently as the Viennese journals – for instance, *Banatski almanah* and *Serbska pcela* were annuals, whereas *Serbska ljetopis* started with three issues per year but then often changed its frequency. *Serbski narodni list* and *Serbske narodne novine*, however, were published once or twice a week (see Kisic and Bulatovic 1996: 54-58).

The early 19th century Belgrade and also some other Serbian cities under the Ottoman jurisdiction developed periodical press in Serbian language only in the 1840s. The first such edition, issued weekly on Saturdays was *Podunavka* which was set up in 1843 and was edited by Milos Popovic; *Podunavka* was closely linked to the activities of the Society of Serbian literature (*Drustvo srbske slovesnosti*). Other less ambitious periodical editions, such as annual or occasional appendices to the existing newspapers were also permitted under the Turkish reign. During the revolutionary developments in the 1848, Serbian intellectuals in Vienna and other urban centers of Europe also attempted to contribute to the development of Serbian culture, language and political agendas (see Kisic and Bulatovic 1996: 54-58). The prime concern of this early Serbian press in Belgrade and elsewhere were strict regulations in terms of censorship and political control; admittedly, strong political control over the press was characteristic for the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires in the 19th century. Other important concerns in this earliest period of the Serbian press included defining the audience, choosing the proper system of Cyrillic writing, and so forth. The early newspapers were dedicated in part to Serbian priests and orthodox monks; their audience was defined as “the esteemed clerics and the nation”, e.g. in *Serbskaja povsednevniija novini*, or as “the people and the consecrated (srb. *posveceni*)”, e.g. in *Slavenno-serbskija vjedomosti* (see Kisic and Bulatovic 1996: 54-58). Editorial focus on the members of the Serbian clergy also implied the use of grammar and alphabet which was used by the orthodox priests; editors consented to adopt a “high” style of writing for their specific audience – see Misovic (1996: 12)

In the 1860s, first political parties developed in the Serbian territories. As a result the Serbian press became more widespread and slightly less repressed as the political life in Serbian territories acquired more modern administrative and societal structures. In 1870s, political opposition to the rulers of Serbia articulated through the rise of new political parties and strengthened its criticism. Finally, during the congress in Berlin in 1878 Serbia was given full international recognition as a sovereign state and became a monarchy. From the perspective of the press, the conditions

were not much different under Serbian sovereign rule than they were before. Arnim argues in retrospect that after 1878 Serbian press was relieved of any foreign influence and was able to develop along with the trends and tendencies that prevailed in the Western Europe (Arnim 1968: 25). But Niksic, on the other hand, mentions that freedom of the press was still only formal under Obrenovic rule in Serbia. Niksic interprets the press in the second half of the 19th century still as strongly regulated and tightly controlled by the authorities. "Due to the political conditions in Serbia, many newspapers, especially progressive ones, were printed outside its territories and smuggled in. Domestic newspapers were censored and their editors were being prosecuted and also imprisoned." (Niksic 1982: 42) Niksic also mentions that Serbian legal system adopted quite modern attitude on the freedom of the press and of the freedom of expression. But these guarantees were merely formal and were not carried out in practice. "Under the influence of the west European liberalism, the constitution of the Kingdom of Serbia which was adopted in 1888 elaborated on the modern notion of the free press." (Niksic 1982: 44) The constitution guaranteed that every Serbian citizen had the right to express his opinion within the boundaries of the law, either by speech, in writing, in the press or with graphic means. The 1888 constitution guaranteed that the press was free. The constitution also guaranteed that no form of censorship could be instituted by the political authorities by whose means it would be possible to prohibit publication, selling or dissemination of the printed material or newspapers. The only exemptions were instances of defamation of the king or of his royal court, defamations of foreign leaders, or general calls for arms. In reality, Niksic also mentions, the press was under a strong political influence while the normative, constitutional guarantees for the freedom of expression and of the press were only rarely, and if that only mildly, voiced in public by the liberal bourgeoisie (Niksic 1982: 44-45).

Smilja Amon argues that Serbian press limited itself in this period to the propagation of political platforms and polemical exchanges of public actors with different opinions. Particularly in the 1890s, the informative function of the Serbian press was marginalized and obliterated by its political agitation and partisanship (Amon 196: 42). Among 15 daily newspapers which existed at the time, Amon also argues, 4 were concerned with commentary on current affairs, 5 were linked to individual political parties, 2 were daily newspapers oriented to professional publics, one was a satiric newspaper, one was devoted to the members of the armed forces, and one aimed at youth (Amon 1996: 42).

An important change in Serbian journalism and press history, as Amon also notes, was introduced with the appearance of the newspaper *Male novine* (eng. *The Small Newspaper*; the newspaper lasted from 1878 to 1903) which were conceived and edited by Pera Todorovic. This daily journal mimicked the commercially successful French daily *Le petit journal* and thus attempted to combine information with a commercially viable

system of small advertising. It also built a network of colportage and soon secured a circulation of 30.000 copies (Amon 1996: 42). The journal did not last long. It was set up under the rule of Obrenovic family, in the year in which Serbian sovereignty received international recognition, and it ceased to exist in 1903 when military coup re-installed the Karadjordjevic on the Serbian throne. It is interesting that this intriguing case from the Serbian press history is rarely mentioned in publications of the Serbian history of journalism. The learned Slovenian historian of journalism Amon comments that *Male novine* signified the introduction of proper mass press in the sense that it appealed to the mass audience and less demanding reader this commentary, however, is not echoed elsewhere.

Before WW1, a widespread media activity and audience existed in the Kingdom of Serbia. In 1911, 15 daily newspapers were published in Belgrade; the biggest ones could rely for the support on approximately 30.000 subscriptions (Skerlic in Arnim 1968: 25). Moreover, there were over 135 newspapers in Serbia, of which 79 were published in Belgrade. Annual output of the Serbian press in 1911 was 43 million copies (Skerlic in Arnim 1968: 25). In 1918, the Serbian territories became integrated with Slovenian and Croatian in the kingdom of Serbians, Croats and Slovenes (srb. *Kraljevina Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca*). The kingdom was ruled by the Serbian family Karadjordjevic (this family succeeded the rule of Obrenovic by a military coup in 1903) until the beginning of WW2. Thus, the role of the monarchy in securing political progress and development of the mass communication system is dubious. Rather more substantial contribution to this effect was due to the growing body of bourgeois merchants, entrepreneurs and intellectuals. Through their endeavor, the Serbian printed press flourished in the first decades of the 20th century.

According to the analysis of Begovic, 1936 was the high point of the Serbian daily press in the time before WW2 (as well as of the press in other parts of Yugoslavia). Arnim (1968) cites his findings and mentions that in 1936 three main Serbian dailies produced as much as about 250.000 copies per day. *Politika*, which Begovic describes as left liberal daily newspaper, produced 120.000 copies per day. *Vreme*, which Begovic describes as the newspaper which was close to the politics of the monarchical government, produced 100.000 copies per day. *Pravda* which Begovic describes as a radical left daily produced 15.000 copies per day (see Arnim 1968: 38).

For the politically complex and turbulent period in the first part of the 20th century in Serbia and its media landscape several more systematic and critical accounts exist (e.g. Bjelica 1968, Cumarevic 1937, Mitrinovic 1928, Mitrovic 1964, Skerlic 1911, Nesovic 1968; see also Amon 1996). It is perhaps interesting to note in connection with this that immediately prior to the WW2 there was a notable interest in the Yugoslavian press among German scholars. Several dissertation theses were written from

the perspective of the traditional German *Publizistikwissen* the foundations of which date as far back as the 19th century and the works of Knies, Schäffle or Bücher (see Hardt 1999). In the precious study by Gustav Adolf von Arnim (1968) several such works are mentioned as, for instance, a dissertation by Alfred Falk on the Yugoslav press from 1937 (titled *Die jugoslawische Presse in Gegenwart*), a dissertation by Bogomir Skaberne from 1936 on the press in Yugoslavia and its role in linguistic unification (titled *Die Anfänge der jugoslawischen Presse und die Bestrebungen zur sprachlichen Einheit*), and a dissertation of Erich Röthel from Leipzig in 1938 on the history of the Slovenian printed press (titled *Die Slowenische Presse*).

It is important to mention that in part, the history of Serbian press links also to the wider Slavic area. Before 1945, numerous newspapers in the Serbian language existed in various urban centers of the East Southern and Central Europe. Since the early 19th century, Serbian newspapers were published in Trieste, Venice, Vienna (Arnim 1968: 24-25, Bjelica 1983, Niksic 1982). Serbian newspapers were also published by organized emigration elsewhere (Kisic and Bulatovic 1996). An extremely valuable data source from this perspective represents the work of Boro Mokrov (1980) who offers a detailed history of the press and journalism in Macedonia before 1945. His work is mainstream political history of press in the sense that it builds up on the notion of the press as an agency of political influence and as a mechanism of associating public intellectuals which may strengthen associative ties and contribute to the articulation of powerful ideas. As Macedonia was a former federal republic in the socialist Yugoslavia, bordering on Serbia, it is important to investigate, at least marginally, historical development of Macedonian press and journalism. Moreover, part of this history developed under a strong influence of Serbian politics (i.e., the idea of the Southern Serbia). Serbian press and journalism, Mokrov argues, played an important role in the history of the Macedonian press, in part because of a strong Serbian ethnic minority in the Macedonian territories and in part because of more or less overt integrative tendencies of the Serbian authorities with respect to certain territories under Macedonian or Turkish jurisdiction before WW2 (Mokrov 1980: 254). Judging by the quantity and influence of the Serbian press in these developments, the Serbian element in the (political) history of Macedonian press and journalism is relatively significant, although the Macedonian national question was framed primarily in its contested relation and differentiation with the Bulgarian culture, language and politics (Mokrov 1980: 6).

Mokrov lists several newspapers which were available in Macedonia between 1895 and 1941 and were either produced in Serbia or in Serbian language, for example *Carigradski glasnik* (1895-1909; Istanbul, ed. Kosta Grupcev), *Vardar* (1908-1914; Skopje and 1932-1936, ed. Milan Jovanovic), *Glas naroda* (1912; Skopje, ed. Arsenije Zdravkovic), *Nova Srbija* (1913; ed. Branislav Nusic), *Bitolske novine* (1915, Bitola), *Velika*

Srbija (1916-1918, Thessaloniki and Skopje, ed. Aleksa Jovanovic), *Juzna zvezda* (1922-1926, Bitola, ed. Spasoje Popovic) *Glas Juga* (1940-1941, Skopje, ed. Andjelko Krstic) in which ample place was offered for discussion of current political affairs as well as for cultural expression in Serbian language (Mokrov 1980: 255-264). Mokrov also mentions a number of periodical publications in Serbian language which resulted from the work of associations, cultural organizations, professional networks, sport clubs and so forth (Mokrov 1980: 263-264). Serbian press was thus widely available in Macedonia due to the efforts of Serbian consulate in the then Istanbul as well as due to the efforts of the journalists and editors which belonged to the Serbian minority in cities like Skopje, Bitola, Prilep, Ohrid.

For the period during WW2, there are several studies that deal with the Serbian press and also the Serbian radio stations (Dedijer 1945, Kupresanin 1960, Bace 1964, Nesovic 1964 and other later sources). For the most part, these analyses focus on the role of the media in the liberation movement. Arnim mentions that, for obvious reasons, there was complete ignorance in the postwar journalistic historiography of the periodical press produced by other parties in the warfare on the Serbian territories (Arnim 1968: 42).

A characteristic and quite interesting study of the media landscape during the WW2 is Nesovic's historical reconstruction of press reports, produced both by the domestic and by foreign press, on the warfare on Yugoslav territories during WW2 (see Nesovic 1964). This book is primarily a documented reconstruction of the information flows about warfare and especially about the attitudes of the foreign press towards the Yugoslav Liberation Front (YLF) and its leader Tito. The book's objective is to document the shift from the ignorance to the acknowledgement of YLF in the foreign press. The information "villain" that the book documents is the Yugoslav king Peter who fled to London after German army declared war on Yugoslavia in 1941 and in exile controlled flows of information concerning warfare in Yugoslavia until YLF was recognized as an ally against Nazism's aggression in Europe. In reconstructing the attitude of the foreign press to the warfare in Yugoslavia, Nesovic cites newspaper reports, editorials, photographs and so forth. It aims at chronologically ordering individual processes and linking political interests behind global information flows. The picture this book draws is outlined by a partisan perspective and is also informed by an insider's observation of the working of the media during the war (Nesovic was a writer and editor during the WW2). Author's intention is summarized in the following statement: "From a mass of news reports and information of war and diplomatic correspondents, from a mass of commentaries, on-site reports of numerous reporters and publicists which were either published in the

world or broadcast on air, from many brochures and books on our nations, which were printed during the war in the great anti-Hitler coalition, this book selected only a small fragment. The book thus contains a selection of this material – which seems to represent statements of individual states, their governments, publics and newspapers of different political worldview concerning the liberation war of our nations, concerning the part contributed by the National liberation army in the victory of the allied nations, and also concerning Tito's Yugoslavia" (Nesovic 1964: 21).

This book is not an academic study of media reporting, it rather oriented to the broad and general audience. It also lacks sophisticated conceptual tools and methodologies but it is a comprehensive and documented account of the foreign coverage on the warfare in Yugoslavia during WW2. It compares output of the Yugoslav information sources – which the book presents primarily as located in Serbia or in connection with the Serbian interwar press – with the coverage in the foreign press. The extent of this international coverage is astonishing; the book details (albeit selectively) news reports from all central interwar newspapers in the UK, the Soviet Union, the USA (*The Times, The Observer, Sunday Times, Post Yorkshire, Daily Telegraph, Daily Mail, Daily Express, Financial Times, The Guardian, The Central European Observer, Pravda, Izvestija, Trud, Komsomolskaja Pravda, Mezudunarodnaja zizn, The New York Times, The New York Herald Tribune, The new York Post, Daily Worker, Post Meridien, La Liberte, Eleftheros Hellene*) as well as all important news agencies from the period, such as Reuter, TASS, United Press, Associated Press. The book also mentions reports of international radio broadcasters such as *BBC, Radio Moskva, Radio London*. The book is composed of verbatim translations of the selected media texts which are then accompanied with short commentaries and intertwined into the overarching narrative of the shift from ignorance to recognition. Occasionally, the selected news reports are supplemented with photographic documentation or reproductions of the original newspaper articles. The interpretation of this overwhelming material is predictable throughout the book. It is offered to the reader as a black and white narrative, which is completely in line with the general idea about the struggle for international recognition of the Yugoslav (Tito's) military and political impact (Nesovic 1964: 22).¹⁸

¹⁸ This agenda is made explicit in another introductory statement of the author: "In addition to the unequal and extremely tough warfare against the fascist conqueror and domestic traitors of all colors, our nations had to fight just as insistently and just as decidedly for full two years and a half in order to reach to the world with the truth about the military struggle, precious sacrifice, important military successes and also about the important contribution to the victory of anti-Hitler coalition. The Yugoslav nations had to fight in order that the world recognized the truth about hideous crimes and mass killings, which were committed by the Germans, Italians, Hungarians, Bulgarians, the Ustashi, Chetniks, the white guards, Balists and followers of Ljotic. Across so many obstacles which the Yugoslav revolutionary reality was facing the world would almost never learn about the heroism and unheard of, unparalleled suffering of our nations, our children,

An authoritative and relatively complete bibliography of Serbian periodical publications that include the time before 1950s – in fact, it covers the time until 1995 – has recently been published by an independent Serbian research institute *Medija centar* (see Kisic and Bulatovic 1996). This book covers periodicals in Serbian language from the first known attempts (dating from 1768) to the time when warfare in the former Yugoslav republics was still raging (bibliography concludes with the year 1995). Compared to the systematic bibliography of the press and other printed media, there is no systematic overview of other existing means of mass communication in Serbia before 1950. Several historically informed fragments exist on Serbian radio before this time but the information is rather scattered.

women and elderly, about the revenge and repression of the punishment expeditions” (Nesovic 1964: 22).

Appendix 2

Socialist conceptions of journalism, mass media, and public opinion

It is impossible to understand media landscapes in socialism unless the systems of mass communication are placed into the context of broader doctrines on journalism, mass media, and public opinion as well as other related notions which were developed in this period. From a contemporary perspective, the conceptual background to the mass media landscape under socialism appears relatively simple. As Splichal (1992) argues, the authority of the socialist state over the mass media was legitimated by the undisputed perception of the political, educational and cultural importance of the media (Splichal 1992: 33). The appearance of simplicity from the present perspective results from the fact that the mass communication system was centralized and also from the point that mass media were in reality exposed to the control and surveillance of the political leadership. Vreg (2000) argues that such notion of mass communication and mass media relates closely to a “monistic model of public opinion” which was characteristic for the socialist countries in the Eastern Europe. The basic trait of this model was that it was generated by the strong administrative apparatus and that it assumed a convergence of interests of labor, intelligentsia, and of the rural populations (Vreg 2000: 148).

All Federal republics of Yugoslavia, including Serbia, Slovenia and others, were by constitution socialist societies. The media landscapes in these societies thus developed along the lines of socialist notions, both practical and theoretical, of mass communication and information. Historically, the most influential ideas on mass media and mass communication were derived from Lenin’s rendering of the young Marx and his publications on the press. Lenin’s (and Leninist) views on communication, propaganda and information were explored in many treatises, dissertations, textbooks and were also propagated routinely in self-reflections of journalists in socialism. As France Vreg mentions, the Yugoslav communist party essentially adopted the Leninist notion of the press as the collective organizer, propagator and agitator who would spare no resources in fulfilling its task (Vreg 2000: 148). It is clear, that Leninist perspective on the press played important role during the restoration of the Yugoslav society immediately after WW2. There was a deep break between the political leadership of Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union in 1948 which marks historical discontinuity in blind application of the Soviet politics in Yugoslavia; this is particularly true in the realms of culture, economy, and also in mass communication. Therefore it is not quite appropriate to argue that the Leninist model of mass media fully characterized the practice of

the Yugoslav mass media. It is also a matter of analysis to what extent Leninist ideas on the mass media were indeed subverted by the mass media system in Yugoslavia. Vreg, for instance, speaks about “anti-Stalinist dissent” which was characteristic for the development of mass media in Yugoslavia (Vreg 2001: 244). Vreg also argues that Slovenian mass media in particular progressed away from the Soviet conceptions of mass communication and propaganda (Vreg 2000: 148-150).

Conceptions of journalism, mass media, mass communication, the public and public opinion which developed in socialism had substantial theoretical significance. They were not given ample theoretical attention only in order to secure internal conceptual consistency of the prevalent platforms and policies of the socialist bureaucracies, but also because they were duly developed from distinguished theoretical conceptions (i.e. from a comprehensive critique of unfettered liberalism and a systematic defense of the freedom of the press which was articulated by Karl Marx). Moreover, the prevalent conceptions of mass communication and mass media which developed in Yugoslavia after its break with the Soviet Union (Cominform) brought to existence a somewhat different mass media and information system. This specific mass media and communication system transformed from a propaganda mouthpiece of the Yugoslav Communist Party (in the late 1940s) into a relatively open and pluralist social space (in the late 1980s). Splichal mentions that socialist Yugoslavia was the only outstanding exception among the Eastern European countries in which the media system was not authoritarian but paternalist (Splichal 1992: 33). According to Splichal, the paternalist model of the mass media developed from the two-sided political influence with centralized planning economy on the one hand and self-management and participation of the labor on the other hand; the media system in the socialist Yugoslavia thus possessed certain traits of the civil society idea and also certain competitive elements on the level of media output (Splichal 1992, 33).

A critical media scholar from Serbia, Stevan Niksic, argued already in the 1980 that political doctrines of the Yugoslav communist party developed a specific mass communication and media system. “The political system of the socialist self-management which is being built in Yugoslavia, logically assumes creation of a corresponding system of the self-managed press. None of the existing models of the press which were established within the frameworks of bourgeois pluralist democracies or one-party state socialism is able to address specific demands of the self-management society nor to its social and political organization” (Niksic 1982: 120)

It can be said that the “paternalistic” rather than “authoritarian” model of mass communication in Yugoslavia importantly contributed to a relatively more balanced development of democratic societal and political structure during the 1980s than in the rest of the socialist countries from the Eastern Europe (such was especially the case in Slovenia, which also peacefully transformed into a democracy, because the rest of the former

Yugoslav republics was halted in this process by the ethnic warfare in the 1990s).

Conceptual specifics of the mass media and mass communication system in Yugoslavia can be perhaps illustrated with an expanded spreadsheet which continues a comparative analysis of mass communication in democracies and mass communication under socialism by James Curran. Curran explains why mass media in communist societies differ substantially from media in democracies (Curran 1991). The communist model of mass communication and mass media emerged from political conception which made the media completely dependent on political leadership. Mass media in liberal economies, Curran claims on the other hand, were historically free to explore economic perspectives of distributing information and news as commodities, but became therefore irreparably dependent on the logic of capitalist profit (Curran 1991: 29-35). Curran selected 6 aspects through which differentiation between the “communist” and “liberal” models of mass media can be explained: (1) the prevalent notion of the public sphere, (2) the political role of the mass media, (3) the economic structure of the mass media system, (4) the goals and aims of journalistic practices, (5) perspective on entertainment contents of the mass media, and (6) possibilities and means for reforming the system. These six aspects provide starting points for conceptualizing differences between the communist and the liberal models of mass communication and mass media. It is perhaps important to mention at this point that all aspects used in Curran’s analysis derive from a critical appropriation of Habermas’ early theory of the bourgeois public sphere and its structural transformation in the contemporary society in which a normative conception of the public sphere is taken as the key element in the development of the media landscapes (Habermas 1989). For better comparison of the communist and liberal media systems, Curran added to his analysis two further models of mass media and mass communication which are still relevant for contemporary theoretical reflection. Curran’s analysis thus additionally includes a model of mass media which can be derived from a Marxist critique of the liberal mass media systems, as well as a model of the mass media which is posited as a theoretical ideal by the radical democratic theory (Curran 1991: 28).

It is possible to add for the present purposes a fifth model, a paternalist model of mass communication and mass media which developed in the socialist Yugoslavia and to differentiate it from the communist model of the mass media and mass communication which Curran justly attributes primarily to the media in the Soviet Union. I also wish to add four further categories with which one could expand the platform for conceptual differentiation of different models of mass media and mass communication. This expanded list could easily include (7) the social role of the journalists, (8) legal guarantees for the free press and for the freedom to express, (9) practical limitations on the freedom to express, and (10) information flow. These categories are included for better

illustration of the main differences between the analyzed models of mass communication and mass media. The spreadsheet below presents central differentiation four our present concern (i.e. differentiation between the communist and socialist model of mass media) in shaded fields.

TABLE 11. COMPARISON OF DIFFERENT CONCEPTUAL MODELS OF MASS MEDIA

	Liberal model of the mass media	Marxist critique of the liberal mode	Communist model of the mass media	Socialist media system (in Yugoslavia)	Radical democratic ideal of the media
Public sphere	Public space	Class domination	Uniformed and artificial	Controlled; occasional genuine outbursts	Public arena of contest
Political role of the media	Check on government	Agency of class control	To further societal objectives	To further societal objectives	Representation/counterpoise
Economics of media	Free market	Capitalist	Public ownership	Public ownership; elements of market economy	Controlled market
Norms of journalism	Disinterested	Subaltern	Didactic	Didactic; criticism within limits	adversarial
Entertainment	Distracting/gratification	Opiate	entertainment as enlightenment	Education of values: also avant-garde expression	Society communicating with itself
Means of reform	Self-regulation	Impossible to reform	Liberalization	Continuous bottom-up improvement	Public intervention
Social role of	Skilled craftsmen	Conformed workers	Officers of the	Officers of the	Organs of the public

journalists			state	socialist society	
Guarantees of free speech	Full guarantees	Full guarantees	Full guarantees	Full guarantees	Full guarantees
Practice of free speech	Self-censorship	Conformity to owners' interests	Political censorship; also self-censorship	Flexibility in political control	Complete freedom
Information flows	decentralized	follow flows of capital	centralized	integrated, regionalized	centralized

Source: The basic template of this table (i.e. mass media models 1-4 and differentiation aspects 1-6) is taken from Curran (1991) and expanded.

Although some entries from the original analysis of James Curran may not be completely clear from the table above and would require additional discussion, it is not practical to repeat Curran's analysis here (see Curran 1991; also Curran 1993). It is, however, necessary to spend some time discussing the main differences pointed out above between the communist model of mass communication (as developed primarily in the Soviet Union) and the socialist model of mass media and communication (as developed in Yugoslavia).

Primarily, the difference between the communist and socialist conception of mass communication stems from the roles assigned to the media of mass communication. On the one hand, we have complete subordination of the media to the political authorities. As Hopkins mentions "the Soviet newspaper, because of its involvement with the political system, has an overriding inclination to defend, explain, and promote – management's the party-government apparatus – policies and views. The Soviet editor, himself a member of the management team, is especially concerned that his publication win acceptance for his peers and superiors. This means of course that he constantly gauges shifts of thought and emphasis among those who make political and economic decisions, and tries to tailor his publication to parallel these changes" (Hopkins 1970: 31). On the other hand, we have a system of mass communication in which the central idea gradually transformed from a Leninist conception of the mass organizer and a catalyst for *political action* into a system which attempts to bind and to channel *social action*. As explained in one treatise on information and mass communication in socialist Yugoslavia: "The system of public information is not only intended to further and disseminate knowledge of individual interests. It is here to serve the realization of these interests.

(...) The system of public information does not include only journalist but much more broadly encompasses forces of social and public life which participate in self-management” (Lekovic 1982: 186). The difference between Soviet and Yugoslav mass communication system therefore seemed to demarcate between political mouthpiece and social tutor vis-à-vis political nexus and encourager of collective social agency.

One characteristic of the socialist mass communication system was, quite paradoxically, that within such definition of mass communication as nexus and a source of encouragement, clearly different expectations of what the precise tasks of the media were existed. This is paradoxical because inner pluralism of perspectives was a praised political goal of the socialist elites, but also a common objection of its practice. The pluralism was there, but it was not very radical in political terms. But it is enough to differentiate it from the complete uniformity of the Soviet model. On the one hand, somewhat rigid conceptions of the tasks of the media were spelled out by the political elites. Political elites in Yugoslavia viewed mass communication system as a practical extension of the abstract ideas with which the socialist project is fuelled. Ramet observed that local communists “tended to believe that the press’s basic assignment was to strengthen the values of socialist self-management and to support the policies of LCY, assisting the politicians in finding and implementing ‘necessary’ solutions” (Ramet 1992: 418). From this perspective, it is clear why some of the most frequent objections from the representatives of the communist party on the account of the press included its “failing to support (or even for being at variance with) party policy, for confronting the public with differing analyses, for ‘confusing’ the public, for overemphasis of negative phenomena in society, for loss of ‘seriousness’, even for ‘neutrality’ in the treatment of burning social issues” (Ramet 1992: 418). On the other hand, ideas existed according to which the press, and other mass media in socialism, primarily followed other goals as well. In the early 1950s, Djilas who was then the leading representative of the league of communists claimed that the goal of the socialist media was to serve as a platform for free exchange of opinion (Djilas 1951). Other similar views concerning free expression in the media emerged later, and were quite wide-spread among journalists, editors, intellectuals, and theorists of mass communication (see Niksic 1982, Robinson 1977). Normative theory of the socialist media and journalism pinpointed these differences early on. A Slovenian journalist Osolnik is often cited for his definition of the three roles of journalism and mass media in a socialist state. These roles are (1) that the media must provide “objective and comprehensive information”, that (2) socialist mass media must create “public forums”, so that they also criticize social and political processes in a society, and finally that (3) they must perform a didactical role of social education and dissemination of fundamental knowledge, values and information (Osolnik cited in Robinson 1977: 119). At a closer look, these three roles simultaneously captured expectations about the

media which could be attributed to political elites (information), audiences (forums), and media personnel (values). It is therefore important to recognize with respect to the above point that different actors, with different roles in the socialist mass communication system maintained diverse, sometimes even opposing, perspectives concerning the social and political role of the socialist media. Other differences existed on the level of ethnic conflicts and the national tensions in the Federation. These differences, political as well as ethnic, were downplayed and occasionally even restricted by the administration.

Against the practice of differentiation in the mass media, genre-specific, ethnic, conceptual, or other, several forces for unification and political subordination of the press existed in the socialist Yugoslavia. As already mentioned, politics closely monitored mass media, occasional sanctions occurred, but political pressures were more often informal or even coexistent with self-censorship of journalists. The major systemic role in information control, however, was played by the infamous national press agency *Tanjug*. Several comprehensive studies were devoted to this agency acknowledging its role in the mass communication system (see Arnim 1968, Robinson 1977, Splichal et al. 1984).

The evidence concerning political control over the press and concerning its freedom to express different opinion is mixed. It is difficult to evaluate in retrospect the extent of political pressure which political authorities exerted on individual media in the socialist Yugoslavia and also on their editors or journalists. The pressure and political control was, in retrospect, not as dogmatic as in the Soviet model. It nevertheless existed. It seems clear that close scrutiny of information and monitoring of opinions published in the press was a continuous activity of the party bureaucracy. It is furthermore clear that restrictive measures (banning or prosecution) resulted from long-term observation of the activities of different publications; such, for instance, were the cases in Slovenia with *Perspektive* in the 1960s or *Mladina* and *Nova revija* in the 1980s; with *Knizevne novine* in 1960s Serbia; or with Croatian journals like *Nedeljnja Dalmacija* and *Omladinska iskra* in the late 1980s and so forth. Whenever publications were deemed problematic, politically reformist or overly critical against the administration then political scrutiny over their writing was increased. Prosecution and formal sanctions in cases of “deviation” were, however, unpredictable. Authorities showed more flexibility when critical media coverage and claims for more independence did not overlap with other general signs of social or political unrest.

Throughout the history of mass communication in socialist Yugoslavia appetites to control the media figured in different forms. It cannot be said, however, that political control over mass communication continuously loosened. There were periods of intense political control over the media and there were periods of encouraged critique of politics. In the socialist Yugoslavia, in sum, political control over the media shifted continuously

from rigid to flexible. It is obvious, that the first tensions in the relations between political authorities and the media emerged in the 1950s. As mentioned, the aftermath of the Cominform crisis produced in the early 1950s a break from the revolutionary conceptions of mass communication which prevailed during and immediately after the WW2. In the early years of the Yugoslav federation, mass media were defined in correspondence with the basic Leninist philosophy of social revolution which placed them in the position of mouthpieces of the communist party. The political hold on the press, as well as other media, was being loosened in the 1950s; although restrictive measures for media still existed. In the 1960s, the process continued and was parallel to other social and political reform. Robinson (1977: 62) observed that after several social and economic reforms in the late 1960s the "censorship" became more a process of open prosecution in courts and that prepublication censorship became only rare and occasional (but see Ramet 1992 for a slightly different interpretation of the same period; also Niksic 1982). By the 1980s the tensions between mass media and politics sharpened because of administration's attempts to hedge the political radicalization of social and economic critique which received increasing attention in the media. By the 1980s, mass media in the socialist Yugoslavia appeared as self-sufficient sub-systems of information which had a powerful influence on political climate. Administration thus attempted to strengthen the grip by introducing new legislation and by more legal prosecution of the controversial publication. But as Ramet analyzed, courts often denied the claims of public prosecution offices who proposed formal sanctions against newspapers and journals (see Ramet 1992: 425-426).

With respect to the political control of the media several further aspects need to be emphasized. The characteristic of the socialist model is better presented if it is placed into a comparative perspective vis-à-vis other Eastern European socialist countries from the period. Vreg mentions that the socialist media in general (from Soviet Union to Albania, from east Germany to Hungary) depended on the propaganda machinery which was under direct control of the state bureaucracy; likewise in the socialist Yugoslavia, party committees existed that steered "mass persuasion" and disseminated centralized directives on information, publication, and editorial policy. These attempts of the political elites to influence the socialist press are indisputable. Technically, the propaganda machinery was limited by the judicial process. "Yugoslavia's prosecutor's office, in contrast to practice in the Soviet Union, does not have the right to prejudge media content. Instead it must wait until a controversial article is published or a film is premiered" (Robinson 1977: 41; see also Ramet 1992).

Throughout the socialist era, mass media were actually allowed a degree of avant-garde and experimentation with forms of symbolism, especially a degree of freedom in the areas of culture and intellectual thought (e.g. film, radio, and intellectual journals). Periodical social science and

humanities journals were particularly important in this respect as the platforms that opened up the socialist public sphere to some degree to the pluralism of views. These journals were able to channel not only culture and art or entertainment, but also complex social, political ideas and even consistent alternative political programs. This explains radical measures which political authorities occasionally adopted against different journals in the early days of socialism (in Slovenia intellectual journals that were banned already in the 1950s and 1960s included *Besede*, *Revija 57* and *Perspektive*¹⁹).

There are interpretations that periodical journals presented the only real and organized alternatives to the ideological and political hegemony of the Communist Party. Unlike the Soviet model of mass communication, however, these media were indeed platforms of fragmenting assumed political homogeneity and for differentiating particular groups, colleagues or schools of thought. In an assumed classless and conflict-free society this was no minuscule endeavor. Ramet observed that the youth press was systematically given more latitude in expressing political criticism (Ramet 1992: 426). A Slovenian historian Repe also claims that periodical journals were the only available political opposition until the mid 1980s in Slovenia (Repe 2004). Cultural and academic periodicals tried to build up and to make clear to the broader audience certain possible political and ideological alternatives. Moreover, Repe claims that post-WW2 political elites in Slovenia, silently allowed degrees of “pluralism in culture, arts, partly in publicistics and philosophy”, especially after the 1950s – but he also adds that the levels of tolerance towards diversity were being modified by the political elites along with the developments (Repe, 2004: 114).

In sum, the system of mass media and communication which developed in the socialist Yugoslavia – and was outlined in the table above – developed through a process of change and substantial institutional transformation. It was not installed *ab ovo* after WW2 but continued the practice of the propaganda machinery which was modeled on the Leninist conception of mass communication. In order to summarize, it is important to reiterate the following. After the break with Cominform, the mass communication in the socialist Yugoslavia evolved through a series of important changes into a specific socialist system which was different than the media system in the Soviet Union. Some of the most important changes which shaped media landscapes throughout different periods related to the reforms of the Yugoslav legal system, some to the available technological resources and economic incentives, and finally, some to the tensions between the people who manned the media, the media audiences and political elites.

¹⁹ It is perhaps interesting, with respect to the banned journals in the Slovenian case, that many authors were the same in all three of them. One author (J. Pucnik) was politically prosecuted twice because of articles he published in *Revija 57* in the late 1950s and for articles he published in *Perspektive* in the early 1960s.

Appendix 3

The present appendix further details contextual information on Serbian media landscapes in socialism which were outlined in the report above. This appendix aims to offer some necessary information as well as rough commentary on the (1) legal regulation of mass communication in the socialist Yugoslavia, on (2) social and political conceptions of the role of journalism in a socialist mass communication system, and on (3) the regulation and organization of foreign correspondence for the media in the socialist Yugoslavia. These details do not follow from the stated aims of the project and were not required by Lancaster to compile a cross-country comparison, but Ljubljana team decided to investigate them in order to gain better understanding of the situation. It is our hope that this appendix and the information we share will enable Lancaster to better understand Serbian media landscapes (as well as our assumptions in analyzing them).

Legal regulation of mass media in the socialist Yugoslavia

The Federal Popular Republic of Yugoslavia was formally founded with a constitution in 1946. The first constitution was valid until the early 1950s and then other constitutional documents. Whenever the Federation adopted constitutional changes, which occurred practically every decade, media landscapes also changed. Media organizations, in particular, were substantially revised and reformed at least 4 times with the passing of new constitutions or constitutional laws. These new overarching legal frameworks were passed in 1953, 1963, and 1974. Including the first federal constitution, the four documents explicitly dealt with the conditions of the mass communication and provided general guidelines for the processes of mass communication, information and the role of media in the state. Moreover, specific laws were passed by the Federation occasionally to control the realm of mass communication as well as activities related to the media, such as the press agency, foreign correspondents and so forth. Starting from the first Yugoslav constitution these were the occasions when constitutional provisions changed.

- 31st of January 1946. The constitution of the Federal Popular Republic of Yugoslavia (slv. and scr. *Federativna ljudska republika Jugoslavija*).
- 13th of January 1953. The Constitutional Law of the Federal Popular Republic of Yugoslavia
- 7th of April 1964. The Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. (Amendments to the constitution in 1968, 1969, and 1971).

- 21st of February 1974. The Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The constitution was a product of large-scale constitutional reform and legally enabled forms of decentralized confederalism. *Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia* was passed in 1974, and was based on several earlier constitutional amendments. Practically simultaneously, constitutions of individual republics and of the two autonomous regions were also passed.

It is important to mention also specific legal regulation (i.e. other media and mass communication laws) which provided the framework for the media landscapes in socialism.

- 31st of August 1945. The Law of the Press. Amendments to this law were also passed in 1946 and in 1948 (Scr. *Zakon o stampi*).
- 27th of June 1956. The Basic Law on the Publishing Companies and Institutions (scr. *Osnovni zakon o novinskim preduzecima i ustanovama*).
- 31st of October 1960. The Law of the Press and Other Means of Information (scr. *Zakon o stampi i drugim oblicima informacija*).
- 1970s: based on the constitution of 1963 and on several reforms and constitutional amendments from 1971, legal regulation of the press and broadcasting became the domain of individual republics.
- May 1985. The Law on the Press and Information (Scr. *Zakon o osnovama sistema javnog informisanja*).
- 1990. Proposal of a new general law of the press and information. The proposal was already drafted and discussed by the parliament in 1990; it was planned to liberalize mass communication and to found information on the principles of market economy.

Other legal regulation that shaped the realm of mass communication in the socialist Yugoslavia included: *The Law on Workers Councils* (in 1950), *The Basic Law on Publishing Companies and Publishing Institutions* (1955), *The Law on Broadcasting Stations* (1955), *The Basic Law on Film* (1956), *The Law on Copyrights* (1957), *The Regulation on the Nomination and Work of the Foreign Correspondence Posts and Correspondents* (1960), *The Regulation on the Press Agency Tanjug* (1962), *The Regulation on Film novelties* (1962). After 1974, regulation of mass communication is placed into the hands of republic authorities (but federal regulation was also still developed further after this time). Most significant change in legal regulation of the mass media and information dates from the late 1980s. Noteworthy was that individual republics (e.g. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slovenia) already adopted new, substantially liberalized legislation concerning mass communication *before* this was done at the federal level! A typical instance was, *The Law on RTV Slovenia* (1990).

These legal documents were merely a framework which prohibited more than it allowed (see also Arnim 1968 for an interpretation of this point). It is sometimes argued that the Yugoslav Federation was flooded with legal detail and bureaucratic work. The fact is that Federal authorities as well as Republic authorities produced enormous amount of legal material, such as laws, amendments, corrections and so forth. The legal framework without a doubt importantly defined the structure of mass media landscapes in Yugoslavia. But it is important to recognize that key practices and norms developed within these legal boundaries, but were not explicitly addressed by legal documents. It was a common and widely shared perception at the time that laws, despite their complexity and comprehensiveness, do not quite cover the entire process of mass communication. Bulatovic mentioned this point more clearly: "It is unrealistic to think that this extremely important area /i.e. the right to information/ which reaches to the very core of the social relations and standing of the working man could be regulated by legal regulation alone. Laws are just one factor which will contribute to the wide and diverse development of that far more important social and self-managerial activity which produces habits, manners, relations and conduct towards the public, towards information, towards the public media and which comes out of our self-standing character of our society" (Bulatovic 1973: 25).

Analysis of legal documents may indicate clearly the point in time when mass media and the entire mass communication system diverged from the Soviet model. The Leninist doctrine on the press was abandoned after the break with Cominform and this is evident also from legal regulation of the media. An elaborate outcome of this divergence is the 1956 decree on the press – which curiously coincides with the revolutionary events in Hungary and further reform in the socialist countries. Foreign analysts observed the following characteristics of the media organization which ensued from the new legislation.

"Another more recent law has effected profound changes in the structure and organization of Yugoslav journalism. This is a decree adopted on June 26, 1956, which defines the status of press enterprises and institutions. It had been drawn in close collaboration with the Federation of Journalists (sic!). This document has no equal in any other Communist country, nor anywhere else in the world (sic!). Its originality lies in the fact that it applies to the press a certain number of principles that have characterized the social and economic evolution peculiar to Yugoslavia since 1948. In the first place, each newspaper possesses a worker's council which appoints an executive committee comprising delegates of journalists, of administrative employees and of workers. Secondly, the publishing company (State institution or else a social group: a trade union, youth organization, cooperative of the paper's employees etc.) appoints a special publishing council, a special body which comprises intellectuals and personalities from the circles for which the publication is destined. This council has nothing to do with

administrative questions but is charged with watching over the publication's line, advising on matters of editorial policy, and seeking to raise the standard of journalism. It assumes the character of an organ of social control but can also at the same time be used as an instrument of political control" (IPI 1959: 123).

It is also important to recognize that legal regulation of mass media was never conceived in isolation from the international affairs. Constitutional and legal documents were often placed in the context of current political developments elsewhere in the world. It was characteristic of the Yugoslav political authorities that they emphasized international context in domestic addresses concerning the press and journalists in order to show its prevalent sentiment (see quotations of Tito in Niksic 1982: 138; see also Arnim 1968, Nesovic 1964, Ramet 1992). Placing the specific Yugoslav legal regulation (and its change) in the global political context became an instrumental reference for representation and for convenient boosting of morale. This principle was known since very early after WW2. Niksic mentions a statement made by the Yugoslav Minister of Information in the post-war government when the first Law on the press was passed in 1946.

"We are the first country in Europe which thus far did not prohibit entry to a single foreign journalist and a country which completely abolished censorship on the reporting of foreign press from here. We have no need to put on an iron curtain over that which is happening in Yugoslavia, we do not want to hide anything, but on the contrary wish that the truth about Yugoslavia is seen and known" (Kosanovic in Niksic 1982: 130).

It is possible to agree with the official doctrine of media scholars in Yugoslavia that chronological development of legal regulation was such that allowed Yugoslav media to perform their political functions and also such that enabled gradual withdrawal of formal restrictions for mass media. According to Bjelica, the foremost historian of the Serbian press and of the mass media during the later socialist period, there are several points from the constitutional dictum that were essential for any valid understanding of the link between constitutional framework of the Yugoslav federation and mass media landscape. Bjelica argues that activities of the mass media "depended" on the constitutional framework (1983: 202). The first constitution of 1946 defined continuity of political ideology which emerged victorious during the Yugoslav socialist revolution throughout and after WW2, but it also defined "means of information" as directly responsible to the state and organs of the communist party (Bjelica 1983: 202). Also important was that the constitution of 1946 nationalized all property, which included printing press shops, paper factories, and other enterprises. Material conditions of media landscapes were thus completely controlled by the political authorities (Bjelica 1983).

Formal aspects of the Yugoslav media landscape immediately after WW2 which was restrictively defined by the Law on the Press (from 1946) were succinctly summarized by Robinson.

“As a result of the centralization of information collection and dissemination and the restricted access prescribed by the 1946 press law, all political, economic, and cultural content was strongly filtered, taking on the uniform coloration well known from other eastern European countries. Party control, following the Soviet model, took five forms. Chief editors and top staff were appointed by the Central Committee. Content was checked before publication, and chief editors were made personally responsible. Distribution and newsprint allocation depended on favorable relationship with the powerful economic planning committee. Individual newspapers and radio stations did not have their own correspondents; instead they received their information from republican ministry branches, which were part of the *Tanjug* national news collection net.” (Robinson 1977: 19)

Immediately after 1948, there emerged a shift in political elites’ attitude towards the media and mass communication system. In the early 1950s we can already speak of new legal regulation of the media. Clearly, the constitutional law of 1953 went a step further in granting more looseness to the media (Bjelica 1983). The Leninist propaganda model of the press was – in the provisions of this constitutional act – abandoned. But even before that, the media landscape was changed by the introduction of the Law on Workers Councils (in 1950). This new law reorganized the formal outlook of publishers and editorial offices; it defined the notion of self-management, which implied common, or public ownership – and not state ownership – of all property. All “means of production”, including the means to publish a newspaper or means to broadcast a radio program were now owned by the workers themselves. In effect, the notion of self-management was an economic and political experiment of the political elites to break conceptually with the Soviet Union and lasted almost until the dissolution of Yugoslavia. After 1950, workers were allowed to participate in the management of the companies and production. In society as a whole, a stronger and more powerful role was bestowed on various societal organizations (sponsored by the state), syndicates (also sponsored by the state), as well as on the local communities (which were administratively organized by the state organs in mid 1950s); these novel roles of social organizations were integrated by the principles of political self-management which promised direct or indirect influence of the entire population on decision making, governance and management. This influence was planned to be channeled through a complex hierarchy of representations set up by the Communist party and the Socialist Alliance. This was considered a step towards “decentralization” of the Yugoslav Federation.

According to a publication of the Yugoslav Institute for Journalism implications of this economic experiment on the mass media were the

following. “The period from 1950 to 1956 represents a period of the press becoming independent and also of deep social change in the position of newspaper-publishing companies, which were conditioned by the process of decentralization of the Yugoslav society and a transition to the societal self-management. In this period of transformation from the etatist relations within the administrative forms of managing economy to the workers self-management (...) newspaper companies also became independent economic organizations with a societal body as its spearhead” (JIN 1964: 8). Bjelica also argues that the constitution of 1953 was a step towards “democratization of the press and other means of public information system” (Bjelica 1983: 202). The constitution explicitly defined the principle of publicity as central to the management of the work of the citizens; it was stated in the constitution that citizens have the right “to use the means of information for the purpose of their knowledge (*obavestavanje*)” (The constitution 1953). This statement immensely increased the social and political importance of the press and other mass media.

Extensive legal regulation in the late 1950s was a consequence of administrative attempts to comprehensively and extensively reformulate formal outlook of the Yugoslavian “brand” of socialism. In its attempts to apply the self-management experiment, prolific legislation concerning mass media and media related activities was passed. A final act in this process was a Law on the press and other means of information from 1960 which defined basic principles and conditions in the area of mass communication and printed media. This law defined freedom of the press both as a freedom to publish and a right to be informed (see JIN 1964: 147). Furthermore, the 1960 law on the press guaranteed a right to a published response to published information in the media (JIN 1964: 147). It is perhaps also interesting to note that this law defined information as any news, data, opinion or other published material which appeared in the means of mass communication. Among the means of mass communication this law included the press, radio, television, and film. The 1960 Law of the press explicitly ruled out censorship in the form of previous notification. But this law explicitly specified nine areas in which information is considered as an abuse and could not be published. These areas, according to the law, included:

- a) An act of crime against the nation and the state; or against the armed forces of Yugoslavia.
- b) Making public or republishing false, biased or alarming news or claims which cause distress of the citizens or threaten public order.
- c) Making public verifiable documents or data concerning armed forces of Yugoslavia or concerning national defense which are military secret.
- d) Making public confidential documents or data which in their character represent official or economic secrecy of utmost importance for the social community.

- e) Propagation or dissemination of aggression or other action in conflict with the goals of the United Nations.
- f) Direct tempering of the maintenance and development of the friendly relations between Yugoslavia and other countries.
- g) Libel against the honor and reputation of our nations, its highest representative organs or the president of the Republic; as well as libel against foreign nations and their leadership or diplomatic representatives.
- h) Serious injury against moral.
- i) Publication of documents or data which harms the interest of the legal system.
- j) Publication of contents which is detrimental to the education of the youth and children. (Law on the press and other means of information, 1960; see JIN 1964: 161)

Throughout the 1960s, the mass media in Yugoslavia were regulated by a set of new basic laws and later also by a new constitution. The new Constitution of 1963, among others, guaranteed freedom of the press and the right to be informed, it also reaffirmed a provision granted in the Law on the press from 1960 that the media operate in the interest of the public and that information is embedded in the foreign policy interest of the Yugoslav federation (Bjelica 1983).

Robinson, as a qualified observer from abroad, focused on two key articles – article 34 on the right to be informed and 40 on the freedom of the press and information – which were defined by the 1963 constitution. Robinson emphasized their importance from the perspective of the practice of media in the socialist Yugoslavia (Robinson 1977); below translation of article 34 is cited for illustration of her argument.

Article 34 (of the Yugoslav constitution from 1963): In order to achieve social self-management, the citizen shall have the right to be informed about the work of the representative bodies and their organs, the organs of social self-management, the organizations carrying on affairs of public concern, and in particular, in the working organizations in which he realizes his interest, the right to be informed about material and financial conditions, the fulfillment of plans, and business, with the obligation that he keeps business and other secrets. /The citizen shall also have/ the right to examine the work of state organs and organs of social self-management, and the organizations that discharge affairs of public concern, and to express his opinion and their work.

(Article 34, Constitution of the Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia, 1963; translation from Robinson 1977: 43)

Robinson argues that these new rights of access to information which the constitution of 1963 secured to the citizens were a notable push in a direction of the critical press and other media in the socialist Yugoslavia. “In a political system in which the press has in the past functioned mainly

as a conveyor belt of handout information from the leadership to the people, these new rights of access to information created a definite stir. That the leadership was and has continued to be serious about its democratization of governmental processes became evident in 1963, when all debates of federal bodies were opened to the press. Sincerity was still more obvious when journalists were actually encouraged to present both sides of issues discussed at such meetings.” (Robinson 1977: 43)

The constitution of 1974 defined the notions of cooperative and consensual decision making in all levels of governance and organization of the socialist society. According to this document, the information provided by the “means of information” served the best possible and expertly informed decision making.

Towards the end of 1980s and the coming of a new political system, legal regulation of the media played a secondary role. While Yugoslavia transitioned from its socialist economy and while it attempted to solve deep conflicts between ethnic groups and also conflicts between political authorities which headed individual republics, the media developed its own subversive role and struggled to contribute to a more open, critical and politically pluralist debate in public.

By the end of 1980s, liberalization of the mass communication in Yugoslavia was expected (Markovic 1990). The federal parliament already proceeded upon a draft of a new law on the press and information in 1990. This draft promised to restructure mass communication on the basis of market economy. The law was written with the intent to copy best practices from the recent experience of developed democracies. Thus, the draft law from 1990 relieved mass media of the immediate political influence. Personal responsibility of editors before the court of law replaced mechanisms to prevent subversive publishing or broadcasting. Restrictions on media ownership were withdrawn and procedures to set up new media were simplified. It was no longer defined that the only possible owner of the media was the Socialist union of working people or any of its branches. Any formal subject could set up a new medium according to the draft law. Foreign investment was also allowed up to 25 percent of the project.

Restrictions on media ownership were withdrawn and procedures to set up a new medium were simplified.

Journalists in socialism

Mass media in socialism, and press in particular, was a very important organ of the social and political life. In fact, it was characteristic for all socialist countries that there was a close alliance between the media and political elites. In this respect, socialist countries from the Eastern Europe were perceived as different from the western democracies. Gertrude Joch Robinson observed in the 1970s that “for many years a common dictum of faith has asserted that there are fundamental differences between the journalism corps in communist east European and capitalist west European countries. These differences were assumed to lie in social background, training and job performance.” (Robinson 1977: 94)

Journalists were considered a significant element of the political decision-making and decision promoting force. This was characteristic of every socialist country in the Eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union. The official doctrine of journalism in Yugoslavia was not unlike a doctrine one could find in other socialist countries. Hopkins cites Nikita Khrushchev as saying to the journalists: “You are not only the true aides of the Communist party, but literally the apprentices of the party, the active fighters of its great cause” (Khrushchev cited in Hopkins 1970: 150). This was a typical Leninist conception according to which the media were the mouthpiece of politics and according to which the role of the journalists was not one of critical control of the political power but a role of disseminating political doctrines to the laymen. It may not be the case that the Yugoslavian media system was quite like that in the Soviet Union, but certainly the Yugoslav notion of journalism was not far from the point made by Khrushchev above.

This observation applied to every aspect of journalism and also to every media outlet from which journalists addressed political and social issues. Table 2 below portrays the structure of journalists by media outlet.

TABLE 12. MEDIA OUTLETS OF YUGOSLAV JOURNALISTS IN 1968

	journalists
Newspapers	43 %
Magazines	14 %
Radio	18 %
Television	9 %
Wire service	3 %
other	13 %
Total	100 %

Source: Association of Yugoslav Journalists (cited in Robinson 1977: 95-96).

The social and professional interpenetration between journalism and politics was substantial in the socialist Yugoslavia. According to some sources, over 90 percents of journalists were members of the Communist party during socialism (Ramet 1992: 418). There is also a significant history to this role, particularly in Serbia, where under the rule of Obrenovic and Karadjordjevic royal families in the late 19th and early 20th century journalists were considered propaganda personnel of the monarchy. This notion that journalists help the regime to promote its social, political and economic goals was essentially the same in socialism as well; Arnim observed that under socialism there developed a notion of a “journalist as a political functionary” (Arnim 1968: 282).

The social status of journalists in Yugoslavia was high above the average. There were around 4,000 full-time journalists employed in the Yugoslavian mass communication system in the 1970s (Robinson 1977: 94). For a country like Yugoslavia, this was not a small number. Given their complex organization and several associational platforms devoted to the entire profession the social and political impact of such a numbered group was significant. An editorial post in the central socialist newspapers was considered a springboard for reaching other and more important, more responsible functions in the political apparatus of the socialist federation (Arnim 1968: 64).

The point that the social status of journalists was above average can be seen in political functions occupied by journalists. Indeed, the presence of journalists in politics was much greater in the early period of the socialist state, when journalists were also political ideologues and leaders, but this overlap between politics and journalism in terms of employment hardly ever decreased. Records from 1958 show, as Arnim noted, that four (former) prominent journalists sat in the Central Committee, i.e. in the Yugoslav federal government (Arnim 1968: 64). Robinson similarly pointed out that a position in the Yugoslav mass communication system allowed individuals to reach prominent assignments or jobs. She investigated the posts of former general directors of *Tanjug*, the national press agency and found out that their subsequent positions were quite prominent.

“Interviews with Tanjug staffers indicated that, though teaching and public relations are becoming more prevalent, ministries of information in the six republics have attracted journalists, as have Yugoslav embassies. These patterns of job mobility out of the media are particularly well illustrated by the seven ex-directors of the national news agency, Tanjug. Vladimir Dedijer (1943-1944) now holds a history chair at Ljubljana University. Ivo Vejvoda (1943-1947) became ambassador to Rome in the 1950s, while Sime Balen (1947-1949) is now a director of a Zagreb publishing house. The only woman in the group, Olga Kreacic (1949-1954) is presently working in the Federal ministry of Information. Vjekoslav Prpic (1954-1959) became ambassador to Austria, and Jovan Marinovic (1959-1963) took over as

head of information services at the federal legislature. Vukasin Micunovic (1963-1967) (...) left the agency to work for the Federal Executive Council.” (Robinson 1977: 102)

Journalists maintained a subtle internal differentiation. Arnim observed in this respect that there was a difference between proper journalists and technical staff such as proof readers, correctors, translators, drawers, caricaturists, photo reporters, and so forth; the former held an esteemed formal position and were classified by law as “social and political workers” which signified that they were responsible for a dignified labor in the minutely structured formal universe of the socialist societies (Arnim 1968: 148).

TABLE 13. PROFESSIONAL PROFILES OF YUGOSLAV JOURNALISTS IN 1968

Position	Percentage
Low level editor	7 %
Rank and file reporters	31 %
Star reporters, content chiefs	37 %
Department heads, editors, foreign correspondents	18 %
Division chiefs, overall responsible for the media	7 %
Mean annual salary of	Salary in thousand US \$
Low level editor	1,2 – 1,4
Rank and file reporters	1,4 – 1,6
Star reporters, content chiefs	1,6 – 2,0
Department heads, editors, foreign correspondents	2,1 – 2,2
Division chiefs, overall responsible for the media	2,3 – 3,1
<i>Plus max. 20 % bonuses and child allowances per salary</i>	

Source: Association of Yugoslav Journalists (cited in Robinson 1977: 96).

In addition to internal differentiation, it is important to mention peculiar processes which led to the external differentiation of journalists and media-related personnel in the socialist Yugoslavia. On the one hand,

these professionals were firmly integrated into the socialist system and its political backbone, but on the other hand they were also able to form a specific social group with its own norms, traditions and formal as well as informal mechanisms of internal regulation. These developments intensified in the 1960s when new legislation and also political climate favored relatively autonomous media sphere and relatively less dependent mass communication system. Media-related professionals no doubt occupied an elite social position in the 1960s and from this platform they were able, occasionally, to exert powerful, vocal pressure on political elites. As Robinson argues, “mass communicators as an elite group have become distinguished from both governmental officials as well as party and trade union practitioners during the 1960s. They have updated their ‘symbol broking’ skills through systematic communication studies and specialized in-service training. They have also banded together to agitate for job protection, professional standards, and the ideal of serving the public through responsible reporting” (Robinson 1977: 114).

In her study of the press in Yugoslavia until late 1970s, American scholar Gertrude Joch Robinson also compiled other basic data which may add to this information and outline some general demographic characteristics of Yugoslav journalists.

TABLE 14. DEMOGRAPHIC PORTRAIT OF YUGOSLAV JOURNALISTS IN 1968

Category	Type	Percentage
Gender	Male	88 %
	Female	12 %
Age	20-30 yrs.	16 %
	31-40 yrs.	44 %
	41-50 yrs.	34 %
	51-60 yrs.	5 %
	over 60 yrs.	1 %
Education	Secondary	45 %
	High school	14 %
	Incomplete university degree	30 %
	university degree	11 %
Journalistic experience	Under 5 yrs	15 %
	6-10 yrs.	27 %
	11-20 yrs.	41 %
	over 20 yrs.	17 %

Source: Association of Yugoslav Journalists (cited also in Robinson 1977: 95-96).

From the table above certain general demographic characteristics are telling. It is possible to extend this outline with information from 1980s. It should be noted, however, that general economic condition declined in the 1980s.

“The average Yugoslav journalist is male, 40 years old (as of 1989) and has less than 20 years to live – (54 per cent of Yugoslav journalists die before reaching retirement age). He has one child but is either divorced or about to be divorced. He smokes 40 cheap cigarettes a day, drinks brandy, suffers from recurrent stomach-aches, rents his apartment, and does not own his car. Of journalists surveyed in 1989, 82 per cent were members of the League of Communists and 65 per cent had a university degree” (Ramet 1992: 432).

Until 1968, journalists were relatively experienced, but the majority still had only little formal education, despite many years of practice in the media. Robinson further explains this point. “In Yugoslavia, where a majority of journalists acquire their skill thorough on-the-job training, (the) historical factors include a training delay due to the World War II. In addition, the political workings of the one-party state supported late entry (into the profession) in the 1950s by requiring that journalists prove their reliability first and their professional skills second.” (Robinson 1977: 99) The peril of this system was inadequate professional skill and autonomy of the majority of journalists. Discrepancy between social status and degrees of achieved education among the majority of media personnel paralyzed critique and control. Inadequate education, as Robinson also pointed out, “affects their work in the sense that they sometimes lack the insight to report complex events adequately or, more often, become the uncritical recorders of official explanation” (Robinson 1977: 105).

For several reasons, some were just mentioned and summarized in table above, education of journalists in socialist Yugoslavia was considered a responsible task and much attention was devoted to its structure and development (see Timotijevic, 1963, Zlender 1963, 1966). A sharp, value-laden argument was often made with respect to the training of professional journalists, namely that their best possible education or training comes from the practice itself. This caused controversies over the need to possess deeper understanding of the mass media system and mass communication processes in order to *practice* journalism in a socialist society. The argument was that the older generations of journalists in fact developed under heavy burden of warfare and yet they integrated successfully into the socialist project.

Organized education of journalists started in the Yugoslav capital Belgrade (Serbia) in the period of the Cominform crisis, which led to the breakup of friendly relations between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. “The first (...) attempt to organize the training of journalists on a different basis was

made in 1948 when the (Academy) of Journalism and Diplomacy was created. A four years' course of studies was planned for 200 journalist candidates and 200 diplomacy candidates to meet the presumed requirements of the moment. The former group in addition to a certain proportion of journalists who had already worked in newspaper offices included a majority of candidates with no professional experience." (Timotijevic 1963: 89) The courses offered at the Academy included topics such as "Marxism-Leninism and the history of diplomacy, as well as those subjects generally taught at college, including national and world literature and general history." (Timotijevic 1963: 90) This project did not last very long and in 1952 the Academy has had to close down.²⁰

In the same period, a similar attempt took place in Zagreb by establishing a School of Journalism (Zlender 1966: 36). This was a two year program and it was focused more on the practice of editing and publishing; it had less structured emphases on theoretical knowledge in mass media, communication, and political culture (Zlender 1966: 36). Like the Academy in Belgrade, the School of Journalism from Zagreb was soon closed down. The official explanation for closing down both schools was that there was no longer thus extensive need in the Yugoslavian media for the amount of educated journalists (Timotijevic 1963, Zlender 1966).

Dimensions of the above explanation can be more fully understood if placed in a larger context of the extent of journalistic profession in the socialist Yugoslavia. In 1963, for instance, about 3000 journalists were registered in the Association of Yugoslav journalists (by 1968 the number grew to 4,300). Data reported by the Association to the Statistical Office was the following (see also Petkovic, 1964: 316).

TABLE 15. REGISTERED JOURNALISTS IN YUGOSLAVIA IN 1963

FEDERAL REPUBLIC	Male	Female	Total
Serbia	1284	164	1448 (47 %)
Croatia	595	107	702 (23 %)
Slovenia	328	62	390 (13 %)
Montenegro	227	26	253 (8 %)
Bosnia and	200	25	225

²⁰ Director of the the Yugoslav Institute for Publicistic argued that the school was nevertheless a success. "It may be said that although this school fathered only a single batch of graduates, it nevertheless gave good results. A fair proportion of its graduate students today occupy important posts and some of them are already noted journalists" (Timotijevic 1963: 90).

Herzegovina			(7 %)
Macedonia	52	11	63 (2 %)
Total	2686	395	3081 (100 %)

Source: Statistical calendar of Yugoslavia and Association of Yugoslav journalists (cited also in Petkovic, 1964: 316).

After 1960, organized attempts to educate professional journalists and other media personnel were more systematic and dispersed in the Federation. With the establishment of the Yugoslav Institute for Journalism and Association of Yugoslav journalists, education and training was improved. The Institute set up a Center for Advanced Training of Journalists which offered regular and continuous information exchange for professional media personnel (Zlender 1966: 37-39). In addition to formal training, workshops, conferences, seminars, and meetings were held at the Institute as well as around the country for the exchange of experience and knowledge among media personnel. Furthermore, translations of journalism textbooks were being prepared, periodical journals and books which focused on mass communication, journalism and media were also published.

In 1963 a first first-degree university program in journalism at the School of Political Sciences in Ljubljana was set up (Zlender 1966, Splichal 2003). The program offered courses in public opinion and sociology of mass communication, Yugoslavian and international press history, Slovenian language and literature, and rhetoric. Other university degree courses in journalism soon followed (in Belgrade in 1969 and Sarajevo in 1970) and thus enabled structured education of media personnel in Yugoslavia.

By 1968, formal education of full-time journalists in Yugoslavia was still relatively inadequate. Moreover, journalism graduates composed no more than a mere tenth of the entire work force. Majority of journalists were trained in the liberal arts and in law!

TABLE 16. EDUCATION OF YUGOSLAV JOURNALISTS (IN 1968)

Fields of study	Percentage
Journalism	8 %
Liberal arts	40 %
Social sciences and history	15 %
Law	33 %
Other	4 %
Total	100 %

Source: Association of Yugoslav Journalists (cited in Robinson 1977: 95).

It is important to mention that education of journalists in Yugoslavia was not considered as other university programs but were obviously closer to specialization programs and practical skill courses. Explained Robinson, "if it is taught at the advanced level at all, it has been grafted on to existing university departments of political science or sociology, or relegated to institutes. The fact that only 8 percent of all (Yugoslav journalists) with university training have specialized in journalism suggests that they, like their United States Colleagues, utilize the profession as a bridge to other careers" (Robinson 1977: 101).

Another informative comment relates to the point that there were inadequate material incentives in Yugoslavia to further education of Yugoslav journalists; lack of incentives was built into the very system of education and professional, social and economic mobility of the socialist society. Gertrude Joch Robinson also reports that "one of Yugoslavia's ministers of information noted in a conversation that effective self-management demanded a communication corps with good education and high status to ferret out sensitive information and to effectively question politicians. Unfortunately, lack of time and inadequate material incentives have seriously hampered the educational upgrading of one-third of Yugoslavia's communicators who are in the forty- to fifty-year old category. Older journalists in both Yugoslavia and Latin America are unable to return to institutes or to a university for specialized courses, because these often require a minimum of attendance, as well as personal payment for professional upgrading. Few journalists have these extra funds, let alone the time for this endeavor." (Robinson 177: 105)

It is perhaps relevant to mention that endeavors to enable and organize formal education for journalism students in Yugoslavia characteristically differentiated its mass communication policy from other countries in the Eastern Europe. Robinson argues that unlike Soviet Union, Czechoslovak republic, Poland, East Germany or Hungary, Yugoslavian authorities attempted to develop journalism schools with emphasis on the aspects of mass communication and public opinion rather than doctrinal political theory of Marxism (Robinson 1977: 112-113).

Nevertheless, the central point of journalism education remained unchanged for much of the time after its initial conception. Systematic education of journalists aimed at educating skilled writers who were able to convey the political discourse to the masses of media consuming citizenry and who were also able to produce, within limits of the constitutional and legal frameworks, an image of the public life (of the socialist public sphere) as a realm in which creative, constructive exchange of different opinions takes place. Today, after socialist media and socialist conceptions of journalism are long gone, popular attitude toward the university courses in journalism in Slovenia, Croatia, and also

Serbia, is still often marred by the perception that this is education aims towards nurturing state officials.

Foreign correspondents

An important issue for the Yugoslav media was, for obvious reasons, their coverage of international affairs and international cooperation generally. Most importantly, they found themselves in precarious situations due to their reporting either from or for the foreign media. Doubly exposed in these situations were foreign correspondents. After 1960, the tasks and duties of foreign correspondents for the Yugoslav media were also formally regulated; a specific law on foreign correspondence was passed in 1960, which installed limitations on the activities of the correspondents and also instituted political control over their reports.

Arnim's study reveals the following structure of foreign correspondents to the Yugoslav daily newspapers in the early 1960s (Arnim 1968: 152-153).

- *Politika* (Belgrade) – 9 foreign correspondents,
- *Borba* (Belgrade) – 8 foreign correspondents,
- *Vjesnik* (Zagreb) – 7 foreign correspondents,
- *Oslobodjenje* (Sarajevo) – 4 foreign correspondents,
- *Delo* (Ljubljana) – 3 foreign correspondents,
- *Nova Makedonija* (Skopje) – 3 foreign correspondents.

These foreign newspaper correspondents were mostly located in world's superpowers. Arnim reports, for instance, that in the early 1960s four Yugoslav correspondents were located in the USA, four also in France, three in the Soviet Union, three in the UK, two in Italy, two in Sweden, two in The Federal Republic of Germany, and further two in East Berlin (Arnim 1968: 153-154). Other foreign newspaper correspondents were located among others in China, Japan, in the United Arab Emirates, India, Indonesia, and also in Cuba (Arnim 1968: 154).

A substantially different situation was found with respect to the foreign correspondents of the Yugoslav press agency (TANJUG). In addition to a strong domestic network, TANJUG also built a comprehensive network of foreign correspondents. According to its own records (confirmed also in Arnim 1968: 157-168), TANJUG employed 17 correspondents in Europe (two in London, two in Paris, two in Moscow, and then one in Rome, Bonn, East Berlin, Vienna, Athens, Stockholm, Warsaw, Prague, Budapest, Bucharest, and Sofia), 2 correspondents in the US (one in Washington and one in New York), 2 correspondents in South America (one in Mexico City and one in Rio de Janeiro), 7 correspondents in Asia (in New Delhi, Beijing, Djakarta, Beirut, Phnom Penh, Teheran, and Rangoon) and also 7 correspondents in Africa (in Accra, Algeria, Cairo, Dar-es-Salam, Addis Ababa, Khartoum, and Leopoldville).

Specific legal regulation of the media landscape and political context also affected the structure of publishers in Yugoslavia. There exists reliable information for the structure of **publishers** of periodical press in 1963. Here are some numbers which details publishers of various newspapers, journals and other periodical publications (published in SG 1964; also cited in Arnim 1968: 84).

- Economic enterprises and unions – **426** periodicals.
- Publishing houses – **378** periodicals.
- State organs and institutions – **351** periodicals.
- Professional unions – **207** periodicals.
- Youth and “Pionir” unions– **163** periodicals.
- Socialist labor unions – **74** periodicals.
- Sport organizations – **70** periodicals.
- Various “civil society” organizations – **46** periodicals.
- Church organizations – **40** periodicals.
- Theatrical, cultural, and educational societies – **28** periodicals.
- Association unions – **21** periodicals
- Military organs, institutions or unions – **19** periodicals
- Unions of veterans of war – **12** periodicals
- Women unions – **5** periodicals
- Communist unions – **4** periodicals

Note however that these numbers invariably include every periodical publication registered in the country. If we look for instance only at the daily press, the situation is characteristically uniform. In 1963, there were 17 daily newspapers in Yugoslavia which were published in different official languages and which targeted different audiences in individual federal republics (SG 1964; also cited in Arnim 1968: 84). Out of this total number, as much as 14 daily newspapers were founded by, and in effect also owned by, the various organs of the Socialist Labor Union (scr. *Socialisticki savez radnog naroda SSRN*, slv. *Socialisticna zveza delavnega ljudstva SZDL*). This union was a network of organs and forums which were set up by the state and were intended to secure participation of the labor in political agenda setting and political decision making. This union was a sort of state sponsored civil society or public sphere with a complex set of hierarchically structured organs. 14 dailies (out of the total 17) were thus in a sense official organs of the state and only 3 existed as endeavors of publishing houses as “economic” enterprises!

Appendix 4

The present appendix offers some further information on Serbian media in socialism vis-à-vis other republics of the former Yugoslav federation. Information is scattered and unsystematic; it was derived from Serbian media studies analyzed for this report.

Comparative data on media landscapes in the socialist Yugoslavia

On the practical side, media technologies in socialist Yugoslavia were no different than elsewhere in the world and included printed media, radio, and television. After WW2, the printed media had a strong network and radio lagged far behind. In the 1960s, radio quickly caught up and established itself in the position of the most important information and music medium. 1970s were characteristic for a rapid expansion of television broadcasting. In the 1980s, gradually “the third generation” of mass media was also introduced, such as VCR, cable TV, audio devices, and pioneering computer technologies.

The printed media were considered the central means of comprehensive mass communication. The peak of its development – compared to the other mass communication technologies – was reached in the early 1960s. Here is a short outline of the situation in 1963.

TABLE 17. CLASSIFICATION OF YUGOSLAV PERIODICALS IN 1963

Frequency of publications	of Yugoslavia
Dailies	21
Several times a week	12
Weeklies	184
Biweeklies	112
Monthlies	424
Irregular	289

Source: Statistical Yearbook (SG 1964).

By the early 1980s, the printed press in Yugoslavia became an established and recognizable system of information. Journals were as much based on regional politics which was specific for individual republics as they were embedded in the languages of their intended audiences. Ramet cites the following figures in order to outline the situation concerning the press in 1983.

TABLE 18. YUGOSLAV NEWSPAPERS WITH CIRCULATION HIGHER THAN 45.000 (IN 1983)

	Copies printed (1983)	Copies sold (1983)
Komunist (LCY; all editions)	550,000	n.a.
Vecernje novosti (Belgrade)	379,921	339,859
Vecernji list (Zagreb)	342,533	309,839
Politika ekspres (Belgrade)	286,451	249,758
Politika (Belgrade)	278,101	243,826
As (Sarajevo)	215,159	n.a.
Sportske novosti (Zagreb)	169,887	141,247
Sport (Belgrade)	127,712	106,781
Delo (Ljubljana)	105,042	99,840
Druzina (Ljubljana)	100,000	n.a.
Glas Koncila (Zagreb)	100,000	n.a.
Vjesnik (Zagreb)	91,116	73,030
Oslobodjenje (Sarajevo)	83,331	71,557
Ognjisce (Koper)	80,000	n.a.
Glas Istre (Rijeka)	78,976	71,274
Slobodna Dalmacija (Split)	78,242	71,571
Vecer (Maribor)	58,477	55,476
Dnevnik (Ljubljana)	53,497	50,723
Mali Koncil (Zagreb)	50,000	n.a.
Rilindija (Pristina)	46,252	41,141
Vecernje Novine (Novi Sad)	45,670	35,049

Sources: *Nasa stampa* and other; selection cited from Ramet (1992: 441).

By the 1980s, radio broadcasting also became a well developed and territorially dispersed activity in Yugoslavia. Statistical records and analytical evaluations for 1988 show the following figures for the general situation in Yugoslav radio broadcasting.

- Eight main radio stations in Yugoslavia aired a total of about 370 hours of program daily.

- An international program Radio Yugoslavia (from Belgrade) aired further 11 hours a day on short waves.
- Rough estimations showed that 215 regional or local radio stations aired about 1,000 hours of program daily (Lucic 1990: 48; Markovic 1990: 35).

Consistent with legal regulation of mass communication (which offered, after the constitution of 1974, more incentive and more leeway to local administration to organize mass media within individual republics) regional television studios appeared in the 1970s. These studios appeared mainly in Serbia, Croatia, and in Slovenia.

It is perhaps interesting to add some insight into the audience recognition of the common radio programming. In a survey conducted in 1978 by Plavsic (1979), it was discovered that about 65 % of the population in Belgrade did not recognize any of the radio program which *Radio Beograd* broadcast via the exchange of Yugoslav broadcasters. This insight was deemed comparable to the results from Kraljevo, where in 1977 researchers established that about 50 % of the residents knew one of the programs which were broadcast *Radio Beograd* as production from other republics and which was received through the exchange of the network of Yugoslav radio broadcasters (Plavsic 1979: 183). These findings may suggest that rural population were more dependent on radio than urban areas. Of course, this further insight should be tested independently.

Television broadcasting by the 1980s reached a degree of complex programming. Television stations combined their own production with domestic as well as foreign exchange. Official records on television broadcasting in 1988 show some interesting insights.

- Television stations in Yugoslavia aired on average 172 hours of program daily in 1988.
- The share of stations' own programming in 1988 did not exceed 57 % of the emitted program; the rest was from domestic (via *JRT*) or foreign (via *EBU*) exchange.
 - *Televizija Sarajevo* broadcast 53 % of its program from JRT exchange.
 - *Televizija Skopje* broadcast 43 % of its program from JRT exchange.
 - *Televizija Beograd* broadcast 39 % of its program from JRT exchange.

- *Televizija Zagreb* broadcast 37 % of its program from JRT exchange.

Also in the 1980s, initiatives were already formed to set up television broadcasting outside the federal broadcasting network, represented by JRT. *Studio B* was planned in the late 1980s in Belgrade, *TV Marjan* was also considered at the same time in Split; in Slovenia, a commercial television enterprise was planned under the name *Kanal A* (see Markovic 1990: 36-37). Federal administration denied these attempts. In 1989, however, *TV Politika* was set up in Belgrade. In Rijeka, a broadcasting production company called *Istarska radio-televizija* was founded in 1990. This was a private enterprise which aimed to produce entertainment, sport and commercial program with the intent to broadcast it through the established network of JRT regional studios and broadcasters, particularly their third programs, until the company would be able to secure its own broadcasting frequency (Markovic 1990: 37).

Paradoxically, in the late 1980s a “federal” television station was set up in Istria, YUTEL. YUTEL was planned to operate as a kind of German ZDF network and to broadcast programs for all federal republics. It was planned to communicate independent, party-free information and news to all parts of the federation. It was planned to broadcast initially with the help of JRT network and later via satellite.

Appendix 5

This bibliography lists sources (books, articles, documents, or reports) which are – by definition adopted by EMEDIATE consortium “MEDIA STUDIES”. Sources are listed in three groups – according to division of the three EMEDIATE periods for CEE countries.

This appendix was composed because the list of references in the report above includes literature which falls outside the scope of “Serbian” media studies and may enable easier inspection of the quality of the goals accomplished in this report.

A further goal of this appendix was to offer succinct information (where applicable) about the in/availability of individual sources to the Ljubljana team. For this reason, (1) detailed notes on attempts to access the sources as well as (2) title translations were added to list of sources where necessary.

Bibliography of the Serbian media studies (1950s to present)*

* Included in the bibliography are both identified and analyzed sources for understanding the Serbian media in the designated period. Sources that were not accessible to the Ljubljana team by the time of the completion of the present report are distinguished in the list below with a thin outlining border!

Period 1

Arnim, Gustav Adolf von (1968) *Eine Strukturanalyse der Press der Föderativen Volksrepublik Jugoslawien. 1945-1963*. Münster: Institut für Publizistik.

Title translation: “A Structural analysis of the Press in the Federal Popular Republic of Yugoslavia. 1945-1963”

Avramovic, Miodrag Zika (1964) Rad i organizacija Tanjuga. In: Bozidar Novak ed. *Suvremeno novinarstvo*, 263-274. Zagreb: Stvarnost.

Title translation: “The work and organization of TANJUG”

Begovic, Branko (1952) <i>Die Entwicklung der Presse bei den Jugoslawen von ihren Anfängen bis zum Gegenwart unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Presse in der Föderativen Volksrepublik Jugoslawien</i> . Dissertation thesis. München.

Title translation: “Development of the press of Yugoslav nations from its beginning to the present with specific overview of the press in the Federative Republic of Yugoslavia”

Note: This dissertation thesis was unavailable via interlibrary loan. The study is mentioned by Arnim (1968), but it was not referenced elsewhere. Arnim also merely reports that the thesis was written by an émigré from Yugoslavia and that empirical data collection at the time was met by many obstacles. Reportedly, Begovic attempted to overcome this by correspondence. There is no information in Arnim on what the study's main theses or findings were!

Bjelica, Mihajlo (1968) *200 godina jugoslovenske stampe*. Beograd: Prosveta.

Title translation: "200 years of the Yugoslav press"

Cakra, Emil (1961) *Jugoslovenska zurnalistika. Slovenka, 9.*

Title translation: "Yugoslav journalism"

JIN (1960) *Savremena sredstva informisanja*. Beograd: Jugoslovenski institut za novinarstvo.

Title translation: "Contemporary means of information"

JIN (1964) *Stampa, radio, televizija, film u Jugoslaviji*. Beograd: Jugoslovenski institut za novinarstvo.

Title translation: "The press, radio, television, and film in Yugoslavia"

JIN (1965) *Masovna komunikacija u Jugoslaviji*. Beograd: Jugoslovenski institut za novinarstvo.

Title translation: "Mass communication in Yugoslavia"

JIN (1968) *Tematska struktura sadrzaja jugoslovenskih listova*. Beograd: Jugoslovenski institut za novinarstvo.

Title translation: "Thematic structure of the contents of Yugoslav newspapers"

Kempers, Frans. 1967. Freedom of information and criticism in Yugoslavia, I. *Gazette, 13, 1, 3-21.*

Kempers, Frans. 1967. Freedom of information and criticism in Yugoslavia, II. *Gazette, 13, 4, 317-336-*

Kojic, Branko (1964) *Vijest, izvjestaj, intervju, posebni stupci i rubrike*. In: Bozidar Novak ed. *Suvremeno novinarstvo, 152-188*. Zagreb: Stvarnost.

Title translation: "News, report, interview, special columns and rubrics"

Kupresanin, Veljko (1960) *Pregled istoriskog razvoja jugoslovenske stampe*. In: *Savremena sredstva informacije*. Beograd: Jugoslovenski institut za publicistiku.

Title translation: "Overview of the historical development of the Yugoslav press"

Manojlovic, Ljubisa (1964) *Humor i humorist u listu*. In: Bozidar Novak ed. *Suvremeno novinarstvo, 92-94*. Zagreb: Stvarnost.

Title translation: "Humor and the humorist in the press"

Markovic, Radivoje (1964) *Razvitak radija i televizije u Jugoslaviji*. Godisnjak JRT.

Title translation: "Development of radio and television in Yugoslavia"

Markovic, Zoran (1996). The nation: victim and vengeance. In: Nebojsa Popov, ed. *The road to war in Serbia*, 587-607. Budapest: CEU Press.

Misovic, Milos (1996) "Stampa i srpsko drustvo 19. i 20. veka." In: M. Kisic and B. Bulatovic (eds.), *Srpska stampa 1768-1995. Istorijsko-bibliografski pregled*, 9-48. Beograd: Medija centar.

Title translation: "The press and the Serbian society in the 19th and 20th century"

Mitrovic, Zivan (1964) Pregled historije jugoslovenskog novinarstva do drugog svjetskog rata. Srbija. In: Bozidar Novak ed. *Suvremeno novinarstvo*, 363-371. Zagreb: Stvarnost.

Title translation: "Overview of the history of Yugoslav journalism until the 2nd world war"

Niksic, Stevan (1982) *Oslobodjenje stampe*. Beograd: Mladost.

Title translation: "Freeing of the press"

Novak, Bozidar ed. (1964) *Suvremeno novinarstvo*. Zagreb: Stvarnost.

Title translation: "Contemporary journalism"

Plavsic, Prvoslav (1979) Beogradzani i zajednicki program radia. *RTV teorija i praksa*, 16, 177-195.

Title translation: "People of Belgrade and common radio programming"

Ramet, Sabrina P. (1992) The Role of the Press in Yugoslavia. In: Allcock et al., eds. *Yugoslavia in Transition: Choices and Constraints*, 414-414. New York: Berg.

Robinson, Gertrude Joch (1977) *Tito's Maverick Media. The politics of Mass Communications in Yugoslavia*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Sijan, Rade, ed. (1986) *Jugoslovenski radio juce, danas, sutra. Nedelja jugoslovenskog radia*. Izbor diskusija s okruglog stola. Beograd: JRT.

Title translation: "Yugoslavian radio yesterday, today and tomorrow. A week of Yugoslav radio; selection of discussions from the round table"

Zivotic, Radomir (1979) *Posleratna reportaza in njene stilske odlike*. Beograd: Decje novine.

Title translation: "Postwar reportage and its stylistic characteristics"

Zlender, Danilo (1963) Evolution of Public Information Media in Yugoslavia. <i>Training of journalists</i> , 5, 16, 57-68.

Period 2

Kandic, Natasa (1990) The content analysis of the attitude towards Kosovo in the *Politika* daily newspaper. In: *Kosovo knot: Untie it or cut it?* The Report of the Independent committee: Beograd: Hronos.

Lucic, Milan (1990) *Lokalni radio – evropska iskustva*. Sombor: IC Sombor

Title translation: "Local radio – European experience"

Markovic, Andrija Majtenji (1990) *Politicki pluralizam i elektronski mediji*. Novi Sad: Centar za istrazivanje programa i auditoriuma.

Title translation: "Political pluralism and the electronic media"

Slapsak, Svetlana (1990) Echoes and reactions in the *Politika* daily newspaper. In: *Kosovo knot: Untie it or cut it?* The Report of the Independent committee: Beograd: Hronos.

Various authors (1990) *Stranacka stampa*. Novinarstvo. Beograd: JIN

Title translation: "The party's press"

Various authors (1991a) *Ratni reporteri I*. Novinarstvo. Beograd: JIN

Title translation: "War reporters, I."

Various authors (1991b) *Ratni reporteri II*. Novinarstvo. Beograd: JIN

Title translation: "War reporters, II."

Period 3

Brankovic, Srbobran (1998) The media in Serbia. *South East Europe Review*, 1-3, 135-142.

Brankovic, Srbobran (2000) Media interpretation of war as an instrument of national homogenization. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 145-152. Beograd: Argument.

Curgus Kazimir, Velimir (2000) The dressing of newspapers. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 97-108. Beograd: Argument.

Dejanovic, Velimir (2003) *Vreme bez slike*. Beograd: Redakcija za istoriografiju.

Title translation: "A time without picture"

NOTE: The book is still in press according to the information of the publisher! We add below an explanation from (<http://www.cesid.org/izdanja/mala.jsp>).

Original text is in serbo-croatian and is given in the original form below as it was found on <http://www.cesid.org>: »VEST br. 23 - Povodom dvadesetpetogodisnjice rada Televizije Beograd, 1983. godine, Redakcija za istoriografiju i tadašnji njen urednik dr. Miroslav Savicevic ustanovili su Biblioteku "Prilozi za istoriju Televizije Beograd" i do 1998. godine izašlo je šest knjiga. Pre neki dan, u Stampariji PGP prisustvovali smo pocetku stampanja nove knjige "Vreme bez slike" autora Velimira Dejanovica. Redakcija za istoriografiju predala je materijal juna 2003, ali finansijski razlozi su sprecili ranije stampanje. Tim pre su, u sredu, 20. jula, poziv Redakcije da se povodom pocetka stampanja okupe oni koji su direktno vezani za objavljivanje ove knjige - prihvatili svi sa velikim zadovoljstvom. Izlasku prvog tabaka nove knjige prisustvovali su autor Velimir Dejanovic; recenzenti Milan Vlajcic i Zoran S. Popovic; Dobrilo Nikolic koji je jos 1983. dao likovno-graficki izgled celoj biblioteci; lektor i korektor Kosana Tanaskovic i dva urednika izdanja Nikola Mirkov i Bojana Andric. Uz sefa Stamparije PGP Dorda Brkica, tehnicara pripreme Zivka Trifunovica i ofset masiniste Gorana Todorovica krenuo je tiraz od 700 primeraka 7. knjige iz Biblioteke "Prilozi za istoriju Televizije Beograd". Knjiga "Vreme bez slike" bice javno predstavljena polovinom septembra u okviru obelezavanja 47 godina rada Televizije Beograd.«

Dimitrijevic-Kozic, Marija (2000) Discourse analysis of the news. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 197-211. Beograd: Argument.

Dzuverovic, Borisav (1994) Lavirinti medijske galaksije. In: Dzuverovic, Mihailovic and Vukovic, *Izborna upotreba medija*, 9-20. Institut drustvenih nauka. Beograd.

Title translation: "Labyrinths of media galaxy"

Djuric, Jelena (2000) The use of myths for creating and destroying a society. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 153-176. Beograd: Argument.

Lalic, L. (1995). *Tri TV godine u Srbiji*. Beograd: Nezavisni sindikat medija.

Title translation: "Three TV years in Serbia"

Miletic, Mirko (2001) *Masovno komuniciranje u Srbiji u poslednjoj deceniji XX veka*. PhD dissertation. Beograd.

Mihailovic, Srecko (1994) Televizija u izbornoj kampanji. In: Dzuverovic, Mihailovic and Vukovic, *Izborna upotreba medija*, 21-28. Beograd; Institut drustvenih nauka.

Title translation: "television in the election campaign"

Mihailovic, S. et al (1997) *Rat je poceo u Maksimiru – govor mrznje u medijima*. Beograd: Medija centar.

Title translation: "The war was started in Maksimir – hatespeech in media"

Mihajlovic, B. (1994) Television Belgrade. Spirit of intolerance. In: *Hate speech*. Beograd: Center for Antiwar Action.

Milivojevic, Snjezana (1993) *Ekranizacija izbora. TV prezentacija izborne kampanje 92. u Srbiji*. Beograd: Vreme knjige.

Title translation: "Screenization of elections"

Milivojevic, Snjezana (1996) The nationalization of everyday life. In: Nebojsa Popov, ed. *The road to war in Serbia*, 608-631. Budapest: CEU Press.

Milivojevic, Snjezana (1997) *Media in Serbia*. Düsseldorf: European Institute for the Media

Nenadovic, Aleksandar (1996) *Politika* in the storm of nationalism. In: Nebojsa Popov, ed. *The road to war in Serbia*, 537-564. Budapest: CEU Press.

Pavicevic, Djordje (2000) Political discourse. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 63-76. Beograd: Argument.

Popov, Nebojsa (2000) Media shock and comprehending it. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 9-18. Beograd: Argument.

Puhovski, Zarko (2000) Hate silence. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 41-52. Beograd: Argument.

Radojkovic, Miroslav (1993) Predistorija medija u postkomunistickim zemljama. Zbornik Matice Srpske za drustvene nauke, 191-206. Matica Srpska: Novi Sad.

Title translation: "Prehistory of media in the post-communist countries"

Note: An extended English abstract is available in the Serbian on-line library catalogue. "The paper discusses the changes within the mass media system which are taking place simultaneously with other important social and political reforms. the analysis observes three aspects, figuratively called vacuums: the legal vacuum, the conceptual-developmental and financial-productional vacuum. As for the first

aspect, it may be stated that the legal framework for the functioning of mass media was adjusted to the principles of the liberal theory about free press. As for radio and TV media, they remain in the dual (state and private) ownership and all the regulations for their functioning have not been adopted yet. In the majority of the postcommunist countries the moratorium for the distribution of frequencies is applied. However, this vacuum will be filled soon. The second aspect studies the economical difficulties of the functioning of mass media which develop because of the change of the ownership concept. There is an obvious wish of all these countries to commercialize mass media, but the economic prerequisites for that do not exist – 'the society of plenty'. Therefore three scenarios for future developments are possible: a) that mass media will continue to fall behind - according to the number and quality of products - compared with the West; b) that nationalization of the most important media will be carried out again in order to prevent the disastrous effects of market economy laws, primitive accumulation of capital and competition; c) that the media of the postcommunist countries will be sold to foreign partners, but that would raise the question of the communicational and cultural identity of these countries. The desirable scenario, proliferation of mass media in all forms of ownership and with foreign investments is not impossible, but it can be carried out only after the successful reconstruction of the economy systems. The easiest way to fill the productional-financial vacuum is to import existing programmes, to sel concessions to the foreign radio and TV stations and to open domestic informational space. However, thinking in longer terms, this would undermine the endogenic cultural values and creative potential of the postcommunist countries. It seems that the foreign mass media are interested primarily in conquering the audience of these countries, in order to "deliver" that audience to the economic advertisers and to increase their own profit. In that sense, the financial-productional vacuum will be most difficult to fill, if it is going to be filled at all." (Radojkovic 1993)

Radojkovic, Miroslav (1996) Prilog raspravi o nezavisnim medijima.

Zbornik Matice Srpske za drustvene nauke, 255-273. Matica Srpska: Novi Sad.

Title translation: "Contribution to the debate on independent media"

Note: An extended English abstract is available in the Serbian on-line library catalogue. The discussion starts from the idea that it cannot be objectively established which media deserve the attribute "independent", if the consensus on the definition is not reached beforehand. The criteria for an objective assessment would stem from the unique definition. Since there is no agreement on this issue, the paper discusses several approaches established in the theoretical literature. The first condition for the independence of the media comes from their autonomy in relation to the state authorities; the second condition is to ensure independence in relation to the persons having political power; the third, today more and more widespread condition, is that money, i.e. the power of their owners and advertisers, represents the source of the subjugation of the media. The discussion showed that all the three perils also exist in our country, under specific conditions. Their consequences were tested within an analysis of subjugation and the degree of autonomy of our electronic media and the press. After the analysis, the conclusion was that there was not a sufficient basis to label a great number of media as "independent". The syntagm "independent media" is thus like an ideal type at which one can and should aim by the gradual liberation of all the mentioned sources of subjugation - which is in the essence of the contemporary struggle for the freedom of press. Although more and more of our media aim at acquiring this attribute, other possible labels were also offered, like: oppositional, alternative, anti-institutional, etc." (Radojkovic 1996)

Ramet, Sabrina P. (2003) Kuga nacionalizma in zapuscina vojne. *Teorija in praksa*, 40, 4, 759-770.

Title translation: "The plague of nationalism and heritage of war"

Skopljanac Brunner, Nena (2000) Media strategies of constructing the image of the "other" as "enemy". In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 117-144. Beograd: Argument.

Stojanovic, Dragana et al. 1999. *Izmedzu etike i etiketa*. Nis: CERID.

Title translation: "Between ethics and etiquettes"

Skiljan, Dubravko (2000) Semantics of war. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 177-196. Beograd: Argument.

Tadic, Svetozar (2002) *Snaga i nemoc javne reci*. Beograd: Zavod za udzbenike i nastavna sredstva

Thompson, Mark (1999) *Forging War*. Luton: University of Luton Press.

Todorovic, Stjepan and Stjepan Gredelj (2001) *Mediji u Srbiji: slobodni i oslobojeni*. Beograd: CESID.

Title translation: "Media in Serbia"

NOTE: The book is still in press according to the information of the publisher! An electronic version exists, however, on the world wide web site of CeSID.

Turkovic, Hrvoje (2000) The partiality and non-partiality norm in news programmes. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 223-261. Beograd: Argument.

Tunnard, Christopher (2003) From state controlled media to the anarchy of the internet. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 3, 2, 97-120.

Veljanovski, Rade (1996) Turning the electronic media around. In: Nebojsa Popov, ed. *The road to war in Serbia*, 565-586. Budapest: CEU Press.

Vukovic, Slobodan (1994) Predizborne igre medija. In: Dzuverovic, Mihailovic and Vukovic, *Izborna upotreba medija*, 29-52. Beograd; Institut drustvenih nauka.

Title translation: "Campaign games of the media"

Zakosek, Nenad (2000) The legitimation of war. In: Skopljanac Brunner et al. ed. *Media and war*, 109-116. Beograd: Argument.

Appendix 6

Selective annotated bibliography

According to the sample report provided by ELIAMEP (Greece), the Ljubljana team decided ***not to offer*** annotated bibliographies because not even one none of the available Serbian media studies discussed notions of Europe, EU, European ethics or European values as a central object of their systematic investigation.

NOTE: It should be more or less clear from the main body of the report above that the media response to constitutive events and values of Europe or of the EU was reconstructed from rather tangential treatment in the Serbian media studies. It should be strongly asserted that is not possible to conclude from this ***fact about Serbian media studies*** that *Serbian media*, either press, broadcasting, or the new media, throughout the second half of the 20th century plus a dozen years more ignored Europe and European values. It is quite likely that Serbian media addressed explicitly Europe and European values but these were not the key topics of Serbian media studies. It is rather understandable that learned researchers of Serbian media, both local and foreign, focused on other contested and perplexing issues, such as free speech, intolerance, nationalism, media wars and so forth.