

**THE YUGOSLAV YOUTH PRESS (1968-1980):  
STUDENT MOVEMENTS, SUBCULTURES AND  
COMMUNIST ALTERNATIVE MEDIA**

Marko Zubak

A DISSERTATION

in

History

Presented to the Faculties of the Central European University in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Budapest, 2013

Supervisor of Dissertation

---

## **Copyright notice**

Copyright in the text of this dissertation rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or in part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author. I hereby declare that this dissertation contains no materials accepted for any other degrees in any other institutions and no materials previously written and/or published by another person unless otherwise noted.

## Acknowledgment

*My deepest gratitude goes to my supervisor Professor Marsha Siefert for her immense support, encouragement, patience, and help during the comprehensive period of research and writing of this thesis.*

## Abstract

The subject of this thesis, the Yugoslav youth press, reinstates the Yugoslav communist media as a research topic with a strong contemporary resonance and rich comparative potential. Developed within the institutional framework of the communist party, the youth press could best be defined as a network of publications intended for the youth and issued under the auspices of youth or student communist organizations.

What makes this medium of special interest is its transformation from the initial purpose for which it was designed. From the late 1960s, instead of serving as crude Party propaganda, these journals gained distinct voice and introduced various media innovations, while creating space for defiant representations opposed to the official norms and linked with the political and cultural initiatives of the Yugoslav youth.

This thesis investigates this unique genre along with its remarkable evolution, making a step forward in the study of communist media and Yugoslavia in particular. First, it repositions this propaganda tool as an example of a specific medium that acted from the margins to provide challenges to the mainstream media and the authorities at large. Using Western theoretical concepts to analyze a non-Western media, the thesis bridges the gap between seemingly competing media frameworks from East and West.

Second, the thesis uses the youth press to elaborate upon the late socialist Yugoslav youth, offering new insights into the late 1960s local student movements and the vibrant punk-rock subculture of the following decade. Moreover, the thesis points to Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana as the three main Yugoslav centers which led the country's development and display its diversity. By comparing the youth press from these cities, I expose the fascinating interplay of republican similarities and differences that emerged out of the complex Yugoslav federal entanglement.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## INTRODUCTION 1

## PART I – DEFINING THE YUGOSLAV YOUTH PRESS 8

[Theoretical roots, Historical practice, Interpretative model]

### 1. CHAPTER: COMMUNIST PRESS 11

#### 1.1. SOVIET PRESS THEORY 11

- 1.1.1. The politics of research literature 11
- 1.1.2. Soviet press within the Bolshevik concept of propaganda 13
- 1.1.3. Leninist theory and Stalinist practice 16
- 1.1.4. Forming the Soviet press model: benefits and shortcomings 19

#### 1.2. YUGOSLAV PRESS THEORY 22

- 1.2.1. Research literature 22
- 1.2.2. Soviet beginnings 25
- 1.2.3. New road: self-management, market and decentralization 27
- 1.2.4. Towards a Yugoslav theory of the press 33

#### 1.3. ASSESSMENT: YUGOSLAV PRESS IN THE EAST EUROPEAN CONTEXT 36

- 1.3.1. The unofficial realm of samizdat 37
- 1.3.2. The transformation of the official media 40

### 2. CHAPTER: COMMUNIST YOUTH AND YOUTH ORGANIZATION 45

#### 2.1. SOVIET YOUTH THEORY & PRACTICE 45

- 2.1.1. Research literature 45
- 2.1.2. Constructing youth under communism 47
- 2.1.3. The *Komsomol*: origins, post-war evolution and structure 49
- 2.1.4. The *Komsomol* and informal youth practices 53

#### 2.2. YUGOSLAV YOUTH THEORY & PRACTICE 55

- 2.2.1. Research literature 55
- 2.2.2. The interwar Yugoslav communist youth movement 58
- 2.2.3. The post-war massive state youth organization 62
- 2.2.4. The 1960s reform process: self-management, student exception, decentralization 64
- 2.2.5. The youth organization and informal youth cultural practices 68

### 3. CHAPTER: YUGOSLAV YOUTH PRESS 71

#### 3.1. ROLE, STATUS, PRE-HISTORY, EVOLUTION 71

- 3.1.1. Soviet origins 71
- 3.1.2. Research literature 73
- 3.1.3. Interwar beginnings 76
- 3.1.4. The post-war period: outside the reach of the main media framework 78
- 3.1.5. Statutory confusion 80
- 3.1.6. The self-management view of the youth press: preview 82

#### 3.2. CLASSIFICATION OF THE YOUTH PRESS: DEFINING THE SOURCES 84

- 3.2.1. Publications by type 87
  - 3.2.1.1. Central organs 87
  - 3.2.1.2. Cultural bimonthlies 89
  - 3.2.1.3. Specialized journals 90
  - 3.2.1.4. Academic journals 91
- 3.2.2. Publication by territory 92
- 3.2.3. Publications by publisher 94
- 3.2.4. Mainstream commercial youth press 96

### 4. CHAPTER: INTERPRETATIVE MODEL 101

#### 4.1. ALTERNATIVE MEDIA MODEL 101

- 4.1.1. Origins and place of alternative media within the media studies 102
- 4.1.2. Devising a new model: novel conceptions of alternative media 106

- 4.1.3. Essential qualities of alternative media 109
- 4.2. APPROACHING YUGOSLAV YOUTH PRESS AS ALTERNATIVE MEDIA 113**
- 4.2.1. Four approaches to the alternative media 114
- 4.2.2. Yugoslav youth press as the alternative media 116

## **PART II – YOUTH PRESS AS ALTERNATIVE MEDIA 119**

[Construction and Representation of the Yugoslav Youth from New Left to Punk Rock]

### **5. CHAPTER: THE ORGAN OF THE STUDENT MOVEMENT (1968-1972) 122**

#### **5.1. YUGOSLAV STUDENT MOVEMENTS (1968-1972) 123**

- 5.1.1. Research literature 123
- 5.1.2. General overview 127
- 5.1.3. Social movements and their media 128

#### **5.2. BELGRADE YOUTH PRESS AND THE STUDENT MOVEMENT 130**

- 5.2.1. Anticipation 131
- 5.2.2. The Belgrade June 1968 revolt 134
- 5.2.3. The voice of the student movement 136
- 5.2.4. Keeping the critical spirit: 1968/69 139
- 5.2.5. Showdown 143
- 5.2.6. Nationalist aftermath: 1970/71 147

#### **5.3. ZAGREB YOUTH PRESS AND THE STUDENT MOVEMENT 150**

- 5.3.1. The ambivalent June 1968 in Zagreb 150
- 5.3.2. Leftist radicalism with no reception: 1968-1969 154
- 5.3.3. Detour: The Croatian Spring 158
- 5.3.4. Syndicalist intermezzo: *Studentski list* and the reform of the university 160
- 5.3.5. Takeover and the birth of the national student movement: 1970/1971 162
- 5.3.6. National students in charge and the consequent repression 165

#### **5.4. LJUBLJANA YOUTH PRESS AND THE STUDENT MOVEMENT 168**

- 5.4.1. Late bloomer 169
- 5.4.2. Adopting the movement: 1970/71 171
- 5.4.3. Radicalization: 1971/72 175
- 5.4.4. Showdown 179

#### **5.5. THE CULTURE OF THE STUDENT MOVEMENT 182**

- 5.5.1. Politicization of cultural youth journals 183
- 5.5.2. Political art: political theatre and *the black film* 187
- 5.5.3. The search for an authentic student culture 191
- 5.5.4. Underground counter-culture: the bridge between politics and culture 193

#### **5.6. COMPARATIVE CONCLUSION 196**

- 5.6.1. Political alternative media 196
- 5.6.2. Contesting ideologies: from leftist solidarity to national rivalry 198
- 5.6.3. Confrontations 201
- 5.6.4. Youth journalists 203
- 5.6.5. Epilogue 204

### **6. CHAPTER: THE VOICE OF PUNK-ROCK (1977-1980) 206**

#### **6.1. YUGOSLAV YOUTH PUNK-ROCK SUBCULTURE 207**

- 6.1.1. Concept and research literature 207
- 6.1.2. Rock culture in communist Yugoslavia: overview 212

#### **6.2. ROCK CULTURE AND THE STUDENT MOVEMENT: *POP-EXPRESS* 215**

- 6.2.1. Breakthrough: the first youth rock journal 216
- 6.2.2. Rock culture 219
- 6.2.3. Media innovations 222
- 6.2.4. The birth of rock journalism 224

#### **6.3. THE *POLET* REVOLUTION 225**

- 6.3.1. Beginnings: a new type of youth press 225
- 6.3.2. *Polet* and the New Wave 230
  - 6.3.2.1. New voices 230
  - 6.3.2.2. Active promotion 231
  - 6.3.2.3. The making of meaning 234

- 6.3.2.4. Fluid boundaries 237
- 6.3.3. Sex & drugs & lifestyle 239
- 6.3.4. Marketing strategy and media innovations 243
- 6.3.5. *Polet* and the authorities 247
- 6.3.6. The school of journalism 252
- 6.3.7. Reflections of *Polet* 254
- 6.4. RADIO ŠTUDENT 255**
  - 6.4.1. Extension of the youth press 255
  - 6.4.2. Punk and *Radio Študent* 256
  - 6.4.3. Actions: Igor Vidmar 258
  - 6.4.4. *Rock Front*: politics of punk 261
  - 6.4.5. Aftermath: the authorities and moral panic 265
- 6.5. COMPARATIVE CONCLUSION 267**
  - 6.5.1. Belgrade exception: *Džuboks* 267
  - 6.5.2. Comparison 271

## **7. CHAPTER: THE IMAGE OF THE YOUTH PRESS 275**

### **7.1. GRAPHIC DESIGN 276**

- 7.1.1. The visual response to the 1960s student politics 278
- 7.1.2. The rendition of foreign trends: from pop-art to psychedelic flower power 280
- 7.1.3. The revival: Goran Trbuljak 284
- 7.1.4. *Polet* 286

### **7.2. COMICS 290**

- 7.2.1. From anti-comics to comix 292
- 7.2.2. The *New Square* 294
- 7.2.3. The legacy and epigones 298
- 7.2.4. The matching discourse 300

### **7.3. PHOTOGRAPHY 303**

- 7.3.1. *Polet's* School of Photography 304
- 7.3.2. Rock photography 307
- 7.3.3. Influence 309

### **7.4. CONCLUSION: THE YOUTH PRESS AS AN ART FORM 311**

## **CONCLUSION 313**

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY 325**

## **APPENDICES 352**

## List of Illustrations

- Illustration 1: *Omladinski tjednik* 27 (9 Oct. 1968) 353  
Illustration 2: *Omladinski tjednik* 99 (23. Sept. 1970) 354  
Illustration 3: *Vidici* 146 (Dec. 1970) 355  
Illustration 4: *Tribuna* 6 (19 Nov. 1970) 356  
Illustration 5: *Tribuna* 15 (1971) 358  
Illustration 6: *Polet* 23 (Nov. 1968) 359  
Illustration 7: *Pop-Express* 5 (7 April 1969) 360  
Illustration 8: *Pop-Express* 9 (2 June 1969) 361  
Illustration 9: *Polet* 120 (6 Feb. 1980) 362  
Illustration 10: *Polet* 97 (11 April 1979) 363  
Illustration 11: *Tribuna* 11 (24 Dec. 1970) 364  
Illustration 12: *Polet* 42/43 (25 Nov. 1977) 365  
Illustration 13: *Polet* 16 (25 Feb. 1977) 366  
Illustration 14: *Pitanja* 6/7 (1979) 367  
Illustration 15: *Polet* 15 (18 Feb. 1977) 369  
Illustration 16: *Polet* 72 (3 Oct. 1978) 370  
Illustration 17: *Polet* 146 (24 Dec. 1980) 371  
Illustration 18: *Polet* 82/83 (27 Dec. 1978) 372  
Illustration 19: *Polet* 144 (10 Dec. 1980) 373



## INTRODUCTION

The war that had broken out at the beginning of the 1990s contributed greatly to the increased academic interest in communist Yugoslavia. Quite understandably, that interest tended to be negatively colored and new research focused exclusively on the legacy supposedly contributing to the belligerent final outcome.<sup>1</sup> The situation was actually a complete reversal to academic interest of the several preceding decades. Unorthodox Yugoslav ideological and institutional solutions that were once treated with the utmost respect seemed irrelevant and obsolete within the new violent scenario. The rejection of the communist legacy that enveloped the successor states in the meantime worked in the same direction. From being an academic favorite, Yugoslavia became the problem state.

Yugoslav media in particular experienced this kind of one-dimensional treatment in light of its perceived responsibility for the bloody breakup of the state. A number of studies portrayed an unflattering image of Yugoslav media as a deadly instrument that fuelled nationalistic sentiments and served as a key advocate of the war.<sup>2</sup> While this body of work accurately pointed to some of its disastrous effects, it blurred the vision from other, differently flavored tendencies.

The subject of this thesis, the youth press, reinstates the Yugoslav communist media as a research topic with a strong contemporary resonance and rich comparative

---

<sup>1</sup> At the heart of this pursuit stood a naïve belief that tragic consequences stem from bad institutional settings alone, or, conversely, that democratic features ultimately lead to the beneficial results. Sabrina P. Ramet, *Balkan Babel: The Disintegration of Yugoslavia from the Death of Tito to the Fall of Milošević* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 2002); John B. Allcock, *Explaining Yugoslavia* (London: C. Hurst, 2000); Dejan Jović, *Yugoslavia: A State that Withered Away* (West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press, 2009).

<sup>2</sup> Mark Thompson, *Forging War: The Media in Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina* (Washington: Article 19, 1995); Kemal Kurspahić, *Zločin u 19:30: Balkanski mediji u ratu i miru* (Prime Time Crime: Balkan Media in War and Peace) (Sarajevo: Media centar, 2003); Philip Cohen, *Serbia's Secret War: Propaganda and the Deceit of History* (Collage Station: Texas A& M University Press, 1996); Mira Beham, *Ratni doboši: Mediji, rat, politika* (War Drums: Media, War, Politics) (Beograd: Miona, 1997).

potential. Developed within the institutional framework of the ruling communist party, the youth press could best be defined as a wide network of publications intended for the youth and issued under the auspices of youth or student communist organizations.<sup>3</sup> The concept is in no way typical solely for the Yugoslav regime. Rather, it reflects the traditional concern of all communist societies towards their young subjects, considered, since Lenin, in need of firm guidance.

What distinguishes the Yugoslav variant, however, is its transformation from the initial purpose for which it was designed. From the late 1960s, instead of serving as crude Party propaganda, these journals gained their own distinct voice. They began to introduce various innovations, while creating space for non-dominant representations opposed to the mainstream norms and closely related to the informal political and cultural initiatives of the youth. The process was not uniform in all republics and could be followed in several phases between the late 1960s and early 1980s whereby periods of crises and cooperation with the regime interchanged with those of confrontation and intense developments.

This thesis aims to investigate this unique genre along with its remarkable evolution. In doing so, it makes a major step forward in two respective fields, in the study of communist media and Yugoslavia in particular. With regards to the first one, I intend to reposition this propaganda tool as a prime example of a specific medium that acted from the margins to provide copious challenges to the mainstream media scene and the authorities at large. Using contemporary Western theoretical concepts to analyze a non-Western media outlet of the past, the thesis locates new realms for

---

<sup>3</sup> As a part of their informative duties, youth and student unions produced various journals which more or less repeated the official messages and were aimed to recruit young loyal followers of the regime. Both terms, youth press and student press, were used at the time, though the latter less frequently. For the distinction between them see the third chapter. Here it suffices to note that both were to a large extent similar and, accordingly, I use the term youth press throughout the thesis to encompass both kinds.

media studies. By the same token it bridges the existing gap between seemingly diametrically opposed media frameworks from East and West, while indicating the embeddedness of the more recent influx of unconventional media forms and usages within unexpected organizational settings.

The study, however, strives for more than just providing an untold, intriguing chapter in the history of Yugoslav media. I use the youth press to elaborate upon the late socialist Yugoslav youth, treating it as a laboratory where important, yet rarely discussed political, cultural and artistic processes could be observed. More precisely, the youth press offers crucial insights into the late 1960s local student movements and the vibrant punk-rock subculture of the following decade. Both have global dimensions, pointing to the capacity of political and cultural forms to cross boundaries and to resurface in different places where they are inscribed with new meanings.

Framed in this way, the proposed project stretches over a multitude of disciplines and overlapping themes. Indeed, one of the major tasks was to come up with a suitable approach capable of integrating this diversity. The thesis is thus by default interdisciplinary and draws from a wide array of perspectives, from historical, social and cultural studies to media theory and semiotic textual analysis. In that respect, the dissertation breaks with the prevailing tradition of theoretically uninformed historical research on communist Yugoslavia, the feature that so accurately mirrors the conservative academic climate of the respective regional historiographies.

As far as the accomplished research is concerned, the study presents a pioneer undertaking. The concept of the youth press is practically absent from the existing literature, in its original and Yugoslav version alike.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, virtually each of the four reference points crucial for its understanding has yet to attract scholarly

---

<sup>4</sup> Youth journals were considered propaganda bulletins of the organizations that issued them and were stripped of all journalistic value. Consequently, as will be seen later on, they were mentioned only marginally within the scholarship on propaganda apparatus.

attention. Nothing or very little is known about the Yugoslav communist media, the post-war youth organization and the major political and (sub)cultural achievements of the late socialist Yugoslav youth. This state of scholarship is discussed in detail in the relevant chapters and profoundly shaped the outlook of the thesis. Namely, before proceeding with the reinterpretation, basic narratives needed to be constructed, rather than simply taken over.

These objectives are matched by the twofold design of the thesis which is comprised of theoretical and research parts, both equal in value and importance. The first uncovers the rich discursive and institutional roots of the youth press, sketches its early history and ends by developing an appropriate terminology for the analysis. Each of the constituent chapters delivers here a new input, from a comparative view of the Yugoslav media theory and youth organization, to the innovative conceptual framing of their offspring.<sup>5</sup>

The second part of the thesis implements the proposed interpretative model in the relevant time frame. The three research chapters present the new youth press in action, exposing its ties with the rising political movements and subcultures, along with its experiments in form and manner of production. These unconventional political, (sub)cultural and visual representations are examined respectively, keeping in mind the complex relationship with their creators and the context in which they were produced. In that way, the exceptional qualities of this unique medium will at the same time provide valuable scholarly insights into these phenomena themselves.

The thesis does not cover each and every youth journal, but instead chooses those which comply with the prescribed theoretical model of the alternative media and exhibit certain features that justify their joint treatment. Such a case study approach

---

<sup>5</sup> In the former, original Soviet discourses on media and youth, and to a lesser measure those of the more liberal regimes in Central Eastern Europe served as the crucial reference points. For the latter, the experiences of the Western marginal media were consulted.

was conditioned primarily by the aforesaid uneven evolution of the youth press, which in itself was determined by the contingencies of the Yugoslav communist regime.

This point requires further attention. Communist Yugoslavia functioned as an integral community of six individual republics with strong inner diversity which fed on different national interests, attained varied cultural and economic levels and fostered specific political currents. Present from the onset, this diversity intensified once the (con)federal system of governance acquired strong shape from the mid 1960s on. The youth press felt the impact. Deeply shaped by the decentralizing factors of the multiethnic state, it operated under varying circumstances across republics. This was the main reason why the new trends failed to affect all the youth journals, leaving many faithful to the classic Leninist concept. The fact that the youth press was not relevant all the time, nor everywhere, found its resonance in the chosen time and regional span, both original in their own ways.

The 1968-1980 period proved decisive for the emergence of a more independent youth press. The analysis begins with the outbreak of the Yugoslav student movements which initiated its conversion and ends with the death of Tito, an event that marked the symbolic and actual beginning of a new historic epoch. Though parts of the youth press continued to exhibit interesting features thereafter, extending this time limit would require introducing numerous new elements and thus only complicate what is already a complex structure. Besides, the selected time span is wide enough to exhibit the main aspects of the youth press, most prominently the telling shift in favored strategies, from political to sub-cultural ones. Finally, it is precisely this period which represents a scholarly no man's land that waits to be

filled.<sup>6</sup> The research chapters in particular seek to remedy this gap in the historiography of communist Yugoslavia.

The thesis centers on the youth press published in the capitals of the three major Yugoslav republics, Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia. Faced with rich journalistic heritage and dynamic contemporary political evolution, Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana became the centers of both the new youth press and the related political and cultural processes. Here, the guiding idea is to treat the youth press as a common Yugoslav phenomenon with a different outlook in each republic. No matter how straightforward it might seem, the formula breaks with the ruling dichotomy in the research of communist Yugoslavia. The approach stands equally at odds with the centralist or narrow national perspectives, both debilitating since they either ignore the local dimension or wider frame, respectively.<sup>7</sup>

In contrast, the study struggles to find a balance between these two levels, often acknowledged, but rarely followed in detail. In line with this common yet diverse path of the individual republics, it preserves the pan-Yugoslav perspective, while remaining sensitive to regional specificities.<sup>8</sup> Likewise, the thesis points to Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana as the three main Yugoslav centers which, during the analyzed decades at least, led the country's cultural, social and political development and

---

<sup>6</sup> Once general overviews are excluded, one can mention but a couple of studies explicitly dealing with these crucial years, all of which are mentioned in these research chapters.

<sup>7</sup> The majority of the fragile scholarship on Yugoslav communism is divided into these two exclusive camps. The first one, dominant in Western academia, adopts a centralist view, commonly disguised as pan-Yugoslav, and results in sweeping generalizations on processes occurring on common state level, while under or misinterpreting the specificities of each republic. The contrasting, national one, typical for the post-1990 revisionist milieus of ex-Yugoslav successor states, exclusively treat the developments in individual republics, neglecting the common Yugoslav features.

<sup>8</sup> The federal framework is generally accepted in principle, but rarely traced in detail. There are only a few studies which go beyond, and try to follow the repercussions. Almost as a rule these are related to the pop-cultural phenomena and produced by more than one researcher, thus pointing to the immense efforts needed for such an endeavor. See for example: Breda Luthar and Maruša Pušnik, eds., *Remembering Utopia: The Culture of Everyday Life in Socialist Yugoslavia* (Washington, DC: New Academia Pub., 2010); Hannes Grandits and Karin Taylor, eds., *Yugoslavia's Sunny Side: A History of Tourism in Socialism (1950s-1980s)* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2010).

display the diversity in practice.<sup>9</sup> By comparing the youth press from these cities, I expose the fascinating interplay of similarities and differences that emerged out of this federal entanglement.

I will conclude with a few words about the sources. Next to the abundant theoretical, historical literature and published documentary material, the thesis makes use of two main types of sources. The core of the study leans on the youth journals themselves, placed under scrupulous qualitative textual analysis. The number of included journals is inferable from the detailed classification in the third chapter and exceeds fifty publications of diverse profile, outlook, size and publication rhythm.<sup>10</sup> The thesis equally draws from a number of interviews conducted with the journalists and editors of the youth press. Their insiders' insights and experiences, specific understanding and performing of the profession which often failed to distinguish between the roles of activist and mediator, proves indispensable for the proper evaluation of the youth press.

---

<sup>9</sup> Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana are only exceptionally recognized as the dominant centers which shaped the country. On account of its language specificities and additional complexity, Slovenia in particular is frequently omitted from the research. For a rare contrasting view see a recent volume on avant-garde art which focus on these three centers, providing both the local story and Yugoslav background. See: Dubravka Djurić and Miško Šuvaković, eds., *Impossible Histories: Historical Avant-gardes, Neo-avant-gardes and Post-avant-gardes in Yugoslavia, 1918-1991* (Cambridge, Mass./London: The MIT Press, 2003).

<sup>10</sup> As noted earlier, the fact that the chapters discuss only certain journals does not mean that they were the only ones examined. On the contrary, presented material is just a tip of the iceberg of the conducted research, extracting examples that document the youth press as an alternative media.

## **PART I – DEFINING THE YUGOSLAV YOUTH PRESS**

### **[Theoretical roots, Historical practice, Interpretative model]**

The first part of the thesis covers the wide ground left by the scholarship that completely ignored the concept of the youth communist press. In addition, the four chapters offer a general set of references needed to contextualize the second part of the thesis. The opening two are devoted to the origins of this concept and provide an appropriate frame for its understanding and explanation. The search starts with a review of the relevant theoretical traditions and historical practices that generated this concept, followed by those that facilitated its evolution. More concretely, Soviet notions of the press and youth, and their Yugoslav adaptations are put under scrutiny. Apart from guiding ideas, the overview encompasses concrete organizational forms from which the very concept of the youth press derives and where the main power of communist propaganda rests.<sup>1</sup>

Such a twofold Soviet-Yugoslav appraisal is needed for two reasons. As designers of a radically new world, Soviets were not afraid to back their rhetoric with novel institutions. Once put to the test, these then turned into role models for other communists to emulate. Like their comrades elsewhere, Yugoslav communists built up their state according to the Soviets.<sup>2</sup> Their treatment of both media and youth was deeply marked by the Soviet experiences which should therefore be carefully exposed. However, after the break with Stalin in 1948, the Yugoslav state launched an ambitious project whereby it tried, within a relatively similar frame, to come up with

---

<sup>1</sup> Peter Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State: Soviet Methods of Mass Mobilization, 1917-1929* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 8.

<sup>2</sup> Dennison Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974* (London: C. Hurst, 1977), 14.



new solutions in order to distance itself from its former idol.<sup>3</sup> In the process, along with common features, a range of Yugoslav idiosyncrasies came into existence.

The two chapters are not entirely even in this respect. In the first, broader one, the Yugoslav press is also measured against the practices in the other communist regimes.<sup>4</sup> For once, the emerged specificities were more prominent in the realm of media and led to its distinct status within the general discussions of communist media. Moreover, despite its interdisciplinary nature, the thesis is primarily situated in the media framework. Comparing the Yugoslav press with different existent communist routines, beside Soviet ones, not only assists in its proper evaluation, but is of vital help in the search of the suitable model for the analysis of its extraordinary kind: the youth press.

The second chapter, on the other hand, places somewhat stronger emphasis on the institutional side. Here, the theory is mostly reduced to the core state youth organization, put in charge of the youth press and recognized as the single most important institution for its operation. Moreover, a stronger accent on the chronology should ease the related burden from the later chapters and contextualize them in advance.

After considering the original Soviet intentions and their Yugoslav variants, the third chapter joins the two core traditions and concentrates on the main object of the thesis, the youth press. I begin with a short sketch of the original Soviet concept, and then move to its Yugoslav counterpart. The chapter portrays its role, status, key features and patterns of operation prior to the analyzed period, and presents a brief

---

<sup>3</sup> James Simmie and Joze Dekleva, eds., *Yugoslavia in Turmoil: After Self-management?* (London/New York: Pinter Publishers, 1991), 30.

<sup>4</sup> This is done in the light of studies that began to emerge as the collapse of the system drew nearer. With the hindsight of the remarkable media transformation that occurred once the wall tumbled down, they broke up with the notions of utterly uniform communist media and instead portrayed it in more realistic and peculiar colors. Next to the modifications of the official media system, an informal communicative realm will be described, as developed in its most notable *samizdat* form.

outline of its evolution as it began to deviate from its roots. In addition, the concept is defined in terms of sources. The remaining part provides a detailed categorization of the youth journals according to their types which determine their inclusion or exclusion in this study.

Finally, feeding on the three preceding chapters, the fourth tries to build an adequate framework for the analysis of the Yugoslav youth press. A paradoxical blend of its marginal status and multiple historical roles imposes a necessity to distance the analysis from communist concepts, orthodox and unorthodox alike. A more fitting model, originating in a different ideological environment, but perfectly apt to accommodate these specificities, is successfully recognized in the recently revived alternative media model. This model will be elaborated in much detail as the main theoretical and methodological tool in the following chapters. Consequently, the chapter concludes with concrete suggestions on to its application to the Yugoslav youth press.

## 1. CHAPTER: COMMUNIST PRESS

### 1.1. SOVIET PRESS THEORY

#### 1.1.1. The politics of research literature

The rich and complex literature on the Soviet press developed in several strands and across different fields. Likewise, its main artifact, Soviet press theory has a loaded background that needs to be contextualized prior to discussing the model itself. The theory is rooted in the original Leninist ideas and Stalinist practice, both of which perceived the Soviet press as indispensable part of the communist propaganda apparatus. Ironically, this initial Soviet input was then rendered and preserved within the Western, primarily US scholarship, in a manner that was to a great deal a propaganda effort in itself.

The model received its main contours by the mid 1950s and evolved within the two newly born academic disciplines, Soviet studies and communication research, both closely intertwined with the Cold War politics. In the same way, the two principle authors, Alex Inkeles and Wilbur Schramm came from a similar milieu and combined their academic roles with advising US policy decisions. Inkeles was an employee of the Harvard's Russian Research Center, a government sponsored institution whose purpose was to utilize social science in the combat against communism.<sup>1</sup> Schramm started as a propaganda analyst in a number of US

---

<sup>1</sup> Inkeles contributed to several of the Center's project such as The Soviet Vulnerability Project and later reformulated his study on the Soviet media into a government briefing, under the telling title: "The Soviet Union as a Psychological Warfare Target". For more on Inkeles see in: David C. Engerman, *Know Your Enemy: The Rise and Fall of America's Soviet Experts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 44-50, 55-56, 182-87.

government agencies contributing extensively in his early career to the Cold War psychological warfare.<sup>2</sup>

Each authored a pioneering study on Soviet media that dominated their specific fields for years to come.<sup>3</sup> Feeding on concepts of totalitarianism and structural functionalism, Inkeles's study was interested in questions of political socialization and stability. Hugely influential with the generations of later Sovietologists, it had less impact on the media scholarship.<sup>4</sup> Schramm, on the other hand, generalized on essential features of the Soviet media system contrasting them to those of the Western liberal-capitalist media. The effort obtained an honorary place within the communication research, not least due to Schramm's pivotal role in its transformation into a distinct academic discipline, presumably more objective, value free and scientific than his previous endeavors.<sup>5</sup>

Far from being ideologically neutral, the resulting product, the Soviet press model is thus politically invested construct, colored with contemporary Cold War concerns. This feature did not inhibit it from being instructive, yet, nevertheless, added a conserving quality to it. The ensuing paradigm of a thoroughly instrumental Soviet press profoundly influenced the scholarship. For decades the ruling perspective remained that of the 1950s: Two opposed media worlds, the Soviet and Western one,

---

<sup>2</sup> Schramm originally compiled his volume on communication theory as a USIA training manual for government propaganda programs, later portraying it as communication research. Throughout the 1950s the field was linked with Cold War "psychological warfare" funded by government, while Schramm worked for US Air Force, Department of Defense or Radio Free Europe. See: Christopher Simpson, *Science of Coercion: Communication Research and Psychological Warfare, 1945-1960* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 71, 107-13.

<sup>3</sup> See respectively: Alex Inkeles, *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia: A Study in Mass Persuasion* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951); Wilbur Schramm "The Soviet Communist Press Theory," in Fred S. Siebert, Theodore Peterson, and Wilbur Schramm, *Four Theories of the Press: The Authoritarian, Libertarian, Social Responsibility, and Soviet Communist Concepts of What the Press Should Be and Do* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956), 105-46.

<sup>4</sup> In this respect, Inkeles's study was no different from so many other works of renowned Sovietologists that ended up having a minor impact on their home disciplines. See: Engerman, *Know Your Enemy*, 263.

<sup>5</sup> Schramm is widely regarded as the father of the mass communication studies. Simpson, *Science of Coercion*, 54, 130-131.

divided apart by the impassable abyss and seen through the lenses of the idealized Western press. Occasional unorthodox views that drew comparisons and searched for Western counterparts to communist media practices remained on the margin of interest.<sup>6</sup> So firm was the grasp of Schramm's vision that one had to wait for the fall of communism to be finally tested.

Considerable research that emerged since indicated the limited value of this Cold War concept of the Soviet press for the explanation of the whole range of media practices found in the communist world. This innovative literature is reviewed in the second part of the chapter. However, I will first portray the original Soviet model in full detail, bearing in mind its influence on the scholarship and the practice alike. As will be seen later on, Yugoslav communists, like their colleagues elsewhere, approached the construction of their own press network leaning on these core Soviet guidelines.

### **1.1.2. Soviet press within the Bolshevik concept of propaganda**

The Soviet press model, as it is constructed in the literature and presented below, is tightly integrated within the innovative Soviet thinking about propaganda, whose impressive range had a direct impact on the advent of the youth press. In his groundbreaking study on the subject, Kenez noted that the concept is extremely elusive, almost impossible to narrowly define. In most general terms, propaganda represents a deliberate attempt to transmit certain social and political values by various means and methods with the aim of influencing people's thinking, emotions and behavior.<sup>7</sup> As such it is in no way indigenous solely to the Soviets. Yet, in contrast to the Western pejorative perception which views it as a forceful, one-sided selection of information

---

<sup>6</sup> See for example: Mark W. Hopkins, *Mass Media in the Soviet Union* (New York: Pegasus, 1970); Ellen Mickiewicz, *Media and the Russian public* (New York: Praeger, 1981).

<sup>7</sup> Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State*, 4.

with the sole purpose of deceiving the public, propaganda carries positive connotations in the Soviet tradition.<sup>8</sup>

The reason lies in the ambitious Soviet project of creating a new humanity and classless society. Soviets were armed with a Marxist-Leninist worldview that claimed to objectively and scientifically explain the functioning of the whole society.<sup>9</sup> Its sweeping aspirations, adaptable to every sphere of life, made spreading of its principles an overt duty of every communist.<sup>10</sup>

In this respect, Lenin's revision of Marxist theory proved crucial. Class consciousness was no longer considered to be born from within, but had to be brought from the outside.<sup>11</sup> The task was put into the hands of the Bolshevik Party who took up the role of an elitist vanguard of the masses in whose name it spoke. The working class needed to be educated and their ways changed in order to prepare them for the revolution.<sup>12</sup>

Propaganda had to be perpetual as well as public. Its operation did not end with the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Even in the new friendly environment, the Party was obliged to shape its subjects with equally strong conviction.<sup>13</sup> Such a plastic conception of human behavior as entirely socially conditioned, forced Bolsheviks to accept propaganda as a key to success of their regime.<sup>14</sup> Numerous paradigms about the nature of communist rule grant key

---

<sup>8</sup> To be precise, this is true only for certain types of propaganda. In Soviet perception, propaganda was divided according to the class and social group that utilized it. In contrast to communist propaganda spreading Marxist-Leninist theory, bourgeois propaganda was considered hostile and filled with lies. Inkeles, *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia*, 41.

<sup>9</sup> Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State*, 5.

<sup>10</sup> Antony Buzek, *How the Communist Press Works* (London: Pall Mall Press, 1964), 13; Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State*, 10.

<sup>11</sup> Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State*, 5-6.

<sup>12</sup> John C. Clews, *Communist Propaganda Techniques* (New York: Praeger, 1964), 13-14.

<sup>13</sup> Buzek, *How the Communist Press Works*, 18, 29.

<sup>14</sup> Gayle Durham Hollander, *Soviet Political Indoctrination: Developments in Mass Media and Propaganda since Stalin* (New York: Praeger, 1972), 7-8. The need for constant struggle for the prevalence of good in people implied continuous propaganda and political work with the masses. *Ibid.*, 19.

significance to their propaganda apparatus, consisting of various means of mobilization, legitimization and indoctrination.

The press stands at the very top of this hierarchy. It plays a vital part as a central mechanism for the dispersal of an ideologically correct symbolic universe of the ruling communist party.<sup>15</sup> Its immense importance required firm monitoring. Lenin readily accepted the classic Marxist argument that “the ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas”<sup>16</sup> And since the press played a great role in the reproduction of ideas, it had to be subjected to the control of the working class or, rather, of its vanguard.<sup>17</sup> Only if the Party regulates this production, the press could genuinely be free.<sup>18</sup>

The fact that neither Marx nor Lenin were always certain about the needed degree illustrates the highly situational nature of their ideas about the press.<sup>19</sup> Yet, the first Bolshevik step after rising to power effectively prohibited all hostile press. Initially articulated as temporary, the decision was never withdrawn, but, with a number of resolutions, encompassed a whole range of publications.<sup>20</sup> It was Stalin who finished the job and established a total state monopoly on the press. In that way, he conserved the materialistic perception of the freedom of the press which equates it with the state ownership of the means of information.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> See: Buzek, *How the Communist Press Works*, 38.

<sup>16</sup> The recipe implied that the rulers also dominate as thinkers. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Collected Works*, vol. 1 (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1975), 59.

<sup>17</sup> Brian McNair, *Glasnost, Perestroika and the Soviet Media* (London: Routledge, 1991), 9.

<sup>18</sup> Lenin considered the Western dogma about freedom of the press one-sided as it safeguards it exclusively for the rich who own the papers. See: *Ibid.*, 27-30.

<sup>19</sup> Marx strongly opposed censorship. His articles in *Rheinische Zeitung* advocated the need for the freedom of the press and would later be used by liberal forces to stress the need for freedom of information. Lenin's pre-revolutionary views were also notably milder than his later formulations as he opposed direct censorship up until the October Revolution. See in turn: *Ibid.*, 8-9; Albert Resis, “Lenin on Freedom of the Press,” *The Russian Review* 36, no. 3 (1977): 823.

<sup>20</sup> Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State*, 38-44.

<sup>21</sup> Hopkins, *Mass Media in the Soviet Union*, 75.

### 1.1.3. Leninist theory and Stalinist practice

What became known as the Soviet model of the press emerged primarily as a compound of theoretical and practical efforts. This is true even on the personal level since its founding father was equally a man of action and thought when it came to the matters of press. Having witnessed its potential in the revolutionary struggle, Lenin, like his predecessor Marx, established various newspapers while developing a vision about its future role.<sup>22</sup>

Lenin's three essays on the role of the press comprise disparate instructions which reflect historical circumstances in which they were created.<sup>23</sup> Each review, however, starts with his famous prescription that became a single most quoted line in the Soviet thinking about the press: "The newspaper is not only a collective propagandist and a collective agitator, it is also a collective organizer."<sup>24</sup> The first two points share the same enlightening aim of political socialization and mobilization of the masses.<sup>25</sup> The press was seen as a prime indoctrination tool through which the regime spread Marxist-Leninist tenants, considered necessary for the transformation of the society. It should breed popular support, legitimize the regime and gather subjects under the common project of constructing the new society. The third prescribed role tied the

---

<sup>22</sup> Marx established *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, regarded by Soviets and Yugoslavs as the model for all subsequent communist newspapers. Similar guiding status had *Iskra*, founded in 1900 with Lenin as one of the editors, or *Pravda* for which he contributed while in exile. See respectively: McNair, *Glasnost, Perestroika, and the Soviet Media*, 10; Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State*, 26, 28.

<sup>23</sup> Most notable are *Where to Begin* in which Lenin advocated a need to establish a nation-wide Party newspaper and *What is to Be Done*, with its famous three-fold division of the press roles. *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>24</sup> Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, *What Is to Be Done?: Burning Questions of Our Movement* (New York: International Publishers, 1969), 160. The formula was in fact borrowed from the German Marxist Wilhelm Liebknecht. It has been pointed elsewhere that a few other components that came to be regarded as Leninist were in effect Soviet adaptations of German social-democratic ideas to their own circumstances. See respectively: Hopkins, *Mass Media in the Soviet Union*, 58, 61; Colin Sparks, *Communism, Capitalism and the Mass Media* (London: Sage Publications, 1998), 46.

<sup>25</sup> Early studies on Soviet propaganda and press devoted special attention to the difference between agitation and propaganda. According to the prescription, originally devised by Plekhanov, the agitator explained a simple idea to the masses while the propagandist elaborated a set of complex ideas to a few party members. The former was in principle oral and emotional in character; the latter used written forms and dealt with the Marxist-Leninist theory. As such, the difference was merely technical and made sense only in the conditions of general illiteracy. With time it lost its importance and propaganda incorporated agitation. See among others: Ellen Mickiewicz, "The Modernisation of Party Propaganda in the USSR," *Slavic Review* 30, no. 2 (1971): 259.



press to the Party, defining it as its organizational and communication channel through which it transmitted directives to its members and masses at large.<sup>26</sup>

Articulated in pre-revolutionary times, Lenin's vision left an indelible trace in the Soviet understanding of the press and was repeatedly echoed at the highest level. Stalin elevated the press to the strongest instrument by which the Party addresses the masses.<sup>27</sup> The reformer Khrushchev spoke in the same tone, when he used customary phrases about the press as the Party's "chief ideological weapon."<sup>28</sup>

Over the years, this simple formula became the foundation of a new media system, unique in many ways. Leaning on Lenin's ideas, Soviet theorists developed other missions for the press, placing before journalists the delicate task of their correct implementation. The press was thus meant to provide moral guidance, serve as an instrument of public control and (self)-criticism of regime, pointing out its faults and shortcomings.<sup>29</sup>

Through Stalin's institutional elaboration of these ideas a complex press network emerged.<sup>30</sup> Following the Party, it was hierarchically structured according to the territorial-administrative lines. At the top stood the most important, centrally produced nation-wide newspapers, while those of the lower rank followed: republican, regional, city, all the way to the factory wallpapers. In order to directly address certain segments of the population, the press was further divided vertically. Depending on the

---

<sup>26</sup> This final role was later translated into the so called "party" principle of the press, prescribing it to follow the party line. Inkeles, *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia*, 173-74.

<sup>27</sup> Buzek, *How the Communist Press Works*, 39.

<sup>28</sup> Hopkins, *Mass Media in the Soviet Union*, 20.

<sup>29</sup> The press was recognized as an ideal mean for transmitting official criticism. Within cautiously defined limits, it could take two forms: from above (by the Party) and from below (by ordinary people). See: Inkeles, *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia*, 194-99.

<sup>30</sup> Soviet press experienced a rapid growth during Stalin years. *Ibid.*, 53-54, 92; 147-56.

targeted occupational-biological group, one could distinguish among peasant, female, youth and other types of press.<sup>31</sup>

The press was not an autonomous entity. Everything from its finance, distribution to staff and editorial policies was carefully supervised, sometimes even to the minutest details, like a number of lines dedicated to individual topics.<sup>32</sup> Numerous institutions of control were established. The censorship agency *Glavlit* served as the central watchdog. Agitprop departments in the editorial boards administrated day-to-day operations.<sup>33</sup> The government agency TASS was given the monopoly over information which it cautiously distributed, generating practices such as silencing events embarrassing for the regime.<sup>34</sup>

Journalists were considered public officials and remained in close contact with the Party which personally appointed editors.<sup>35</sup> Accordingly, once founded, journalism training institutions filled a sizeable part of their curriculum with political training.<sup>36</sup> To illustrate the alleged closeness to the masses, several types of amateur journalism were initiated, but soon lost their spontaneity.<sup>37</sup> By the time of Khrushchev, the Soviet

---

<sup>31</sup> Inkeles identifies eight different types of specialized press publications. The origin of the concept of the youth press lies precisely in this vertical (functional) differentiation. *Ibid.*, 149-50.

<sup>32</sup> Apart from formal laws, Party supervised the press by three means: its supervisor machinery, directives governing the content and operation, and political training of editorial and writing personal. In addition, a number of semi-official influences, such as the professional journal *Zhurnalist*, provided guidelines and criticized bad examples. See: *Ibid.*, 188-92; Hollander, *Soviet Political Indoctrination*, 47-51.

<sup>33</sup> Hopkins sees in *Glavlit* a prime censoring instrument, while Inkeles gives it only secondary importance. Hopkins, *Mass Media in the Soviet Union*, 79; Inkeles, *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia*, 188.

<sup>34</sup> The so-called "non-news" phenomenon refers to the news that does not exist, stating that nothing happened amidst a contradicting reality. Hopkins, *Mass Media in the Soviet Union*, 50.

<sup>35</sup> The resulting self-censorship of the staff transpired into another important element in the control mechanism. See: Inkeles, *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia*, 175-83.

<sup>36</sup> The new trend towards more professionalism, beginning in the 1950s, did not change much in that sense. The journalistic schools and faculties had predominant political orientation. Accordingly, Party membership remained the safest route to secure top positions. See: Hollander, *Soviet Political Indoctrination*, 36-37.

<sup>37</sup> Soviets used two new genres as a check from below on local authorities. The first concerned the creation of so called *Rabsel'kor* movement, a network of worker/peasant correspondents who reported on irregularities in their own workplaces. On the other hand, the press regularly, often within a specially created department/section, published readers' letters which, in theory, provided ordinary

press was thus no more open to the working class than the Western media.<sup>38</sup> Its prescribed critical role remained strictly formal and limited by a range of taboos.<sup>39</sup> In turn, the press had no inhibitions when it came to glorifying the regime.<sup>40</sup>

With no profit incentive, little attention was paid to the readers' interests.<sup>41</sup> The Soviet press developed different news values determined by the proclaimed "ideological", "party" and "mass" principles.<sup>42</sup> Sheer factual reporting had no point unless it included selection and interpretation, contrary to Western standards.<sup>43</sup> Marxist-Leninist theory had complex relationship to the objectivity. The aura of Marxism-Leninism allowed them to be truthful and committed at the same time.<sup>44</sup>

The newspapers paid the final price. Written in a dreary bureaucratic style, they were filled with Party resolutions and economic treatises, often transferred in the original form. Graphically uninspiring and stripped of entertainment features, the Soviet press provided an utterly uniform and dull reading.<sup>45</sup>

#### 1.1.4. Forming the Soviet press model: benefits and shortcomings

This view of the Soviet press, as conceived by Lenin and finalized by Stalin, is how the Soviet model came to be known in Western media theory, particularly due to

---

citizens with a chance to express their grievances about certain matters. See: Inkeles, *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia*, 202-6, 215-22.

<sup>38</sup> Such an outcome was facilitated by the professionalization of the Soviet press, elaborated in more detail later on. Hopkins, *Mass Media in the Soviet Union*, 106.

<sup>39</sup> Certain criticism was allowed with regards to bureaucracy, corruption, failure to reach targets or, later on, poor consumer services. In contrast, issues such as communist ideals, main Party line, political leaders, military matters and foreign policy remained immune to any critique. See: *Ibid.*, 45, 86-88.

<sup>40</sup> Hollander, *Soviet Political Indoctrination*, 30.

<sup>41</sup> Buzek, *How the Communist Press Works*, 78.

<sup>42</sup> They were originally known as principles of "ideinost", "partiinost", "masovnost/narodnost". For a full list of other principles see: McNair, *Glasnost, Perestroika, and the Soviet Media*, 14-15.

<sup>43</sup> Hollander, *Soviet Political Indoctrination*, 39. On news values different from the Western notions, led with the intent to educate and agitate rather than inform and whereby social processes instead of events are treated as news see: Inkeles, *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia*, 140; Buzek, *How the Communist Press Works*, 168-69.

<sup>44</sup> McNair, *Glasnost, Perestroika, and the Soviet Media*, 18-19. On the other hand, sensationalism, escapism and objectivism were considered journalists' deadly sins which demonstrate the lack of class interpretation. Buzek, *How the Communist Press Works*, 57-59.

<sup>45</sup> McNair, *Glasnost, Perestroika and the Soviet Media*, 16-17.

Schramm's "Four Theories of the Press."<sup>46</sup> Colin Sparks pointed out that Schramm merely accepted Lenin's ideas at their face value, and thus artificially systematized what was initially a vague ideological compound, hugely influenced by practical concerns of the day.<sup>47</sup> Selectively quoting the same citations of Lenin, Schramm acknowledged the Soviet self-description. He fully agreed with Soviet commentators on the nature of communist media.<sup>48</sup> The only difference was in its evaluation: what was positive for the Soviets, for Schramm, in accordance with his Cold War concerns, was utterly negative.<sup>49</sup>

Despite its background, Schramm's account possessed a considerable explanatory power. Designed according to the revolutionary principles, communist media developed unique features that do not fit into the standard Western formulations and require a distinct theoretical frame.<sup>50</sup> Schramm's theory offered clear answers in this respect, indicating major structural differences between the operation of media in communist and democratic societies. His juxtaposition of the socially responsible Soviet press to the market-oriented libertarian media systems provided insights in the

---

<sup>46</sup> Schramm, "The Soviet Communist Press Theory," 105-46.

<sup>47</sup> While writing in tsarist censorship, Lenin fought for the freedom of the press; in the civil war he advocated prohibition of the Bolshevik-hostile press and its close relation to the proletariat; during the first post-war years he emphasized press's obligation to reveal the shortcomings of the new state. Sparks's argument should be understood within the related wider debate about the nature of Lenin's rule and its inherent potential to turn into Stalinist terror. For this purpose, however, it is less relevant if Lenin's scattered thoughts represent a coherent press theory, like Schramm and Soviet commentators believed, or ad hoc "penetrating insights" as Sparks thought. Neither is crucial whether they unconditionally result in totalitarian practice or the subsequent reality speaks more about Stalin who, in Sparks's view, misused Lenin's instructions as an excuse for creating strictly controlled media subordinated to the party. Sparks, *Communism, Capitalism and the Mass Media*, 47-49.

<sup>48</sup> Colin Sparks, "Media Theory After the Fall of European Communism: Why the Old Models from East and West Won't Do Any More," in James Curran and Myung-Jin Park, eds., *De-Westernizing Media Studies* (London: Routledge, 2000), 30.

<sup>49</sup> Schramm was an active participant of the Cold War, working for the US government. See: Timothy Richard Glander, *Origins of Mass Communication Research During the American Cold War: Educational Effects and Contemporary Implications* (Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000), 135-38.

<sup>50</sup> Sparks, *Communism, Capitalism and the Mass Media*, 45.

distinct ways in which the communist state and the market influence media behavior.<sup>51</sup>

In Schramm's formulation, while the latter guides media by commercial dynamics, forcing it to pay attention to the readers' interests and variety of critical views, in the former direct political supervision is a proclaimed rule and everyday occurrence. Loyalty to political authorities is publicly acclaimed and leaves little space for the emergence of critical voices. The whole media operation is planned according to central directives and leans on a consciously biased selection and construction of the news, designed to obtain proclaimed organizational, mobilizing and educational objectives.<sup>52</sup> The system filters only socially functional messages into the public sphere striving to achieve conformity within a broader totalitarian project of putting all aspects of life under state control.<sup>53</sup>

Once formulated, Schramm's model engulfed the scholarship with sweeping force, spreading its authority beyond the Soviet context. Not only the Stalinist press, but the whole communist media was described similarly; its role was to socialize the public with communist values, forge revolutionary enthusiasm for building the new socialist world, strengthen the regime and validate its superiority over its capitalist rivals, generate mobilization and support for the hegemonic role of the party.<sup>54</sup>

Schramm's theory of the Soviet press accurately recognized that these principles constituted an indisputable norm for all the communists to follow. The problem, however, appears when, in addition to this normative dimension, Schramm's theory is used as an objective account of the existent practice. In that regard, the model is

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., 36, 50-51.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 27-29.

<sup>54</sup> Karol Jakubowicz, "Media as Agents of Change," in David L. Paletz, Karol Jakubowicz, and Pavao Novosel, eds., *Glasnost and After: Media and Change in Central and Eastern Europe* (Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 1995), 24.

methodologically flawed for assuming that media systems are coherent wholes which logically derive from the basic values of society and directly reflect the beliefs of the ruling elite.<sup>55</sup> As such, it is utterly ahistoric and necessarily ignores the actual relations of media production that were hardly as straightforward as the Schramm's theory suggested.<sup>56</sup>

Assumed uniformity notwithstanding, communist regimes underwent a constant process of transformation that media could not evade. To accept a general validity of this Soviet propaganda model would thus be no different than putting the totalitarian label to all communist regimes. But just like the concept corresponds solely to the advanced Stalinist society, Schramm's Soviet press theory adequately accommodates the communist press only in certain, mostly early formative stages.<sup>57</sup> Some of these drawbacks are brilliantly disclosed by the unconventional contours of the Yugoslav communist media: In contrast to its solid Leninist beginnings, its development deviated from the static model proposed by Schramm's theory.

## 1.2. YUGOSLAV PRESS THEORY<sup>58</sup>

### 1.2.1. Research literature

Unlike the well-researched Soviet case, the literature on Yugoslav communist media is remarkably scarce, fragmented and characterized by huge gaps that are yet to be filled.<sup>59</sup> A potential student can rely primarily on the abundant theoretical

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., 52-53.

<sup>56</sup> Sparks, "Media Theory After the Fall of European Communism," 31-32.

<sup>57</sup> Downing, like Sparks, pointed to the faulty presumption, implied in the Soviet press theory, that the communist regimes always followed their rhetoric. John D. H. Downing, *Internationalizing Media Theory: Transition, Power, Culture: Reflections on Mass Media in Russia, Poland and Hungary 1980-95* (London: Sage Publications, 1996), 191.

<sup>58</sup> Similar to the Soviet case, Yugoslav media theory and press theory will be treated as synonyms.

<sup>59</sup> The sole exception is the comprehensive research conducted on the interwar epoch. Irrespective of their glorifying Marxist perspective reflecting the official Yugoslav adulation of the interwar

appraisals of its ideological roots and organizational forms. Authored by the researchers affiliated to the Yugoslav Institute of Journalism (YIJ), the bulk of this writing shares one debilitating thread. It was driven primarily by daily political concerns.<sup>60</sup> A marriage between research and policy measures was firm and numerous articles dwelled upon official press-related documents, such as party resolutions, draft laws, constitutional provisions or professional codes of conduct.<sup>61</sup>

When stripped of its bureaucratic language, this material reveals the official narrative of the Yugoslav communist press.<sup>62</sup> According to the YIJ research, the Yugoslav press progressed in a unique, but straight line towards the liberated system in harmony with the interest of the working class. The argument received systematic contours only by the mid 1970s.<sup>63</sup> And it took another decade for the “official truth” to

---

communist activity, these studies managed to provide an insight into basic principles and structure of the Party press. Moreover, they had something to say about the content itself, a feature otherwise rarely present. See: Milan Vesović, *Ilegalna štampa KPJ, 1929-1941* (Illegal Press of CPY, 1929-1941) (Beograd: Institut za savremenu istoriju, 1989); Milan Vesović, *Revolucionarna štampa u Kraljevini Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca: 1918-1929* (Revolutionary Press in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes: 1918-1929) (Beograd: Institut za savremenu istoriju, 1979); Fran Vatovec, *Razvoj jugoslovenskega novinarstva, del 1: Razvoj slovenskega novinarstva* (Development of Yugoslav Journalism, vol. 1. Development of Slovenian Journalism) (Ljubljana: Visoka šola za politične vede, 1967). On the other hand, the existent literature on post-1945 period serves primarily as a collection of primary sources. In fact, the first scholarly attempts appeared in the form of basic statistics on the growth of the Yugoslav press that were gathered from early on. The same is also true for the ceremonial volumes on formal journalistic associations or major dailies, including those published more recently, that remain valuable mostly as a reference for future research rather than in their own right. See respectively: Živorad Stoković, *Štampa naroda i narodnosti u SFRJ 1945-1973: Građa za istoriju štampe* (The Press of SFRY Nations 1945-1973: Sources for the History of the Press) (Beograd: Jugoslavenski institut za novinarstvo, 1975); Miodrag Avramović, ed., *Srebrni jubilej SNJ, 1945-1970* (SNY's Silver Jubilee, 1945-1970) (Beograd: Savez novinara Jugoslavije, 1971); Mirko Peršen, ed., *Vjesnikov leksikon, 1940-1990* (Vjesnik Lexicon, 1940-1990) (Zagreb: Vjesnik, 1990).

<sup>60</sup> Formed in 1959 by the Yugoslav journalist union, a heavily bureaucratized entity in itself, YIJ remained the main institution for the research of the press. It published various monographs including, from 1965 on, quarterly *Novinarstvo* (Journalism). Apart from theory and statistics, the journal dealt with the daily journalistic concerns and practical tools, normally taught in colleges. See: *Novinarstvo* (Belgrade, 1965-1990).

<sup>61</sup> While the liaison caused a void in coherent scholarship, due to the unorthodox media policies discussed below, it also placed the Yugoslav media firmly in the domain of public communication rather than propaganda.

<sup>62</sup> Written as a comment to the existing system, this body of knowledge was heavily colored by the contemporary bureaucratic terminology. In their raw, unprocessed form, these documents could be located in *Naša štampa* (Our Press), an official organ of the Yugoslav union of journalists that meticulously documented this production. See: *Naša štampa* (1950-1990).

<sup>63</sup> See: Mihailo Bjelica and Zdravko Lekovic, *Communication Policies in Yugoslavia* (Paris: Unesco, 1976); Stevan Nikšić, *Oslobođenje štampe* (Liberation of the Press) (Beograd: Mladost, 1982); Muhamed Nuhić, *Sistem informisanja u SFRJ* (The Information System in SFRY) (Sarajevo: Svjetlost,

first come under question with few contrasting, if sketchy accounts of the constant fight between freedom and censorship, political supervision and oppositional resistance.<sup>64</sup>

Paradoxically, scholarship did not benefit from the breakup of Yugoslavia and the subsequent removal of ideological restraints.<sup>65</sup> While the successor states tried to distance themselves from communist legacy, fresh studies came in short supply and when they did, failed to cover the lost ground.<sup>66</sup> It comes as no surprise then that the finest work was created by an outsider. Gertrude Robinson's 1977 monograph remains to this day the most comprehensive analysis of the Yugoslav media system.<sup>67</sup>

So what does this work tell us about the Yugoslav press? Is it justified to speak, following YIJ research and Robinson, about a specific Yugoslav theory, at variance with the Soviet one?<sup>68</sup> In fact, the Yugoslav narrative on the rise of press freedom

---

1981). Though not of great length, these works vastly surpassed earlier volumes whose focus on the post-1945 Yugoslav press did not exceed ten pages. See: Mihailo Bjelica, *200 godina jugoslovenske štampe* (200 Years of Yugoslav Press) (Belgrade: JIN, 1968); Nikola Kern, ed., *Štampa, radio, televizija i film u Jugoslaviji* (Press, Radio, Television and Film in Yugoslavia) (Beograd: Jugoslavenski institut za novinarstvo, 1964).

<sup>64</sup> Mihailo Bjelica, *Velike bitke za slobodu štampe* (Great Struggles for the Freedom of the Press) (Beograd: Narodna knjiga, 1985).

<sup>65</sup> Majority of the relevant post-1990 works, quoted in the introduction, focused solely on the bad sides of the late socialist Yugoslav media, blaming it for the eruption of violence.

<sup>66</sup> Those few existent recent studies shared the two mentioned faults in the post-1990 research on communist Yugoslavia: the limited centralist or republican perspective. Moreover, faced with huge unprocessed material, they fell short in filling the gap where this was most needed: in the qualitative analysis of the communist press. However, this is not to say that these works are entirely without value since they cast somewhat different light on the operation of the Yugoslav press. See: Mihailo Bjelica, *Mediji i politička moć: Istraživanje političke štampe i novinarstva u Srbiji (1945-1997)* (Media and Political Power: Research of Political Press and Journalism in Serbia, 1945-1997) (Beograd: Institut za političke studije, 1997); Božidar Novak, *Hrvatsko novinarstvo u 20. stoljeću* (Croatian Press in the 20th Century) (Zagreb: Golden marketing, 2005); Josip Grbelja, *Cenzura u hrvatskom novinstvu: 1945-1990* (Censorship in Croatian Journalism: 1945-1990) (Zagreb: Naklada Jurčić, 1998). As mentioned, recent volumes on major dailies are useful mostly as a reference. See: Igor Mandić, ed., *60. obljetnica Vjesnika: 1940.-2000.* (Vjesnik's 60th Anniversary: 1940-2000) (Zagreb: Vjesnik, 2000); Miodrag Marović, *"Politika" i politika. Knj. 1: Otpor; knj. 2: Sunovrat (Politika and Politics. Vol. 1, Resistance; vol. 2, Collapse)* (Beograd: Interprint, 2003); Manojlo Vukotić, ed., *Brzo, kratko, jasno: 50 godina "Večernjih novosti"* (Fast, Short and Clear: 50 Years of *Večernje novosti*) (Beograd: Novosti, 2003).

<sup>67</sup> Gertrude Robinson, *Tito's Maverick Media: The Politics of Mass Communications in Yugoslavia* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977). Robinson too devotes her attention predominantly to the formal and organization structures rather than the actual newspapers.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 189.



could easily be applied to the Soviet case, except that its key turning point was a conscious Yugoslav decision to distance itself from Soviet experiences.

### 1.2.2. Soviet beginnings

A short historical interlude is here in order. In contrast to their Eastern European colleagues, Yugoslav communists emerged from the World War II as genuine victors with a strong popular support and legitimacy equal to none other than those of the Bolsheviks.<sup>69</sup> And yet, the constitution of the new state is hardly distinguished from the remainder of the Soviet bloc. Virtually the entire system, the press included, was copy-pasted according to the Soviet pattern. This meant that the press would serve as a mouthpiece of the party that transmitted central directives and mobilized the masses.<sup>70</sup>

The Yugoslav fascination with the Bolshevik press stretched far back into the interwar past. As early as 1920, Yugoslav communists turned over the control of its press to the central party body which was to make sure that it relied on Leninist principles.<sup>71</sup> Secretary General Filipović faithfully repeated the well-known maxim: “Our newspapers must not be only our collective agitator and collective propagandist, but our collective organizer as well.”<sup>72</sup> His successor and the later head of Yugoslav communist state, Josip Broz Tito, though hardly a match to either Marx or Lenin in matters of the press, theorized about it from the same standpoint.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> John E. Roemer, *A Future for Socialism* (London: Verso, 1994), 85.

<sup>70</sup> Bjelica, *Velike bitke za slobodu štampe*, 139

<sup>71</sup> Resemblance to the Bolshevik press did not end there. Like its role model, the interwar Yugoslav communist press served as a battlefield for party factions. See: Vesović, *Ilegalna štampa KPJ, 1929-1941*, 303-6.

<sup>72</sup> Filip Filipović, “Za radničku štampu” (For Workers’ Press), in *Izabrani spisi* (Selected Writings) (Beograd: Kultura, 1962), 13.

<sup>73</sup> A resolute communist with a heart for details, Tito even dealt with minor issues such as the most effective style of journalistic expression, thus securing his chapter in the histories of the Yugoslav press. Nevertheless, his press related thoughts were hardly original and never gained the guiding

Once in power, Yugoslav communists merely had to implement these existing principles. Fully aware of the importance of the press for the consolidation of their rule, they wholeheartedly embraced the entire Soviet media system. Literary everything was taken over: nationalization of the press;<sup>74</sup> laws effectively limiting its freedom;<sup>75</sup> strict party control through agitprop sections;<sup>76</sup> direct appointment of top personnel, close overlap of journalistic and political roles, newly established government information agency and strong censorship.<sup>77</sup> Finally, nearly identical press structure was rapidly erected. Emulating the Soviet example, it was divided horizontally across the republics, down to the lower administrative levels; and vertically, with specialized press targeting chosen sections of population.<sup>78</sup> The break with the pre-communist past was complete.<sup>79</sup> The early Yugoslav press, just like its Soviet equivalent, was utterly uniform and filled with hard political content presented in appropriately rigid and formalistic manner.<sup>80</sup>

---

importance comparable to those of Lenin. Josip Broz Tito, *Govori i članci* (Speeches and Articles) (Zagreb: Naprijed, 1959), 323.

<sup>74</sup> All printing plants were taken over from the private owners. See: Bjelica and Lekovic, *Communication Policies in Yugoslavia*, 19.

<sup>75</sup> Following the footsteps of their Soviet comrades, Yugoslav communists adopted the Press Law immediately after coming to power. While formally guaranteeing the freedom of the press, the law imposed various restrictions allowing only official organizations to publish newspapers. In the debate that followed, Edvard Kardelj, a leading theorist of Yugoslav socialism, defended the restrictions rephrasing the Lenin's notion of superficial Western norm of the freedom of the press: "To set it free would mean putting it literally in the hands of the enemy." Zdravko Leković, *Štampa i revolucija* (Press and the Revolution) (Beograd: Radnička štampa, 1982), 151.

<sup>76</sup> Ministries of Information and Agitprop were set up in all of Yugoslavia's six republics and tightly supervised the press. For more on Agitprop, led by Milovan Djilas, especially for an insight into its wider impact on the overall cultural production see: Ljubodrag Dimić, *Agitprop kultura: Agitpropovska faza kulturne politike u Srbiji, 1945-1952* (Agitprop Culture: Agitprop Period in the Cultural Policy in Serbia, 1945-1952) (Beograd: Rad, 1988); Katarina Spehnhjak, *Javnost i propaganda: Narodna fronta u politici i kulturi Hrvatske, 1945.-1952.* (Public and Propaganda: People's Front in Politics and Culture in Croatia, 1945-1952) (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest/Dom i svijet, 2002).

<sup>77</sup> For a detailed list of features see Robinson, *Tito's Maverick Media*, 18-19.

<sup>78</sup> In accordance with its huge importance, the press experienced rapid growth, disproportional to the other segments of economy. See: Kern, ed., *Štampa, radio, televizija i film u Jugoslaviji*, 7.

<sup>79</sup> Virtually the only newspaper allowed to claim continuity with the interwar past was Belgrade's *Politika*, primarily because of its strong leftist inclinations of the time and subsequent closure during the war. See: Stoković, *Štampa naroda i narodnosti u SFRJ 1945-1973*, 78; Novak, *Hrvatsko novinarstvo u 20. stoljeću*, 431.

<sup>80</sup> Kern, ed., *Štampa, radio, televizija i film u Jugoslaviji*, 8.

### 1.2.3. New road: self-management, market and decentralization

This early period, referred to as the administrative phase, lasted from 1945 to 1950 and hardly anticipated the major transformation that was to occur.<sup>81</sup> During the next two decades the Yugoslav press differentiated, both in theory and practice, from its Leninist foundations. Passing through several periods, it turned into a relatively autonomous, miscellaneous and less censored entity and gained considerable editorial and financial independence. Three elements proved crucial in that respect.

The backbone behind the new press theory was a staggering ideological transformation occurring in the aftermath of Tito's 1948 break with Stalin and consequent Yugoslavia's expulsion from Cominform.<sup>82</sup> Somewhat ironically, the initial impulse for this complex ideological project was a foreign policy move. When it became apparent that the quarrel with Stalin was more than a common misunderstanding, the necessity appeared for a different way of legitimization.<sup>83</sup> From then on, Yugoslav communists embarked on formulating an alternative ideology, one which should provide a testimony of their communist orientation and Stalin's deviations.<sup>84</sup>

The solution was found in the self-management.<sup>85</sup> Essentially a variant of the Marxist dogma of withering away of the state, the new state doctrine was guided by the idea that the immediate decision-making should be left to actual workers.<sup>86</sup> Despite various possible interpretations, the concept carried considerable liberating

---

<sup>81</sup> The name originates from the common term designating the adherent initial phase in Yugoslav socialism. Bjelica, *200 godina jugoslavenske štampe*, 201.

<sup>82</sup> For a detailed look on the Soviet-Yugoslav split see: Ivo Banac, *With Stalin against Tito: Cominformist Splits in Yugoslav Communism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988).

<sup>83</sup> James H. Satterwhite, *Varieties of Marxist Humanist: Philosophical Revision in Postwar Eastern Europe* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1992), 77.

<sup>84</sup> Vladimir Tismaneanu, *The Crisis of Marxist Ideology in Eastern Europe: The Poverty of Utopia* (London, Routledge, 1990), 101.

<sup>85</sup> John B. Allcock, *Explaining Yugoslavia* (London: C. Hurst, 2000), 76.

<sup>86</sup> Stevan Mezei et al., *Samoupravni socijalizam* (Self-management Socialism) (Beograd: Savremena administracija, 1976), 55.

potential. Before long, it turned into a major ideological weapon in the proclaimed struggle against the threats of bureaucratic Stalinism.<sup>87</sup> Claiming to be the genuine interpretation of Marxist-Leninism, self-management had equally wide-ranging ambitions, applicable to all spheres of social and political life.<sup>88</sup>

It took a while until the doctrine penetrated into the media realm, but when the first measures were finally taken in 1956, the scenery dramatically changed.<sup>89</sup> The implementation introduced novelties in the internal organization of the press enterprises. These were now considered economic entities and could elect their own self-management organs, thus enhancing their autonomy.<sup>90</sup> On a theoretical level, self-management implied that the workers should be properly informed if they were to effectively fulfill their duties and make direct decisions. For the first time in communist history, free access to information became a prerequisite for the functioning of the whole system rather than just a proclaimed formality.<sup>91</sup>

This fundamental right, initially expressed in narrow economic terms, received numerous legal endorsements over the years. Each new document expanded it to other spheres of workers' interest. By the mid 1960s, a range of formal provisions guaranteed the freedom of the press in an almost equal measure as the previously

---

<sup>87</sup> Dušan Bilandžić, *Historija SFRJ: Glavni procesi* (History of the SFRY: Main Processes) (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1978), 205, 208.

<sup>88</sup> Blagoje Bošković and David Dašić, eds., *Samoupravljanje u Jugoslaviji* (Self-management in Yugoslavia) (Beograd: Privredni Pregled, 1977), 48. In accordance with these aspirations the whole system was renamed into "self-management, democratic socialism."

<sup>89</sup> At first, self-management slowly infiltrated the structures of a heavily centralized state and was restricted to the economic sphere alone. Laden with huge social significance, the press lagged behind in this respect. However, the impact of a new doctrine proved the most dramatic when it entered the social and cultural realm, six years after the concept was originally introduced. See: Mezei et al., *Samoupravni socijalizam*, 54.

<sup>90</sup> The 1956 Law defined publishing houses and journalistic institutions as autonomous enterprises. See: Kern, *Štampa, radio, televizija i film u Jugoslaviji*, 8.

<sup>91</sup> The right to information was integrated in the self-management since decision-making was directly dependent on it. By the same token, any act that would hinder the free access to information was made illegal. See: "O pravu na pribavljanje informacija" (On the Right to Gather Information), *Novinarstvo* 3 (1965): 35-46.

despised Western standards.<sup>92</sup> Likewise, censorship in the form of previous notification disappeared and those remaining restricted areas were legally, rather than arbitrary defined.<sup>93</sup>

Meanwhile, the functions of the press diverged from the orthodox Leninist instructions. Journalists were no longer expected to simply transfer party views, but to interpret them and report in a creative manner.<sup>94</sup> Moreover, they were supposed to criticize the system and initiate public debates while feeding on various sources, much like their counterparts in the West.<sup>95</sup> The press responded adequately. Opening its pages to various new ideas, it played a major part in the democratization of the Yugoslav public life in the 1960s.

But the newly created space was not up for grabs. Self-management had to ensure the supremacy of the workers and, accordingly, it was their interests that the press needed to reflect. The assertion was incorporated in the notion of social responsibility that was assigned to all media actors.<sup>96</sup> They now faced the daunting task of attaining the proper balance between the right to publish information and their obligations

---

<sup>92</sup> The progress went as follows. In 1952, 1956, 1960, 1963, and 1965 different laws and constitutions stipulated respectively: the citizen's right to be informed, to use the information, the principle of public work of state officials (enhancing the possibilities for their control by the press) and, eventually, the right to be informed about all spheres of life and publish newspapers. All these were reaffirmed and strengthened during the 1970s. See: Bjelica, *Velike bitke za slobodu štampe*, 145-58.

<sup>93</sup> The 1960 Law of the Press and Other Media of Information made the first step towards the abolition of pre-censorship, clearly pointing out the restricted areas. The 1963 Constitution additionally defined these regulations. Decreased censorship remained unequally distributed across different types of information. While almost non-existent in the economic sphere, in culture and politics certain extra-legal committees emerged. See: Robinson, *Tito's Maverick Media*, 42, 61-64.

<sup>94</sup> Edvard Kardelj, *Beleške o našoj društvenoj kritici* (Notes on Our Social Critique) (Beograd: Kultura, 1966), 5.

<sup>95</sup> During the 1960s, various conceptions of media as public forum, previously regarded as "bourgeois", were rehabilitated and openly advocated. See among others: "Štampa kao slobodna javna tribina" (The Press as a Free Public Forum), *Novinarstvo* 2-3 (1967): 24-30.

<sup>96</sup> Robinson labels the whole Yugoslav press theory as one of social responsibility: See: Robinson, *Tito's Maverick Media*. 35. Actually, the name in general refers to the anti-commercial nature of the media and in that sense is no different from the Soviet model that also carried the same social burden.

towards the working class, between constructive critique and destructive criticism. The rift between proclaimed freedom and practical boundaries widened.<sup>97</sup>

Strictly speaking, in the self-management society the interests of the communicators and audience should not have clashed in the first place. The Yugoslav doctrine was no different from the Soviet one in so far as it aimed to secure a homogenized environment where all conflicts were resolved in the initial stages.<sup>98</sup> To make sure that the theory became a reality, political institutions were supposed to subject media organs to constant pressure. Certain problems in this regard were posed by the new self-management role of the Party, now reduced to indirect ideological guidance.<sup>99</sup> The main burden thus fell on the publisher of the newspaper. The so called founder, as was the official Yugoslav term, became directly responsible for its publication.<sup>100</sup> The publisher controlled the finances, determined the general conception, editorial and personnel policy, appointed directors and chief editors and set up the editorial council.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>97</sup> Scholars relentlessly debated how journalists should respond to these delicate tasks, see: “Dileme o društvenoj ulozi novinara u izmeni mišljenja” (Dilemmas about the Social Role of Journalists in the Exchange of Opinions), *Novinarstvo* 2-3 (1966): 3-11; “Uloga novinara u razvitku samoupravne socijalističke demokratije” (The Role of Journalists in the Evolution of Self-management Socialist Democracy), *Novinarstvo* 3-4 (1977): 63-66.

<sup>98</sup> Edvard Kardelj, *Self-management and the Political System* (Beograd: Socialist Thought and Practice, 1980), 171. As its father, Edvard Kardelj, asserted, self-management was a stream within the communist workers’ movement true to Marxist foundations and should not be misinterpreted as the third way between capitalist and communist systems. See: Bošković and Dašić, eds., *Samoupravljanje u Jugoslaviji*, 10.

<sup>99</sup> As part of the transition to the self-management system, the Party was renamed in 1952 as the *League of Communist of Yugoslavia*. The move was supposed to indicate its ascending hierarchies and retreat from direct administrative intervention, though much more in theory than in actual practice. See: Michael Waller, *Democratic Centralism: An Historical Commentary* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981), 103.

<sup>100</sup> Most commonly, the founders were certain political or economic organizations, such as the Party, the Trade Union, or the Socialist Alliance. Bjelica and Lekovic, *Communication Policies in Yugoslavia*, 45-48.

<sup>101</sup> The founder was supposed to evaluate the content, reveal deviations in editorial policies and influence the appointment of the top staff, held personally accountable. *Editorial council* was another form of immediate institutional pressure that elaborated on the editorial policy and supervised its implementation. Normally, two thirds of its members were appointed by the founder and the other third by the staff. *Ibid.*, 45-8.

The second key impulse in the revisionist Yugoslav press model was the introduction of market elements into the planned economy.<sup>102</sup> The major break came with the far-reaching 1965 reform when the state, in an effort to stimulate the stagnating economy, abandoned many of its control mechanisms.<sup>103</sup> As a result, all enterprises, including media, acquired the right to plan and finance their production. The press received greater control of its income and, in turn, became less dependent on government subsidies.<sup>104</sup> In the new semi-market conditions, tapping new audiences became a necessity. While struggling for greater profits, newspapers were forced to pay increasing attention to readers' interests, leaving behind an unprecedented variety in both content and style.<sup>105</sup>

The Yugoslav press greatly diversified during the 1960s. Next to the existing vertical structure, a new array of special interest magazines were born, this time brought to life by the market, rather than state-planning.<sup>106</sup> The huge rise of numerous weeklies or evening dailies, with their breezier style, lighter orientation and glossier graphics, illustrated a wider trend away from hard politics towards more entertainment.

---

<sup>102</sup> Market socialism is frequently cited as the other specific feature of the Yugoslav socialism. Allcock, *Explaining Yugoslavia*, 76. Though market elements were actually implied in the very concept of self-management, they also directly contradicted it causing numerous controversies. More on the relationship between self-management and market economy see in: Saul Estrin, *Self-management: Economic Theory and Yugoslav Practice* (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1983).

<sup>103</sup> Launching the most radical set of measures since the introduction of self-management, the reform was full of contradictions as it balanced market incentives with state planning and ended in partial failure. See: Bilandžić, *Historija SFRJ*, 305-15; Allcock, *Explaining Yugoslavia*, 87.

<sup>104</sup> On account of its special social importance, market relations were never applied to all of the media and some outlets, the youth press included, continued to rely on subsidies. See: Leković, *Štampa i revolucija*, 156.

<sup>105</sup> Robinson, *Tito's Maverick Media*, 45.

<sup>106</sup> The beginnings of the media diversification stretch back to the 1950s when newspapers began to publish comics, crime and romance stories. By the mid 1960s the scene was filled with a range of professional, cultural, entertaining, even tabloid-like magazines in a measure unequal anywhere in the communist world. *Ibid.*, 33, 51.

The majority of the press publications were produced by the big publishing enterprises dispersed across the country.<sup>107</sup> Trying to combine their assigned social role with the increasing market requirements they organized into fully professionalized corporations where less commercialized titles were financed by the commercial ones. Business-like behavior was a necessity and each publisher developed its own distribution and marketing network, assigned with the sale of their products.<sup>108</sup> While beneficial for the readers, this great dive into consumerism only added to the confusion. For if the press was to be left entirely to the market it would hardly be able to fulfill its social mission. In the ensuing confrontations between the Party and the media, pejorative labels like sensationalism were pulled from the past reminding journalists of their social duties.<sup>109</sup>

A final element that contributed to the new patterns of the Yugoslav press was an effective federalization of the state. In contrast to its rigidly centralized inter-war predecessor, communist Yugoslavia was from its outset established as a union of six republics. Still, it was not until the mid 1960s that the state resolutely embarked on a more decentralizing road. The constitutional reform went on for almost a decade and reached its peak in the 1974 constitution which instituted strong con-federal elements.<sup>110</sup>

The loosened federal structure facilitated the differentiation of the press across republics in several ways. Together with other institutions, the press was

---

<sup>107</sup> Most notable publishers were Belgrade's *Politika* and *Borba*, Zagreb's *Vjesnik* or Ljubljana's *Delo*.

<sup>108</sup> *Vjesnik's* "Agency for marketing and sales" thus covered everything in the range of design, market research and sales of *Vjesnik's* press products, or the largest Croatian distributive network. See: Novak, *Hrvatsko novinarstvo u 20. stoljeću*, 585; Peršen, ed. *Vjesnikov leksikon*, 102.

<sup>109</sup> Similar objections were regularly expressed at the highest level labeling those negative instances when market orientation lead to pure commercialism and "vulgar deterioration of public taste." See: Kern, ed., *Štampa, radio, televizija i film u Jugoslaviji*, 27.

<sup>110</sup> For more on Yugoslav federalism see: Sabrina P. Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia, 1962-1991* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992); Steven L. Burg, *Conflict and Cohesion in Socialist Yugoslavia: Political Decision Making since 1966* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983).



institutionally divided along republican lines. Consequently, each republic developed its own media subsystem that co-existed within the unique Yugoslav framework.<sup>111</sup> In such a dispersed network there existed no counterparts to central organs like *Pravda*. Instead, each republican press enjoyed precedence in its respective neighborhoods. In addition, centrifugal tendencies fed on dissimilar existing journalistic traditions to reemphasize the inter-republican differences in achieved professional standards and available infrastructure.<sup>112</sup>

Finally, political decentralization forced each republican press to function under increasingly diverse contexts. Each had its own set of immediate references closely linked to the surrounding political circumstances. The press from each republic not only reported about different issues but advocated mutually opposing views about the same issues, as their respective political elites entered into confrontations. Criticizing the politicians and the press from other republics expanded the boundaries of permitted criticism.<sup>113</sup>

#### 1.2.4. Towards a Yugoslav theory of the press

This review reveals the Yugoslav communist press in constant flux and responsive to the ongoing process of reforms that affected basic structure of the state. Regardless of how incoherent the outcome was, it is hardly an overstatement to speak of a specific Yugoslav thinking about the press. Ever since the break with Stalin, there was

---

<sup>111</sup> 1971 constitutional amendments enhanced the federalization of the media. Funding decentralized, while lawmaking became a prerequisite of individual republics. The latter was less relevant as dual formal laws (on federal and republican level) remained more or less the same. Nevertheless, republics became responsible for their own communication networks. See: Robinson, *Tito's Maverick Media*, 39-42.

<sup>112</sup> Other scholars as well stressed the importance of distinct pre-communist journalistic traditions for the success of the application of the Soviet press model. See: Buzek, *How the Communist Press Works*, 81-82.

<sup>113</sup> The liberalization of the media was thus a byproduct of the rising republican hierarchies. Pavao Novosel, "The Iron Law of Communication," in David L. Paletz, Karol Jakubowicz, and Pavao Novosel, eds., *Glasnost and After: Media and Change in Central and Eastern Europe* (Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 1995), 15.

an obvious effort to develop a distinct press system, compatible with the new orthodox ideological matrix.<sup>114</sup>

Three ingredients decisively modified the Yugoslav media, helping it to diverge from the initial Marxist-Leninist role. The concept of self-management promoted the right for a free access to information, while the economic reform and federalization additionally diversified and decentralized the media scene. The process was all but linear, and evolved during two decades with democratizing tendencies and consequent backlashes succeeding each other, almost always in direct correlation with general political development.<sup>115</sup>

When compared with the rest of the communist world, the Yugoslav press was more diverse, filled by more professionalized staff, and relied on a wider variety of sources. It enjoyed greater financial and operational autonomy and a considerably larger extent of permissible criticism. All this led Robinson to claim, along with YIJ researchers, that the revisionist Yugoslav press theory differentiated from the Leninist model to such an extent that it became a separate form, rather than just its variant.<sup>116</sup>

But what Robinson termed the “dualist character of the Titoist press philosophy” was a much less coherent theory capable of securing a fifth chapter in the “Four Theories of the Press,” and much more a paradoxical structure created by the introduction of Titoist innovations and market elements against the background of old

---

<sup>114</sup> Ever since the break with Stalin, Yugoslav communists highly valued theory since it was precisely theory that was supposed to differentiate them from the Soviet Union.

<sup>115</sup> Writing in 1977 and partly leaning on the work of local scholars, Robinson distinguished four distinct periods. After the administrative Leninist phase (1945-1950) a decade long transition period (1951-1961) led to the decentralized media (1963-1970) with its socially responsible, self-managed, diverse press system with strong audience appeal. Political backlash in the early 1970s marked the beginning of the fourth “uncertain” period, when strong political filtering and supervision reappeared, while keeping many other features. See: Robinson, *Tito's Maverick Media*, 15. Recent studies added the post-Titoist period (1980-1990) when many of the former trends were brought to the extreme. See: Novak, *Hrvatsko novinarstvo u 20. stoljeću*, 876-85.

<sup>116</sup> Robinson, *Tito's Maverick Media*, 119.

fashioned state socialism.<sup>117</sup> Fusing self-managed decentralized economy and one-party rule, audience preferences with government plans, advocacy and freedom, resulted in an awkward mixture of commercial and Leninist features that posed numerous contradictions, difficult to handle in practice.<sup>118</sup>

The Yugoslav theory assigned the press an important social mission while leaving it to function to a great extent under competitive market conditions.<sup>119</sup> The social role itself was ill defined: the press was to foster criticism, but only if it was based in the self-management and took care of the broader social goals, both of which had fluid boundaries. The extensive protective legislation existed side by side with various restrictions whereby the publishers of the newspapers inherited many of the former agitprop duties.

While successful, efforts to put journalism on a professionalized footing failed to alter the fact that party membership remained a prerequisite for top positions.<sup>120</sup> In turn, irrespective of their social burden, editors frequently acted more as coordinators than autocratic decision-makers. By the late 1960s, the Yugoslav press could thus be both an instrumental Party tool and a creative professional enterprise. This schizophrenic frame was equally capable of nurturing obedient media, glossy tabloids or unique genres such as the youth press.

---

<sup>117</sup> Ibid., 58.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., 224.

<sup>119</sup> The press was not considered a commodity in the same line with other goods and subsidies were awarded according to the given social importance. Yet, reality often contradicted such provisions. Political and financial dependency remained the most important modes of control and, accordingly, autonomy was achieved either through more critical editorial policy or market commercialization.

<sup>120</sup> Appointment of directors and top editors was done according to political criteria. People with no professional experience were often named by bodies staffed with distinguished public figures, or so called “socio-political workers.” On the other hand, there was an ongoing process of professionalization, facilitated by the emergence of new journalistic faculties. See: Bjelica and Lekovic, *Communication Policies in Yugoslavia*, 19.

### 1.3. ASSESSMENT: YUGOSLAV PRESS IN THE EAST EUROPEAN CONTEXT

So far the analysis focused on the discrepancies of Yugoslav media with the classic Soviet model as described by its founders and by Western scholarship. Its contradictory patterns, however, also need to be put in the broader perspective that will enable its assessment and facilitate the search for a suitable framework in dealing with its peculiar offspring.

The prime issue at stake here is the exceptional nature of the Yugoslav media. To what extent was its evolution truly distinctive within the communist world? For a long while, the related research remained largely unresponsive to the Yugoslav scenario.<sup>121</sup> The interpretative consensus saw the established Soviet paradigm basically intact, disregarding the occurring changes merely as cosmetics. Was then the Yugoslav media indeed a unique phenomenon drowned in the otherwise uniform sea of deadly serious media that obediently performed propagandistic duties? Many of its distinct features materialized long after the Soviet propaganda model came into existence. So, what happened with the main paradigm in the meantime? Did it evolve as well or, rather, stayed the same even half a century after its creation? And, if so, what kind of challenges did it have to endure?

In order to answer these questions, Yugoslav and Soviet press theory needs to be compared with the existing media practice in the rest of the communist bloc. This will be done in two stages, first regarding the unofficial and then the official media realm.

---

<sup>121</sup> The fact that Robinson's study failed to make a major impact should not come as a surprise since non-Soviet communist media rarely attracted scholarly attention. In the few available collected volumes, Yugoslav case was either omitted altogether, or uncritically grouped within the propaganda camp along with the other communist media. See: Buzek, *How the Communist Press Works*.

### 1.3.1. The unofficial realm of samizdat

The first serious threat facing the Soviet model came in the form of unofficial communication channels. Those arose, from the 1960s on, as a reaction against the aspiration of communist regimes to impose full media control. Their principal type originated in the Soviet Union and became known as *samizdat*.<sup>122</sup> The term initially referred to the literary works that failed to pass through the filter of state censorship, forcing their authors to search for different ways of their publishing.<sup>123</sup> Before long it became a synonym for a whole network of rival publications created outside state institutions.<sup>124</sup> With a second generation, *samizdat* turned into an instrument for the articulation of independent political, social and cultural thought. In this form, the phenomenon spread a decade later throughout Central-Eastern Europe, standing in close relation with the emerging dissident movements.<sup>125</sup>

By far the most successful was the Polish *samizdat* which evolved into a parallel media system.<sup>126</sup> Its circulation, at the peak of *Solidarity*, reached 80,000 and strongly influenced public opinion with its socially relevant content.<sup>127</sup> In Czechoslovakia, the

---

<sup>122</sup> The word literary means “self-published” and was created in the late 1950s as an analogy from the acronym *izdat* used in the names of the official publishing houses (i.e. *Gosizdat*). Similar terms were soon devised to mark the other types of unofficial publications, such as *magnitizdat* referring to the musical tape recordings, or *tamizdat* (“published there”) covering Soviet books published abroad. See: F.J.M. Feldbrugge, *Samizdat and Political Dissent in the Soviet Union* (Leyden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1975), 3-4.

<sup>123</sup> The publication of Boris Pasternak’s *Doctor Zhivago* in Italy is widely regarded as the birth of *samizdat* although, as noted above, this was actually a *tamizdat* publication. This period of literary *samizdat* encompassed works by renounced writers and poets like Solzhenitsyn, Sinyavsky, Daniel, Brodsky and others. See: Michael Meerson-Aksenov and Boris Shragin, eds., *The Political, Social, and Religious Thought of Russian "Samizdat": An Anthology* (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland Publishing Company, 1977), 56-57.

<sup>124</sup> The term is consequently used in this sense throughout this section.

<sup>125</sup> H. Gordon Skilling, *Samizdat and an Independent Society in Central and Eastern Europe* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan, 1989), 5-6; Skilling’s study provides a useful comparative look at the Central-European *samizdat* production.

<sup>126</sup> Polish oppositional media began to flourish from the mid 1970s. A nice review see in: Tomasz Goban-Klas, *The Orchestration of the Media: The Politics of Mass Communications in Communist Poland and the Aftermath* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1994).

<sup>127</sup> Polish *samizdat* publications were unparalleled in their number, influence and range, experiencing sharp fluctuations in growth in the periods immediately before, during and after *Solidarnost*. According to its principal researcher, Karol Jakubowicz, the *Solidarnost* media advocated media empowerment, socialization and participation, the right to communicate and express ones’ own identity. Moreover, it

so called “typewriting culture” comprised a network of semi-academic periodicals linked to the Charter 77 human rights movement. Their influence remained restricted to the circle of dissident elite from where the majority of authors and readers were recruited.<sup>128</sup> Finally, *samizdat* emerged in Hungary as well, albeit on an even smaller scale, confined to like-minded opponents of the regime.<sup>129</sup>

Drawn by the specificities of the *samizdat* production, initial researchers recognized in it an attempt to maintain the printed communication in its defective form, against the background of strong censorship. The corresponding literature is saturated with descriptions of reproductive and distributive methods in the range of various do-it-yourself techniques, semi-legal publishing houses or illegal bookshops hidden in private apartments.<sup>130</sup>

A more ambitious theoretical frame was developed by the end of 1980s, under the influence of the Polish *samizdat* which generated an atmosphere of civil liberty. Jakubowicz argued that *samizdat* was “the mainstay of civil society that amounted to the wider independent sphere.”<sup>131</sup> Seen as an element of the *other* society and a part of the network of unofficial institutions, these publications and their adherent surrogate public sphere were perceived in strictly oppositional terms.<sup>132</sup>

---

also served organizational purposes and formulated surrogate media policies. See: Karol Jakubowicz, “Musical Chairs? The Three Public Spheres in Poland,” in Peter Dahlgren and Colin Sparks, eds., *Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere* (London: Routledge, 1991), 156; Karol Jakubowicz, “Poland,” in David L. Paletz, Karol Jakubowicz, and Pavao Novosel, eds., *Glasnost and After: Media and Change in Central and Eastern Europe* (Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 1995), 131-33.

<sup>128</sup> Skilling, *Samizdat and an Independent Society*, 11-13, 26-31. Skilling is Jakubowicz’s counterpart regarding the Czechoslovakian *samizdat* scene. See also his: H. Gordon Skilling, *Charter 77 and Human Rights in Czechoslovakia* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1981).

<sup>129</sup> Skilling, *Samizdat and an Independent Society*, 32-35.

<sup>130</sup> See among others: Feldbrugge, *Samizdat and Political Dissent in the Soviet Union*, 15-19; Skilling, *Samizdat and an Independent Society*, 10-11; Rudolf L. Tökés, ed., *Dissent in the USSR: Politics, Ideology, and People* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), 266-68; Mark W. Hopkins, *Russia’s Underground Press: The Chronicle of Current Events* (New York: Praeger, 1983), Chapter 7, 8.

<sup>131</sup> Jakubowicz, “Media as Agents of Change,” 34.

<sup>132</sup> Apart from Habermas’s concept of public sphere, this view was hugely influenced by the ideas of Eastern-European intellectuals about anti-politics (Havel) and second-society (Hankiss). The latter in

According to Skilling, they constituted an authentic outlet of communication, independent from the state and dedicated to the free speech.<sup>133</sup> With their counter news, absent from the official media, they endangered legitimization claims of the regime. As such they posed a direct threat to the authorities that were at pains to destroy them, even when their circulation was almost insignificant.<sup>134</sup> This leads to the crucial feature of all *samizdat* media: its importance never laid in the volume, but rather in the potential to disrupt the cognitive control and to break up existing media unanimity.<sup>135</sup>

Though relevant for the media that openly opposed the regime, *samizdat* tradition is not without limits regarding the purposes of this thesis. The sketchy cross-country comparison revealed narrow milieu favorable for its success. As the Polish case illustrates, *samizdat* blossomed when, within the still predominant Leninist press theory, the autocratic regime was no longer capable of sustaining full media control. In the absence of these conditions, chances radically diminished. *Samizdat* could not spread in its Soviet homeland before the end of Stalinist terror.<sup>136</sup> Nor did it gain much importance in the liberalized media systems, such as those of Yugoslavia, where a relatively broad scope for free press existed.<sup>137</sup>

---

particular saw in *samizdat* the *second* communication system constituting an alternative public sphere and, as such, being part of the *second society*. See: Elemér Hankiss, “The ‘Second Society’: Is There an Alternative Social Model Emerging in Contemporary Hungary?,” in Ferenc Fehér and Andrew Arato, eds., *Crises and Reform in Eastern Europe* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1991), 312. More recent studies generally agree on this crucial oppositional nature of the unofficial publications. See for instance: Gross, *Entangled Evolutions*, 125.

<sup>133</sup> Skilling, *Samizdat and an Independent Society*, 31, 169.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, 21-25, 36-37.

<sup>135</sup> Downing, *Internationalizing Media Theory*, 76.

<sup>136</sup> Gayle Durham Hollander, “Political Communication and Dissent in the Soviet Union,” in Tökés, ed., *Dissent in the USSR*, 264.

<sup>137</sup> This is the reason why *samizdat* was the least prevalent in Hungary where, following the Yugoslav path, the official media most radically departed from Schramm’s vision. *Samizdat* is thus closely connected with the appearance of an open and organized dissent scene. In comparison to the other Central-Eastern European countries, in Yugoslavia both phenomena were subdued. The reason, however, was not totalitarian repression, like in Romania or Bulgaria, but rather relatively wide space available for independent action. For a comparative insight into general trends of Yugoslav and Eastern European dissent see: Jane Leftwich Curry, ed., *Dissent in Eastern Europe* (New York: Praeger, 1983),

Most importantly, the *samizdat* tradition posed only an indirect challenge to the Soviet press model. Its very existence proved that the communist regimes, even in their prime, did not succeed in attaining the original goal of maintaining the total information control. However, it had nothing to say about the official media and had no pretensions to dispute its authority in the formal realm.

### 1.3.2. The transformation of the official media

To do so, one had to wait for the fall of communism when the new wave of studies altered the entire field, till then dominated by Schramm's vision of Leninist press prevailing throughout the communist sphere. Bedazzled by the prominent role the media played in the unexpected collapse, scholars formulated different theories that tried to provide feasible explanations. The majority still argued for the unbridgeable gap between the communist and the Western media systems.<sup>138</sup> A few daring commentators blurred the division line, in an effort to internationalize media theory that almost exclusively generalized on Western experiences.<sup>139</sup> In both cases, if only in hindsight, it became clear that the official communist media were by no means undifferentiated wholes that never deviated from the typical image of a tightly controlled apparatus whose only purpose was organization, mobilization and education of the masses.

---

Chapter 3, 7.; Rudolf L. Tökés, ed., *Opposition in Eastern Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979).

<sup>138</sup> See among others: Karol Jakubowicz, *Rude Awakening: Social and Media Change in Central and Eastern Europe* (Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 2006); Peter Gross, *Entangled Evolutions: Media and Democratization in Eastern Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002).

<sup>139</sup> Trying to contest the idealistic image of superior Western liberal media, authors like Downing and Sparks pointed to the debilitating consequences of such narrow conceptualization. See: Sparks, *Communism, Capitalism and the Mass Media*, 18; Downing, *Internationalizing Media Theory*, 196, 229.



First, the media differed across the region.<sup>140</sup> At one pole, in rigid regimes, like the one in Romania, it faithfully imitated the Soviet model up until the very end.<sup>141</sup> Elsewhere, media gradually transformed, mostly in Hungary where, by the last decade, even original tenets were questioned.<sup>142</sup> Finally, certain mutations also encompassed the Soviet media, particularly when Gorbachev's policy of *Glasnost* provided it with reviving democratizing impetus.<sup>143</sup>

The most compelling variations were the media's behavior during political crisis. In each of the major challenges to communist rule (1956 in Hungary, 1968 in Czechoslovakia, 1980 in Poland), the media dismissed Leninist principles, following an almost identical scenario.<sup>144</sup> The political liberalization allowed the appearance of dissenting voices which soon received support from parts of the official media. These in turn pressured for further reforms, thus fostering both the political protest and its own continuous change.<sup>145</sup> The media's role did not remain unnoticed. Once the authorities decided to react, they promptly took back control over the media.<sup>146</sup>

In the long run, Soviet model experienced more permanent, if less dramatic evolution that was largely reminiscent of the unorthodox Yugoslav road.<sup>147</sup> Periods of

---

<sup>140</sup> For a comparative insight see: Jerome Aumente et al., *Eastern European Journalism: Before, During and After Communism* (Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 1999).

<sup>141</sup> Peter Gross, *Mass Media in Revolution and National Development: The Romanian Laboratory* (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1996), 8-25.

<sup>142</sup> Between these extremes were countries like Czechoslovakia, where resistance remained limited to the sporadic attempts of the cultural dissident elite, or GDR whose scene was completely colonized by electronic images of West German media. For Hungarian case in particular see: Ildiko Kováts and Gordon Whiting, "Hungary," in Paletz et al., eds., *Glasnost and After*, 98-104.

<sup>143</sup> For more on the influence of *Glasnost* and *Perestroika* on the Soviet press see: Joseph Gibbs, *Gorbachev's Glasnost. The Soviet Media in the First Phase of Perestroika* (Collage Station, Texas: A&M University Press, 1999); John Murray, *The Russian Press from Brezhnev to Yeltsin: Behind the Paper Curtain* (Aldershot, UK: E. Elgar, 1994); McNair, *Glasnost, Perestroika and the Soviet Media*.

<sup>144</sup> The extraordinary transformation of the Czechoslovak press during the Prague Spring is exceptionally well covered. For a detailed insight into the mutual links see among others: Frank L. Kaplan, *Winter into Spring: The Czechoslovak Press and the Reform Movement, 1963-1968* (Boulder, Colo.: East European Quarterly, 1977).

<sup>145</sup> Jakubowicz, *Rude Awakening*, 130-1.

<sup>146</sup> *Ibid.*, 131.

<sup>147</sup> The best documented case, the evolution of the Polish media, comprised of relatively similar historical stages to those of the Yugoslav media. After initial Stalinist totalitarianism (1948-1954), when the propaganda model dominated, came the authoritarian period (1955-1976) with its reduced

liberal and repressive media policies exchanged with one another, depending on the wider political situation.<sup>148</sup> Even the actual adjustments resembled Yugoslav experiences, though up until the very end firmly lagged behind, regarding the intensity and scope. All the same, they are worth repeating.<sup>149</sup>

With the end of Stalinism, virtually everywhere media became a useful weapon in the intra-party struggles. Newspapers held different views about a variety of issues and altered them according to the current situation. Contrary to Schramm's assertions, power structures had more than one media voice.<sup>150</sup> The degree to which these fights were either openly presented or, rather, required reading "between the lines" reveals the level of accomplished relaxation.

Journalists were actively involved in this process, often acting as the vanguard of intelligentsia.<sup>151</sup> Depending on the available pre-communist heritage and attained level of professionalization which affected the media across the region, they redefined their roles from those of propagandists to guardians of public interest.<sup>152</sup> Where the process advanced the furthest, party control weakened and subtle media pluralism appeared. By the end of the 1980s, media turned into a surrogate public forum, allowing semi-

---

cognitive control and system-indifferent content. This was eventually replaced by the post-authoritarian media (1977-1989) characterized by intensified East-West communication and the inclusion of system-challenging as well as system-opposed content, within the official press and dissident *samizdat* respectively. See also a division by: Goban-Klas, *The Orchestration of the Media*, 250.

<sup>148</sup> Regarding the relationship between the media and social changes, Jakubowicz convincingly supports the interdependence theory that ascribes the media only secondary role in the process, dependent on the existence of favorable circumstances. This view looks upon media not as a leading force, but rather simply following general social changes, reacting to the pre-existing pressures. The key impetus always comes from the outside of the media system. See: Jakubowicz, "Media as Agents of Change," 34.

<sup>149</sup> These features are nicely summarized in: Jakubowicz, *Rude Awakening*, 140.

<sup>150</sup> Journalists enjoyed certain freedom in the selection of information while their patrons tried to protect them. See: Kováts and Whiting, "Hungary," 100.

<sup>151</sup> Various researchers demonstrated how political liberalization enabled non-censored press to develop its own independent voice in the political process. See: Madeleine Korbelt Albright, *Poland, the Role of the Press in Political Change* (New York: Praeger, 1983).

<sup>152</sup> For an exceptional insight into the professionalization of the Polish journalists see: Jane Leftwich Curry, *Poland's Journalists: Professionalism and Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 178. In the Soviet Union, the process began during Khrushchev's era whereby the Soviet press developed its own specific ethos. See: Hollander, *Soviet Political Indoctrination*, 42; Hopkins, *Mass Media*, 106.

open discussions of sensitive issues.<sup>153</sup> The scope of permitted criticism varied across topics, while the residual propaganda ritualized and de-ideologized.<sup>154</sup> The holy trinity of Leninist press functions was expanded to tolerate some entertainment. Once market socialism made its entrance, certain audience preferences came to be respected, causing diversification of media outlets designated for different segments of population.<sup>155</sup>

Many of the mentioned features should not be overemphasized since they barely materialized until the last communist decade. Still, no matter how marginal, they prove that the reality was far more complex than Schramm's simplified vision suggests.

Placed in this wider context of common communist media practice, the specific contours of the Yugoslav press emerge in a somewhat less peculiar light. The Yugoslav model presents itself then not so much as an unprecedented digression in the history of communist media, but more as a radical preview of the general modification of the Soviet model that evolved throughout the communist Europe. The extent varied across the countries, but, in general, stayed proportional to the evolution of the communist system and followed the specificities of individual countries.<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>153</sup> Jakubowicz, *Rude Awakening*, 138.

<sup>154</sup> Curry showed how the aim of Soviet *black propaganda* during the 1980s was no longer to recruit new supporters but to forge a feeling of helplessness and maintain the distance between the people and the regime, combining images of failure with those of irrefutable state power. Jane Leftwich Curry, "Glasnost in the Polish and Soviet Media: Some Comparisons," in *Kennan Institute Volume on Gorbachev's Reforms in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe* (Washington: Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, 1989), 8.

<sup>155</sup> The orientation towards entertainment reflected an effort to counter the images of Western electronic media which slowly colonized the mediascape, especially the one in German Democratic Republic. See: Helmut Hanke, "Media Culture in the GDR: Characteristics, Processes and Problems," in *Media, Culture and Society* 12 (1990): 185.

<sup>156</sup> Media transformation occurred within the so called "top-down evolution" of the communist system, which extended to the media realm. Jakubowicz convincingly demonstrates how the communist regimes, confronted with various pressures from below, sought to find some kind of accommodation with the society. Granting concessions on several levels, they assisted the evolution of media systems allowing them to test the boundaries of freedom, until the point of open opposition. This was the result of the fact that media ultimately failed to provide the regime with the legitimacy and the credibility it

This is the chief reason why the Yugoslav press stood out for so long in the communist media scene. Due to its early departure from the Soviet archetype and indigenous ideological support, it became in many ways an extreme example in the process of change. Even so, it was far from the sole exception to the rule. And as proven by the *samizdat* tradition, not even the most radical one.

## 2. CHAPTER: COMMUNIST YOUTH AND YOUTH ORGANIZATION

### 2.1. SOVIET YOUTH THEORY & PRACTICE

The presented communist media theory, in its entire range, provides the most important theoretical setting of this thesis. The chapter placed the Yugoslav press into a wider media context that at the same time indicated its origins, while facilitating the comprehension of some of its specificities.

For the concept of the youth press, however, this is only first half of the equation. Its birth and purpose are equally embedded in the specific Soviet understanding of the youth, or, rather, in its core institutional form – the state youth organization *Komsomol*. The second chapter addresses the remaining defining element and reveals the theoretical background and evolution of this unique organization, responsible for both the youth and, by extension, of its press. Following a presentation of the original Soviet construct, I proceed then with the analysis of its Yugoslav adaptation, putting somewhat stronger emphasis on the concrete policies and historical outline.

#### 2.1.1. Research literature

The scholarship on Soviet youth was for a long time confined in institutional terms. Focusing upon the *Komsomol*, the Cold-War Soviet-area specialists recognized in it the instrument of political socialization and dwelled on its usefulness for the preservation of the regime.<sup>1</sup> More complex accounts, limited to its formative years,

---

<sup>1</sup> In contrast to the detailed available studies of its formative period, the *Komsomol* failed to attract scholars' attention after Khrushchev's demise, mainly due to its dreary character and secondary political role. The interest renewed with the Gorbachev's reforms, albeit with a crucial difference. Unlike those early Cold-War works which, while critical of the *Komsomol*'s anti-democratic methods, stressed its efficiency, the new appraisals were entirely negative both regarding its means and utility. See respectively: Ralph Talcott Fisher, Jr., *Pattern for Soviet Youth: A Study of the Congresses of the*

did not appear before the 1980s, while the full integration of political, social and cultural elements occurred only with the linguistic turn.<sup>2</sup> Attention then gradually shifted from the formal categories to the symbolic importance and informal (sub)cultural practices of the youth.<sup>3</sup>

Sociologists in particular enriched the research. Moving away from concrete experiences, they examined youth as a social construct, trying to accommodate Soviet paradigms within the Western youth theory.<sup>4</sup> Along the way, they rediscovered Soviet sociology. The burgeoning discipline promoted youth among its chief concerns and treated it, within a specific Marxist branch of structural functionalism, as a preparatory stage for taking one's place in the society.<sup>5</sup> Despite its abrupt disappearance after the

---

*Komsomol, 1918-1954* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959); Allen Kassof, *The Soviet Youth Program: Regimentation and Rebellion* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965); Jim Riordan, "The *Komsomol*," in *Soviet Youth Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989).

<sup>2</sup> Stressing various aspects, studies scrutinized the *Komsomol*'s conversion into a pervasive instrument of the state, filling the gaps left by the official Soviet histories that distorted periods where the Bolsheviks played a minor role or their decisions contradicted later policies. See: Isabel A. Tirado, *Young Guard!: The Communist Youth League, Petrograd, 1917-1920* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988); Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State*. Arguably the best example of the inter-disciplinary approach remains Gorsuch's monograph that together with the aforementioned works cover the Civil War and NEP era. See: Anne E. Gorsuch, *Youth in Revolutionary Russia: Enthusiasts, Bohemians, Delinquents* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000).

<sup>3</sup> The appearance of these ground-breaking works overlapped with the launching of *Glasnost*. See: Jim Riordan, ed., *Soviet Youth Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989); Richard Stites, *Russian Popular Culture: Entertainment and Society since 1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). Gorbachev's reforms also instigated anthropological studies of the youth transition. See: Deborah Adelman, *The "Children of Perestroika": Moscow Teenagers Talk about Their Lives and the Future* (Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1992).

<sup>4</sup> See in particular: Hilary Pilkington, *Russia's Youth and Its Culture: A Nation's Constructors and Constructed* (New York: Routledge, 1994); Claire Wallace and Sijka Kovatcheva, eds., *Youth in Society: The Construction and Deconstruction of Youth in East and West Europe* (London: Macmillan Press, 1998).

<sup>5</sup> Communist sociology swelled during the 1970s when the youth, contrary to the Marxist orthodoxy, constituted as a distinct socio-biological group. The existing works could be divided into three streams: empirical surveys with no theoretical ambitions; selective dialogue with the Western theory in the form of criticism of the alienated Western youth; indigenous Marxist explanations of the ambiguous phenomena, such as informal youth culture, whereby results embarrassing for the regime were often censored. For a Western and insiders' insight into the Soviet youth sociology, and a more general look at the whole Eastern Europe see respectively: Pilkington, *Russia's Youth and Its Culture*, 51-56; Iu. A. Zubok and V.I. Chuprov, "The Founding and Development of the Sociology of Youth in This Country", *Russian Education and Society* 51, no. 9 (2009): 22-39; Wallace and Kovatcheva, eds., *Youth in Society*, 40-43.

fall of the regime, the once thriving field of youth studies that expanded across the region testifies to the significance given to youth by all communist societies.<sup>6</sup>

### 2.1.2. Constructing youth under communism

A special, rigid manner of constructing the concept of youth underlies the Soviet youth policy.<sup>7</sup> Openly ideologized and over-politicized, it diverged from the later Western patterns that positioned youth within the binary frame, as a problematic object of intervention or a passive consumer of entertainment.<sup>8</sup> In the heart of the Soviet concept of youth lay another, somewhat different tension, between the youth's huge potential and the great dangers that were concealed within.<sup>9</sup>

In the communist tradition the youth was assigned the role of a revolutionary agent and the backbone of the new society.<sup>10</sup> Its importance was symbolic as much as practical. Features related to the youth, such as energy or enthusiasm, were precisely those needed for the revolution and the subsequent reconstruction of the state.<sup>11</sup> With its immense physical strength and innovative views, the youth embodied communism

---

<sup>6</sup> The collapse of communism led to the severe decline in the research on youth across the Eastern bloc. Numerous existing youth institutes, seen as the remnants of the former regime, ultimately dissolved and, with them, the main incentive disappeared. The East-German youth program is the sole example where the reverse trend occurred, mostly thanks to the growing attention of the West-German scholars who, in contrast to their Eastern colleagues, resisted the apathy. See: Alan L. Nothnagle, *Building the East German Myth: Historical Mythology and Youth Propaganda in the German Democratic Republic, 1945-1989* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999); Alan McDougall, *Youth Politics in East Germany: The Free German Youth Movement 1946-1968* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004).

<sup>7</sup> The youth as a distinct social category is a construct created as an offspring of the process of modernization. Rigid manner of its construction characterizes communist and fascist societies alike, both assigning the youth the heavy burden of being the bearer of the future. See: Wallace and Kovatcheva, eds., *Youth in Society*, 26, 44, (66)

<sup>8</sup> Dick Hebdige, *Hiding in the Light: On Images and Things* (London, New York: Routledge/Comedia, 1988), 8.

<sup>9</sup> These paradigms were expressed implicitly since within the proclaimed non-conflictuous Soviet society the youth was not regarded as a distinct social category with its own specific interests, different from those of the rest of the working class. Wallace and Kovatcheva, eds., *Youth in Society*, 33.

<sup>10</sup> Pilkington adequately refers to this vision as "youth-as-builders-of-communism" paradigm. See: Pilkington, *Russia's Youth and Its Culture*, 31.

<sup>11</sup> Gorsuch, *Youth in Revolutionary Russia*, 15-16; Pilkington, *Russia's Youth and Its Culture*, 41. The Party's appeals to youthfulness were initiated by Lenin who equated the Bolsheviks with the youth, placing in its hands the future of the Party. See. V.I. Lenin, *On Youth* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1967), 148.

as its finest metaphor.<sup>12</sup> If pushed to the extremes, it was identified as a superior constituent of the future world.<sup>13</sup>

The pedestal upon which the youth was placed soon crumbled, making it the object of a range of political, educational and correctional measures.<sup>14</sup> Within Soviet behaviorist understanding the formation of communist consciousness was not taken lightly. Rather, the new Soviet citizen had to be formed, and the correct attitudes and behavior implanted on him/her.<sup>15</sup> The youth represented an ideal target in that respect. Unburdened by the norms of the past, the youth was presumed innocent, pure and eager to absorb new transformative knowledge. On the other hand, its tender, immature age rendered it vulnerable, as if pleading for direction that would guarantee the fulfillment of grand expectations.<sup>16</sup>

The anxiety gave birth to the second major paradigm in which the youth was perceived as the potential victim of harmful influences. The risk increasingly gained in importance as the Soviet regime consolidated, and the ideal image of the youth collided with the reality.<sup>17</sup> At first the menace threatened from the survived bourgeois values of the old world. When these were supposedly eliminated, paranoia crossed the border and pointed to the corruptive influence of the West. The Cold War sealed the link between the anti-Soviet youth behavior and capitalist subversion for good.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Gorsuch, *Youth in Revolutionary Russia*, 184.

<sup>13</sup> The view had strong advocates within the highest ranks of the Party, primarily Trotsky who, in contrast to distrustful Stalin, saw in the militant youth a dam against the bureaucratization of the Party. See: Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State*, 176.

<sup>14</sup> Gorsuch, *Youth in Revolutionary Russia*, 41.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 50.

<sup>16</sup> The women were also attributed a revolutionary potential which, due to their physical weakness, required cautious and organized management. See: Pilkington, *Russia's Youth and Its Culture*, 34.

<sup>17</sup> Here too, the roots stretched back to the pre-revolutionary days. In 1903, Lenin pointed out the need to recruit the young to prevent them from succumbing under the influence of "false friends." See: V.I. Lenin, "On the Attitude towards the Soviet Youth," in *On Youth*, 84.

<sup>18</sup> The key date in that regard was the 1936 proclamation of attainment of true communism. Stressing that the new paradigm did not simply replace, but coexisted with the old one, Pilkington illustrated the change in the treatment of the *besprizorniki*, homeless war orphans. From the victims of the old regime that required help of the state, they suddenly became responsible for their own fate. In contrast, the first recognizable youth culture, those of *stylagi* of the 1950s, was instantly met with disapproval and



The single weapon that was to resolve this tension and mobilize the youth, while enabling to resist the lures of damaging seductions, was political education. Its broad and pervasive understanding that intruded into the most prosaic facets of life stands out as the defining feature of the Soviet youth policy.<sup>19</sup> Namely, if the youth was to live up to its promises, it needed careful and constant guidance. The chief instrument entrusted with its implementation was the central state youth organization.<sup>20</sup> Established after the Bolsheviks rose to power, the *Komsomol* would become a lasting solution and a key institution for politically educating youth under communism.<sup>21</sup>

### 2.1.3. The *Komsomol*: origins, post-war evolution and structure

From the onset, the *Komsomol* embodied this tension between the youth's potential and vulnerability, disclosed by the early conceptual dilemma about its nature. Should it be an autonomous entity with exclusive legitimacy within its youth constituency? Or, rather, be placed under the control of the Party, since the interests of the youth should not diverge from those of the working class at large?<sup>22</sup>

A resolute answer was not immediately provided.<sup>23</sup> The *Komsomol* was established in 1919 as an independent body with voluntary membership and only indirect, spiritual bonds to the Party. The initial program even proclaimed youth to be the most active part of the proletariat.<sup>24</sup> While such vanguard assertions were quickly

---

condemned as morally stumbled imitation of Western trends. See: Pilkington, *Russia's Youth and Its Culture*, 41-50.

<sup>19</sup> Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State*, 178.

<sup>20</sup> Wallace and Kovatcheva, eds., *Youth in Society*, 68.

<sup>21</sup> Lenin's preferences for a tightly unified Party and the young age of the Bolsheviks made the creation of the youth auxiliary unnecessary at first. Its establishment was dictated by the practical problems the Bolsheviks faced once they adhered into power, such as neutralizing the existing anti-regime youth groups or winning over their loyalty. See: Fisher, *Pattern for Soviet Youth*, 1, 7.

<sup>22</sup> Tirado, *Young Guard!*, 205.

<sup>23</sup> Even if the progress always headed towards greater dependency on the Party, the fact that the issue was not immediately resolved, despite the Bolshevik majority at its First Congress, indicates that there existed no ready-made blueprint for the youth. Gorsuch, *Youth in Revolutionary Russia*, 50.

<sup>24</sup> Even some non-communist names for the organization were initially proposed. Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State*, 88.

dropped, the *Komsomol* displayed signs of independence throughout the subsequent decade, reflecting the intra-party conflicts of which it was a part.<sup>25</sup> However, the transformation into an intrusive bureaucratic institution was already on the way.<sup>26</sup> Though formally still autonomous, the *Komsomol* was by 1927 stripped of the right to pursue and formulate its own agenda.<sup>27</sup>

The organization became the “transmission belt” of the Party – one in the line of institutions that, while nominally independent, came under the Party’s control and were used in an indirect way to promote and execute its policies.<sup>28</sup> These extended the Party’s reach, enabling it to tailor propaganda according to the specific segments of society.<sup>29</sup>

Indeed, the list of *Komsomol*’s duties reveals the institution as the Party’s representative among the youth, rather than the other way round. It connected the youth with the policy-making bodies, fostering its active involvement in the construction of the state. It also served as the Party’s recruitment agency, a training unit of future cadres, and a source of fresh reserves.<sup>30</sup> Finally, using ritual, schooling and agitation, including its own media, the *Komsomol* was supposed to socialize the

---

<sup>25</sup> Back in 1921, Lenin inaugurated the schizophrenic formula that simultaneously defined the *Komsomol* as both autonomous and supervised. In practice, however, the Party control prevailed. Radical ideas within the *Komsomol* were related to the Trotskyite faction, and as such survived until its demise. See in turn: V.I. Lenin, “The Tasks of the Youth Leagues,” in *On Youth* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1967), 229-245; Gorsuch, *Youth in Revolutionary Russia*, 15-17.

<sup>26</sup> Tirado convincingly argues that the spontaneous, autonomous youth communist movement could only survive under revolutionary conditions. Its commitment to defend the regime inevitably translated into unconditional support of the Party, detaching it from the narrow youth issues. The change was reflected in the new iconography: the image of militant vanguard was replaced by the disciplined Party supporter. See: Tirado, *Young Guard!*, 204-205.

<sup>27</sup> Consequently, the initial Party methods to secure its control proved permanent: parallel membership of the young Party members in the *Komsomol*, accountability of the *Komsomol*’s Central Committee to that of the Party and arbitrary decision-making on top positions. See: Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State*, 90.

<sup>28</sup> Clews, *Communist Propaganda Techniques*, 86-87.

<sup>29</sup> Other similar organizations included Trade Union or Zhenodtel. See: Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State*, 84.

<sup>30</sup> For the list of other roles see: Kassof, *The Soviet Youth Program*, 51.

Soviet youth according to the Party's image, instilled with proper morals, language and conduct.

With the stabilization of the regime in the 1930s, it was this pedagogical mission that overshadowed all others. In the process, the *Komsomol* became increasingly similar to a conventional educational institution. From a tiny, militant group of elite youths, the *Komsomol* gradually transformed into a mass organization that encompassed the majority of the young generation.<sup>31</sup>

No more was the youth requested to actively interact with the system. Instead, it merely had to passively adopt the correct values.<sup>32</sup> Entrance criteria lowered as well. In contrast to the first members that exhibited rigid ideological loyalty and discipline, now anyone could become a member, or, more precisely, was forced to do so.<sup>33</sup> The sole condition was to meet the age census which expanded over the years, eventually to include everyone between 14 to 28 years of age.<sup>34</sup>

In that respect the *Komsomol* represented the last instance within the wider youth program, into which one was expected to enter from early childhood.<sup>35</sup> Within the *Komsomol* itself, there was another internal division, separating the working from

---

<sup>31</sup> Kassof, *The Soviet Youth Program*, 16. Regardless of occasional lulls, the increase of membership was persistent throughout and moved from 20 thousand in 1918 to 40 million in 1987. The trend became progressive in the mid-1930s, with the real surge occurring after the World War II, when only between 1949 and 1958 the membership doubled. On the steady rise of membership see: Riordan, "The *Komsomol*," 22-25.

<sup>32</sup> Pilkington pointed out that the early Bolshevik ideal was not straightforward didactic teaching of communism with the youth used as raw material, but a reciprocal relation where the young, as objects of education and subjects of historical activity, were (trans)formed in the process of the construction of the new society. See: Pilkington, *Russia's Youth and Its Culture*, 37.

<sup>33</sup> Fisher, *Pattern for Soviet Youth*, 288.

<sup>34</sup> The extending of age boundaries reflected the bureaucratization of the *Komsomol* and can be traced to its earliest history. The initial upper limit, 20, by 1920 was already 23, only to raise further during the NEP. See: Tirado, *Young Guard!*, 4.

<sup>35</sup> The program comprised various youth organizations. Structured according to the age they were devised to extend the control of the youth outside the jurisdiction of the traditional pedagogical system and contribute to the common effort of spreading the proper communist morals. Parallel with the school, the Soviet child would first enter the Octobrests; at the age of 10 it moved on to join the Pioneers, and when it reached 14 it finally enrolled in the *Komsomol*. The pattern was readily adopted by the other communist countries, with the possible fusion of the first two levels into one, as was the case in Yugoslavia. See: Wallace and Kovatcheva, eds., *Youth in Society*, 40; Kassof, *The Soviet Youth Program*, 16, 31, 79.

schooling youth.<sup>36</sup> The early *Proletkult* preferences ensured that the former enjoyed privilege at first, but the balance progressively shifted in favor of the students due to their ever rising growth in membership.<sup>37</sup>

In correspondence to the Party, the *Komsomol* embraced the principle of democratic centralism along with the hierarchical internal structure, moving from city and regional bodies to republican and federal ones.<sup>38</sup> The main policy guidelines were always set out at the Party level and then forwarded to the periodically elected youth bodies. Rather than deciding on their own, these would merely formally accept the already formulated tasks at all-union congresses.<sup>39</sup>

The aging officials best exemplified the growing bureaucratization of *Komsomol*.<sup>40</sup> Appointed by the Party and exempt from the age census, these were typical apparatchiks attentive solely to the wishes of their mentors.<sup>41</sup> With the leadership unaccountable to the pressure from below, rank and file exerted little or no influence on the *Komsomol*'s policies and inevitably alienated from it.

---

<sup>36</sup> Despite the fact that the independent communist student organization was abolished in 1919, the operational specificities which distinguished between the two segments of the youth survived. While the working youth was encouraged to achieve production norms, with the schooling youth the accent was placed on political education. See: Kassof, *The Soviet Youth Program*, 100-119.

<sup>37</sup> The rising disproportion in numbers was caused by the fact that the entry into the high schooling, unlike the factories, was conditioned by the *Komsomol*'s reference. See: Riordan, "The *Komsomol*," 34.

<sup>38</sup> Only at the lowest level (i.e. in schools or factories) the rank and file came in immediate contact with the program and could directly elect their representatives, though even here with restrictions. Elsewhere party candidates were routinely elected, while the democratic centralism secured that subordinate bodies carried out the determined policies. See: Kassof, *The Soviet Youth Program*, 54-56.

<sup>39</sup> Despite their formal character, youth congresses, held at the republican and federal level, were treated as ceremonial events and received wide media coverage that provided the *Komsomol* with the legitimacy and image of popular support. See: *Ibid.*, 48, 58.

<sup>40</sup> The aging process again had origins from the earliest periods: See: Vladimir Brovkin, *Russia after Lenin: Politics, Culture and Society, 1921-1929* (London: Routledge, 1998), 132.

<sup>41</sup> Following their service in *Komsomol*, the youth officials could even head for the secret service, thus hinting at the similar qualities required for the control of the youth and society at large. See: Kassof, *The Soviet Youth Program*, 52.

#### 2.1.4. The *Komsomol* and informal youth practices

While in reality increasingly out of touch with the youth, on a formal level, the *Komsomol* encompassed a range of activities under its tutorship. At least in theory, the institution and the youth became one and the same.<sup>42</sup> For once, such totalitarian ambitions proved pernicious for the rival youth organizations. Irrespective of their character, they were all terminated and vanished, leaving the *Komsomol* as the sole authorized channel of institutional youth affiliation.<sup>43</sup>

Its aspirations did not end there. In the non-antagonistic Soviet society the socialist way of living was supposed to be common to all. With no room for differentiation, the authorities were suspicious toward any type of deviation from formally sanctioned activity.<sup>44</sup> Due to its symbolic baggage, defiant behavior of the youth resonated in particular, having profound consequences for the treatment of informal youth cultures.

Supervision of the anti-social behavior of the youth became the essence of the *Komsomol's* guidance. Growing efforts were devoted to enforce strict discipline among the Soviet youth and prevent the emergence of independent initiatives. Against the evident rise of such activities in the 1960s and 1970s, the network of controlled spaces spread, tampering with the most banal aspects of leisure and everyday life.<sup>45</sup>

The ultimate goal, absolute conformity, was hardly established.<sup>46</sup> While the *Komsomol* enjoyed unquestionable political hegemony, the cultural sphere remained

---

<sup>42</sup> Likewise, the official formulations defined the youth as a biological group comprising those between 14 and 28 years of age that are eligible to enter the *Komsomol*. Wallace and Kovatcheva, eds., *Youth in Society*, 40.

<sup>43</sup> Their termination began immediately upon the revolution. In fact, the first victims were ideologically akin political groups, such as Menshevik's *Trud* or independent student communist organization. These were followed then by apolitical scouting and sports associations. The initial methods, limited to infiltration within these organization, were mild when compared to the later hard-line policies whereby every such attempt was openly criminalized. See: Fisher, *Pattern for Soviet Youth*, 18-19.

<sup>44</sup> Gorsuch, *Youth in Revolutionary Russia*, 184. Gorsuch rightly recognized in such anxiety a prime example of the moral panic, a concept devised by Stanely Cohen to refer to the (exaggerated) perceived public threat stemming from the problematic behavior of the youth. *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>45</sup> Wallace and Kovatcheva, eds., *Youth in Society*, 70.

<sup>46</sup> Kenez nicely observes the irony that the Soviet revolutionaries were desperate to instill conformity. In accordance, later aesthetic governance, such as intolerance towards beards or long hair, was

an open battlefield. Total dictatorship of taste was imposed only during Stalin's terror. Both before and after, a variety of youth responses could be observed that grew with time into recognizable cultural practices.<sup>47</sup>

In the milieu where every non-conformist expression of style was seen as an act of defiance, these necessarily became forms of resistance, challenging the state agenda, even when that was not their prime intention.<sup>48</sup> Regardless of the scale, unconventional gestures, clothes and behavior represented a symbolic threat, signifying a public refusal of official values.<sup>49</sup> Stigmatized by Soviet authorities as subversion and anti-state sabotage, these youth (sub)cultures became an arena for the rising conflict between the youth and the system in which the *Komsomol* stood firmly on the side of the latter.<sup>50</sup>

Determined during Stalin's regime, the *Komsomol's* key features proved extremely resilient against all democratization efforts. The Khrushchev Thaw that enveloped significant segments of the Soviet society left the institution untouched.<sup>51</sup> Equally ineffective were sporadic reforms during the 1960s and 1970s or the challenges of informal youth groups a decade later.<sup>52</sup> Up until its demise, the *Komsomol* remained the agent of the Party, destined to parrot its messages among the youth masses.

---

evidently not rooted in Marxist-Leninist tenets. See respectively: Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State*, 187; Wallace and Kovatcheva, eds., *Youth in Society*, 164.

<sup>47</sup> Gorsuch, *Youth in Revolutionary Russia*, 182.

<sup>48</sup> Wallace and Kovatcheva, eds., *Youth in Society*, 170. For more on the concept of youth resistance, see Chapter 4 and, especially, Chapter 6.

<sup>49</sup> Stites, *Russian Popular Culture*, 143.

<sup>50</sup> Wallace and Kovatcheva, eds., *Youth in Society*, 164.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 19, 60.

<sup>52</sup> Wallace and Kovatcheva, eds., *Youth in Society*, 70-71. The reform attempts were halfhearted at best, as proven by the failure of the most serious one occurring during *Glasnost* when severe criticism was directed at many of the organization's internal contradictions and features, albeit to no effect. For the detailed account of the whole process that thus restricted to the mere rhetorics see: Riordan, "The *Komsomol*," 28-36.

This only enhanced its appeal to the other communist regimes as they approached the daunting task of securing the loyalty of its young subjects. In both of its forms, as an elitist vanguard and as the means of mass socialization, the *Komsomol* soon epitomized the communist youth policy way beyond the original Soviet borders. This is no less true for Yugoslavia than it is for the rest of communist Europe.

## 2.2. YUGOSLAV YOUTH THEORY & PRACTICE

The second part of this chapter reveals the manner in which the Yugoslavs embraced this Soviet concept. In contrast to the previous section, the accent is placed on the policy, rather than the surrounding youth discourse whose finer details will become evident in the research chapters. In addition, the following outline sketches the basic chronology of the Yugoslav youth organization that should help to contextualize the research chapters and relieve them from the related burden.

### 2.2.1. Research literature

The literature on the Yugoslav communist youth organization follows the pattern already noted in the research on media. A gap concerning the post-war years is contrasted by the well covered interwar era. Enjoying institutional support, the latter developed into a distinct subfield within the historiography of the Yugoslav communist movement.<sup>53</sup> In spite of the crude Marxist positivistic framework and

---

<sup>53</sup> The agenda figured prominently within the Institutes for Workers' Movement whose researchers could lean on rich Party archives. Apart from the works on the leftist interwar student movement listed further below, the relevant literature can be divided into general overviews and national studies that mushroomed since the mid 1970s. The first group includes: Slavoljub Cvetković, *Napredni omladinski pokret u Jugoslaviji: 1919-1928* (Progressive Youth Movement in Yugoslavia: 1919-1928) (Beograd: Institut društvenih nauka, Odeljenje za istorijske nauke, 1966); Mirosljub Vasić, *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret u Jugoslaviji: 1929-1941. godine* (Revolutionary Youth Movement in Yugoslavia. 1929-1941) (Beograd: Narodna knjiga, 1977); Petar Kačavenda, *Omladina u revoluciji: Ujedinjeni Savez antifašističke omladine Jugoslavije 1942-1945* (Youth in Revolution: United League of

celebratory intentions, the published research provided valuable insights into the institutional side of the (inter)war youth communist movement.<sup>54</sup>

Regrettably, this is not the case with its post-war counterpart.<sup>55</sup> In constant motion and drowned in controversies, the Yugoslav youth communist organization was considered a matter of politics, not scholarly analysis.<sup>56</sup> In another parallel with the scholarship on media, research did not profit by the fall of the regime. From the 1990s on, academic interest in youth radically declined, with the exception of those phenomena that could point to its defiance to communist rule.<sup>57</sup> To reconstruct the post-war evolution of the Yugoslav youth union, one must therefore rely on primary

---

Antifascist Youth of Yugoslavia 1942-1945) (Beograd: Institut za savremenu istoriju, 1985). For Croatian and Slovenian youth movements see respectively: Vojo Rajčević, *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret u Hrvatskoj. Knj. 1, 1919-1928; knj. 2, 1929-1941* (Revolutionary Youth Movement in Croatia. Vol. 1, 1919-1928; vol. 2, 1929-1949) (Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1979; 1980); Anka Vidovič-Miklavčič et al., eds., *Napredno mladinsko gibanje na Slovenskom, del 1&2* (Progressive Youth Movement in Slovenia, vol. 1&2) (Ljubljana: Republiška konferenca ZSMS, 1982; 1985).

<sup>54</sup> Studies were typically published on relevant anniversaries, marking the outbreak of the communist youth and student movements. On the other hand, the literature focused primarily on the organizations with strong communist influence. Numerous other inter-war political youth associations were largely ignored and even tabooed. The crack began to be filled only after the fall of regime, though hardly at galloping speed. See: Željko Karaula, "Croatian National Youth – (HANA O): Contribution to the Study of the Activity and Work of Croatian Youth Organizations in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes," *Slovo* 20, no. 1 (2008): 1-15; Stevo Đurašković, "Ideologija Organizacije jugoslavenskih nacionalista: (Orjuna)" (The Ideology of the Organization of Yugoslav Nationalists: (Orjuna)) *Časopis za savremenu povijest* 1 (2011): 225-247.

<sup>55</sup> The research in fact ended with 1948 when the elitist and mass youth organization merged. Two post-1990 studies of the post-war Belgrade University shifted the upper limit to the early 1950s. See respectively: Miroljub Vasić, ed., *Četvrti kongres SKOJ-a i zajednički kongres SKOJ-a i NOJ-a: 1948* (Fourth Congress of SKOJ and Joint Congress of SKOJ and NOJ: 1948) (Beograd: Izdavački centar Komunist, 1985); Dragomir Bondžić, *Beogradski univerzitet 1944-1952* (Belgrade University 1944-1952) (Beograd: Institut za savremenu istoriju, 2004); Đorđe Stanković, *Studenti i Univerzitet: 1914-1954. Oglеди iz društvene istorije* (Students and the University: 1914-1954. Essays in Social History) (Beograd: Centar za savremenu istoriju jugoistočne Evrope, 2000).

<sup>56</sup> Few existent titles that traverse this time span are misleading as they only briefly mention the post-war era. See: Marko Lolić, *Mladost revolucije: SKOJ-SSOJ 1919-1979* (The Youth of Revolution: SKOJ-SSOJ 1919-1979) (Zagreb: CKD SSO, 1979); Petar Kačavenda, ed., *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret Jugoslavije 1919-1979* (Youth Revolutionary Movement in Yugoslavia 1919-1979) (Beograd: Ekspert Pres, 1979); Dušan Plenča, ed., *Omladinski pokret Jugoslavije 1919-1969* (Yugoslav Youth Movement) (Beograd: Mladost, 1969).

<sup>57</sup> Until lately, this referred primarily to the literature on youth subcultures, discussed below. A more recent account of the Slovene youth organization in the 1980s changed this. And yet, this sole appraisal of any Yugoslav youth body, regrettably beyond the chosen time span, was prompted precisely by its unique role in the disintegration of the state. See: Blaž Vurnik, *Med Marxom in punkom: Vloga Zveze socialistične mladine Slovenije pri demokratizaciji Slovenije (1980-1990)* (Between Marx and Punk: The Role of the League of Socialist Youth of Slovenia in the Democratization of Slovenia (1980-1990)) (Ljubljana: Modrijan, 2005).



sources: statutes, congress reports or formal debates that accompanied periodical reform processes.<sup>58</sup>

The latter heavily drew from the booming youth sociology that turned into a pivotal branch of the new discipline. Institutes for social research along with specialized research departments at youth organizations instigated empirical analyses in search of correct policy measures.<sup>59</sup> In accordance, the studies initially touched upon organizational questions alone.<sup>60</sup> However, standards rose with time.<sup>61</sup> Methodological and ideological autism disappeared in waves, allowing the interests to broaden and eventually include non-institutional issues such as leisure or sub-cultural practices.<sup>62</sup> Pending the breakdown of the state a comprehensive body of knowledge was created that will be re-visited during the thesis.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Abundant relevant material can be found in the youth press and will be displayed in the research chapters. As for the statutes and congress reports, these were regularly published from the late 1960s on. About the same time, a number of theoretical volumes on youth began to appear, echoing the ongoing youth politicization of the time. See among others: Veljko Cvjetičanin et al., eds., *Društvo revolucija omladina. Mladi između sadašnjosti i budućnosti* (Society Revolution Youth. Youth between the Present and the Future) (Zagreb: Centar za kulturnu djelatnost, 1969); Stanko Posavec, ed., *Omladina i socijalizam – ostvarenja i mogućnosti* (Youth and Socialism – Achievements and Potentials) (Zagreb: Centar za društvene djelatnosti omladine, 1971); Ema Derossi-Bjelajac, ed., *Sveučilište i revolucija* (University and Revolution) (Zagreb: Sveučilišni komitet SKH, 1970).

<sup>59</sup> Backing policy designs with scientific claims became customary during the mentioned student political upheaval. Two listed volumes are indicative of the practice: the first summed up the research commenced within the preparations for the 1972 Party conference on youth, the second was among the materials gathered for the 1974<sup>th</sup> youth congress. See respectively: Miloš Nikolić, ed., *Omladina i društvo* (Youth and Society) (Beograd: Izdavački centar Komunist, 1972); Borislav Džuverović, *Generacija budućnosti. Mladi između mogućnosti i stvarnosti* (Generation of the Future. Youth between the Possibilities and Reality) (Beograd: Ideje, 1974).

<sup>60</sup> Lacking the basic institutional overviews, a potential scholar should turn to these works that deal with the youth's integration in the system and its attitude towards their organizations. Other relevant works of the kind include: Pavle Novosel, *Struktura i funkcija omladinskih organizacija u Hrvatskoj* (Structure and Function of the Youth Organizations in Croatia) (Zagreb: CDD, 1971); Ivan Grdešić et al., *Omladina u delegatskom sistemu: Rezultati istraživanja provedenog u SR Hrvatskoj 1980. godine* (Youth in the Delegate System: The Results of the Research Conducted in SR Croatia in 1980) (Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti SSOH, 1982); Velimir Tomanović, *Omladina i socijalizam* (Youth and Socialism) (Beograd: Mladost, 1977).

<sup>61</sup> See for example: Miro A. Mihovilović, *Konflikti generacija: Roditelji-djeca: Rezultati istraživanja u Zagrebu* (Generational Conflicts: Parents-Children: Results of the Zagreb Research) (Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti Saveza socijalističke omladine, 1978).

<sup>62</sup> By the mid 1980s the rich literature on youth was produced mostly by academics and became increasingly detached from immediate political concerns. In a parallel process, an open dialogue with Western sociology occurred, along with its application upon local phenomena. Nenad Fanuko et al., *Fragments omladine* (Fragments of the Youth) (Zagreb: Radna zajednica republičke konferencije Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1988); Jordan Aleksić, ed., *Mlada generacija osamdesetih godina: položaj, svet i ponašanja* (Young Generation of the Eighties: Status, World and Attitudes)

### 2.2.2. The interwar Yugoslav communist youth movement

To a certain extent this uneven literature reflects the core incongruity present in the Yugoslav youth policy. Innovative attempts, so typical for Yugoslav communists, remained here in the shadow of the basic Soviet ideas.<sup>64</sup> With their eyes fixed on Moscow, the Yugoslav comrades recognized in the *Komsomol* a perfect means with which to cope with the growing youth politicization that flooded the region.<sup>65</sup> The advent of its Yugoslav version, the *SKOJ*, no more than a year after the Soviet original, instantly re-opened the same issues of its nature and size.<sup>66</sup> The answers proved more or less the same.

The *SKOJ* was founded in 1920 as an autonomous organization that moved “parallel with the Party” and tended to think of youth as a vanguard of the proletariat.<sup>67</sup> Unlike the early social-democratic leanings of the Yugoslav Party, the youth auxiliary posed from the start as a homogenous communist force with open revolutionary ambitions.<sup>68</sup>

However, one should not exaggerate the sovereignty of *SKOJ*. The very choice of name, loyalty of its leadership to the Party and subsequent acceptance of its leading role, all indicated that the *SKOJ* firmly headed for the designed role of the trained

---

(Beograd: Centar za društvena istraživanja CK SKJ, 1986); Mirjana Ule, *Mladina in ideologija* (Youth and Ideology) (Ljubljana: Delavska enotnost, 1988); Srećko Mihailović et al., *Deca krize: Omladina Jugoslavije krajem osamdesetih* (The Children of Crises: Yugoslav Youth at the End of the Eighties) (Beograd: Institut društvenih nauka, 1990); Vlasta Ilišin et al., *Ogledi o omladini osamdesetih* (Essays on the Eighties Youth) (Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 1990).

<sup>63</sup> For the list of literature on youth subculture see the end of the section.

<sup>64</sup> Consequently, it is the formative phase when the seminal input was first received that should be elaborated in more detail.

<sup>65</sup> The decision was in tune with wider Eastern European trend where youth movements emerged primarily in the shape of youth sections of existent political parties. In this way, all relevant political actors, rather than communists alone, directly politicized the youth awarding it with a crucial task of securing the nation's future. See: Wallace and Kovatcheva, eds., *Youth in Society*, 65-66.

<sup>66</sup> Established in Zagreb, the *SKOJ* is an acronym for Savez komunističke omladine Jugoslavije (The League of the Communist Youth of Yugoslavia). Rajčević, *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret. Knj. 1, 1919-1928*, 61-64.

<sup>67</sup> Indicatively, the *SKOJ* initially received support of the Party's left faction, not the leadership itself. Vasić, *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret u Jugoslaviji*, 11.

<sup>68</sup> Rajčević, *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret. Knj. 1, 1919-1928*, 251-52.

reserve and helper of the Party.<sup>69</sup> The reasons behind its somewhat stronger status compared to the *Komsomol* should be sought in different working conditions. While the Bolsheviks constituted their youth outlet after coming to power, the *SKOJ* emerged simultaneously with the Party and, with it, found itself in the highly antagonistic surroundings of the interwar Yugoslavia. Along with the other communist organizations, both were outlawed in 1921 which severely endangered their existence.<sup>70</sup>

It is this illegal context, rather than a distinct discourse that gave birth to the early specificities of the Yugoslav youth policy. The latter was in fact merely a hazy compilation of Soviet instructions, not always correctly interpreted.<sup>71</sup> Unfavorable operative conditions encouraged improvisation and *ad hoc* solutions.<sup>72</sup> Among those was a tight liaison with the interwar student movement whose post-war consequences demand its explanation.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> Vasić, *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret u Jugoslaviji*, 12-16.

<sup>70</sup> Youth communists contributed to the hostility. Following their 1921 assassination of the interior minister, the authorities strengthened their anti-communist decree, so called *Obznana*, adopted the previous year. The new harsher Law for the Protection of the State incited numerous arrests that decimated the *SKOJ*. *Ibid.*, 13-14.

<sup>71</sup> The extent of the blurred vision illustrates the 1936 incident when a single misinterpreted Soviet order sufficed for the main *SKOJ*'s cells to dismantle and the body formally seized to exist for a while. See: Vasić, *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret u Jugoslaviji*, 673.

<sup>72</sup> The perilous milieu led to the formation of parallel youth body, the *SROJ* (The League of Working Youth of Yugoslavia), which became the *SKOJ*'s legal outlet, active until its ban in 1924. See: Cvetković, *Napredni omladinski pokret u Jugoslaviji*, 165-71.

<sup>73</sup> For reasons stated below, the research of the leftist interwar student movement literally flourished, especially on the most developed, Belgrade student movement: Milica Damjanović, *Napredni pokret studenata Beogradskog univerziteta. Knj. 1. Od 1919. do 1929. godine; knj. 2. Od 1929. do 1941. godine* (Progressive Student Movement at the Belgrade University. Vol. 1, From 1919 till 1929; vol. 2, From 1929 till 1941.) (Beograd: Nolit, 1966; 1974); Miroljub Vasić et al., eds., *Ideje i pokreti na Beogradskom univerzitetu od osnivanja do danas. Knj. 1 & 2* (Ideas and Movements at the Belgrade University from the Foundation till the Present. Vol. 1&2) (Beograd: Centar za marksizam Univerziteta u Beogradu, 1989); Neda Božinović et al., eds., *Beogradski univerzitet u predratnom periodu, narodno-oslobodilačkom ratu i revoluciji. Knj. 1&2* (Belgrade University in the Pre-war Period, Liberation War and Revolution. Vol. 1&2) (Beograd: Centar za marksizam Univerziteta u Beogradu, 1986; 1989). For the movements on the Zagreb and Ljubljana University see: Vojo Rajčević, *Studentski pokret na zagrebačkom sveučilištu između dva rata: 1918-1941* (Student Movement at the Zagreb University in the Interwar Period: 1918-1941) (Zagreb: Mladost, 1959); Slavko Kremenšek, *Slovensko študentsko gibanje 1919-1941* (Slovenian Student Movement 1919-1941) (Ljubljana: Inštitut za zgodovino delavskega gibanja, Mladinska knjiga, 1972).

Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana students were among the first to rise against the proclaimed dictatorship of interwar Yugoslavia, and headed the majority of anti-regime demonstrations.<sup>74</sup> Under the prevalent conditions, their movement became a legal channel for communist activity.<sup>75</sup> Protected by the autonomy of the university, communists formed numerous academic organizations, disguised under various legal names, while infiltrating professional student associations.<sup>76</sup> At first, their actions were restricted to narrow student issues, but steadily obtained strong political connotations.<sup>77</sup>

Still, the interwar student movement was both ideologically and structurally a much broader force in comparison to the *SKOJ*, whose members remained its meager, if active, part, swinging between cooperation and opposition with other rival political youth groups.<sup>78</sup> Besides, communists prevailed only at the Belgrade University during the 1930s.<sup>79</sup> Their presence was smaller in both Zagreb and Ljubljana where student movements to a greater extent resembled the general political situation, with the communist success depending on the successful merger of class and national issues.<sup>80</sup>

Mutual inconsistencies aside, the official post-war tradition treated the interwar student upheaval as an integral part of the common youth communist struggle.<sup>81</sup> The

<sup>74</sup> Rajčević, *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret. Knj. 2, 1929-1941*, 224.

<sup>75</sup> Damjanović, *Napredni pokret studenata Beogradskog univerziteta. Knj. 2*, 17-18.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid.; Damjanović, *Napredni pokret studenata Beogradskog univerziteta. Knj. 1*, 155-58.

<sup>77</sup> Bondžić, *Beogradski univerzitet 1944-1952*, 41-45.

<sup>78</sup> For the numbers at the most leftist Belgrade university see: Stanković, *Studenti i Univerzitet*, 58-59.

<sup>79</sup> The Belgrade University, the so called “communist fortress,” became a real oppositional centre. Damjanović, *Napredni pokret studenata Beogradskog univerziteta. Knj. 1*, 163.

<sup>80</sup> The *SKOJ*'s founders, Zagreb student communists, opposed the alliance between the youth subsidiaries of the main parties and the new national(istic) youth organizations, joined by their resistance to Serbian centralism. At the Ljubljana University communists were the weakest of the existent political groups and at great pains to forge liaisons along the Popular Front lines. See respectively: Rajčević, *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret. Knj. 1, 1919-1928*, 253; Rajčević, *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret. Knj. 2, 1929-1949*, 224; Kremenšek, *Slovensko študentovsko gibanje*, 426-39.

<sup>81</sup> The greater ideological diversity of the student movement and its collaboration with non-communist groups found its reflection in the term used to define its nature. The movement was called *progressive*, rather than *revolutionary*, with the latter reserved for the *SKOJ*. See: Damjanović, *Napredni pokret studenata Beogradskog univerziteta. Knj. 2*, 12, 19-20.

project aimed to forge the revolutionary legacy of the university.<sup>82</sup> Moreover, the sheer extent of the movement rated high within the new Party criteria. Unfortunately, the *SKOJ*, like its Soviet twin, remained a tiny, but disciplined and committed body throughout its formative phase. Though a perfectly reasonable strategy considering the circumstances, the official historians disagreed. Always in search of great numbers, they interpreted *SKOJ*'s entire history as a one-way progress to the creation of a mass youth organization. Accordingly, accounts criticized decisions that opposed later policies, above all, *SKOJ*'s vanguard and elitist tendencies.<sup>83</sup>

The very first step in the opposite direction, the *SKOJ*'s decision to cooperate with the other progressive political youth groups came to signify a turning point in the Yugoslav youth communist movement. In an attempt to establish a distinct Yugoslav youth route, the post-war narrative contributed the move, instigated by Moscow, to Tito's ascent to the head of the Party.<sup>84</sup> Indeed, credited for the revitalization and federalization of *SKOJ*, Tito's place in the Yugoslav youth theory is far more prominent than the one routinely granted to him in other spheres.<sup>85</sup> In an evident parallel to Lenin's *On the Task of the Youth Leagues*, Tito's *SKOJ on the Novel Path* was canonized as a cornerstone of the Yugoslav youth theory.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> Bondžić, *Beogradski univerzitet 1944-1952*, 8-10.

<sup>83</sup> All relevant authors followed this strategy. The other preferred tactic included finding alibis for the policies that did not fit into the post-war criteria. See for example: Vasić, *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret u Jugoslaviji*, 12.

<sup>84</sup> Rajčević, *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret. Knj. 2, 1929-1949*, 225-226.

<sup>85</sup> Tito was thus attributed with the appointment of Ivo-Lola Ribar as the First Secretary of the *SKOJ*. Ribar later emerged as another pivotal Yugoslav youth theorist, praised for formulating the *SKOJ*'s role in the revolutionary struggle that resulted in the mass following. See: Ivo Lola Ribar, *Omladina i revolucija* (Youth and Revolution) (Beograd: Mladost, 1976).

<sup>86</sup> Somewhat paradoxically considering its status, Tito's article mentioned crucial Soviet directives. See: Josip Broz Tito, "SKOJ on the Novel Path" (*SKOJ on the Novel Path*), in *O omladini* (On Youth) (Beograd: Mladost, 1974), 13-15.

### 2.2.3. The post-war massive state youth organization

Notwithstanding the great authority behind it, the birth of the distinct youth discourse did not immediately result in indigenous ideas. Nor did the changed post-war settings divert the Yugoslav gaze from the Soviet brothers. Glorified for the immense war efforts, the Yugoslav youth was ascribed with the same symbolic and practical responsibility for the construction of the new society.<sup>87</sup> This fragile and heavy burden required persistent guidance in the spirit of socialism.<sup>88</sup> After all, the accepted Leninist postulate taught that the socialist environment alone does not guarantee loyalty.<sup>89</sup> The youth in particular needed direction: not yet liberated from the old ways it could easily stray from the righteous Marxist-Leninist course.<sup>90</sup>

The Yugoslav communists reached again for the Soviet solution. In 1948 a massive youth body was formed as the *SKOJ* reunited with the previously founded *NOJ*.<sup>91</sup> Rather than trying to mobilize the best part of youth, the new entity aimed to include the whole young generation under the collective educational-political project.<sup>92</sup> Familiar organizational principles – democratic centralism, hierarchical

---

<sup>87</sup> Stipe Šuvar, *Omladina između ideala i stvarnosti* (Youth between the Ideals and the Reality) (Osijek: Konferencija SKH Zajednice općina, Centar za idejno teorijski rad, 1984), 21.

<sup>88</sup> Stanko Posavec, “Politička ideologija i omladina” (Political Ideology and Youth), in *Omladina i socijalizam*, 35.

<sup>89</sup> It followed then that the youth was neither backward nor progressive *per se*, but shaped by the surrounding circumstances. See: “Rezolucija III. Konferencije SKJ” (III LCY Conference Resolution), in Ibrahim Hadžić and Vladimir Maksimović, eds., *Omladinske organizacije u socijalističkom samoupravnom društvu: Od treće konferencije do IX kongresa* (Youth Organizations in the Socialist Self-management Society: From the Third Conference till the Ninth Congress) (Beograd: Mladost, 1975), 14-20.

<sup>90</sup> Mirko Bolfek, “Razvoj i uloga omladinskog pokreta poslije Kongresa ujedinjenja” (Development and the Role of the Youth Movement after the Unification Congress), in Cvjetičanin et al., eds., *Društvo revolucija omladina*, 33.

<sup>91</sup> Already during the war, the newly founded body *USAOJ* gathered all progressive, rather than just communist youth in the full tradition of Popular Front. After the war *USAOJ* was renamed into *NOJ*, with a new acronym standing for Narodna omladina Jugoslavije (People’s Youth of Yugoslavia), Within the established network of mass youth organizations, the *NOJ* for a while coexisted with the *SKOJ*, that was formally still a narrow group, but their shared objectives of total politicization led to the unification. See: Slobodan Žarić, *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret u Hrvatskoj, 1941-1948* (Revolutionary Youth Movement in Croatia, 1941-1948) (Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1980), 203-204; Bondžić, *Beogradski univerzitet 1944-1952*, 154-55.

<sup>92</sup> Bondžić, *Beogradski univerzitet 1944-1952*, 167.

centralized structure, “voluntary” entrance and 14-27 age census – made sure that the *NOJ* strode along the beaten tracks of bureaucracy and monopoly.<sup>93</sup>

By and large, the Yugoslav youth organization remained true to the “transmission belt” fundamentals throughout its existence. Nevertheless, to fully equate it with its Soviet counterpart would omit the subtle differences that surfaced once the Yugoslavs embarked on the separate historic road. Despite their restricted impact, they point to the rare novelties in the otherwise uniform communist youth policies. More concretely, these include ideological rejuvenation, a more complex set of reforms, parallelism with the student association, federalization of the state, and greater tolerance towards informal practices.

The introduction of a new state doctrine altered the theoretical perspective on the role of the youth.<sup>94</sup> Self-management generated a new paradigm that saw in the youth an equal partner that would enter into an open dialogue with the Party and would co-create its own destiny. Consequently, the youth organization was supposed to secure its active participation in self-management.<sup>95</sup> The link went the other way too, since its implementation was inconceivable without the youth, regarded as its “most trustworthy adherent.”<sup>96</sup> In the new circumstances, the transmission was no more

---

<sup>93</sup> Ule, *Mladina in ideologija*, 53; Bolfek, “Razvoj i uloga omladinskog pokreta poslije Kongresa ujedinjenja,” 32.

<sup>94</sup> Nikolić, ed., *Omladina i društvo*, 21.

<sup>95</sup> The paradigm received statutory formulation at the 1958 Congress. See: *Rezolucija o zadacima NOJ u društvenom samoupravljanju, VI. kongres NOJ* (Resolution on the Tasks of NOJ in the Social Self-management, Sixth Congress of NOJ) (Beograd: Politička dokumentacija, 1958), 200; quoted according to: Zvone Filipović, “Prispevek k razvoju pogledov na organizacijsko-politični razvoj mladinske organizacije 1945-1975” (Contribution to the Evolution of Views in Organizational-political Development of the Youth Organization 1945-1975), in Vidović-Miklavčič et al., eds., *Napredno mladinsko gibanje na Slovenskom, del 2*, 340.

<sup>96</sup> Radoš Smiljković, “Transformacija odnosa Saveza komunista – omladina u samoupravljanju” (Transformation of the Relation between the League of Communists and Youth in Self-management) in Cvjetičanin et al., eds., *Društvo revolucija omladina*, 233.

required.<sup>97</sup> The new norm praised the democratic movement from below where the youth learned by doing, in a creative interactive process full of potential mistakes.<sup>98</sup>

At least the theory declared so. Reality was something else. Long after self-management penetrated other spheres, it remained at the margins of the youth organization, causing only minor structural changes.<sup>99</sup> Instead of an active and autonomous political role, the Party's tutelage persisted, furthering the estrangement of the passive membership.<sup>100</sup> Such an obvious discrepancy between the official declarations and actual practice proved increasingly embarrassing for the regime. In the mid 1960s it became a leitmotif of the launched reform process that aspired to adjust the organization with a new ideological frame.<sup>101</sup>

#### **2.2.4. The 1960s reform process: self-management, student exception, decentralization**

Conceived as an integral part of the general social reform, the transformation of the youth organization was accompanied by agitated disputes about its role in the self-management society.<sup>102</sup> The articulated ideas reflected the great semantic range of the new doctrine. Bold assertions about the progressive nature of the youth exchanged

---

<sup>97</sup> A general agreement prevailed that the transmission belt model played a positive role in the immediate post-war years and was voluntarily accepted by the youth. See among others: Velimir Tomanović, "O menjanju položaja, uloge i odnosa u omladinskom pokretu u novije vreme" (On the Change of the Status, Role and the Relations within the Youth Movement in Recent Times) in Cvjetičanin et al., eds., *Društvo revolucija omladina*, 39-40.

<sup>98</sup> Novosel, *Struktura i funkcija omladinskih organizacija u Hrvatskoj*, 3.

<sup>99</sup> The youth and Party officials seized to overlap, while their duties were formally separated. See: Bondžić, *Beogradski univerzitet 1944-1952*, 168-69.

<sup>100</sup> Nikolić, ed., *Omladina i društvo*, 16.;

<sup>101</sup> *Izveštaj o radu Saveza omladine Hrvatske i Centralnog komiteta Saveza omladine Hrvatske između šestog i sedmog kongresa* (Report on the Activities of the League of Youth of Croatia and the Central Committee of the League of Youth of Croatia between the Sixth and Seventh Congress), quoted according to: Novosel, *Struktura*, 6.

<sup>102</sup> The 1968 Youth Congress proclaimed the execution of the social reform as the chief task of the youth. See: *Osmi kongres Saveza omladine Jugoslavije* (Eighth Congress of the League of Youth of Yugoslavia) (Beograd: Mladost, 1968), 17.



with panicked cries for its firm guidance to impede harmful influences and prevent it from going astray.

The formal level kept lagging behind and sided with the conservative option. Timid beginnings from 1963 remained limited to the change of name. The new one, the Youth Union, allegedly hinted that from now on, the organization was to serve, rather than control the youth.<sup>103</sup> True reforms began in 1968 when the new statute replaced democratic centralism with the so called principle of “self-management agreement.”<sup>104</sup> Underlying the move was a genuine attempt to decrease the existing hierarchy, approach the constituency and integrate their informal initiatives. The subsequent republican statutes acknowledged these democratic trends that echoed the ongoing political liberalization occurring at the state level.<sup>105</sup>

The membership eagerly responded. From 1968 till 1972 a complex youth politicization evolved, whose analysis features prominently in this thesis.<sup>106</sup> For the first time in communist Yugoslavia, genuine political initiatives emerged within the youth unions and soon spilled beyond the institutional borders. In Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana, fully-fledged student movements broke out, reaching further than the official reforms could ever envisage.

The whole process ended in failure. After four exciting years, the severe backlash in 1972 sharply suppressed the student politicization, spurring the onset of a deep political crisis. In what was arguably a woeful résumé of this process, the 1974 Youth Congress changed the organization’s name yet again. This time the label *socialist* was

---

<sup>103</sup> The name could also be translated as the League of Youth, which corresponds to the new League of Communists. However, just as I prefer the simplified term, the Party, I will use the label “youth union” throughout the thesis. Tomislav Badovinac, *Sedmi kongres Saveza omladine Jugoslavije* (Seventh Congress of the League of Youth of Yugoslavia) (Beograd: CK SOJ, 1963), 13.

<sup>104</sup> *Osmi kongres Saveza omladine Jugoslavije*, 124-27, 130-31.

<sup>105</sup> Filipović, “Prispevek k razvoju,” 344; *Sedmi Kongres Saveza omladine Hrvatske: Dokumenti* (Seventh Congress of the League of Youth of Croatia: Documents). (Zagreb: Konferencija Saveza omladine Hrvatske, 1968), 84; *Osmi Kongres Zveze mladine Slovenije* (Eighth Congress of the League of Youth of Slovenia) (Ljubljana, 1968), 77-85.

<sup>106</sup> See Chapter 5.

added, to stress the allegedly insufficient ideological commitment.<sup>107</sup> In a parallel move towards tighter control, organizational principles were re-strengthened again.<sup>108</sup> Periodic reforms routinely continued throughout the next decade. But the initial determination to alter the basic transmission belt model and turn the youth unions into autonomous political agents disappeared, at least until well into the last Yugoslav decade when the Slovenian youth union transformed into a true political party.<sup>109</sup>

[What the Yugoslav reformists failed to see was that the self-management vision of the youth openly contradicted the ruling Soviet pedagogy. The new paradigm required the best of possible worlds, the one where the youth would self-willingly choose the correct communist path. In other words, exactly what the behavioristic concept refused to take for granted and thus provided the youth organization with its *raison d'être*. The whole process was doomed and even in its serious phase left but poor results.<sup>110</sup> The bureaucratization only insignificantly decreased, while the major events kept taking place on the non-institutional levels.]

Having missed its chief goal, the reforms left traces at other levels. The confederalization of the state in the late 1960s bolstered the role of the republican youth bodies. These grew into transmission belts of their respective republican parties, and their loyalty switched accordingly. The process proved detrimental for the authority of the federal youth union, left with an increasingly formal charge of delegating vague

---

<sup>107</sup> “Osnovne karakteristike delovanja organizacija omladine u međukongresnom periodu” (Basic Features of the Activities of Youth Organizations in the Inter-congress Period), in Hadžić and Maksimović, eds., *Omladinske organizacije u socijalističkom samoupravnom društvu*, 102-106.

<sup>108</sup> *Statut Saveza socijalističke omladine Jugoslavije* (Statute of the Socialist League of Youth of Yugoslavia) (Zagreb: CDD, 1975), 11; “Rezolucija III. Konferencije SKJ,” 37.

<sup>109</sup> The best example of the ensuing sterility was the introduction of the so called delegate system applied along the whole spectrum of existing political organizations. The new invention merely reformulated democratic centralism and enhanced the bureaucratic tendencies. Its alienating and negative effects on the youth were even confirmed by the contemporary empirical survey. See: Grdešić et al., *Omladina u delegatskom sistemu*, 137-39. On the Slovenian process see: Vurnik, *Med Marxom in punkom*.

<sup>110</sup> The introduction of the rotation principle in 1963, limited to a narrow layer of reliable leaders evoked the general manner in which the reform was carried out. See: Šušvar, *Omladina između ideala i stvarnosti*, 24-25.

policy guidelines.<sup>111</sup> On the other hand, individual republican youth bodies found themselves in growing mutual conflict. Following their respective superior parties, they began supporting opposing policies with profound effects, felt especially during the mentioned political upheaval from the late 1960s.

The autonomy of the republican youth unions survived long after the outbreak of political crises. In fact, it only prospered under the new con-federal constitution and the growingly dissimilar republican contexts. Despite the principally common youth policy of the 1970s, the organizational forms continued to vary across the country, depending on the existing cultural infrastructure and tradition.<sup>112</sup>

The rift along the republican lines was preceded and reinforced by another inner division. The legacy of the interwar student movement permitted the formation of a distinct mass student organization within the framework of the youth union. As early as 1951 students at each university gathered in a separate entity that catered for specific student problems.<sup>113</sup> The ambiguous relation of the student union, towards the youth union was embodied in the contradictory principle of “programmatically unity and organizational independence.” Being its “collective member” the student union was formally subordinated to it, sharing with it many common tasks.<sup>114</sup> The preserved

---

<sup>111</sup> The federal youth union was an umbrella entity that comprised of representatives from each republics who were dependent on their own Party. The union remained fully bureaucratized and fully remote from any real youth concerns.

<sup>112</sup> In Ljubljana, for instance, the student radio station was launched at the end of the 1960s, in Zagreb in the mid 1980s, while in Belgrade only by the end of the decade. The circumstances equally differed: *Radio Student* was initiated by the Ljubljana student union. Zagreb’s *Radio 101* emerged as the pirate station and only eventually adopted by the city youth organization. See respectively: For more on the founding see: Ciril Baškovič et al., *Študentsko gibanje 1968-72* (Student Movement 1968-1972) (Ljubljana: Krt, 1982), 46; Novak, *Hrvatsko novinarstvo u 20. stoljeću*, 868-73; Zinka Bardić and Silvija Šeparović, “Radio 101: The Radio that Never Stops,” *Erasmus* 17 (1996): 32-33.

<sup>113</sup> Bonžić’s and Stanković’s accounts of the student union’s formative period, though limited to Belgrade, are applicable to the whole organization. More on the foundation of the student union in: Bondžić, *Beogradski univerzitet 1944-1952*, 168-69; Stanković, *Studenti i Univerzitet*, 207-208.

<sup>114</sup> Džuverović, *Generacija budućnosti*, 234-37.

autonomy, however, allowed it to take the lead in the mentioned reform process and during its zenith proclaim formal independence.<sup>115</sup>

Behind such vague instructions lay a serious Marxist doubt about the model that privileged students above other segments of the youth. Namely, their interests, problems and intellectual capacity were considered sufficiently specific to receive a distinct institutional framework.<sup>116</sup> Such implicit elitism occasionally obtained explicit forms where students were elevated into a vanguard of the entire working class. The youth politicization from the late 1960s manifested all the dangers of such concept. Being one of its pivotal centers, the student union failed to survive its end. Paralyzed immediately upon the onset of the crisis, at the 1974 Congress it was fully subordinated to the youth union and ceased to exist as an autonomous entity.<sup>117</sup>

### **2.2.5. The youth organization and informal youth cultural practices**

Regardless of its fate, this internal student autonomy indicated the lesser monopole of the Yugoslav youth union when compared to its Soviet match. Just like the *Komsomol*, it strived to achieve complete control over youth activities in as many spheres as possible.<sup>118</sup> Nevertheless, the markedly different Yugoslav context worked against its original totalitarian ambitions and fragmented its efforts. In its best days, the self-management doctrine openly acknowledged the heterogeneity of the youth interests and thus incited the inclusion of various specialized sub-organizations within

---

<sup>115</sup> At the central conference in June 1971, the student union officially stepped out from the youth union and turned into an independent political organization responsible to its membership. *Statut Saveza Studenata Jugoslavije* (Statute of the Student Union of Yugoslavia) (Beograd: ICS, Predsjedništvo Konferencije Saveza studenata Jugoslavije, 1972), 11.

<sup>116</sup> Šuvar, *Omladina između ideala i stvarnosti*, 20.

Even leading theorists identified students as the core of the youth, having all its attributes: Velimir Tomanović, *Omladina i socijalizam* (Youth and Socialism) (Beograd: Mladost, 1977), 19.

<sup>117</sup> “Rezolucija III. Konferencije SKJ,” 38; Filipović, “Prispevek k razvoju,” 355.

<sup>118</sup> Novosel, *Struktura i funkcija omladinskih organizacija u Hrvatskoj*, 1.

the youth union.<sup>119</sup> In fact, the reform process mostly affected these side-activities that tried to encompass popular youth concerns and directly approach the constituency.<sup>120</sup>

The effort was further dictated by the unorthodox political environment. Yugoslavia's policy of non-alignment freed the West from the typical role of the main culprit for all the social evils.<sup>121</sup> Market socialism worked in the same direction. The fusion of the two resulted in a much higher level of consumerism and stronger Western influence. Together these facilitated the formation of informal youth cultures outside the borders of youth organizations. Early entry of foreign and domestic pop-music enhanced the emergence of authentic youth styles that developed to a greater extent and range than in the rest of the communist Europe.

Though seemingly affirmative, the official stance was far from positive. Especially in their formative periods, non-institutional youth practices could easily turn into expressions of resistance.<sup>122</sup> Nevertheless, the regime's ability to integrate, institutionalize or co-opt them was significantly greater. While the 1972 crisis

---

<sup>119</sup> Ibid.

<sup>120</sup> Professionals or young enthusiasts were increasingly appointed to the top positions in these institutions, often regarded as politically irrelevant. As such, they remained primarily devoted to their specific activities, rather than the youth organization as a whole.

<sup>121</sup> The mentioned paradigm which treated youth as the potential victim of pernicious influence thus took significantly different contours than in the Soviet Union. The West served as the arch-enemy only for a short while. Much greater dangers were attributed to the national(ist) ideas from the inter-war past. Hence, many surveys inquired about the youth's attitudes towards the national question. See: Zdravko Leković, *Omladina i Savez komunista* (Youth and the League of Communists) (Beograd: Privredni pregled, 1972); Borislav Džuverović, *Omladina u jugoslavenskom društvu: Socio-demografski profil mlade generacije* (Youth in the Yugoslav Society: Socio-demographic Profile of the Young Generation) (Beograd: Mladost, 1974); Dušan Davidović, ed., *Mladi i nacionalizam* (Youth and Nationalism) (Beograd: Mladost, Centar za istraživačku, dokumentacionu i izdavačku delatnost predsedništva Konferencije Saveza socijalističke omladine Jugoslavije, 1984).

<sup>122</sup> The continuity with the pre-1990s research was established precisely in this sphere of informal subcultural youth practices, since they were assigned with the role of a subversive factor. For the pre-1990 research see: Slobodan Drakulić, "Omladinske subkulture i njihovo proučavanje" (Youth Subcultures and Their Research), *Revija za sociologiju: sociološki tromesečnik* 3-4 (1984): 241-47; Ante Fulgosi and Furio Radin, *Stilovi života zagrebačkih srednjoškolaca* (Lifestyles of Zagreb's High-school Youth) (Zagreb: CDD SSOH, 1982); Kasim Ihtijarević, *Eseji o kulturi mladih* (Essays on Youth Culture) (Sarajevo: RK Književne omladine BiH, 1988); Ines Prica, *Omladinska potkultura u Beogradu: simbolička praksa* (Youth Subculture in Belgrade: Symbolic Practice) (Beograd: Etnografski institut SANU, 1991); Gregor Tomc, *Druga Slovenija: zgodovina mladinskih gibanj na Slovenskem v 20. stoletju* (The Other Slovenia: History of Youth Movements in Slovenia in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century) (Ljubljana: Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS, Knjižnica revolucionarne teorije, 1989).

suppressed all forms of genuine youth politicization, this segment remained open and was used as an institutional frame through which the authentic youth activity was channeled. Albeit with questionable effects, since their content was frequently in total contrast with the basic communist principles.

### **3. CHAPTER: YUGOSLAV YOUTH PRESS**

#### **3.1. ROLE, STATUS, PRE-HISTORY, EVOLUTION**

The previous two chapters elaborated upon the two core elements standing behind the concept of the communist youth press: the Soviet notion of the press, coupled with the distinct manner of constructing youth. The first saw in the press a perfect tool for shaping ones' consciousness in accordance with the main ideological agenda; the second perceived youth as a fragile group whose immense symbolic and practical weight required perpetual guidance. In addition, the Yugoslav rendering of these theories demonstrated crucial specificities in the realm of both media and youth policy, that would allow the Yugoslav youth press to evolve in unique ways during the late 1960s.

The third chapter makes another step forward by bringing together these two elements and focusing on the youth press itself. Following a brisk introduction into the original Soviet concept, I turn to the main object of the thesis, the Yugoslav youth press, leaning on the scarce available scholarship, documents of the youth union and the youth journals themselves. In the first half I sketch the role, status, and early history of the youth press, from its outset to the late 1960s, concluding with a short preview of the analyzed period. From these general claims, I then move to actual primary sources and in the remaining portion of the chapter define and classify the youth press in terms of its concrete publications.

##### **3.1.1. Soviet origins**

As mentioned earlier, the concept of the communist youth press is missing equally from the basic literature and its Yugoslav variant. What is known about the

relationship between the youth and the media originates primarily from the Western experiences. There the youth was historically treated either as a villain or commodity, breeding along notions like moral panic or youth commercialized media.<sup>1</sup>

A communist concept stands at odds with this tradition. In its roots, as revealed by the first two chapters, the youth press is a propaganda tool *par excellence*, underlined by what seemed to be a perfect combination of the highest instrument and the neediest of recipients. The linkage between them was so obvious that the Bolshevik's call for the youth press preceded even the formation of their youth auxiliary that eventually became its publisher.<sup>2</sup> The 1926 decree officially sealed the merger dividing the press structure according to the targeted audience. Not surprisingly, youth easily made it into the ten chosen socio-biological groups awarded with specialized press attention.<sup>3</sup>

Other than that not much is known about the Soviet youth press. Placed under the *Komsomol's* tutelage, the newly born youth press fed on notions of political socialization and guidance in the full Leninist tradition. Embodying the Soviet propaganda model at its finest it served as one in the line of the *Komsomol's* tools.<sup>4</sup> The combination never promised much in terms of importance or excitement, not least because of the *Komsomol's* secondary political role.<sup>5</sup> Its marginal influence in both of its parent realms placed it out of the sight of media and youth scholars alike.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Consequently, Western media studies developed three different streams of research on youth: media effects on youth, youth's usage of media in cultural studies tradition, and more recently, media constructions and representations of youth. See: Sharon R. Mazzarella, "Constructing Youth: Media, Youth, and the Politics of Representation," in Angharad N. Valdivia, ed., *A Companion to Media Studies* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 227. For more on Western youth media see: Bill Osgerby, *Youth Media* (London: Routledge, 2004).

<sup>2</sup> The Sixth Party Congress requested the setting up of press organs for the agitation among the young, and soon thereafter *Pravda* included a column on *Komsomol* news. See: Kenez, *The Birth of the Propaganda State*, 93.

<sup>3</sup> Dictated by propaganda purposes, the whole structure was artificial and demanded huge subsidies. See: Hopkins, *Mass Media in the Soviet Union*, 82-83.

<sup>4</sup> The new type of the press adopted a common hierarchical division across republics and regions whereby the central journal, *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, served as a model for the rest to follow. See: Inkeles, *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia*, 149-50.

<sup>5</sup> *Komsomolskaya Pravda* is occasionally mentioned as a pacesetter of the changes occurring in Soviet journalism in the late 1950s, namely with the turn towards more efficient and attractive methods of



### 3.1.2. Research literature

The literature on Yugoslav youth press progressed along similar patterns. Here, too, research abruptly ended with its initial phase, encompassed by the general works on the inter-war Yugoslav communist press. Conversely, the youth press is almost entirely absent within the fragile scholarship on the Yugoslav post-war media. There exists virtually no account of any considerable length, not even a chapter, let alone a detailed volume devoted to this unique genre. Periodicals are no better. In over 35 years of its existence, the central academic journal *Novinarstvo*, published no more than four short essays loosely related to the youth press.<sup>7</sup>

The literature is lacking not only in insights but the very definitions. Media specialists frequently failed to address the concept. Robinson does not even mention the term. Local scholars merely list it along with the other types of the press.<sup>8</sup> Additional comments were scarce and at best identified the youth press with periodicals issued by the youth and student union.<sup>9</sup>

In fact, one needs to dig deep to locate that handful of bibliographic items that tried to go beyond this common knowledge. Some of them are of questionable

---

presentation, more in touch with the reader's taste. The change, however, equally affected evening newspapers and was mostly due to the general editor, Khrushchev's son in law, Alexei Adzubei and the general change in political climate. See: Buzek, *How the Communist Press Works*, 94-97.

<sup>6</sup> In addition, as seen earlier, (perceived) monotonous contours of the two core fields, namely the Soviet press and the Soviet youth were disregarded by scholars soon after the initial conceptual tools were formulated. For only other available insight into the Soviet youth press see: Gleb Tsipursky, "Citizenship, Deviance, and Identity. Soviet Youth Newspapers as Agents of Social Control in the Thaw-era Leisure Campaign," *Cahiers du Monde russe* 49, no. 4 (2008): 629-49.

<sup>7</sup> Two of these were conference reports, which then leaves just two proper articles. See: Borisav Džuverović, "Tretman mladih u jugoslavenskoj štampi" (The Coverage of the Youth in the Yugoslav Press), *Novinarstvo* 1/2 (1971): 45-64; Miloslav Milosavljević, "Primjer proučavanja strukture lista pomoću analize sadržaja" (The Example of the Study on the Structure of the Journal Using Content Analysis), *Novinarstvo* 3/4 (1972): 86-96.

<sup>8</sup> Kern, ed., *Štampa, radio, televizija i film u Jugoslaviji*, 27; Mihailo Bjelica, "Karakteristične faze u razvitku jugoslavenskog novinarstva 1945-1985" (Typical Features in the Evolution of the Yugoslav Press 1945-1985), *Novinarstvo* 3/4 (1986): 123.

<sup>9</sup> The Yugoslav encyclopedia of journalism went the furthest in this regard. Identifying the youth press with journals devoted to the youth life, it added another constituent subcategory: high-school student journals. See: Ljiljana Marković, ed., *Leksikon novinarstva* (The Journalistic Lexicon) (Beograd: Savremena administracija, 1979), 200.

academic nature or utility.<sup>10</sup> Others are primary sources in themselves, created, without exception, within the youth organization, for its own internal needs. As such they left but a feeble impact on the main media narrative and the scholarship at large.

The first such texts date from the end of the 1960s. Generalizing on the newly developing features of the youth press, they merely echoed the ongoing debates held within the youth press at the time.<sup>11</sup> Before these efforts could gain momentum and reach some analytical depth, they were halted by the erupting political crises that surrounded the youth press with political taboos.

The interest in the youth press did not renew until the late 1970s when a few new studies emerged from the existent deadlock. Benefiting from the rising usage of sociology by the youth organizations, these were wrapped in the popular research mode of the time. Three resulting content analysis of the individual journals, joined by the inquiries into the youth's reading habits, came closest to qualifying as genuine scholarship.<sup>12</sup>

This short glimpse of the available writing, or rather the lack of it, reveals several important features of the phenomenon itself, all of which will be elaborated later on.

---

<sup>10</sup> See commendable but hardly usable bibliography of Serbian children, youth, and student journals: Milica Kisić, *Pionirska i omladinska štampa u SR Srbiji 1945-1985: bibliografija* (Pioneer and Youth Press in SR Serbia 1945-1985: Bibliography) (Gornji Milanovac: Dečje novine, 1988).

<sup>11</sup> The two existing articles complained about the lack of research and basic theoretical concepts which manifested in their contrasting titles. Referring to the student and youth press respectively, both in fact discussed the same journals, trying to answer the question that was at the heart of these debates: What is the youth/student press? What they fail to mention is that they could not rely on official documents either. See: Borisav Džuverović, "Osobenosti studentske štampe" (The Specificities of the Student Press), *Gledišta* 3 (1969): 410-15; Lovro Lisičić, "O omladinskom tisku" (On Youth Press), in Posavec, ed., *Omladina i socijalizam – ostvarenja i mogućnosti*, 195-223.

<sup>12</sup> The analyzed journals included Belgrade's *Nezavisne omladinske novine*, Zagreb's *Polet* and Ljubljana's *Mladina*. See respectively: Ljiljana Bačević, et al., *Mladi u sistemu masovnog komuniciranja* (Youth in the System of Mass Communication) (Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1979); Dean Ajduković, "Analiza sadržaja *Poleta*" (Analysis of Contents of *Polet*), *Pitanja* 5 (Nov. 1980), suppl., 1-24; Smilja Amon et al., "Mladinski tisk in mladi" (Youth Press and the Youth), in Vili Pšeničny, ed., *Mladina Slovenije '82. Rezultati raziskovanj v SR Sloveniji* (Slovenia Youth '82. The Results of the Research in SR Slovenia) (Ljubljana: Republiška Konferenca ZSMS, 1982), 236-75. None of the several historical sketches that appeared since surpasses five pages: See: Zdravko Huber, "Četiri decenije omladinske štampe u Srbiji" (Four Decades of the Youth Press in Serbia), *Novinarstvo* 3/4 (1984): 102-107; Tomislav Marčinko, "Razvoj omladinske štampe u Srbiji" (The Development of the Youth Press in Serbia), *Novinarstvo* 3/4 (1984): 108-111.

On the most obvious level, this gap illustrates the presumed irrelevance of the youth press within the whole Yugoslav system of the press. Media scholars, however, faced another obstacle in dealing with the issue. Namely, the discipline traditionally developed in close proximity with the adherent legislation and was to a large extent confined to its theoretical elaborations. The problem with the youth press was that these were vague and hazy at best, leaving researchers with no material to process.

The first who handled the question were those who worked in it, journalists and editors of the youth press. For them the youth press was primarily a matter of practice, not theory. Still, occasionally they reflected upon its essential features contributing to interesting ideas that will be mentioned in the conclusion. Besides, research typically emerged in reaction to some external political impulse, often following various administrative measures taken against the journals.<sup>13</sup> Throughout the period, political incentives frequently sparked attention in the youth press.<sup>14</sup>

The two tides of interest date from the late 1960s and the late 1970s and roughly designate the time span of my thesis. The first coincided with the moment when the youth press embarked on the public scene and joined in the student political turmoil. The second corresponded with its revival in somewhat different direction. After the failure of its political engagement, it became involved with the creation and articulation of local punk-rock subculture.

---

<sup>13</sup> The first available survey, conducted by the Croatian youth organization, was spurred by the 1968 student unrest and the related backlash of the regime against the youth press. See: Vladimir Podrebarac and Stanko Posavec, *Idejno-političke tendencije u omladinskoj i studentskoj štampi* (Ideological-political Tendencies in the Youth and Student Press) (Zagreb: Istraživački i izdavački centar Naše teme, 1969).

<sup>14</sup> Out of a scanty number of articles on the youth press to be found in *Naša Štampa*, a monthly organ of the journalists' union specialized in formal press resolutions and congress reports, a majority relates to the administrative measures taken against various youth and student journals. See among others: "Privatizacija jedne tribine" (Privatization of a Forum), *Naša Štampa* 166 (May, 1969): 15; "Koliko je *Student* studentski list" (To What Extent Is *Student* a Student Journal), *Naša Štampa* 170 (Nov. 1969): 19; "*Tlo* dobija novog urednika" (*Tlo* Gets a New Editor), *Naša Štampa* 179 (Oct. 1970): 15; "Zabranjen deveti broj *Tribune*" (Banning of the Ninth Issue of *Tribuna*), *Naša Štampa* 191 (Dec. 1971): 9.

### 3.1.3. Interwar beginnings

So what exactly is the Yugoslav youth press? How did it evolve prior to the beginning of the analyzed period? And what was its status and role within the overall media system?

The literature on the interwar communist Party press documents that the Yugoslav communists adopted the concept with astonishing speed. Less than two months after its foundation, the *SKOJ* launched its own journal *Crvena Zastava*, the first out of several it would publish.<sup>15</sup> The event marked the birth of the Yugoslav youth press whose interwar evolution closely resembled those of the Party press of the time.<sup>16</sup>

Strict control and supervision were the order of the day. The *SKOJ* passed a special resolution on the youth press, making sure its journals turned into the organization's mouthpiece.<sup>17</sup> Party bodies closely supervised them, never hesitating from concrete instructions, whether in the realm of the general political line or the manner of expression.<sup>18</sup> With *SKOJ*'s leaders frequently acting as editors, journals could not but follow the *SKOJ*'s political objectives and tactics.<sup>19</sup> In addition, they played up nicely to their assigned Leninist roles, transmitting party directives,

---

<sup>15</sup> The decision was made at the *SKOJ*'s founding congress. For more on this biweekly organ that survived until *Obznana* see in: Vesović, *Revolucionarna štampa u Kraljevini Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca*, 49-50.

<sup>16</sup> Alternatively, the progressive high-school journal *Iskra* from Zagreb was identified as the predecessor of the Yugoslav youth press, not least since its journalists later contributed to *Crvena Zastava*. See: Inoslav Bešker, "O ulozi srednjoškolskog lista *Iskra* 1918/19. u konstituiranju komunističke omladinske štampe u Zagrebu" (On the Role of the 1918/19 *Iskra* High-school Journal in the Emergence of the Youth Press in Zagreb), in Kačavenda, ed., *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret Jugoslavije*, 24-29.

<sup>17</sup> "Rezolucija o štampi prve zemaljske konferencije SKOJ-a, 4. VIII 1922." (Resolution on Press of the SKOJ's First National Conference, 4 Aug. 1922), *Novinarstvo* 3/4 (1969): 72-73.

<sup>18</sup> For concrete examples see: "Cirkular biroa CK SKOJ-a o *Mladom Boljševiku*, 1927" (CC SKOJ Biro's Circular on *The Young Bolshevik*), *Novinarstvo* 3/4 (1969): 84; "*Mladi Udarnik i Rdeći signali*" (*Young Strike Worker and Red Signals*), *Novinarstvo* 1/2 (1970): 92-96.

<sup>19</sup> In accordance with the *SKOJ*'s program *Crvena zastava* called for revolution in its very first issue. Likewise, once the Yugoslav authorities banned communist activities, the *SKOJ*'s legal fraction immediately released its own organ. See respectively: Vesović, *Revolucionarna štampa u Kraljevini Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca*, 89; "Rezolucija o štampi prvog kongresa Saveza radničke omladine Jugoslavije, 10.II.1924." (Resolution on Press of the First Congress of the Workers' Yugoslav Youth Union, 10 Feb. 1924), *Novinarstvo* 3/4 (1969): 74-75.

preparing and reporting on youth congresses.<sup>20</sup> Quality was another matter. Hit by state censorship and hampered by financial difficulties, *SKOJ*'s bulletins such as *Mladi boljševik* were poorly written and short-lived, issued irregularly and in tiny circulation.

Many of the same features were shared by the leftist student journals of the period that came under the Party's influence. Though not openly outlawed like *SKOJ*'s periodicals, they were targeted by state censorship and due to strong communist presence forced to constantly alter their names in order to survive.<sup>21</sup> Affiliated with the student movement, they inspired and organized student actions, sharing its objectives and attributes.<sup>22</sup> Journals like Belgrade's *Student* were thus ideologically less rigid than their strictly communist-oriented *SKOJ*'s counterparts.<sup>23</sup> In the long run, a feature inevitably led to the greater quality and diversity that stretched beyond the narrow Party or student issues.

Despite strong mutual resemblance, the two strands of journals were not perceived as a unit at the time.<sup>24</sup> For this to occur, the network of youth and student organizations had to be fully instituted, following the consolidation of the Yugoslav communist regime.

---

<sup>20</sup> Practical issues heavily outweighed theoretical ones. Vesović, *Revolucionarna štampa u Kraljevini Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca*, 241-43.

<sup>21</sup> Belgrade's *Student* changed its name four times. See: Milan Vesović, "Uloga studentske štampe na Beogradskom univerzitetu između dva svetska rata" (The Role of the Student Press on the Belgrade University between the Two World Wars) in Vasić et al., eds., *Ideje i pokreti na Beogradskom univerzitetu. Knj. 1*, 333.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 337. On Zagreb's interwar student journals more in: Stanko Dvoržak, *Studentski dani* (Student Days) (Zagreb: Studentski list, 1970).

<sup>23</sup> True to the idea of People's Front, journals urged for the formation of wide coalition of all democratic forces. See: Ljiljana Simaković-Đukić, "List *Student* i antifašistička platforma studentskog pokreta na Beogradskom univerzitetu" (The *Student* Newspaper and the Anti-fascist Policy of the Student Movement at the Belgrade University) in Vasić et al., eds., *Ideje i pokreti na Beogradskom univerzitetu. Knj. 2*, 126.

<sup>24</sup> Among others, the first Secretary of *SKOJ*, Ivo-Lola Ribar contributed to *Student*, thus proving the existent interaction. Damjanović, *Napredni pokret studenata Beogradskog univerziteta. Knj. 2*, 277.

### 3.1.4. The post-war period: outside the reach of the main media framework

The youth press smoothly survived the transition into the communist environment.<sup>25</sup> The newly established youth and student organizations swiftly revitalized their press operations and continued publishing various journals in what seemed to be radically different, more favored conditions.<sup>26</sup> After all, instead of being outlawed, journals found themselves in a dominating position, facing no competition from rival youth periodicals.

And yet, somewhat surprisingly, the youth press failed to profit much from this drastic change in settings, keeping many of its initial features, such as insecure operation or marginal status. After its resurrection, the Yugoslav youth press formed a distinct media entity, placed under direct authority of the youth and student bodies.<sup>27</sup> With time, some of them formed special subdivisions responsible for supervising their publishing activities.<sup>28</sup> In both cases, however, the youth press was removed from the main press infrastructure embodied by the big publishers that issued everything, from major dailies to specialized magazines, and were thus responsible for what could legitimately be called the mainstream press.

The distinctive institutional framework proved disadvantageous on several fronts. For one, it increased the financial and political dependency of the youth press, forcing it to rely on the subsidies from its publisher alone. More importantly, it shaped its

---

<sup>25</sup> Youth organization continued publishing periodicals during the WWII. See: Marjeta Čampa, "Mladinski tisk med narodnoosvobodilnim bojem" (Youth Press in the People's Liberation Struggle) in Vidovič-Miklavčič et al., eds., *Napredno mladinsko gibanje na Slovenskem. Del 1*, 186-91.

<sup>26</sup> Majority of these journals, such as Belgrade's *Mladi Borac*, Zagreb's *Omladinski borac* or Ljubljana's *Mladina* were launched during the war and kept their titles in the communist Yugoslavia. Belgrade's *Narodni Student*, however, directly leaned on the traditions of the inter-war *Student*. For its beginnings see: Dragan Aleksić, "Narodni Student (1946-1948)" (*People's Student, 1946-1948*), in Božinović et al., eds., *Beogradski univerzitet u predratnom periodu, narodno-oslobodilačkom ratu i revoluciji. Knj. 2*, 292-98.

<sup>27</sup> Novak, *Hrvatsko novinarstvo u 20. stoljeću*, 483-84.

<sup>28</sup> In the 1960s, Zagreb youth union thus founded the *CKD* (Center for Cultural Activities) which issued cultural youth journals. In the mid 1970s, Croatian youth organization established the *CDD* (Center for Social Activity) leaving it in charge of its publishing.

whole economics of production, condemning it to small circulation and semi-amateur relations.<sup>29</sup>

Out of the reach of the big publishers, the youth press was stripped of all the benefits enjoyed by the mainstream press. Journals had to recruit their own, inexperienced staff, organize their own distribution (mainly by subscription or street vendors), while generally being denied a chance to accumulate their own profits.<sup>30</sup> Consequently they frequently faced financial difficulties, and operated with inadequate technical equipment and fluctuating personnel. Deprived of an equal media status and supervised by the inferior political bodies, the youth press was doomed by default to become a minor media outlet.<sup>31</sup>

Ultimately, during the first two post-war decades, the youth press was to a great extent left out of the described progress in the narrative on the Yugoslav press. By and large it continued to lean on the transmission belt principles of its publishers, oblivious of the new media trends. True, there were minor exceptions. An attentive eye could trace certain forthcoming trends, such as criticism in the sphere of culture, back to this period.<sup>32</sup> There were even occasional signs of the “market turn” as few journals tried to turn into commercial magazines and compete on the market.<sup>33</sup>

However, such attempts were neither frequent, nor successful.<sup>34</sup> Long after the mainstream press began its evolution, the majority of the youth journals were still

---

<sup>29</sup> “Savjetovanje o položaju i društvenoj ulozi omladinske štampe” (Counseling on the Position and Social Role of the Youth Press), *Novinarstvo* 1/2 (1972): 161-62.

<sup>30</sup> Bačević, et al., *Mladi u sistemu masovnog komuniciranja*, 23-24.

<sup>31</sup> Quite often, the youth journals were forced to use the printing facilities owned by the big publishing companies, which only made them more dependent.

<sup>32</sup> Stanković, *Studenti i Univerzitet*, 218-21.

<sup>33</sup> For instance, Belgrade’s *Naš Vesnik* were among the first local journals to cover Western popular culture, while Ljubljana’s *Mladina* tried to imitate commercial magazines. See respectively: Huber, “Četiri decenije omladinske štampe u Srbiji,” 104-105; Nikola Damjanić, “Vsebinske tendence časopisa *Mladine*” (Content Trends in the Journal *Mladina*), in Pšeničny, ed., *Mladina Slovenije '82.*, 255-59.

<sup>34</sup> Due to all of these drawbacks the contest was far from fair. See: “35 leta tednika *Mladina*. Nastanek in razvoj glasila Zveze socialistične mladine Slovenije,” 45.

structured along the agitprop lines. Serving as propaganda tools of their publishers, they were barely more than bulletins of the organizations that issued them, unimportant in any journalistic sense, and miles away from turning into a relevant media.<sup>35</sup>

### 3.1.5. Statutory confusion

For more than two decades, legal silence accompanied such trivial and orthodox existence of the youth press. Chaos reigned regarding its role and status in the new ideological milieu. At least in theory, self-management formulated new models for both the press and the youth organization. With major constituents determined, the role of their offspring, the youth press was presumed to be self-understood. But was it really? The previous sections highlighted the ambiguities engendered by the imbalanced introduction of the Yugoslav revisionist doctrine that was loaded with democratizing aspirations and Marxist-Leninist credentials. Market elements, Western influence and decentralization of the state merely added to the confusion. Rather than being firmly determined, the youth press was then put in a legal vacuum with ample possible options. Should it stick with the conservative youth organization or go with the media flow?

As long as the youth press stuck to the first option, the problem remained in the background. The moment this began to change, from the end of the 1960s, and the youth press actively penetrated this vacuum, a wide space for negotiation opened up that required strict regulation.

However, in sharp contrast to the 1920s when *SKOJ*'s resolutions openly formulated its tasks, the guidance was missing. The most obvious place to search for

---

<sup>35</sup> They were mainly read by the persons in charge, while many future political activists replaced one another on editorial position that served merely as a step in the Party career.



it, the statutes of the youth organizations, was curiously imprecise when it comes to the youth press.<sup>36</sup> In addition, once they finally became more verbal, they were inconsistent across the country, hinting to the uneven development of the youth press and the decentralized environment that surrounded its transformation into a relevant media factor.<sup>37</sup>

The first time the role of the youth press was explicitly and uniformly articulated on the formal level, in the new self-management way, occurred as late as 1972, at the special Youth Union's counseling on the youth press. The incident took place in the aftermath of the political crises and was actually a response to the deadlock the youth press had fallen into.<sup>38</sup> By then, however, many of its features had already evolved and offered formulations were to a large extent informed by the recent experiences.<sup>39</sup>

The inspiration remained the same once the statutes, at the end of the late 1970s, finally granted the youth press a systematically defined place.<sup>40</sup> The move formally

---

<sup>36</sup> A search of the documents originating prior to the mid 1960s proves futile. Surprisingly, even the 1968 reform-driven statute of the federal youth union skipped the youth press altogether. See: *Osmi kongres Saveza omladine Jugoslavije* (Eighth Congress of the League of Youth of Yugoslavia) (Beograd: Mladost, 1968).

<sup>37</sup> For example, unlike the federal one, the 1968 reformist statute of the Croatian youth organization, explicitly stated among its goals the establishment of the youth press, true to the principles of self-management and public forum journalism. In contrast, its later 1974 statute, despite some Congress discussions, suddenly became silent, impressed by the emerged political crises in the Republic. On the other hand, the Slovenian statute of the same year elevated the reading of the youth press into a duty of all union members, placing it into its Action-political program, the move that did not become a common standard before the end of the decade. See in turn: "Rezolucija 7. Kongresa Saveza omladine Hrvatske" (Resolution of the 7th Congress of the League of Youth of Croatia), in *Sedmi Kongres Saveza omladine Hrvatske: Dokumenti* (Seventh Congress of the League of Youth of Croatia: Documents) (Zagreb: Konferencija Saveza omladine Hrvatske, 1968), 76; "Rezolucija" (Resolution), *VIII Kongres SSOH. Dokumenti, Pitanja 52/53/54* (1974): 273; *Deveti kongres Zveze socialistične mladine Slovenije* (Ninth Congress of the Socialist League of Youth of Slovenia) (Ljubljana: RK Zveze socialistične mladine Slovenije, 1975), 213.

<sup>38</sup> The meeting was organized by the federal youth union and gathered its representatives along with those of the youth press. See: "Savjetovanje o položaju i društvenoj ulozi omladinske štampe," 161.

<sup>39</sup> Numerous administrative decrees and several court bans have already been adopted against the youth press. These can be seen in the 5th chapter on the youth press and the student movement.

<sup>40</sup> A whole eventful decade had to pass for the youth press to make its way into the statutes. Only by the end of the analyzed period or even early 1980s one can find helpful instructions on its role and features. See among others: "Rezolucija 10. kongresa" (Resolution of the Tenth Congress), in Dušan Skupek, ed., *Deseti kongres Zveze socialistične mladine Slovenije* (The Tenth Congress of the Socialist League of Youth of Slovenia) (Ljubljana: Republiška konferenca ZSMS, 1978), 104-105; *Statut i akciono politički program Saveza socijalističke omladine Srbije* (Statute and Action-political Program of the

acknowledged the youth press as a vital component in the newly developed information system of the youth organization.<sup>41</sup> Despite this new vocabulary, brought about by the introduction of the new delegate system, formal definitions, to a large part, continued to borrow from concrete practice.

### 3.1.6. The self-management view of the youth press: preview

The self-management perspective of the youth press was formulated in the dialogue between the youth press and the youth organization whereby practice to a large extent shaped the theory. Accordingly, the legislators were not the ones with the upper hand in this process. From the very start policies, proclamations and decrees remained a step behind the actual practice, legislators being typically content to qualitatively assess the general political line of the journals. Whether merely commenting or disciplining, they nevertheless drew from these same experiences and frequently accepted definitions that had already been formulated within the youth press.

A full definition of the youth press stands among the main goals of this thesis. However, a tentative introductory definition can be offered here, based on the medley of mentioned writing and formal documents.<sup>42</sup> When all these texts are assembled, the recommended prescription amounts to a dazzling mixture of classic Leninist propaganda instructions, revisionist Yugoslav input, concrete operative difficulties and original experiences.

---

LSY of Serbia) (Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1978), 79-81; *Jedanaesti kongres SSOJ* (Eleventh Congress of the SSOJ) (Beograd: Mladost, 1983), 96-97.

<sup>41</sup> See: Živko Andrevski, *Informisanje u SSO* (Informing within the SSO) (Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1985), 32-33; *Izveštaj o radu Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske između IX i X kongresa* (Report on the Work of the Socialist League of Youth of Croatia between the Ninth and Tenth Congress) (Zagreb: Republička konferencija Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1982), 11.

<sup>42</sup> Though not without problems, such an effort is plausible. Due to the same sources, namely, actual experiences, there were no big discrepancies between the older and newer documents.

The youth press inherited a great deal of the original Leninist tasks, such as pedagogical responsibility for the readership, dissemination of Marxist worldview or informing on its parent organization.<sup>43</sup> The youth press was also expected to express as well as form the youth opinion.<sup>44</sup> In other words, it not only addressed the young, but was supposed to be produced by them and present them with creative opportunities, not necessarily restricted to the youth issues.<sup>45</sup> Made in an analogy to the “by the people for the people” principle, the prescribed overlap between the producers and receivers owed equally to the new self-management paradigm of the youth.

The third, vital portion of the projected features referring to the inherent critical and democratic nature of the youth press could easily be rooted in the self-management view of the press.<sup>46</sup> Yet, in reality, the latter served merely as an excuse, while provisions turned into normative decrees primarily through an intense interpretative struggle within the youth press. There were no such doubts with radically new notions, like the youth press’s distinct media identity, its ambivalent relation to the mainstream press, disadvantaged economics of production or innate creative and innovative forms of expression.<sup>47</sup> All these were impressed not by theory, but by the genuine practice, in the way it evolved from the late 1960s.

Spurred by the overall liberalization and the reform of the youth organization, the youth press began to radicalize then both in form and content. In the process, it

---

<sup>43</sup> Andreovski, *Informisanje u SSO*, 98-99, 34-36; Đuro Tadić, *Rasprava o djelovanju Saveza socijalističke omladine* (Discussion about the Activities of the Socialist League of Youth) (Zagreb: CDD, 1981), 12.

<sup>44</sup> Bačević, et al., *Mladi u sistemu masovnog komuniciranja*, 23.

<sup>45</sup> Andreovski, *Informisanje u SSO*, 32-34

<sup>46</sup> Aside from the other elements of self-management press, this concerned the typical provision that the youth press should serve as a critical, public forum open for various debates: See among others: Andreovski, *Informisanje u SSO*, 36-38; “Rezolucija 7. Kongresa Saveza omladine Hrvatske,” 76.

<sup>47</sup> See: Lisičić, “O omladinskom tisku,” 205-208; Džuverović, “Osobnosti studentske štampe,” 412; “Savjetovanje o položaju i društvenoj ulozi omladinske štampe,” 161-62; Bačević, et al., *Mladi u sistemu masovnog komuniciranja*, 24; *Jedanaesti kongres SSOJ*, 97.

emerged into a distinctive media factor at odds not only with the Soviet origins but with Yugoslav mainstream production too. Feeding on as well as diverging from all of these various traditions, the Yugoslav youth press developed new characteristics.

This fresh outlook was formulated in different ways and in varying extent with strong deviations across republics and periods. The first signs of the new youth press were firmly linked to the volatile politicization of the Yugoslav students at the end of the 1960s. The second appeared when the youth press shifted its focus from direct political action to subversive subcultural activities, such as the vibrant punk-rock scene. In addition, using all the favorable conditions originally created for propaganda purposes to its own advantage, youth press turned into a testing ground for diverse journalistic and artistic experiments. Before presenting an analytical model that can accommodate all these different features and traditions, the youth press needs to be categorized first.

### **3.2. CLASSIFICATION OF THE YOUTH PRESS: DEFINING THE SOURCES**

Every academic work in the unmapped field requires initial decisions concerning the outline of the territory. All the more so when it deals with the ambiguous concept such as the Yugoslav youth press, consisting of diverse newspapers and journals dividable across different criteria. The following section will thus categorize the Yugoslav youth press in terms of primary sources. Using concrete examples, I will define its constituent parts, name specific journals that are included in this concept and explain in what way they differ among themselves as well as from the related journals that remain outside.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> The following outline of the Yugoslav youth press is facilitated by the extensive study of collections of a wide range of journals and newspapers that could be classified either as *youth* or *student*. Detailed

The following dissection of this compound journalistic body, the first of its kind, will be done in two steps.<sup>49</sup> First, the publications are classified in three ways: by territory, by publisher and by type, each of which having relevance not only for interpreting the substance of publications, but for the narrowing of the concept itself, as well as the scope of my thesis. The youth press proper is then further separated from the youth magazines that were part of the mainstream press production. For easy reference a table is added to the text, showing a list of journals divided into the relevant categories.<sup>50</sup>

### **Table 1 – General classification of the youth press**

*Table 1* shows the schematic division of the youth press according to the type, publisher and the city of origin, necessarily simplified for easy reference. As mentioned, it is not easy to draw a clear line between different groups of journals. Owing to constant processes of reorganization, journals changed their institutional affiliation, while numerous modifications in the editorial policy shifted them from one type to another. Such incidents are indicated only when the change was drastic; there were, however, many other examples when the transformation was less radical, and

---

listing of these hitherto unclassified sources within a new framework allows insight into the scope of the existing material and the extent of the conducted research in the relevant national libraries. More precisely, these include Narodna biblioteka Srbije (Belgrade), Nacionalna sveučilišna knjižnica (Zagreb) and Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica (Ljubljana). The fact that the offered generalizing claims are based on a broad overview of various journals over a number of years caused somewhat unorthodox, less specific footnoting, since citing individual articles from particular youth journals would hardly suffice to cover the scope of presented argument.

<sup>49</sup> While several authors mentioned possible classification criteria, they failed to execute them. The sole exception from the early 1970s cannot withstand the scrutiny since it is a highly impressionistic contribution to the initial discussion on the features of the youth press. Searching for its defining properties, Lisičić here divided the youth press into the official, epicurean and genuine youth journals. In contrast to the first two that are either transmission belt organs or apolitical altogether, genuine youth press is involved in the process of politicization and heads the revolutionary movement. Such classification clearly confuses several different criteria (outlook, attitude, affiliation) and cannot be praised for analytic qualities. See in turn: Huber, “Četiri decenije omladinske štampe u Srbiji,” 102; Andreovski, *Informisanje u SSO*, 34; Lisičić, “O omladinskom tisku,” 195-96.

<sup>50</sup> The table as well as the classification itself encompasses only journals issued in Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana during the chosen time span, that is from the mid 1960s to early 1980s.

these cases remained unrecorded. Regrettably, subtitles were also left out on account of too frequent changes, though they often point to the deeper shifts in editorial policy or formal arrangement.

		Belgrade/Serbia		Zagreb/Croatia		Ljubljana/Slovenia		Federal	Regional
		City	Republic	City	Republic	City	Republic		
Central (bi)weekly newspapers	Student	<i>Student;</i> <i>Frontisterion</i> (Phil. Faculty)		<i>Studentski</i> <i>list</i>		<i>Tribuna</i>  <i>SP</i> (Phil. Faculty)			<i>Indeks</i> (Novi Sad); <i>Katedra</i> (Maribor)
	Youth		<i>Susret;</i> <i>Omladinske</i> <i>novine</i>	<i>Omladinski</i> <i>tjednik</i>	<i>Tlo;</i> <i>Polet</i>		<i>Mladina</i>	<i>Mladost</i>	<i>Val</i> (Rijeka); <i>Iskra</i> (Split)
Social- cultural (bi) monthlies	Student	<i>Vidici</i>							<i>Naši dani</i> (Sarajevo)
	Youth			<i>Polet;</i> <i>Pitanja</i>					<i>Lica</i> (Sarajevo)
Specialized cultural magazines	Student	<i>Književna</i> <i>reč</i>		<i>Prolog</i>					<i>Polja</i> (Novi Sad)
	Youth			<i>Film;</i> <i>Pop-Express</i> <i>Paradoks</i>					
Academic “thick“ journals	Student	<i>Gledišta</i>		<i>(Hrvatsko</i> <i>sveučilište);</i> <i>(Razlog)</i>		<i>Problemi</i>	<i>Časopis</i> <i>za kritiko</i> <i>znanosti</i>	<i>Ideje</i>	
	Youth			<i>Gordogan;</i>	<i>Naše</i> <i>teme;</i> <i>Pitanja</i>				
Mainstream commercial youth journals		Comics (multiple editions)		Comics (multiple)		Comics (multiple)			
		<i>Džuboks</i> (Music)							
		<i>Zdravo</i> (General)		<i>Tina</i> (Teenage Girls)					
		<i>Politikin</i> (Youth); <i>Kekec</i> (Youth)	<i>Zabavnik</i>	<i>Plavi vjesnik</i> (Youth); <i>Zov</i> (Youth)					

### 3.2.1. Publications by type

Division according to the type is by far the most relevant, profoundly affecting both the content and the outlook of the journals. In total, four types of publications produced by youth and student bodies can be identified. Internal boundaries between them were neither fixed, nor could all be regarded as the youth press proper. With time certain journals changed their profile, while others combined various features.

#### 3.2.1.1. Central organs

The first type, central informative organs of their publishers were issued relatively consistently on a regular (bi)weekly basis by nearly every significant student or youth organization.<sup>51</sup> As such, they represent the most numerous and important sources of my thesis and played a pivotal role in the transformation of the youth press. It is here where the crucial processes evolved and where the bulk of journalists worked.

Visually they were not that dissimilar to daily newspapers. With standard large format and usually low quality paper they ranged in size anywhere from 8 to 32 pages.<sup>52</sup> Circulation is even harder to determine with close precision, since it also varied enormously across periods and newspapers, from a few thousand copies in the least favorable conditions up to seventy thousand during the greatest flourish.<sup>53</sup>

Content-wise, they were “all-round” newspapers dealing with a wide array of youth and general interests.<sup>54</sup> Roughly divided, one could distinguish between the two

---

<sup>51</sup> There was no daily youth organ in Yugoslavia. Producing a newspaper comparable to *Komsomolskaya Pravda* was hardly possible outside the main press framework, where the Yugoslav youth press, unlike the latter, remained constrained. See: Tsipursky, “Citizenship, Deviance, and Identity. Soviet Youth Newspapers as Agents of Social Control,” 632.

<sup>52</sup> Normally, the upper limit did not exceed 24 pages. However, it could rise up to 36 in the case of double issue, customarily used to fill up frequent gaps caused by the financial difficulties and irregular publication rhythm.

<sup>53</sup> Frequent changes or breaks in regular circulation of journals additionally impede its precise determination, making only an approximate assessment possible in this sense.

<sup>54</sup> The Yugoslav encyclopedia of journalism articulated the early presumption that the youth press should focus on the youth issues alone. However, with time, formal definitions harmonized with the

main parts, again with flexible inner balance. The “serious” share dealt equally with major political and social concerns of the day, as well as with the activities of their respective youth or student bodies or their sporadic informal extensions. The remaining portion was left over to “lighter” themes, such as leisure or everyday life. Its main element, however, was an extensive cultural section, included by virtually every newspaper and taking as much as the third of the whole issue.<sup>55</sup> Dividing its attention between wider and narrow youth production, the section typically split into individual segments like literature, arts, film, theatre, music, photography, caricatures or humor.<sup>56</sup>

Texts leaned heavily on current, up-to-date information. In terms of genre, they covered a wide spectrum from short news reports to analytical commentaries or partisan editorials. The internal ratio was again complex and changed across periods and the achieved degree of critical awareness.<sup>57</sup> Composite staff consisted of political activists, aspiring journalists as well as distinguished young writers and critics.<sup>58</sup> Predominantly still in their student age and without prior professional experience, they introduced unorthodox critical views on a variety of political, social or cultural issues.

The most prominent newspapers of this type were Belgrade’s *Student*, *Omladinske novine*, and *Susret*, Zagreb’s *Studentski list*, *Omladinski tjednik*, *Tlo* and *Polet* and

---

actual practice where the journals were free to touch upon the general issues of the whole society, and did so, especially during political crises. For two contrasting definitions see respectively: Marković, ed., *Leksikon novinarstva*, 200; Andreovski, *Informisanje u SSO*, 32.

<sup>55</sup> The cultural section, a residue from the pre-war period, penetrated from early on, first into the student and then into the youth journals. See: Dragan Aleksić, “*Narodni Student (1946-1948)*” (*People’s Student, 1946-1948*), in Božinović et al., eds., *Beogradski univerzitet u predratnom periodu, narodno-oslobodilačkom ratu i revoluciji. Knj. 2*, 292-98.

<sup>56</sup> The choice was optional and journals rarely contained all the mentioned subsections.

<sup>57</sup> Building on concrete experiences and the self-management doctrine, the critical approach turned into the formal prerequisite of the youth press. Yet, only a certain number of journals, treated in this thesis, developed it fully. For formal instructions see: Bačević, et al., *Mladi u sistemu masovnog komuniciranja*, 24.

<sup>58</sup> As will be seen from the research chapters, the profile of the staff significantly changed over the years with the tendency to include more and more future professional journalists.



Ljubljana's *Tribuna* and *Mladina*. For all the stated reasons, most of these are in the centre of the subsequent chapters.<sup>59</sup>

### 3.2.1.2. Cultural bimonthlies

To supplement these central organs a few larger organizations introduced a second type of journal: the so called “*revija*.” These are labeled here as cultural bimonthlies for their dominance of the cultural topics over the social and political issues.<sup>60</sup> Yet, it was the latter that first launched them in the spotlight of public attention, linking them tightly with the frame of the youth press.<sup>61</sup>

More extensive in volume, averaging between 100 and 150 pages, they spread on high-quality paper and corresponding attractive design, reminiscent of mainstream magazines.<sup>62</sup> Published at a slower pace, they were less inhibited by the need to provide up-to-date content. Different purpose, along with larger format and smaller circulation allowed more space for lengthy, detailed pieces written in analytical-essayistic style.<sup>63</sup> The smaller number of “typical” journalistic tasks left its mark on the profile of the staff as well. Somewhat different from the one found in central newspapers, it included fewer specialized journalists, and instead, gathered more young intellectuals, academics, writers and critics alike, most of them still in their student status.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Out of these, *Susret* and *Mladina* were actually hybrid journals, sharing many similarities with the next type of the youth press.

<sup>60</sup> The term “*revija*”, borrowed from the professional jargon, is best translated as illustrated magazine and corresponded mainly to the colorful, lush design of these journals. At times it found its place in the headings and served as a subtitle; more often it was used in the surrounding discussions to hint at the difference with the first, main type of the youth newspapers.

<sup>61</sup> Unlike the central organs which were present from the beginnings, this second type emerged mostly from the late 1960s and were understood as a theoretical or cultural extension of the former.

<sup>62</sup> While the format of the pages was smaller, paper quality surpassed that of the central newspapers. In general, journals of this type typically devoted particular attention to the visual design and brought important innovations in this field.

<sup>63</sup> In compliance with their elitist character, these papers had a significantly lower circulation than the central organs that never exceeded 5,000 copies.

<sup>64</sup> This, however, should not undermine the great overlap between the staff of the two types of journals.

As stressed beforehand, the shift between the types was not clear-cut. There are actually only a few “pure” journals belonging to this category, Zagreb’s *Polet* and *Pitanja* or Belgrade’s *Vidici* among them. Belgrade’s *Susret*, or Ljubljana’s *Mladina*, both already labelled as the first type, were in fact borderline cases. They combined their central informative role with features characteristic of the second type, like visual (magazine) outlook, lesser frequency or favored essayistic approach to writing.

### 3.2.1.3. Specialized journals

In contrast to the first two types that remain firmly within the concept of the youth press, this is not the case with the remaining two. The third type consists of specialized journals dealing with one particular cultural area such as literature, film or theatre. By and large, they resembled standard academic journals, albeit standing out for their innovative and resourceful approach and younger editorial and writing staff.<sup>65</sup> The other variant specialized in mass-cultural phenomena, such as pop-music, and in accordance with its profile took the form of the magazine. Both kinds were exceptions whose short-term and irregular existence directly depended on some internal initiative within certain vibrant youth bodies.<sup>66</sup>

When they survived they evolved, as a rule, into important periodicals that introduced new directions and viewpoints in their respective fields, leaving behind a rich cultural legacy. Yet, these were by definition elitist publications. Due to their narrow focus that rarely touched on wider social concerns they cannot be treated as parts of the youth press proper, even if some thematic or personal overlap existed

---

<sup>65</sup> Their founders frequently contributed to the cultural sections of the non-specialized youth journals. *Prolog*’s and *Film*’s editors Slobodan Šnajder and Nenad Polimac both began their career in youth press where they wrote profusely on theatre and film, respectively.

<sup>66</sup> Exceptionally the incentive came from outside the organization, as was the case with *Pop-Express*. Envisaged by a group of youngsters in one of the earliest examples of private press enterprises, this musical journal was ultimately embraced by the cultural section of the Zagreb youth organization that became its publisher, providing it with editors and staff. See: Novak, *Hrvatsko novinarstvo u 20. stoljeću*, 651-52.

among them.<sup>67</sup> To a large degree they fall outside the scope of this thesis, except for those instances when they initiated or reinforced certain major trends, relevant for the core of the youth press.<sup>68</sup>

As far as the individual titles are concerned, they include publications as diverse as Zagreb's *Prolog* (focus on theatre), *Film* (film), *Gordogan* (literature), Belgrade's *Književna reč* (literature), all of them belonging to the "academic" subtype, or somewhat hipper *Pop-express* (music) and *Paradoks* (humor, caricature), both from Zagreb.

#### 3.2.1.4. Academic journals

The final type might be regarded as the variant of the former. It includes intellectual, socially engaged, academic "thick" journals that were not focused on one area *per se*, but rather showed philosophical, sociological and political inclinations. These were residues of the serious tone that prevailed in the youth union during the 1950s.<sup>69</sup> Run by distinguished public personas with long term editorial posts, they were intended for academics, cultural, political and public figures of all ages who discussed general ideological, political and social problems of the society. Design matched the inside. The comprehensive volume spread on as many as 300 pages and was filled with footnote-based texts, cast in standard "thick" journal format with unappealing covers and lettering.

Apart from enjoying the patronage of youth organizations, they were practically indistinguishable from the rest of the academic periodicals. As such, though interesting in their own right and at times influential, they are almost completely left

---

<sup>67</sup> For instance, despite the dominant presence of film critics who otherwise contributed to the non-specialized youth press, *Film* should be regarded as film, rather than youth journal.

<sup>68</sup> *Prolog*, for instance, verbalized some of the issues of the student movement, while *Pop-Express* provided a preview of the "rock-subcultural" turn in the youth press.

<sup>69</sup> The specific nature of these journals was articulated by the small distinction in the headings that stated the Central Committee of the youth unions, rather than the whole body as their publisher.

out of my research.<sup>70</sup> They will be mentioned only in the case of rare interaction with the core of the youth press, when some of them re-conceptualized into the second type of the youth press.<sup>71</sup>

This course was pursued by Zagreb's *Pitanja* in the mid 1970s, and to a much lesser degree by Ljubljana's *Problemi*. Others, like Belgrade's *Gledišta*, Zagreb's *Naše teme* or the federal journal *Ideje* remained throughout true to their "academic" origins.<sup>72</sup> Their atypical features were occasionally noticed: *Naše Teme* was formally excluded from the youth press when it changed its publisher from the youth union to the wider political body.<sup>73</sup>

### 3.2.2. Publication by territory

The second taxonomy breaks the umbrella term of the Yugoslav youth press into its local components. Accordingly, irrespective of any other differences, the publications from a single city are collectively named after that city. For example, the Belgrade youth press refers to all the journals produced by the Belgrade youth or student bodies.<sup>74</sup> Republican capitals in particular turned into major centers of the

---

<sup>70</sup> While it might be ambitious to see in them oppositional periodicals in the ranks of Ljubljana's *Perspektive* or Zagreb's *Praxis*, they were not without controversies. Unlike these, however, they shared one lasting feature of the youth press: with the partial exception of *Naše Teme*, they failed to receive any scholarly attention. See: Dag Strpić, *Kako smo rušili dogmatizam* (How We Destroyed Dogmatism) (Zagreb: Kulturni radnik, 1988)

<sup>71</sup> Such scenario was quite rare and, if successful, included rejuvenation of both content as well as staff.

<sup>72</sup> *Gledišta* was in fact a crossbreed. Jointly published by the Central Committee of the Serbian youth union and the Belgrade University (rather than its student union) it was equally a university periodical, similar to the likes of Zagreb's *Hrvatsko sveučilište*. Apart from those, one should mention Ljubljana's *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo* which started out in 1973 as an annual journal.

<sup>73</sup> In 1970 *Naše Teme* substituted its former publisher, youth union, with the widest public organization, Socialist Union of the Working People.

<sup>74</sup> Unlike many preceding labels, this one was widely used at the time, and emerged naturally as the outcome of the shared formative experiences, inter-communication and similar profile of the journals from the same city.

youth press since they housed numerous youth bodies due to the hierarchical federal system and the restricted university network.<sup>75</sup>

Three main groups in this respect were the Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana youth press. Their common institutional framework generated shared features that cut across narrow city borders. At the same time each of them was conditioned primarily by its own local context. Periodicals from the same city covered the same events, at times even sharing staff, facilities and formal authority. Finally, they were drawn together by the same perspective which increasingly shaped along republican lines as the decentralization of the state progressed.

During the period covered by this study, a changing relationship developed among the Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana youth journals, turning them into key analytical units. This interplay of differences and similarities ranged from solidarity and support to rivalry and hostility, reflecting the complexity of the late Yugoslav federation and should become evident in the chapter on student politicization.

For reasons mentioned earlier, this thesis is limited to the three main city presses playing a major role in all of the discussed processes. Yet, despite its minor importance, the regional press should be mentioned as well. Largely amounting to one journal per city, they include Novi Sad's *Indeksi*, Maribor's *Katedra*, Split's *Iskra*, Rijeka's *Val* as well as Sarajevo's *Dani*.<sup>76</sup> All of them shared some features of the youth press and will be occasionally mentioned in relevant sections, while the youth journals from other cities are less important.

---

<sup>75</sup> For example, as many as four relevant youth bodies (Ljubljana youth union, Slovenian youth union, Ljubljana student union and Slovenian student union) were based in Ljubljana alone, and issued between themselves four different journals (*Tribuna*, *Mladina*, *Problemi* and *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo*).

<sup>76</sup> All of the above were central organs, the first two of the student, and the others of the youth union of the mentioned cities. In addition, there were some regional examples of the second type of the youth journals, such as Sarajevo's *Lica* or Novi Sad's *Polja*.

### 3.2.3. Publications by publisher

The youth press can further be categorized with respect to the particular body it was attached to. The latter acted as its official publisher and was thus formally in charge of its editorial policy.<sup>77</sup> On the one hand, journals split into student press and youth press proper, depending on whether they were published under the auspices of a student or youth organization. In theory, each should have focused primarily on its own natural domain: the former on the student events, and the latter on the general youth issues. The vague official formula left, however, minor traces on the content, for the most part limited to the formal coverage of the respective adjoined organization.<sup>78</sup> Arguably, the least read section of the newspaper, it could be easily circumvented with related writing.<sup>79</sup> Hence, the joint term – youth press – was used commonly to encompass both youth and student journals.<sup>80</sup>

Along similar institutional lines, the youth press could also be classified into city, republican or federal journals, indicating the position of the publisher within the federal system.<sup>81</sup> Guidelines were similar but equally ineffective. In fact, city and republican journals were fully interchangeable. Far from accommodating their

---

<sup>77</sup> In accordance with the offered recipe, they named the editors of the journals and formed its Editorial Council.

<sup>78</sup> This included reports on congresses, assemblies as well as various formal proclamations. Consequently, this taxonomy refers solely to the central organs, since these alone provided such information.

<sup>79</sup> The extent in which the formal differences were ignored is illustrated by the extensive coverage of the student movement by the official youth journals which in no way hesitated to analyze student affairs. See: Chapter 5.

<sup>80</sup> Alternatively, the two terms were used interchangeably, merely adding to the existent definitional confusion. Thus while the first two authors outwardly discussed two different phenomena, Džuverović the student press and Lisičić the youth press, the actual disparity between them was minimal as they both referred to the same concrete journals, some of which were published by the youth and others by the student union. See: Džuverović, “Osobenosti studentske štampe,” 410-15; Lisičić, “O omladinskom tisku,” 195-223.

<sup>81</sup> This is another classification with limited scope. It bore no relevance to the student journals, attached to the student unions of the particular university. These were all of city rank and enjoyed clear dominance over the republican student bodies that were active only for a short period and never issued a single journal. However, the categorization here sporadically reached lower levels when the student union’s branches from certain faculties decided to publish their own journals. Most notable examples, mentioned in this thesis, are the journals of the student union’s branches from the Belgrade and Ljubljana’s Faculties of Philosophy respectively, *Frontisterion* and *SP*.

interests according to the jurisdiction of their publisher, they occasionally even turned the official recipe upside down.<sup>82</sup>

The two central federal journals, on the other hand, differed so much that they represent special cases and remain outside the very concept of the youth press. The first one, *Ideje*, the organ of the central umbrella student body, was a prime example of the previously described academic youth press, and as such is excluded from my research. And so is *Mladost*, the Belgrade-based journal of the federal youth union, albeit for different reasons. *Mladost* enjoyed a uniquely favored status among the youth press. Staffed by professionals and supported by a distinct publishing house of the same name, it operated like any other mainstream journal.<sup>83</sup>

Among the rare signs of *Mladost*'s institutional affiliation was its coverage of the central youth union's proceedings. Reports, however, never transgressed the "mouthpiece" pattern. Instead of asking questions, *Mladost* repeated sterile formal messages, remaining outside the ranks of journals that encouraged genuine youth politicization.<sup>84</sup> Paradoxically, this is also where the ideological duties stopped altogether. Lacking in both criticism and creativity, *Mladost* played safe, choosing to imitate rather than innovate. Topics like state-sponsored popular music, publicly acclaimed celebrities or teenage love problems were approached in sensational and paternalistic manner, evocative of the mainstream routines.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> Good examples are Zagreb's *Omladinski tjednik* and *Polet*. The first was a city journal but showed increasing interest in the broader republican arena. The latter, though of republican rank, followed extensively narrow urban issues. See Chapter 5 and Chapter 6.

<sup>83</sup> *Mladost* was the only youth journal placed under the joint authority of the youth union and publishing house that otherwise specialized in diverse publications loosely concerned with the youth. See among others: "Odluka Predsedništva Saveza omladine Jugoslavije o *Mladosti* – listu Saveza omladine Jugoslavije" (Decision of the Presidency of the Yugoslav Youth Union on *Mladost* – the Journal of the Yugoslav Youth Union), *Naša Štampa* 158 (May, 1968): 13.

<sup>84</sup> Though hardly an exception in this regard, *Mladost* stood out for its high rank. In a move suggestive of its special status, *Mladost* abandoned in 1968 its newspaper format and turned into a glossy magazine printed on high quality color paper, all of which were properties normally reserved within the youth press for publications with lesser circulation and frequency. Milosavljević, "Primjer proučavanja strukture lista pomoću analize sadržaja" 91.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 88-90.

The combination might have proved fruitful for the circulation figures that reached heights that the rest of the youth press could only dream of.<sup>86</sup> Nevertheless, it turned *Mladost* into an uninspiring mishmash between a mainstream tabloid and dreary youth bulletin that failed to interact with almost any of the practices associated with the youth press.<sup>87</sup>

*Mladost* was not alone in pursuing this course.<sup>88</sup> Either of their own will or pressured to do so, few other journals followed its example and at certain times tried to commercialize reproducing the same mainstream clichés.<sup>89</sup> Attempt was rarely successful since the journals were stripped of the advantages that *Mladost* had at its disposal.<sup>90</sup> More importantly, almost exclusively, it was made at the expense of losing all journalistic and political relevance, leaving these journals, along with *Mladost*, at the sidelines of the seminal processes occurring in the youth press.<sup>91</sup>

### 3.2.4. Mainstream commercial youth press

The foregoing interlude provided a logical step to the closing distinction in this catalogue. Namely, the youth press should be differentiated from the related mainstream commercial youth magazines produced by the big press enterprises. Trying to adjust their operation according to the rising market pressure, these slowly expanded their editorial policies to meet the readers' interests. In the process, as early

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 86.

<sup>87</sup> As such, *Mladost* cannot be treated as a genuine youth press journal. This attitude was certainly shared by the youth journals which had an active role in the student politicization. None of them perceived *Mladost* as their equal. Rather, they attacked it along with the rest of the mainstream press. The analysis of *Mladost* will thus be reduced mainly to the discussion of the youth press's rising hostility towards the dominant press production.

<sup>88</sup> Still, only for *Mladost* this was never a detour, but an enduring one-way route.

<sup>89</sup> Belgrade's *Susret* and Ljubljana's *Mladina* were among the journals that adopted such policy, the former following the forceful removal of its Editorial Board, the latter on its own will and on the longer run. See respectively, Huber, "Četiri decenije omladinske štampe u Srbiji," 106; Damjanić, "Vsebinske tendence časopisa *Mladine*," 255-62.

<sup>90</sup> "35 leta tednika *Mladina*. Nastanak in razvoj glasila Zveze socialistične mladine Slovenije," 45, 54.

<sup>91</sup> As the chapter on the punk-rock subculture will demonstrate, the commercialization in itself did not necessarily lead to the decline in journalistic value. Rather, what made the difference were the manner in which it was attempted, the used methods, surrounding issues and targeted audience. See Chapter 6.



as the mid-1950s, they began producing various magazines intended for the wide consumption of children and youth.<sup>92</sup>

Different institutional setting, purpose and economic status brought about several crucial distinctions that exclude them from the corpus of the youth press. In fact, they constituted a parallel media world in many ways.<sup>93</sup> For once, they enjoyed the full support of the big machineries of the major publishers. Unlike the youth press, they were created by experienced, qualified and high-skilled professionals.<sup>94</sup> In addition, they were virtually uninhibited by the open ideological responsibility for their readership. Stripped from the need to provide political guidance, they barely touched on socially relevant issues.<sup>95</sup> Instead, they fed on entertainment or education at best, spreading the seeds of Western pop-culture.<sup>96</sup>

The leverage between commercial and social values heavily favored the former. For the most part, the doctrine of social responsibility was implemented only indirectly, in the shape of special tax imposed on these journals, along with the rest of the downright commercialized press.<sup>97</sup> The effect was questionable, not so much because of its provisional character, as it only intensified their need to play up to readers' expectations and survive on the market.

---

<sup>92</sup> As such, these were an important element in the huge rise in the illustrated, special interest magazines that erupted from the early 1960s. See: Robinson, *Tito's Maverick Media*, 45, 51-52.

<sup>93</sup> In terms of research, however, the situation was less different. There exist not more than a few articles explicitly dedicated to these journals, easily traceable in the notes below. Youth magazines were widely considered parts of the entertainment press, and, if so, usually were treated jointly with it. See: "Ekspanzija i socijalna rasprostranjenost zabavne štampe u našoj suvremenosti" (Expansion and Social Distribution of Entertainment Press in Our Time), *Naše teme* 4-6 (1975): 1543-45.

<sup>94</sup> Publishers at times even formed bigger units around these and other entertainment periodicals. Notorious were Zagreb *Vjesnik's* departments for entertainment press and comics, both placed under the editorship of Nenad Brixy. See: Peršen, ed., *Vjesnikov leksikon*, 395, 549.

<sup>95</sup> For example, a text on the student movement could never appear in the mainstream youth magazine.

<sup>96</sup> See: Ivan Dukić, "Studio i Plavi vjesnik: pogled na istraživanja prodora i utjecaja zapadne popularne kulture u Hrvatsku (1963.-1965.)" (*Studio and Plavi vjesnik: A Look upon the Research on the Influence of the Western Popular Culture in Croatia (1963-1965)*), *Radovi* 29 (1996): 331-48.

<sup>97</sup> The impediment, introduced in 1972, came to be known under the derogative label the "pulp tax/law". See: "Zakon o oporezivanju knjiga, novina i drugih publikacija u prometu" (Law on the Taxing of Books, Newspapers and Other Publications in Circulation), *Službeni glasnik* 33 (1972): 6.

In fact, the whole body was very much attuned to the Western notions of youth press and graciously exploited related paradigms of “youth as fun” and “youth as commodity.”<sup>98</sup> Consequently, the chief criterion by which they were judged was the success on the market. And the achievements were rarely modest. Integrated within the large distributive networks, their circulation was incomparably greater when compared to those of the youth press.<sup>99</sup>

To make their products more competitive, big publishers eventually turned to familiar strategies in the market research. In the mid 1970s, faced with the failure of several of its youth editions, Zagreb’s *Vjesnik* tested out the pilot issue of its new youth journal in order to appraise its chances for commercial success.<sup>100</sup> The accompanying expertise included a detailed survey on the youth’s interests that illustrated the whole extent of the schizophrenia that had enveloped the Yugoslav press.<sup>101</sup> Namely, the study openly contested the core presumption underlying the concept of the youth press: the idea that the youth constitutes a distinct target reading group.<sup>102</sup>

The actual titles were numerous, but can be narrowed to three basic types, all to a large degree copy-pasted from abroad. By far the most popular were entertainment weeklies, among which Belgrade’s *Politikin zabavnik* and Zagreb’s *Plavi vjesnik*

---

<sup>98</sup> Likewise, these magazines were created by adults, similar to the Western press where the youth is typically denied its own voice and forced to construct its identity on the margins of society. See: Mazzarella, “Constructing Youth: Media Youth, and the Politics of Representation,” 242.

<sup>99</sup> The figures for the most popular magazines exceeded hundreds of thousands of copies. Peršen, ed., *Vjesnikov leksikon*, 356.

<sup>100</sup> The project never materialized since the estimated risks were considered to big. See: Vesna Lamza, ed., *Mladi i novine. Rezultati istraživanja provedenog povodom izdavanja oglednog primjerka omladinskog magazina "Ševa"* (Youth and the Newspapers: Results of the Research on the Exemplary Issue of the Youth Magazine *Ševa*) (Zagreb: NIŠP Vjesnik, 1977), 1-2.

<sup>101</sup> The study was conducted by the psychologists and sociologists employed in the *Vjesnik*’s department for market research and carries considerable scholarly value. *Ibid.*, 3-5.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 23; In yet another refutation of the youth press’s roots, the study proposed to assess the need of the market, rather than that of the society for the youth magazine. *Ibid.*, 1.

achieved the greatest recognition.<sup>103</sup> Filled with the mixture of interesting stories, adventure history writing, readers' letters, quizzes and comics they were intended primarily for school children.<sup>104</sup> Several others tried to reach different audiences. Worth mentioning is Zagreb's *Tina*, a pioneering project created in the best tradition of sentimental press that targeted adolescent girls with writings on love and fashion.<sup>105</sup>

Belgrade's *Džuboks* was for a long period the only existing Yugoslav rock journal and headed the group of specialized music magazines. Though not nearly as numerous, they nevertheless played an equally ground-breaking role in the spread of Western cultural forms.<sup>106</sup> Finally, abundant comic editions, of domestic and foreign origin alike, saturated the press scene from the early 1960s.<sup>107</sup>

As far as this thesis is concerned, these magazines are relevant for their ambivalent relationship with the youth press proper. Occasionally they were deplored by the youth press for their embrace of commercial (Western) values and lack of critical stance. At the same time, they shared common interests, somewhat paradoxically, linked precisely to pop-culture. *Džuboks*, in particular, interacted with the youth press of the late 1970s. Likewise, the input of the youth press in the realm of artistry cannot be appraised without taking into account the surrounding comic production. Personal

---

<sup>103</sup> Their titles reveal their publishers: *Politika* (Belgrade) and *Vjesnik* (Zagreb). Established during the inter-war period, *Polikin Zabavnik* was relaunched at the beginning of 1952 (still being issued) and was by a long way the most read of the kind with a circulation reaching 300 000 copies. On the other hand, *Plavi Vjesnik* (1959-1970) in its 1964 zenith averaged around 120 000 copies per issue. See respectively, *International Journal of Comic Art* 2 (2000): 99; Peršen, ed., *Vjesnikov leksikon*, 357.

<sup>104</sup> Other bigger journals of this type include Borba's *Kekec* (1957-1990) or more adult oriented *Politika's Zdravo* (1976-1981). *Vjesnik's* encyclopedic edition *Sve oko nas* (1970-1973) was published as a part of the wider Western European project made according to the Dutch license. See: Novak, *Hrvatsko novinarstvo u 20. stoljeću*, 583.

<sup>105</sup> *Tina* (1971-1976) reached its peak in 1974 with 80 thousand copies per issue. For the list of mainstream commercial youth journals of the late 1970s see: Lamza, ed., *Mladi i novine*, 20-26.

<sup>106</sup> While pop-music was widely covered by mainstream press, only a few specialized music journals emerged, most notably Novi Sad's *Ritam* (1962-1965) or Belgrade's *Džuboks*. The latter was issued in two periods, first in 1966-1969, and then in its most important phase from 1975 to 1986. On the music press in general and the first *Džuboks* see: Радина Вучетић, "Рокенрол на Западу Истока - случај *Џубокс*" (Rock and Roll on the West of the East – The *Džuboks* Case), *Годишњак за друштвеној историји* 1-3 (2006): 71-88.

<sup>107</sup> For a detailed list see Chapter 7. In addition, foreign youth press became widely available in the last decade of the Yugoslav youth press.

contacts were established too. Having learned “their trade” in the youth press, journalists frequently continued working in mainstream magazines, seeing no contradiction in such a move.<sup>108</sup> Accordingly, these journals will be treated either when discussing the infiltration of Western pop-culture into the Yugoslav mediascape, or when analyzing the youth press’s critique of the mainstream media.

---

<sup>108</sup> Zagreb rock journalists Dražen Vrdoljak and Darko Glavan exemplify this interaction between the youth press proper and the mainstream media, since they equally worked for both, often at the same time. See: “Kritičarski rad ne pamtim po neugodnostima” (I Don’t Recall My Reviewing Work to Be Unpleasant), *Slobodna Dalmacija* (4 March 2003): 6.

## 4. CHAPTER: INTERPRETATIVE MODEL

### 4.1. ALTERNATIVE MEDIA MODEL

During the 1960s the Yugoslav youth press distanced itself from its origins. The detour, however specific, does not represent a unique case in communist history. As the recent research showed, communist media in general did not fully correspond to the propaganda image created during the Cold War. The Yugoslav media had a leading role in this overall media evolution. Its departure from the Soviet model occurred at earlier point in time and was wider in range, more radical in degree and more diversified in manner. From the very beginnings, behind its iconoclastic practices stood the firm support of the new self-management matrix designed to redirect the structure of the whole society, media included, away from the Soviet experiences.

The so-called Yugoslav media theory facilitated the genesis of a great variety of the late socialist Yugoslav media. However, owing to its inner-contradictions, its analytic potential weakens when it aims to explain media, such as the youth press, specific for its puzzling blend of the initial propaganda purpose, marginal position and multi-fold journalistic relevance.

At the same time, this unique mix is too elusive to be incorporated within the tradition of oppositional communist media. With its strictly defined features, antagonistic intentions and unofficial publishing framework, *samizdat* is too narrow phenomenon to be identified with the Yugoslav youth press. Likewise, the related concept of non-communist public sphere, entirely independent from the state, proves equally unfitting. However, the fact that the youth press cannot be absorbed into the

*samizdat* tradition does not mean that the two share no similarities. As will become evident, both can be considered parts of the same wider media phenomenon.

Faced with these insufficiencies, in the following section I will construct an interpretative framework that will enable the understanding of the youth press while offering guidelines for its analysis. In order to find such a context it is necessary to move away from the presented traditions and, instead, rely upon one less known line of thinking that emerged on the other side of the Iron curtain. More precisely, I refer to the concept of alternative media that strives to create a distinct theoretical space for the discussion of media produced outside of the mainstream. I will provide a thorough look at the development of this concept, starting from the initial motives standing behind it, historical examples to the scholars relevant for its articulation into a useful analytical tool, applicable to a range of different media. In the conclusion, I will show how this model can be applied to the study of the Yugoslav youth press.

#### **4.1.1. Origins and place of alternative media within the media studies**

The origins of this concept lay in a stream of Western media studies that emerged as a response to the dominant functionalist view of the 1970s. According to its neo-Marxist critics, the latter stripped media of all influence of class and power.<sup>1</sup> Reacting to this forged idealized image, new critical scholars argued, using Althusserian vocabulary, that the ideological (state) apparatus cannot be studied without taking into account the surrounding political and economic structures and associated power relations, and that these could be observed in the mass media.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> More on the functionalist perspective on media in: Charles R. Wright, *Mass Communication: A Sociological Perspective* (New York: Random House, 1975), 26.

<sup>2</sup> See: Louis Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy* (London: New Left Books, 1971). Leaning on Althusser, critical media scholars acknowledged that media, like other institutions of cultural production, does not simply legitimize the views of the ruling elite, but is crucial for their production and the limitation of existing other options.

Acknowledging that even in the Western democracies the media is not an independent agent was but the first step. The second one came when the pessimistic view about the inevitable indoctrination was confronted by the new “resistance” school that revitalized Gramsci’s idea of counter-hegemony.<sup>3</sup> Contrary to Marx, Gramsci assumed that the spreading of the ruling ideology is applied by force only in rare cases. Typically, it disseminates through the existing institutions and discourses in such a subtle manner that it is normally accepted as common sense, and thus turns into hegemony.<sup>4</sup> But just because it disperses unnoticed does not mean that it could not be withstood. A complex battle is fought on the ideological level of cultural production whereby any mode of resistance represents counter-hegemonic strategy.<sup>5</sup>

In other words, the ruling ideas are not set out once and for all. On the contrary, they are open to reinterpretation and reproduced only to the extent to which dominant forces counteract adversary definitions. In the mid 1970s, this idea was picked up by the group of cultural Marxists gathered foremost around the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS).<sup>6</sup> These scholars revitalized cultural studies turning their attention to the non-mainstream representations embodied in the cultural and political forms that challenged the existing hegemony by their radically different meanings.<sup>7</sup> Among their best subjects were underprivileged social actors like

---

<sup>3</sup> See: Stuart Hall, “Cultural Studies and the Centre: Some Problematics and Problems,” in Stuart Hall et al., eds., *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies* (London: Hutchinson, 1980), 15-47.

<sup>4</sup> See: Carl Boggs, *Gramsci’s Marxism* (London: Pluto Press, 1976); Robert Bocock, *Hegemony* (New York: Tavistock Publications), 28-39.

<sup>5</sup> Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992).

<sup>6</sup> Graeme Turner, *British Cultural Studies: An Introduction* (London: Routledge, 1990), 177-81.

<sup>7</sup> Scholars associated with the CCCS, like Stuart Hall, Dick Hebdige or David Morley, investigated the relationship between media and ideology through semiotic analysis of the systems of signification in media texts. Their aim was to rediscover ideology as a concept that can reveal the ‘politics of signification’ of the media institutions. Dan Laughey, *Key Themes in Media Theory* (Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press, 2007), 60-61.

(working-class) youth, which led them to reinvent analytical concepts of youth subcultures and resistance, reviewed in the sixth chapter.<sup>8</sup>

Media-wise, however, the newly discovered space was used primarily for the critique of the mass media.<sup>9</sup> In that sense, critical scholars hardly distinguished themselves from the prevailing share of media studies of mainstream players alone. They too ignored marginal media practices, despite the fact that during the 1960s and 1970s they were faced, in their own backyard, with the two exceptional counter-examples to conventional media usage: the underground press and the fanzines respectively. Since the Yugoslav youth press shares some similarities with both of these genres they will be introduced here in more detail.

The first, the underground press, refers to the range of mostly US and British based magazines associated with the *New Left* student movement and the developing counterculture in the late 1960s. Making a break with the mainstream media, they adopted non-hierarchical organizational forms, distinct graphical outlook, different news values and one-sided, partisan pro-movement approach and content that went further than just filling in the gaps left behind by the mass media. All these unorthodox qualities were not adequately assessed.<sup>10</sup> The available literature is devoid of a consistent theoretical framework and provides a poor insight into the specificities of this press.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, prevalent disagreement regarding its main features offers a preview of the recurring problem concerning the definition of the alternative media.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> CCCS scholars analyzed the ways in which youth subcultures, using aspect of popular culture, can be turned into sites of resistance to dominant values and norms. See: Andy Bennett, Mark Cieslik, and Steven Miles, eds., *Researching Youth* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan: 2003): 187-188.

<sup>9</sup> James Lewes, *Protest and Survive: Underground GI Newspapers during the Vietnam War* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2003), 18.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 33-35. Lewes's volume made a significant contribution in that regard, though it dealt only with a tiny section of the underground press, namely, with magazines and newspapers created by the US troops.

<sup>11</sup> Existent monographs reflect primarily subjective prejudices of its authors, the active participants, supporters and adversaries alike. See for instance: Abe Peck, *Uncovering the Sixties: The Life and Times of the Underground Press* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985); Laurence Leamer, *The Paper*



Todd Gitlin's influential 1980 study *The Whole World is Watching* is a good illustration of the critical media scholars' neglect of the non-mainstream media.<sup>13</sup> Interested in the impact of the American media on the public attitude towards the anti-Vietnam War and the fate of the anti-war movement, Gitlin focused exclusively on the mass media.<sup>14</sup> He conceded that the underground journals were indispensable for the articulation of the counter-hegemonic demands of the anti-war movement, but only to eventually dismiss them as irrelevant since they failed to affect public opinion. The movement could not assert itself outside the dominant culture and, consequently, the influence of the underground press was easily subsumed and contained by the mass media.<sup>15</sup>

In a slightly different formulation, a similar argument underpins Dick Hebdige's discussion of another instance of media resistance: punk-fanzines. These were non-commercial, semi-amateur, self-produced booklets whose authors addressed, directly and without restrictions, a narrow circle of the like-minded adherents of the same subculture.<sup>16</sup> In his seminal work *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*, Hebdidge recognized in fanzines the media's equivalent of punk. Within the subculture itself,

---

*Revolutionaries. The Rise of the Underground Press* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972); Roger Lewis, *Outlaws of America: The Underground Press and its Contents: Notes on Cultural Revolution* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972); Robert Glessing, *The Underground Press in America* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970); Ken Wachsberger, ed., *Voices from the Underground: Insider Histories of the Vietnam War Underground Press. Vol. 1&2* (Tempe, AZ: Mica's Press, 1993).

<sup>12</sup> Definitional discrepancies had repercussions in the view of the actual publications that were encompassed under the underground press label. The problem concerned primarily the status of commercial underground magazines like *The Rolling Stone* that some considered the most important underground magazine, while the others dismissed altogether. See: Lewes, *Protest and Survive*, 34.

<sup>13</sup> Todd Gitlin, *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making & Unmaking of the New Left* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980).

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 15-16.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 3. Unburdened by methodological concerns, Gitlin revalued the underground press in a more positive light. See: Todd Gitlin, "The Underground Press and Its Cave-in," in Anne Janowitz and Nancy Peters, eds., *Unamerican Activities* (San Francisco: City Light Books, 1981), 21.

<sup>16</sup> Mitzi Waltz, *Alternative and Activist Media* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 29. In their beginnings, punk fanzines represented zones of free expression. Their success was enabled primarily by the Xerox revolution which hugely enhanced possibilities of reproduction. Eventually, fanzines spread to different musical genres and other spheres of interest. Good historical overview of the fanzine culture can be found in her Chapter 7, 77-86.

fanzines created a critical space capable of distorting dominant social values.<sup>17</sup> Yet, according to Hebdidge, this space exists only as long as it stays under the control of the subculture.<sup>18</sup> As soon as it comes under the spotlight of the mass media it disappears and the subculture becomes manufactured from above. Framed against the dominant messages, counter-hegemonic meanings are recuperated by the mass cultural industry, losing in the process initial subversive potential.<sup>19</sup>

Finally, John Fiske, another eminent scholar from the “resistance camp” rejected the non-mainstream media on a similar basis. While distinguishing its ability to create different news, he remained skeptical about its influence because of its narrow scope and instead chose to concentrate on the resistance readings by which the audience receives dominant media messages.<sup>20</sup>

#### **4.1.2. Devising a new model: novel conceptions of alternative media**

The minor influence and vulnerability of non-mainstream media dissuaded critical media scholars from its thorough research. Not surprisingly, this media appears only on the margins of the existing theoretical traditions.<sup>21</sup> Apart from sporadic and at times contradictory handbook definitions coupled with a few sketchy attempts, until the past decade there were hardly any systematic efforts to develop a theoretical frame for the analysis of this media.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Dick Hebdige, *Subculture, The Meaning of Style*, (London : Routledge, 2002), 111.

<sup>18</sup> Dick Hebdige, “The Meaning of Mod,” in Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson, eds., *Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain* (London: Routledge, 2002), 94.

<sup>19</sup> Hebdige’s analysis of *The Face* magazine, combining mainstream and alternative features, is guided by this debilitating feature of alternative media. See: Dick Hebdige, “The Bottom Line on Planet One: Squaring Up to *The Face*,” in *Hiding in the Light: On Images and Things* (London/New York: Routledge/Comedia, 1988), 155-76.

<sup>20</sup> Fiske was particular about alternative media’s capability to politicize the repression of events. See. John Fiske, “Popularity and the Politics of Information,” in Peter Dahlgren and Colin Sparks, eds., *Journalism and Popular Culture* (London: Sage, 1992), 45-63.

<sup>21</sup> Chris Atton, *Alternative Media* (London: Sage Publications, 2006), 7.

<sup>22</sup> For a typical handbook definition, according to which alternative media should advocate radical social change, pursue new directions in content and use democratic methods of production see: Tim O’Sullivan et al., *Key Concepts in Communication and Cultural Studies* (London: Routledge, 1994),

The ground-breaking effort in the creation of the model of alternative media was undertaken by another neo-Marxist, John Downing.<sup>23</sup> Leaning on anarchist principles, he developed the concept of radical media as a middle road between the capitalist and the transmission belt media.<sup>24</sup> Downing's model, even in its significantly expanded version, remains limited to the oppositional social movement media.<sup>25</sup> All the same, its true value lies in the introduction of notions like counter-hegemony, alternative public sphere and prefigurative politics that respectively refer to some of the crucial features of the radical media such as the subversive questioning of the mainstream media power, distinct space within which it operates and the attempt to practically implement progressive ideas it promotes.<sup>26</sup>

The author of another pioneer contribution, Stephen Duncombe, moved away from the strictly oppositional political content. Instead, dealing with fanzines, he located the "alternative" in the very act of amateur production (and the associated social relations) that removed established boundaries between the producers and consumers.<sup>27</sup> More importantly, along with Downing, he contradicted the belief in the exclusive relevance of big numbers which figures so prominently in the Western media studies.

---

10; Enzensberger's essay, on the other hand, differentiates from the rest for its attempt to accentuate some of the less obvious features of the alternative media, like its potential to re-form the public sphere because of the horizontal communicative linkages between the staff and the audience. See: Hans Magnus Enzensberger, "Constituents of a Theory of the Media," in *Raids and Reconstructions: Essays on Politics, Crime and Culture* (London: Pluto Press 1976), 20-53.

<sup>23</sup> John D.H. Downing, *Radical Media: The Political Experience of Alternative Communication* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1984). For a significantly revised and more accessible version see: John D.H. Downing et al., *Radical Media: Rebellious Communication and Social Movements* (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 2001).

<sup>24</sup> Accordingly, radical media should present multiple realities of oppression and is characterized by partisan approach that privileges movements over institutions. See: Downing et al., *Radical Media*, 17.

<sup>25</sup> The term refers to the small media that emerge around social movements. In the 2001 revised edition, Downing included artistic practices in his concept, but, again, only in so far as they are used by social movements. For a detailed look on the defining features see: Downing et al., *Radical Media*, ix-xi.

<sup>26</sup> A nice illustration of the latter is the US underground magazine *Rat* whose hard-line feminist personnel lived by the politics they preached. See: Angela Phillips, "The Alternative Press," in Kate Coyer, Tony Downum, and Alan Fountain, *The Alternative Media Handbook* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 52.

<sup>27</sup> Duncombe argues that a productive context can provide a radical equivalent of content and that fanzines can serve as a role model for empowering participatory cultural production and organization. Stephen Duncombe, *Notes from Underground: Zines and the Politics of Alternative Culture* (London: Verso, 1997), 129.

Recent works agree that cultural, social and political significance of certain types of media vastly surpasses its circulation.<sup>28</sup> Giving precedence to the latter ignores its other potentials. The concept fully evolved during the past decade with the crucial help of the new technologies that multiplied the possibilities of such enriching media practices. Differently titled new studies point to a varied character of these phenomena, seemingly re-opening the old problem of definition.<sup>29</sup> However, a detailed overview of the new literature reveals in the *radical alternative*, *activist*, *autonomous* or *citizen's media* merely sub-types of the same, wider phenomena.<sup>30</sup> The terminological confusion is primarily the result of different aspects that the authors emphasized, in accordance with their varied approaches, conditioned by the specific media that served them as primary sources.

Frequent mutual overlaps not only justify their joint treatment but enable the construction of the model of alternative media that successfully absorbs this complexity. While taking into account all new studies, the present review, in order to avoid repetition, primarily relies on the most systematic one, written by Chris Atton.<sup>31</sup> In correspondence with the purpose of this thesis, Atton's adaptable model can be applied to media developed in various contexts. Moreover, it remains receptive for new elements and easily accommodates the contributions of other researchers that will be indicated where relevant.

---

<sup>28</sup> See among others: Coyer et al., *The Alternative Media Handbook* (New York: Routledge, 2007), p.10.

<sup>29</sup> In addition to the already mentioned volumes by Downing, Atton and Coyer, Downmunt and Fountain see: Clemencia Rodriguez, *Fissures in the Mediascape: An International Study of Citizen's Media* (Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 2001); Mitzi Waltz, *Alternative and Activist Media* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005); Andrea Langlois and Frédéric Dubois, eds., *Autonomous Media: Activating Resistance & Dissent* (Montréal: Cumulus Press, 2005); Wilma De Jong, Martin Shaw, and Neil Stammers, eds., *Global Activism, Global Media* (London: Pluto Press, 2005); Nick Couldry and James Curran, eds., *Contesting Media Power: Alternative Media in a Networked World* (Lanham, Md./Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003).

<sup>30</sup> More on the problem of definition and diverse terminology, in: John D. H. Downing, ed., *Encyclopedia of Social Movement Media* (London: Sage Publications, 2011), xxv, 16.

<sup>31</sup> Atton, *Alternative Media*.

Relying on the tradition of critical media studies, Atton's inclusive model pays equal attention to the content as well as the process of production.<sup>32</sup> Basically, it encompasses the range of media projects that emerged as a response to dominant constructions and represent different ways of doing media.<sup>33</sup> Atton's alternative media resists mainstream discourses at several different levels: they treat topics normally excluded from the public scene, change the existing forms and give voice to those who are under/misrepresented.<sup>34</sup>

#### 4.1.3. Essential qualities of alternative media

Alternative media carries non-dominant and often subversive, counter-hegemonic messages. In the initial conceptualizations this was understood primarily on the level of explicit politics. Alternative media should thus promote radical, progressive and openly antagonistic political ideas. Moreover, it does not merely advocate social change but is actively involved in it, providing incentives for action and having a strong mobilizing potential.<sup>35</sup> As such, it emerges around social movements and in many ways depends on their vitality.<sup>36</sup>

Still, alternative media is not confined to the oppositional political media.<sup>37</sup> Fanzines (or stylistic magazines) that emerge around subcultures can just as easily possess emancipatory potential.<sup>38</sup> As Stuart Hall demonstrated, subcultures, together with their media, create room for the discourse of resistance. The multiple levels on

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 32.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 9-10, 15, 19.

<sup>35</sup> Atton calls this type of mobilizing content "information for action." Ibid., 85-88.

<sup>36</sup> In the most radical formulation, the alternative media turns into a social movement itself. See: Coyer et al., *The Alternative Media Handbook*, 10.

<sup>37</sup> Atton's model, more successfully than Downing's, encompasses all cultural forms of independent production and is applicable to a range of heterogeneous artistic and stylistic media. Atton, *Alternative media*, 7-8.

<sup>38</sup> Angela Phillips, "The Alternative Press", 49.

which alternative media can challenge hegemony is a new essential component in the recent analysis.

According to Couldry and Curran, its key defining feature is the ability to challenge, in whatever manner, the concentration of existing media power.<sup>39</sup> Others perceive it flourishing in the space of relative freedom and negotiation with institutional power.<sup>40</sup> Crucial is thus not the political orientation, but the tendency to pursue a critical agenda, guided by different news values and offering atypical solutions about what is usually considered as news, how are they presented and who creates them.<sup>41</sup>

In addition to new discourses, alternative media introduces new actors. Offering means of communication to the groups that are usually excluded from the media production, it subverts the usual hierarchy of access.<sup>42</sup> It gives a voice to those of low media status, reports stories from their perspective in which they are the main actors. Creating space for direct representation is particularly important to groups that are otherwise poorly served by media. Socially marginalized actors, like subcultures or dissidents, frequently become creative nuclei of the alternative media because it offers them a way to communicate, a chance to present their marginalized views, under their own conditions, to the wider community.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Couldry and Curran, eds., *Contesting Media Power*, 7; Elsewhere, Couldry placed the alternative media in the structural opposition to “the place of media power.” See: Nick Couldry, *Place of Media Power* (London: Routledge, 2000).

<sup>40</sup> Incidentally, and in relevance to the previous assertion, such space is often created by various social movements or subcultures. See: Coyer et al., *The Alternative Media Handbook*, 10.

<sup>41</sup> Atton, *Alternative Media*, 10, 16. The concept of alternative media thus encompasses an entire range of cultural, social and art publications, when these reflect new trends or pose challenges to the existing standards. In this perspective, *samizdat* can be regarded as a prime example of alternative media, something that Downing already noticed in his own terminology. Downing, *Internationalizing Media Theory*, 74-77.

<sup>42</sup> This assertion revisits the idea, put forward by the Glasgow Media Group, about privileged access to media by certain social groups. Glasgow University Media Group, *Bad News* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976), 245; Glasgow University Media Group, *More Bad News* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980), 114.

<sup>43</sup> Waltz, *Alternative and Activist Media*, 7-8.

For some, like Rodriguez, media empowerment is the essential feature of alternative media.<sup>44</sup> In the ideal case, this media can transform the communication process by breaking the traditional barriers between the audience and the staff, replacing them with dialogue. Along with the new actors come new forms of cultural capital, knowledge and professional authority.<sup>45</sup> In principle, alternative media is adorned by democratic participatory ethos and intellectual democracy, facilitating the flow of different ideas, worldviews and agendas.<sup>46</sup>

Finally, alternative media provides challenges on the level of form. Inclined to experiments and innovations, it changes standard forms of presentation using in the process various novel methods, from guerrilla semiotics and colloquial language to atypical visual imaginary and reproductive techniques.<sup>47</sup> Playing with forms can become an end in itself. Under the umbrella of alternative media one can find artistically driven media offering venues for research in the area of graphic design and artistic processes, for its own sake.<sup>48</sup> The fact that these innovations emerged as a response to dominant representations does not prevent them from becoming a target of major players. Mass media regularly takes over hip themes and forms, previously put

---

<sup>44</sup> Direct media participation creates the links between the media and community and promotes the identification of the speaker and the one being addressed. See: Rodriguez, *Fissures in the Mediascape*, 20.

<sup>45</sup> Elsewhere, cultural critics contended that non-dominant groups are equally capable of generating cultural capital. See: John Fiske, "The Cultural Economy of Fandom," in Lisa A. Lewis, ed., *The Adoring Audience: Fan Culture and Popular Media* (London: Routledge, 1992), 30-49.

<sup>46</sup> Atton, *Alternative Media*, 86-88.

<sup>47</sup> The creators of alternative media frequently use strategies akin to the surrealist traditions that blend art and political practices. Particularly popular is the so called *détournement* whereby certain aesthetic elements are taken out from their original contexts and then attached with radical messages, not intended by the initial creators. Waltz, *Alternative and Activist Media*, 111.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 3; Waltz notes few examples of such style/artistic focused media, such as *The Face*, *San Francisco Oracle*, *Émigré*, that converted artistic visions in media forms or searched for new visual styles. *Ibid.*, 67-68.

to the test by the alternative media. Moreover, it employs their creators, establishing permanent links between the alternative and mainstream realm.<sup>49</sup>

Most of these researchers agree that alternative media operates from the margins, but, unlike their predecessors, do not see this as a hindrance. The marginal status of alternative media is manifested in small circulation, distribution and finances, incomparable to those of the mainstream media.<sup>50</sup> During political crises, its existence is additionally endangered by state repression and censorship, determined to silence its hostile messages.<sup>51</sup>

However, as new studies stressed, the creators of alternative media are often content with the limited existence within its own marginalized sphere.<sup>52</sup> Poor finances often reflect a conscious non-profit orientation. Guided by prefigurative politics, they adopt non-hierarchical organizational structures that rely on collective decision making, job rotation and fluid staff membership. While detached from standard notions of professionalism, this unorthodox economics of production often proves favorable for the development of new media skills.<sup>53</sup>

In general, alternative media can be recognized by some of the following features: radical content (political, social and cultural), different news values, openness to experiments in form and expression, strong aesthetic dimension (graphics, reproductive innovations), unconventional production methods, non-hierarchical

---

<sup>49</sup> A detailed insight into the recuperation of ideas and personnel between the alternative and mainstream media, along with the consequences of this process can be found in: Waltz, *Alternative and Activist Media*, 109-118.

<sup>50</sup> Coyer et al., *The Alternative Media Handbook*, 1.

<sup>51</sup> Atton, *Alternative Media*, p.19.

<sup>52</sup> The concept of the sub/alternative public sphere will be referred to in more detail in the final section. For this purpose see Nancy Fraser, "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy," in Craig Calhoun, ed., *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 1992), 109-142.

<sup>53</sup> Alternative media protagonists, for instance, often use innovative methods of distribution, such as street-vendors. Atton, *Alternative Media*, 46.



internal organization and transformative communicative processes emphasizing horizontal relations between audience and staff.<sup>54</sup>

In reality, however, one can expect to find only hybrid forms. The search for the perfect alternative media comprising all of the elements above is doomed to fail. Alternative media breaks the rules, but rarely all of them. Atton's crucial insight lies exactly in the fact that the failure to do so in one aspect in no way excludes the subversive potential in the other.<sup>55</sup>

#### **4.2. APPROACHING YUGOSLAV YOUTH PRESS AS ALTERNATIVE MEDIA**

The alternative media model has an exceptional analytical power that allows it to gather, under the common theoretical umbrella, a mixture of marginal media practices that usually remain at the fringes of scholarly interests. The great reach of this model has, as its consequence, a great diversity of possible approaches. In fact, there is no single way to frame alternative media. Just the opposite: the more varied the approach is, the more it will elucidate all the specificities of the particular media.<sup>56</sup> The scheme of four possible approaches proposed by Guedes Bailey, Cammaerts and Carpentier represents the best methodological answer to this problem.<sup>57</sup> With certain adjustments, their scheme, applicable to a broad range of media, can serve as a starting point for the analysis of the Yugoslav youth press, in the same way as Atton's model provided it with the appropriate theoretical frame.

---

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., 27.

<sup>55</sup> For instance, alternative media can be radical regarding social engagement while mainstream in its communication processes or vice versa. See: Ibid., 28-29.

<sup>56</sup> Olga Guedes Bailey, Bart Cammaerts, and Nico Carpentier. *Understanding Alternative Media* (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2008), 5, 150. Multiple approaches correspond to the wide array of actual alternative media practices with their numerous different features and aspects.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 3-34.

#### 4.2.1. Four approaches to the alternative media

The first approach within this scheme observes the alternative media from the aspect of the community that it addresses and whose media voice it creates; in short, as a community media.<sup>58</sup> Accordingly, after determining the type of the targeted community, the focus then moves on the strategies of its (self)-representation and attempts to create collective identity.<sup>59</sup> More concretely, this study should inspect the *youth* part of the Yugoslav youth press and examine the extent to which it was open towards specific voices, representations, ideologies and interests of the Yugoslav youth. If relevant, one should also assess the level of micro-participation of the community, in this case the youth, in the media production.<sup>60</sup>

The second approach searches for the “alternative” in the youth press, perceiving it either as a corrective or a direct critique of the mass media.<sup>61</sup> Here, the attention is turned towards its transformative potential, whether at the level of content, outlook or practices that modify traditional roles and social relations. By portraying a variety of new topics, forms, ideas, types of expression, visual styles and strategies tested out in the youth press, the study will appraise its capacity to create room for experiments and innovations and diversify the existent Yugoslav mediascape.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 7-15. The authors show how this affects different concepts of community, from those geographically and ethnically defined to interpretative and cultural entities, so called communities of meaning. Ibid., 7-10.

<sup>59</sup> As noted before, the ability to articulate the interests of the community and to express ones’ own identity is especially relevant for groups that are marginalized, one-sidedly or wrongly represented by media. Ibid., 14.

<sup>60</sup> More precisely, this refers to the question whether and, if so, to what extent the media converts the usual one-way communication into a two-way process, where the audience turns into communicators. Ibid., 10, 13.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 15.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 20. As a critique of the mainstream media, alternative media questions the existing media power and engages in an ideological struggle over meanings and hegemony, where the major battlefield is representation. See: Stuart Hall, “Signification, Representation, Ideology: Althusser and the Post-structuralist Debates,” in James Curran, David Morley and Valerie Walkerdine, eds., *Cultural Studies and Communications* (London: Arnold, 1996), 31.

The third approach recognizes in the alternative media a part of the civil society.<sup>63</sup> If the term is taken tentatively, the point here is to assess the democratic potential of this media, its ability to extend media freedom and feed the debate with actors and topics seldom present in the public. This is crucial since alternative media often embodies social structures with liberating potential that endanger the authorities, forcing them to counter-react and unleash their repressive mechanism.<sup>64</sup> The analysis of the youth press will thus be guided primarily by its role in the articulation of the contested Yugoslav student movements and the youth punk-rock subculture. In conclusion, its contribution to the creation of a new, distinct youth public sphere will be put under scrutiny.

Finally, the fourth approach corresponds to the new element in recent studies: contingency of the alternative media.<sup>65</sup> While the previous concepts insisted on its constant opposition, the new ones emphasize fluid boundaries.<sup>66</sup> The three authors convincingly argue that its distinctive nature does not exclude links (organizational, thematic, staff-wise) with the mainstream media, nor it forces it to operate outside the existing power structures. Rather, alternative media is capable of forming various relations with the mass media and state at large, without necessarily losing its own

---

<sup>63</sup> Bailey et al., *Understanding Alternative Media*, 20-25. The authors treat alternative media as the middle voice between the society and the market. The term civil society should be understood primarily as a reflection of the authors' post-communist perspective in which the liberal-capitalist media enjoy unquestionable dominance. In its essence, it points to the alternative media's potential to serve as a place for counter-hegemonic resistance by certain social groups through various discursive practices.

<sup>64</sup> Phrased differently, this approach is interested in the close ties between the alternative media and marginalized collective actors, formed as the result of its orientation towards disadvantaged social groups and mobilizing political content, whose liberating potential contribute to the overall democratization.

<sup>65</sup> Leaning on Derrida's metaphor of rhizome, the authors tried to capture with this "rhizomatic" approach fluidity and elusiveness of the alternative media. *Ibid.*, 27-30. It can safely be argued that these movable internal boundaries stand in the background of the recurrent problem of defining the alternative media.

<sup>66</sup> Illustrative for the mentioned "contingency turn" is a revised Downing's volume, informed by the fresh insight that "everything is, at some point, alternative to something else" or, in another version, that "what is alternative at one point is mainstream in another." See: Downing et al., *Radical Media*, ix.

identity or destabilizing, counter-hegemonic potential.<sup>67</sup> In the case of the Yugoslav youth press, this approach then observes its interplay between resistance and cooperation, so important because of its institutional position within the state apparatus. Unlike most of the historical alternative media, the youth press was produced and sponsored by the state. Yet, as will be seen, this never diminished its capacity to subvert and contravene a wide array of ruling norms.

These four approaches do not exclude each other. On the contrary, they are complementary. Ideally, the study of alternative media would combine all of the mentioned strategies. It should look at its ties with the targeted community, reveal its proximity with the insolent movements and subcultures, expose the innovations and experiments that distinguish it from the rest of the media and reveal the wider context in which it operates.<sup>68</sup>

#### **4.2.2. Yugoslav youth press as the alternative media**

When applied to the youth press, the formula reads as follows. By determining its creators and envisaged audience, a number of things could be said about the status, composition, and preferred representations of the late socialist Yugoslav youth. Through examining its paramount role in the local student movements and punk-rock subculture, key insights can be gained into the depth of its challenge to the state ideology that disclose a major turn from direct political to subversive cultural youth defiance occurring within a single decade. Finally, description of novelties tried out in the youth press should enlighten its contribution to the Yugoslav media as a whole. In doing so, one needs to constantly keep in mind its central institutional position as well as the interaction with the neighboring media outlets. Only then the outcome will be a

---

<sup>67</sup> Bailey et al., *Understanding Alternative Media*, 28.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 5, 150.

realistic appraisal of the youth press that goes beyond simplified notions of total opposition or complete obedience that dominate the scholarship on communist media.

Rather than being media-centered, this multifaceted approach is sensitive to the surrounding social, political and historical context. In that way, it allows the researcher to go beyond the media and discuss the processes in which the youth press played a part. Conversely, it addresses the crucial question of the applicability of this model to the phenomena developed in different environment.

Although based on the Western experiences, the concept is perfectly suitable for a qualitative analysis of the Yugoslav youth press and offers an appropriate frame for understanding its distinctive properties. As the following three chapters will show, instead of serving as a propaganda tool, the youth press represented alternative media *par excellence*, characterized by a surprising number of the aforesaid features. The fact that it emerged in communist settings, strikingly different from those in which the concept is originally rooted, can only add new dimensions to the Atton's model.

The application of this model to media such as the youth press, which emerged in a different ideological context, brings additional value. It can force us to reconsider what we know about communist media in general and help us to distance ourselves from typical bipolar images that rely either on Soviet propaganda model or its direct opposite, *samizdat*.<sup>69</sup>

In addition, the communist framework removes some limitations with which researchers in the past approached the alternative media, namely those regarding its minor influence and vulnerability. Such dismissal makes little sense in societies that by default aspired to uniformity and were marked by ambition to attain total

---

<sup>69</sup> Sparks and Downing argue that the fall of communism posed serious challenges to Western media theory, too narrowly based on the "self-understood" American concepts. In this regard, the study of the alternative communist media in particular can be fruitful for gaining new insights. See: Sparks, "Media Theory after the Fall of European Communism," 29; Sparks, *Communism, Capitalism and the Mass Media*, 21; Downing et al., *Radical Media*, 196, 229.

information control. Even in Yugoslav communism, with all its heterodoxy, any dissonant voice, no matter how marginal, gained in importance, particularly when it appeared in the very heart of the regime. Likewise, the communist milieu renders irrelevant yet another objection, the one regarding the containment of alternative meanings by the mainstream media. If such containment occurred, it only enriched dominant practices, which was significant in itself considering the proclaimed one-sidedness and pre-destined future of the communist regimes.

## **PART II – YOUTH PRESS AS ALTERNATIVE MEDIA**

### **[Construction and Representation of the Yugoslav Youth from New Left to Punk Rock]**

The first part of the thesis explained the propagandistic background of the youth press, outlined the basic elements that facilitated its evolution and concluded by sketching a new frame for its analysis. Leaning on these parameters, the second part has a somewhat different accent and purpose. If the first part pointed to the new conceptual media horizons emerging from the Yugoslav interpretation of the Soviet heritage, this second part implements them in practice, showing how the resulting hybrid played out. Whereas the first four chapters described the idiosyncratic Yugoslav communist road, the following three take up the same theme, but bring it to another level, displaying the ensuing Yugoslav inner-diversity.

After years of marginal existence, noteworthy only for breeding occasional cultural initiatives, the Yugoslav youth journals from the late 1960s began to challenge and oppose a number of official discourses and practices. Throughout the rest of the thesis, I explore this extraordinary process, presenting the Yugoslav youth press as the alternative media that acted from the margins to produce radical and subversive political, cultural/artistic and media messages. The stress is on the active role of their authors and, consequently, throughout the whole part, the narrative is complemented with the detailed first hand insights of the youth journalists.

Moreover, by choosing the context sensitive approach, the subsequent chapters aim to make a significant contribution to the history of communist Yugoslavia. I use the youth press to offer a new, more nuanced and comparative perspective on the late

socialist Yugoslav youth and its key achievements on which the journals had a profound impact. The proposed goals are closely interrelated. The challenge posed by the youth press can only be understood, if the publications themselves are examined in light of their late socialist context.

Each chapter discusses one particular aspect of the youth press, constituting a clear cut thematic unit that complies with both of these objectives. This is especially true with the first two that address the two core interests of the youth press, both seminal to its emergence into a relevant media actor. The extensive fifth chapter concentrates on the crucial initial step whereby the youth press, at the end of the 1960s, redefined and diverged from its Soviet origins. I will show how the youth journals, exploiting the reform of the youth unions, developed a fresh rebellious political voice, becoming heavily intertwined with the burgeoning student politics and the sprouting student movements that erupted in Yugoslavia in the late 1960s and the early 1970s.

The sixth chapter resumes after a period of crises caused by the political repression of the early 1970s. Here I look at the way in which the achieved legacy was reshaped in the latter part of the 1970s to fit the new circumstances and the remaining subcultural realm. The chapter examines the quintessential contribution of the youth press in the making of Yugoslav punk-rock and its surrounding lifestyles.

Both chapters shed new light on these two phenomena which helped the youth press to acquire an alternative voice: the student politics from the late 1960s and the punk-rock subculture of the subsequent decade. When combined, they roughly divide the time span of the thesis into two parts, with the historical progress highlighting the indicative shift in the youth's interests in this period.

That being said, the chapters vary in their scope, style and stress, placed on different aspects. The analysis had to accommodate for the fact that the role of the



youth press was not the same in each instance. Whereas a wide range of youth journals got involved in the students' political upsurge, only a few contributed to the birth of punk-rock. Likewise, though already present in the first stage, the accompanying innovations in style, content and processes of production were more prominent during the second one.

In addition, the uneven available literature in each of these fields determined the extent and manner in which the present gaps needed to be filled, and the ruling misperceptions contravened and amended. While I expand the existing research on both the student movement and punk-rock subculture, the accent is different in each case. The fifth chapter constructs a new, threefold course of the Yugoslav student politicization. Devoting strong attention to the mutual interaction of motives and ideologies across the three republics it provides a new timeline of the relevant events. In contrast, the sixth chapter moves away from the chronology and, instead, offers an in-depth theoretical reading of the punk-rock's arrival in the Yugoslav socialist environment.

Finally, in order to gain full insight into a range of challenges provided by the youth press and thus illustrate a stunning variety of its contributions, the last chapter turns away from the content as such. Here I supplement the review of its input to the Yugoslav mediascape, by observing the visual and artistic forms and expressions tried out by the youth journals. These not only constitute a major part of their legacy, but add a new and different dimension to the main argument about the alternative youth press.

## **5. CHAPTER: THE ORGAN OF THE STUDENT MOVEMENT (1968-1972)**

This comprehensive chapter has two major objectives. First and foremost, it portrays the Yugoslav youth press as the alternative political media that closely interacted with the rising Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana student movements of the late 1960s and the early 1970s. Over the next 80 pages, I demonstrate how the youth press turned into a relevant political actor that provided defiant political messages which deeply critiqued the fundamentals of the Yugoslav socialist society. In doing so, the Yugoslav youth press showed extreme determination and willingness to engage in confrontations with the mainstream press, its publisher and the authorities at large.

By studying this exceptional political behavior of the youth press, I will also meticulously explore these movements themselves, along with the surrounding process of politicization. I will reconstruct their course and elaborate their diverse profile and the ideological background, comparing them with each other and with their Western counterparts. Since the two goals are complementary, the major share of this parallel examination is integrated.

I start out by reflecting on the scarce research on the Yugoslav student movement, go on to sketch its short outline and add a few theoretical thoughts on the ambiguous interrelation between the media and social movements in general. All of this should facilitate the understanding of the core sections of the chapter where I deal with the youth press's manifold role in the anticipation, organization and articulation of the Yugoslav student political upheaval from the late 1960s and the early 1970s.

In contrast to the existent research, this complex analysis acknowledges the inner diversity created by the Yugoslav federal framework and is, consequently, split in three individual sections, each devoted to one student movement, in Belgrade, Zagreb

and Ljubljana. For each movement, I scrutinize the dominant issues and strategies used by the journals to formulate, radicalize and defend the students' political goals. Moreover, in each case I trace the whole process of politicization for as long as it transgressed the usual parameters, regardless whether it resulted in fully fledged movement. Finally, I closely follow the counter-reaction of the regime which habitually responded to the new messages by repressive measures.

While the spotlight is firmly on politics, the chapter does not neglect the accompanying cultural echo. The last analytical section thus exposes the youth press's attempt to offer an appropriate cultural response to the ongoing political explosion. Here exceptionally, the overlap between the responses across the three centers along with their inconsistent nature necessitates joint treatment. Last of all, I look more closely to the youth journalists themselves and conclude with some comparative remarks.

## **5.1. YUGOSLAV STUDENT MOVEMENTS (1968-1972)**

### **5.1.1. Research literature**

Writing about the Yugoslav student movements from the late 1960s and the early 1970s turned into a taboo right after their abrupt repressive end. The harsher the Party verdict, the stronger it was stigmatized, and the interpretive freedom limited.<sup>1</sup> Whereas the research on the interwar student movement blossomed, contemporary turbulence remained trapped between the official, pre-determined critical appraisal and the sole revisionist interpretation that broke through.

---

<sup>1</sup> The univocal censure of the Zagreb student movement left minimal room for analysis. The ambivalent stance towards the Belgrade case resulted in latent misunderstandings about its nature. Finally, relatively benign view of the Ljubljana students opened up the broadest, though not realized, opportunities. The limited existing literature is listed further below.

The scholarship did not respond favorably to the post-communist context either. The movements' marginal position within the new national narratives and the ambiguous political careers of their major leaders helped to prolong the research gap up to the present. For almost four decades after the original events took place, we are left with no more than a single comparative attempt and a few works that often best serve as primary sources.<sup>2</sup>

Not surprisingly, the Yugoslav student movement is indicatively missing from the abundant comparative literature on the global youth turmoil of the time.<sup>3</sup> This comes as something of an irony, since one of the main lessons drawn from the global movements should be applied to the Yugoslav case. Indeed, as the plural form from the subtitle suggests, it is incorrect to speak of a single process. Instead, one deals here with a composite phenomenon which next to a range of common features displays a range of local ones.<sup>4</sup> The indigenous student politicization erupted in all three major Yugoslav university centers, Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana, each having its own specific manner of expression, ideology and chronology.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Up until very recently, the scholarship was dominated by the two early titles, both published under the auspices of the Marxist *Praxis* circle, widely regarded as the intellectual inspiration of part of the revolting students. As such, both were censored at the time. The first one, a comprehensive collection of documents from 1970, remains the main source on the early course of the protest. One of its editors, Nebojša Popov, a *Praxis* Marxist himself, is the chief scholar of the movement in which he recognized a critical force that tried to revitalize Yugoslav communism, which he claimed was saturated by Stalinist deviations. Popov's study is instructive, though not without shortcomings. Regardless of his unique, comparative ambitions, he focuses mainly on Belgrade, while his fragmentary treatment of Ljubljana and Zagreb events is one-sided at best. Moreover, his crude Marxist framework prevented him from recognizing the movement's economic naivety, centralist overtones and rigid intolerance towards liberal and national ideas. See respectively: *Zbornik: Dokumenti Jun-Lipanj 1968*. (Collection of Documents: June 1968) (Zagreb: *Praxis*, 1971); Nebojša Popov, *Sukobi: Društveni sukobi – izazovi sociologiji* (Conflicts: Social Conflicts – Challenges to Sociology) (Beograd: Centar FDT, 1990).

<sup>3</sup> For the exception, a rudimentary overview, one customarily focused on Belgrade, see: Boris Kanzleiter, "Yugoslavia," in Martin Klimke and Joachim Scharloth, ed., *1968 in Europe: A History of Protest and Activism, 1956-77* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 219-28; More helpful is Kanzleiter's recent article: "1968 in Yugoslavia: Student Revolt between East and West," in Martin Klimke, Jacco Pekelder and Joachim Scharloth, eds., *Between Prague Spring and French May: Opposition and Revolt in Europe, 1960-1980*. (New York: Berghahn, 2011), 84-100.

<sup>4</sup> Klimke and Scharloth, ed., *1968 in Europe*, 1-7.

<sup>5</sup> Turmoil that sporadically broke out at other regional university centers, such as Novi Sad, Split, Sarajevo or Priština never evolved into fully-fledged movements, comparable to those discussed. For more about the mistreatment of the Zagreb and Ljubljana movements see the next sections.

This is an essential premise of this entire chapter that contradicts the ruling fragmentary perception in the research literature. Indeed, with but a few exceptions, the Yugoslav student movement is commonly reduced to its initial peak, a seven-day 1968 June unrest in Belgrade, with some minor resonance in other cities. Alternatively, those rare attempts to follow the wider subsequent politicization focus almost exclusively on Belgrade alone.<sup>6</sup>

To a large extent this approach is a direct legacy of the *Praxis* Marxist interpretation that first contradicted the official Party verdict and dominates the scholarship to this day.<sup>7</sup> Interested in one particular type of leftist student politics that flourished mainly in Belgrade, the *Praxis* narrative carries an ideological baggage of its own. Namely, it offers a partial reading of the student movement as the expression of *Praxis*'s own, self-idealized yearning for humanist socialism.<sup>8</sup> Almost by default, it leaves out everything that does not fit in this frame.<sup>9</sup>

The other two student movements are thus typically ignored, each for its own reasons. The one in Zagreb is, as a rule, excluded from the common student struggle.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> See: Boris Kanzleiter and Krunoslav Stojaković, eds., *1968 in Jugoslawien, Studentenproteste und kulturelle Avantgarde zwischen 1960 und 1975* (Bonn: Dietz Verlag, 2008); Boris Kanzleiter, *Die "Rote Universität". Studentenbewegung und Linksopposition in Belgrad 1964-1975* (Hamburg: VSA Verlag, 2011).

<sup>7</sup> Based in both Zagreb and Belgrade, the group of revisionist Marxists gathered around the philosophic journal *Praxis* is engulfed with controversies and represented yet another research taboo. Still, unlike the student movement it is discussed in the foreign literature. More in: Gerson Sher, *Marxist Criticism and Dissent in Socialist Yugoslavia* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977); James H. Satterwhite, *Varieties of Marxist Humanism: Philosophical Revision in Postwar Eastern Europe* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1992).

<sup>8</sup> For the alternative interpretation that corresponds to the ambivalent Party's view of the Belgrade movement, that accepted its goals, while discarding its methods, see: Mirko Arsić and Dragan R. Marković, *'68: studentski bunt i društvo* ('68: Student Revolt and Society) (Beograd: Istraživačko izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1988).

<sup>9</sup> Within the post-communist ignorance of the Belgrade protest, random new titles rarely added fresh illuminating insights. The exception is the valuable compilation of testimonies by a range of contemporary actors: Đorđe Malavrazić, *Šezdeset osma – lične istorije: 80 svedočenja* (Sixty Eight – Personal Histories: 80 Testimonies) (Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2008); See also: Radmila Radić, *1968 - četrdeset godina posle = 1968 - Forty Years Later*, (Beograd: Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije, 2008).

<sup>10</sup> A typical example is the aforementioned Popov's study, which, while not discounting its whole evolution altogether, reduces it to the Zagreb June 1968 events. These are seen favorably, but framed as part of the Belgrade 1968 unrest. Conversely, he views the later national climax as the abstraction, basically repeating the Party's negative assessment: Popov, *Sukobi*, 39-42; 213-24.

Virtually outlawed after its suppression, the movement is practically unknown in the literature and scarcely addressed ever since.<sup>11</sup> A few available sporadic accounts tend to focus solely on its final national segment, treating it within the context of the Croatian Spring, a broad process of democratization, liberalization and national enthusiasm that engulfed the Republic.<sup>12</sup> While such an approach acknowledges the movement's external dimension, it neglects a long politicization that preceded it and, in many ways, prepared it, regardless of its different ideology.<sup>13</sup>

On the other hand, the Ljubljana student movement is overlooked altogether, reflecting a general scholarly disregard for Slovenian developments, wrongly dismissed as peripheral.<sup>14</sup> Due to its belated outbreak, smaller magnitude and the fewest related controversies, the movement failed to attract the attention outside its republican borders. Regrettably so, since it adds another interesting dimension to the fabric of Yugoslav student political trends. Last but not least, the literature

---

<sup>11</sup> Up until recently potential researcher could rely solely on a miniscule collection of press articles, published back in 1971. A recent popular monograph only partially amended this situation as it provided most general, if incomplete, overview aimed at the wider rather than scholarly audience. See in turn: *Preporod hrvatskih sveučilištaraca: Anatomija slučaja Čičak* (Croatian Students' Renaissance: The Anatomy of the Čičak Case) (Zagreb: Kritika, 1971); Tihomir Ponoš, *Na rubu revolucije - studenti '71* (On the Edge of the Revolution – Students '71) (Zagreb: Profil International, 2007).

<sup>12</sup> The Croatian Spring was equally surrounded by controversies and at the time proscribed by a harsh Party verdict. Accordingly, the lack of research on the Zagreb student movement is related to the scholarly fate of the Croatian Spring. Despite its strong national tone, the revisionist post-communist Croatian scholarship failed to produce new insights into the process whose leaders ended up on the wrong side in the upcoming changes. More on the treatment of the Croatian Spring and the student movement, in: Marko Zubak: "The Croatian Spring 1967-1971: Testing the Pitfalls of the Croatian Historiography and Beyond", *East Central Europe/L'Europe du Centre Est, Eine wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift* 1 (Feb. 2006), 191-226.

<sup>13</sup> In Zagreb too the uproar began in 1968 in a direct response to the Belgrade events. Ponoš included these beginnings in his narrative, but failed to pursue the politicization in its full length.

<sup>14</sup> This is why an extensive collection of documents from the early 1980s remains a key source into the phenomenon. The censorship was nevertheless present. A sketchy chronology of the movements' climax, written by one of the participants, had to wait for more than a decade to be published. Finally, post-1990 scholarship could boast with only one fresh insight, focusing on the process of the university reform. See: Ciril Baškovič et al., *Študentsko gibanje 1968-72* (Student Movement 1968-72) (Ljubljana: Krt, 1982); Iztok Ilich, ed., *Pričevanja študentske pomladi* (The Testimonies on the Student Spring) (Ljubljana: Partizanska knjiga, 1986); Bogomir Mihevc, "Študentske kritike in predstave o študiju in univerzi" (Student Criticism and Notions on the Study and the University) (Ph.D. diss., Univerza v Ljubljani, 1995).

consistently ignored the cultural side of the student movements and, at best, pointed out its marginal impact, failing to offer any deeper insights.<sup>15</sup>

### 5.1.2. General overview

While this chapter proposes to amend the perplexed perception of the Yugoslav student upsurge that stems from this literature, a few, more general features need to be stated in advance. As will be seen, all three student movements arose through a specific blend of foreign influence and domestic content. To an extent, they were local expressions of the global student uprising whose ideology and iconography inspired the emerging local drive. In turn, the movements broke out against the background of deep internal Yugoslav social and economic reforms instituted in the mid and late 1960s. For the later stages, especially important was the introduction of the constitutional changes aimed at the greater federalization of the state.<sup>16</sup> Around the same time the group of younger, more liberal Republican Party leaders stepped on to the political stage. In the Croatian case, the combination resulted in the outburst of the national movement known as the Croatian Spring.<sup>17</sup>

These changes had a twofold effect. They profoundly democratized the political life of the country which flourished until the onset of political crisis in 1972. By the

---

<sup>15</sup> The fragmentary literature on the local student movements excludes their cultural side almost as a rule and, at best, merely point out its marginal role, without offering any actual insights. See: Žarko Puhovski, “Junski sukob 1968” (June Confrontation 1968), *Pitanja* 5-6 (1988): 99-103.

<sup>16</sup> As stated earlier, the reform of the youth unions was a constituent part of this wider reformist project which intensified after the dismissal of the centralist hard-liner, interior minister Aleksandar Ranković. More on the process in: Sabrina P. Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia: 1962–1991* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992); Steven L. Burg, *Conflict and Cohesion in Socialist Yugoslavia. Political Decision Making since 1966* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983).

<sup>17</sup> In all three major republics, the process had the same, dramatic outcome. Following the brief wave of liberalization, the young guard of political leaders was forced to resign at the beginning of 1970s, turning the process into another neglected research topic. For the most notorious Croatian case, named in the analogy with the Prague Spring, see: Ante Cuvalo, *The Croatian national movement 1966–1972* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990); for Serbian and Slovenian cases see: Slavoljub Đukić, *Slom srpskih liberala: tehnologija političkih obračuna Josipa Broza* (The Breakdown of the Serbian Liberals: The Technology of Josip Broz’s Political Confrontations) (Belgrade: Filip Višnjić, 1990); Božo Repe, “‘Liberalizem’ v Sloveniji” (“Liberalism” in Slovenia), *Borec: revija za zgodovino, literaturo in antropologijo* (Ljubljana: RO ZZB NOV Slovenije, 1992): 673-949.

same token, they widely exposed the intrinsic contradictions of the Yugoslav society that was defined by both self-management democracy and one-Party rule, market reforms and planned economy, confederal and centralist elements. It was this inbuilt tension that gave birth to the unorthodox student politicization. In the new, liberalized climate, the harsh contradicting reality became increasingly visible while the opportunities to articulate it were more readily available.

Like their colleagues abroad, the Yugoslav students were initially preoccupied with *syndicalist* issues, a common contemporary term which designated their own specific concerns, from the poor standard of living to the reform of the youth/student unions. From there, they gradually moved to the more general problems of society, raising in the process key political questions of Yugoslav socialism.<sup>18</sup>

In each case, the student politicization emerged around the youth and student unions which underwent the most ambitious attempt at reorganization. And yet, the major events always occurred beyond the institutional borders. In all three cities, the politicization transpired into fully fledged political movements which peaked during various student strikes. Immediately thereafter, the movements would subside, at the pace which depended on the exerted repression that was neither simultaneous nor had the same intensity everywhere. The outcome, however, was the same throughout Yugoslavia. By 1972, the final wave of political suppression swept the country, erasing all traces of independent student politics.

### **5.1.3. Social movements and their media**

In all this, the youth press had a cardinal role. It is next to impossible to analyze the student movements without taking the youth journals into account. The available

---

<sup>18</sup> Popov, *Sukobi*, 24-26, 36-38.



literature indirectly recognized this fact as it heavily leaned on the youth press as a major source. The media as such, however, its crucial impact on the rise, articulation and sustaining of these movements is barely mentioned at all.<sup>19</sup>

For once, this absence is not a Yugoslav idiosyncrasy. Even where the scholarship on social movements is burgeoning, their own media remains largely unknown. However, the media of social movements have an immense importance, as a vital source, for the analysis of the movements themselves. There are only a few detailed case studies of those smaller media outlets that arise around the movements and often play crucial roles in their formative periods. Next to the mentioned works on the late 1960s US underground press, one should note Atton's relevant chapter on the new social movement media.<sup>20</sup> Jakubowicz's study of the Polish *Solidarnost* press, on the other hand, is the sole existing account of such media coming from the communist world.<sup>21</sup>

Yet, it is this alternative media tradition, with its preferences for anti-hegemonic political ideas and grass-roots movements, that will guide the following analysis.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> The literature merely provides documents regarding the suppression of the journals. Even the sole monograph devoted to the Yugoslav youth press is a collection of transcripts from the student assemblies where the *Student's* editorial board was removed. See respectively: *Zbornik: Dokumenti Jun-Lipanj 1968* 455-497; Baškovič et al., *Študentsko gibanje 1968-72*; 236-258; Ilija Moljković, ed., "Slučaj" *Student: Dokumenti* (The *Student* "Case": Documents) (Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2008).

<sup>20</sup> Atton, *Alternative Media*, 80-102.

<sup>21</sup> Karol Jakubowicz, "Musical Chairs? The Three Public Spheres in Poland" in Peter Dahlgren and Colin Sparks, eds., *Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere* (London: Routledge, 1991), pp.153-173.

<sup>22</sup> Social movement scholars are of not much help in that regard. Concerned about the initiation of collective actions, they regularly focus on the mass media alone. Their main analytical concept, framing theory, queries the manner used by the media to select particular themes and define the interests and exponents of the movements, thus influencing their understanding and forging of identity. Drawing on Gossman's analysis of cognition, the theory centers around the concept of media frames which, as defined by one of its key students, refer to the persistent patterns of organization, selection, interpretation, emphasis and exclusion in which media discourse is organized. Accordingly, media collective action frames should enlighten the role of the media discourse in the salience of the issues and goals of the movement. If applied to the Western mass media, the framing paradigm exposes the inherent hegemony and news rules that underline its coverage. Due to the imbalance between the frames offered by the mass media, oriented towards creating consent, with those of the movement, interested in changing the status quo, it can indirectly point to the ways in which the movements react to the inadequate treatment, creating their own media strategies, often with profound consequences. There are, however, certain drawbacks to the theory which limit its value in this study. Its relevance is

What follows then is a unique, comparative account of the Yugoslav student politicization from the late 1960s and the early 1970s, told from the perspective of its major actor: the Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana youth press and its writers. As mentioned, the narrative makes a major break with the previous research of the subject in several aspects. First, it expands the review from Belgrade to include two other centers as well, illustrating how each movement evolved individually. Second, rather than concentrating solely on the climax, it addresses the whole student political process from its outbreak to the consequent repression.

Overall, I will show how the youth press decisively influenced the evolution and understanding of the local student movements, and contributed to their formation and effectiveness.

## 5.2. BELGRADE YOUTH PRESS AND THE STUDENT MOVEMENT

While often blown out of proportion, the June 1968 unrest in Belgrade is rightfully acclaimed as a major historical landmark that profoundly shaped the outlook of Yugoslav student politics. Much of its reputation rests on the fact that it was the first massive public outcry in communist Yugoslavia and, as such, caught the authorities completely unaware. Yet, had they paid more attention to the Belgrade youth press, the shock would be much smaller.

---

questionable in the research of the media evolving in a communist context, with different news values and ideologies. Likewise, it is less helpful when applied to those media, like the youth press, that relate or identify with the particular movement, and thus offer identical frames with it. More on the framing theory and the ambivalent relation between social movements and the mass media in: William A. Gamson and David S. Meyer, "Framing Political Opportunity" in Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald, eds., *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp.274-290; William A. Gamson, "Bystanders, Public Opinion, and the Media" in David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi, eds., *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2007), pp.242-261; William A. Gamson, *The Strategy of Social Protest* (Belmont: Wadsworth, 1990) (Challenging Groups since 1945); Gitlin, *The Whole World is Watching*.

### 5.2.1. Anticipation

From early in 1968, the student organ *Student* and the city youth union's *Susret* anticipated nearly all key issues raised during the June revolt. With the appointment of new editors, Đorđije Vuković and Mirko Klarin, both journals assumed leading roles in the rise of student discontent.<sup>23</sup> Their vivid prose described harsh life and penury at the new student campus, where a few months later the unrest would break out.<sup>24</sup> To complement, hard theory dwelled on mounting social injustices. Not long ago seen as taboos, these questioned the official phrases about the fulfilled promises of the new socialist society.<sup>25</sup>

Frustration amassed. How should one deal with that? The prospects, nature and range of Yugoslav youth politics slowly grew into the journals' vital concern.<sup>26</sup> Both *Student* and *Susret* firmly embraced the self-management reform of their publishers, insisting on more strident formulations: the students had a right to deal with key political problems of society.<sup>27</sup>

The view across the border inspired. From Polish March to French May, the international student rebellion resonated throughout the youth press. The coverage

---

<sup>23</sup> Klarin became *Susret*'s editor-in-chief already in 1967 and held the position until his removal in May 1969. Vuković took over *Student* at the start of 1968. He was succeeded in November by Alija Hodžić and Aleksandar Ilić, with the latter moving in the autumn of 1969 to edit cultural student journal *Vidici*. Alija Hodžić, interview by author, 5 June 2006, Zagreb, tape recording; Aleksandar Ilić, interview by author, 3 August 2011, Belgrade, e-mail; Mirko Klarin, interview by author, 16 April 2011, The Hague, Skype recording.

<sup>24</sup> See articles about the hardships and petty crimes reigning at the student campus: "Integracija opet odložena" (Integration Postponed Again); "Studentski teksas' u Novom Beogradu" ('Student Texas' in Novi Beograd), *Student* 4 (16 Jan. 1968): 6, 11.

<sup>25</sup> First sounds of revisionist Marxism broke through in the process: "Nasleđe ili reprodukcija bede" (Legacy or Reproduction of Poverty), *Susret* 83 (June 1968): 8.

<sup>26</sup> *Susret*'s series of related texts began with the telling title: "Nova levica danas i ovde" (New Left Today and Here), *Susret* 81 (1 May 1968): 10.

<sup>27</sup> The reform found in the youth journals its strongest proponents. *Student* argued that its publisher should not merely transmit official views or deal with syndicalist concerns, but, rather, tackle wide political issues, even if this endangers the existing hierarchy: "Jedina mogućnost" (The Only Opportunity); "Zamerke novoj koncepciji Saveza studenata" (Objections to the New Concept of Student Union), *Student* 12 (2 April 1968): 4; 12.

reflected both a local agenda and accumulated dissent. For their part, Belgrade journals always had practical concerns in mind. Writing from across Europe, *Susret*'s correspondents articulated the common positive features of the phenomenon. Those who disagreed, like the head of the Yugoslav student union, never received the journal's backing. Wary about the spread of similar methods at home, he drew a line between the righteous student struggles in the West and the ambiguous one in socialist Poland.<sup>28</sup> *Susret* and *Student* argued otherwise. Amidst the silence of the rest of the Belgrade media, they identified with the Polish appeals for democratic socialism, which so bluntly repeated the lectures that could be heard in their own backyard, at the Belgrade Philosophic Faculty.<sup>29</sup>

These were getting increasingly louder, thanks to the group of professors gathered around the philosophic journal *Praxis*.<sup>30</sup> In the growing disagreement with the Party, their take on revisionist Marxism strived to cleanse Yugoslav communism from within. *Praxis* philosophers rejected bureaucratic Stalinist heritage in the name of some distant, yet obtainable humanist socialism. Not surprisingly, they were the first to come in the defense of the accused Polish students and professors, including one of their own, the member of the *Praxis* editorial board, Leszek Kołakowski. And *Student* was there to document it.<sup>31</sup>

Receptive students soon rejoined in what became the beginning of the turmoil at the Belgrade University. In April 1968, they endorsed their Polish colleagues "without

<sup>28</sup> "Bunt protiv ljudske bede" (Rebellion Against Human Misery), *Susret* 79 (3 April 1968): 14-15.

<sup>29</sup> "Što hoće poljski studenti" (What the Polish Students Want), *Susret* 79 (3 April 1968): 8; "Naš program ispisan je na ustavu" (Our Program is Written on the Constitution), *Susret* 80 (17 April 1968): 14.

<sup>30</sup> *Praxis* philosophers posed as the true interpreters of Marx, and wished to democratize the Party and the communist system, but were at the same time ignorant of all liberal or national ideas. A nice insiders' view is available in: Nebojša Popov, ed., *Sloboda i nasilje* (Freedom and Violence) (Beograd: Res Publica, 2003).

<sup>31</sup> "Što se događa u Poljskoj?" (What Is Going On in Poland?), *Student* 13 (9 April 1968): 1, 6-7.

consulting”, only to end up labeled as “one-sided” by their union.<sup>32</sup> The ensuing dispute revealed a deeper misunderstanding between the youth journals and their supervisors. Whereas the youth officials insisted that all political activities should be prearranged, the journals promoted these spontaneous envoys into the finest communist intelligentsia.<sup>33</sup> Strong language matched the grave issue at stake. The political monopoly of the student union was suddenly challenged by a string of local solidarity gestures with a range of “progressive” forces abroad, hailed by the journals.<sup>34</sup>

Their staff were exhilarated. Whatever the occasion, the protests against the Vietnam War or German Emergency laws, they welcomed this unprecedented novelty in the post-war youth politics.<sup>35</sup> Students were encouraged to persist in these “socialist” acts, especially when they stretched beyond the institutional frames, or evoked trendy foreign iconography.<sup>36</sup> *Susret* pompously recounted from the first Belgrade “sit-in”, referring to an informal follow-up of the Anti-American rally where students, halted by the police, sat down along the road and sang protest songs.<sup>37</sup> *Praxis* philosophers continued contributing. Its distinguished member, by chance in

---

<sup>32</sup> “Saopštenje Univerzitetskog odbora Saveza studenata” (Announcement of the Student Union’s University Committee), *Student* 14 (16 April 1968): 3.

<sup>33</sup> See among others: “Univerzitetski Odbor – Uvređeni sudija” (University Committee – Offended Judge); “Da sam student, ne bih to potpisao” (If I Were a Student, I Would Not Sign); “Otvoreno pismo UO SS BU” (Open Letter to the UC SU BU), *Student* 15 (23 April 1968): 3, 4; “Otpori” (Resistances), *Susret* 81 (1 May 1968): 3.

<sup>34</sup> “Za ili protiv posmatračkog morala” (For or Against Viewer’s Moral), *Susret* 15 (23 April 1968): 1; “U čemu su razilaženja” (What Are the Disagreements), *Student* 16/17 (30 April 1968): 5.

<sup>35</sup> “Protest studenata i građana protiv rata u Vijetnamu” (Student and Citizen Protest against the Vietnam War), *Student* 13 (9 April 1968): 1; “Mirne demonstracije pred ambasadam SR Njemačke” (Peaceful Demonstrations in Front of the FR Germany Embassy), *Student* 18 (14 May 1968): 8.

<sup>36</sup> *Susret* utilized a common claim in legitimizing controversial issues: the youth was obliged to back their foreign colleagues who thought highly of Yugoslav revolution: “Solidarnost” (Solidarity), *Susret* 80 (17 April 1968): 3.

<sup>37</sup> “Sit-in protiv rata” (Anti-War Sit-in), *Susret* 80 (17 April 1968): 8.

Paris during the May revolution, happily served as the first-hand reporter and shared his enthusiasm in *Student*.<sup>38</sup>

Lastly, the revolts provided exciting role-models. The German student leader, Rudi Dutschke, enjoyed unparalleled celebrity status.<sup>39</sup> Everything about “Red Rudi” as he was endearingly addressed, from his charisma to the assassination attempt, was discussed with passion.<sup>40</sup> Not least since it was so incompatible with the typical image of the Yugoslav youth apparatchiks.<sup>41</sup>

If critical Marxism attested to the galloping breach between the proclaimed ideals and crude reality, the aggressive *New Left* tactics showed how to confront it. In the dawn of the Belgrade unrest, both editors urged their readers to come out on the streets and join “the new global revolution.”<sup>42</sup> *Student*’s appeal recapped domestic problems, enchanted with the spell of demonstrations which seem to “turn the students into relevant actors in the eyes of the regime.”<sup>43</sup> Once the protest exploded in the immediate neighborhood, the need to speculate about the ones abroad became less obvious.

### 5.2.2. The Belgrade June 1968 revolt

Like in so many other places that year, the June 1968 unrest in Belgrade began as a minor scuffle involving students. Within hours, the brutal use of police force and

---

<sup>38</sup> Mihajlo Marković hailed the French students who distanced from the corrupted Communist Party, in search for a new society: “Deset dana koji su potresli Francusku” (Ten Days That Shook France), *Student* 19 (21 May 1968): 8.

<sup>39</sup> Two *Susret* covers featured Dutschke: *Susret* 77 (6 March 1968): 1; *Susret* 81 (1 May 1968): 1.

<sup>40</sup> *Susret*’s reporter learned about the shooting on his way to interview Dutschke in Berlin. The shocked editor instantly sent his best wishes on the behalf of the Yugoslav youth. “Crveni Dučke” (Red Dutschke), *Susret* 80 (17 April 1968): 3.

<sup>41</sup> If not in words, *Susret*’s essay on the issue was clear on that, disclosing in the background Dutschke’s familiar counters. “Lider – zašto ga više nema” (Leader – Why Is He Gone), *Susret* 82 (15-29 May 1968): 6.

<sup>42</sup> Klarin outlined the program for student action, in harmony with the global protests: “Razlike” (Differences), *Susret*, 82 (15-29 May 1968): 3.

<sup>43</sup> Vuković listed a number of reasons for the student discontent, asking “if they were preparing for something else rather than the exams.” “Znaci političke krize” (Signs of Political Crisis), *Student* 19 (21 May 1968): 1.

false media reports fuelled it into large-scale demonstrations.<sup>44</sup> Agonized students rallied instinctively and formed informal, collective rotating bodies which, next to the official student union, guided their future actions.

On June 3, they jointly called for a week-long strike sanctioned by their professors.<sup>45</sup> During the next seven days, Belgrade students staged all-night sit-ins throughout the newly renamed Karl Marx Red University. At its vibrant centre, the Faculty of Philosophy, they engaged in *Sorbonne*-like debates over a range of issues.<sup>46</sup> There, enclosed by the police, *Praxis* Marxists obtained prominent roles, providing vital intellectual stimulus.

The students requested firm sanctions against those responsible for the police carnage and deceptive information disseminated to the public, a privilege normally in the domain of the highest state officials. They called for better living standards and a vaguely defined university reform. As the revolt proceeded, their complaints swelled to address booming bureaucracy, hampered self-management and lack of democratic freedoms.<sup>47</sup> Conversely, their utopian egalitarian ideas went as far as demanding firm state control.<sup>48</sup>

Indeed, the Belgrade students took cover under the official Party program. Emulating their *Praxis* professors, they asked merely for its rigorous implementation. Such a revolt that took socialist principles all too seriously baffled the authorities who,

---

<sup>44</sup> Students were angered by the press agency which instantly reproached them, falsely accusing them of shooting a policeman. Such media support of repressive police actions was present worldwide, and, in turn, facilitated the rise of the student movements: Stuart J. Hilwig, "The Revolt Against the Establishment: Students Versus the Press in West Germany," in Detlef Junker, ed., *1968: The World Transformed* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 326-35.

<sup>45</sup> Popov, *Sukobi*, 18-26.

<sup>46</sup> The so called Convent embodied the novel spontaneous forms that emerged during the revolt and deeply troubled the regime. Popov, ed., *Sloboda i nasilje*, 58.

<sup>47</sup> Popov, *Sukobi*, 15-26; 36-38.

<sup>48</sup> Due to this anti-reformist and potentially centralist dimension, Croatian interpretations of the protest are by and large less favorable: Dušan Bilandžić, *Moderna Hrvatska* (Modern Croatia) (Zagreb: Golden Marketing, 2000), 518-21. For a fresh alternative and more positive interpretation see: Hrvoje Klasić, *Jugoslavija i svijet 1968* (Yugoslavia and the World: 1968) (Zagreb: Naklada Ljevak, 2012).

ultimately, settled for a compromise. They acknowledged its goals, but rebuked the methods, that is, precisely the most novel element of the protest, unpleasant not so much for its ideas as for the aggressive style.<sup>49</sup>

Tito, on the other hand, used this ideological proximity to his advantage. In his surprising television speech delivered on June 9, he publicly supported the students, proclaiming that ninety percent of their claims were justified.<sup>50</sup> The broadcast instantly neutralized the protest as the majority of the students dispersed in celebration. However, the demagogic motives of Tito's move swiftly recurred when the remaining, potentially hostile elements were used as an excuse for the imminent backlash.<sup>51</sup>

### 5.2.3. The voice of the student movement

The June revolt immediately acquired a mythical status throughout Yugoslavia. In the same way, it left a permanent mark on the Belgrade youth press whose staff promptly responded to the unrest which it assisted in so many ways. Their six special issues firmly merged the two transformative attributes of the youth press: the links to the student movement and the opposition to the mainstream media.

The manner of their involvement varied and would be continued throughout the period. *Susret* was the partisan chronicler which interpreted and observed the rebellion.<sup>52</sup> *Student* became its integral part with its editorial board entering a narrow circle of decision-makers.<sup>53</sup> Its editor Vuković inspired and drafted the students'

---

<sup>49</sup> Alternatively, the officials reduced student demands to the questions of standard, and ignored their more general claims. Popov, *Sukobi*, 26-33.

<sup>50</sup> *Zbornik: Dokumenti Jun-Lipanj 1968*, 337-40.

<sup>51</sup> Svetozar Stojanovic, *The Fall of Yugoslavia: Why Communism Failed*, 45.

<sup>52</sup> As a biweekly, *Susret* was inapt for swift reaction, especially since its editor was out of the town when the protest erupted. Even so, the journal managed to produce a comprehensive volume on the unrest. Klarin, interview.

<sup>53</sup> From June 4<sup>th</sup> to July 25<sup>th</sup>, *Student* devoted five special issues to the protest, the first three during its course, and the remaining in its immediate aftermath.



*Action-Political Program*.<sup>54</sup> Many of its staff were insiders who acted as (in)formal student leaders. Present at all main events, from clashes with the police to the meetings of strike committees, they hugely influenced the course of the unrest.<sup>55</sup>

Both journals presented the students' "truth" about the protest, giving them a voice they could not find in the rest of the media. Each was at pains to refute their portrayal of students as enemies of the state or plain hooligans.<sup>56</sup> All Belgrade dailies were scorned for their hypocritical half-truths shaped to meet the changing official statements.<sup>57</sup> *Susret's* back cover photo could not be more blunt: *Don't believe the press*.<sup>58</sup> *Student* explicated: "*Belgrade newspapers...sustained an unprecedented moral decline in the history of our journalism.*"<sup>59</sup>

The youth journals exposed the violence of the police.<sup>60</sup> Gripping first-hand testimonies of injured students extolled their defiance, turning the allegations upside down.<sup>61</sup> It was the police that should be accused of counter-revolution: "*I carried the Party flag which I never let go. Three policemen brutally clubbed me down.*"<sup>62</sup> Frequent analogies with the interwar anti-communist purges amounted to the same effect.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Ilić, interview.

<sup>55</sup> Lazar Stojanović, interview by author, 22 Apr. 2011, Belgrade. *Skype* recording.

<sup>56</sup> *Student's* comprehensive chronology of the students' clash with the police contradicted the existing press reports: "Šta se dogodilo u podne 3. juna kod podvožnjaka" (What Happened Near the Subway at Noon on June 3), *Student*, spec. vol. (4 June 1968): 3.

<sup>57</sup> "O sredstvima informisanja javnosti, miliciji, moralu i nečem drugom" (On the Public Information, Police, Moral and Others), *Student*, spec. vol. 2 (8 June 1968): 4; "Tri lica jednog lista" (Three Faces of a Paper) *Student*, spec. vol. 4 (18 June 1968): 4.

<sup>58</sup> *Susret's* cover headline was equally suggestive: *Truth about the Red University*. See: *Susret*, spec. vol. (11 June 1968): 1, 24.

<sup>59</sup> "They identified with primitive, crude collective consciousness... whose envoys beat the students" in: "O štampi i radiju" (On the Press and Radio), *Student*, spec. vol. (4 June 1968): 3;

<sup>60</sup> Police call for manslaughter was cited at length: "The officer said: run, we will beat you. He ordered: 'Charge', shouted 'Kill'. A massacre ensued." in: "Svedočanstva" (Testimonies), *Susret*, spec. vol. (11 June 1968): 6.

<sup>61</sup> "As a guard clubbed me in the jaw and the other bent my arm, a hero hooked me in the chin. I tumbled"; "My shoe was filled with blood, I had no idea a bullet smashed my leg," in: "Kako je počelo" (How It Began), *Student*, spec.vol. (4 June 1968): 2;

<sup>62</sup> "Povređeni pričaju" (The Injured Speak), *Student*, spec. vol. 2 (8 June 1968): 3.

<sup>63</sup> "Surovije nego pre rata" (Harsher than Before the War), *Student* spec. vol. (4 June 1968): 3.

Captivating accounts of the riotous mood posed comparisons with the global protest imagery.<sup>64</sup> *Susret* juxtaposed dramatic photographs of passionate student rallies with those of the bandaged youths, beaten up while lying on the ground.<sup>65</sup> No doubt, Belgrade and the world were united in pain and glory.

Within days, the strike was inaugurated into a “movement” which required legitimization. *Student* reprinted all key documents adopted by the students, displaying their consistency with the interests of the working class.<sup>66</sup> To prove it, large photos of Lenin and Tito featured on the covers; the unusual red ink confirmed ideological credentials. In the face of mounting charges against its methods and values, the strike was applauded as a true avant-garde socialist act.<sup>67</sup> Authorities, on the other hand, were blamed for coercing workers to detach from students who genuinely wished to form a new revolutionary coalition.<sup>68</sup>

Both journals stressed the endorsement the students received from the faculty members, including just about each *Praxis* Marxist. Their encouraging speeches revealed the underlying ideology of the protest.<sup>69</sup> *Student* blatantly repeated the controversial *Praxis* credo calling for the “ruthless critique of all that exists.”<sup>70</sup> Similarly, it remained torn between the contrasting appeals for more freedom and

---

<sup>64</sup> “Jedna noć na crvenom univerzitetu” (A Night at the Red University), *Susret*, spec. vol. (11 June 1968): 7-10.

<sup>65</sup> Their number and size were overwhelming, spreading over a third of the issue and across the whole pages, something rarely seen on the covers, let alone in the inside. *Susret*, spec. vol. (11 June 1968): 5, 15, 19, 20, 22.

<sup>66</sup> See among others: “Akciono politički program” (Action-Political Program), *Student*, spec. vol. 2 (8 June 1968): 1.

<sup>67</sup> “Studentska komuna” (Student Commune), *Student*, spec. vol. 3 (11 June 1968): 3.

<sup>68</sup> Conversely, those rare cases of successful alliance were praised. See: “Umesto da usvoje pismo ‘odozgo’, radnici podržali studente” (Instead of Accepting the Letter From ‘Above’, the Workers Supported the Students), *Student*, spec. vol. 2 (8 June 1968): 2.

<sup>69</sup> “Birokratija protiv spontanog pokreta” (Bureaucracy versus Spontaneous Movement), *Susret*, spec. vol. (11 June 1968): 10; “Desetorica na profesora Tadića” (Ten on Professor Tadić), *Student*, spec. vol. (4 June 1968): 3.

<sup>70</sup> “Svet ne mora biti tako rđav kakav jeste” (The World Need Not Be as Bad as It Is), *Student*, spec. vol. 4 (18 June 1968): 3; “A šta sada” (And Now What), *Student*, spec. vol. 3 (11 June 1968): 3.

more authentic communism. Its egalitarian ideas concealed centralizing undertones that would surface later on.

Anxious to prolong the ongoing tension, *Student* produced two more issues in the immediate aftermath of the unrest. In a preview of the following season, its staff guarded the movement's aims, pressuring for their execution.<sup>71</sup> Once again, one could read those unprecedented demands for the removal of "bureaucrats" and "conservatives" who attacked the students.<sup>72</sup>

The journals' uncompromising stance remained the true legacy of the June unrest. By the same token, it was also among the reasons for the regime's decision to silence it. The suppression began during the protest itself. After first being declined by the printers, *Susret*'s issue somehow found its way to the readers.<sup>73</sup> The first two issues of *Student* were temporarily banned; the court's decision about the final one was irrevocable and all the copies were destroyed.<sup>74</sup>

#### 5.2.4. Keeping the critical spirit: 1968/69

During the next eighteen months, the Belgrade youth journals endeavored to preserve this revolutionary spirit. Fearing that the revolutionary zeal might fade away, they sided with those students who were less mesmerized with Tito's words and

---

<sup>71</sup> "Uzbuna u političkoj čaršiji" (Alarm in the Political Bazaar), *Student*, spec. vol. 3 (11 June 1968): 3; "Neki politički forumi morali su da pogreše u proceni situacije" (Some Political Forums Must Have Wrongly Assessed the Situation), *Student*, spec. vol. 4 (18 June 1968): 3.

<sup>72</sup> Following Tito's speech, many of those who condemned the students, revised their opinions, but *Student* refused to accept such change of hearts. Instead, the journal evoked the so called *pillory*, special notice board where the students hanged deceitful press articles. See respectively: "Bezvoljni ili suviše oprezni" (Half-Hearted or Too Cautious); "Malo ovako, malo onako" (A Bit Like This, a Bit Like That) *Student*, spec. vol. 3 (11 June 1968): 3; "Stub srama" (Pillory), *Student*, spec. vol. 4 (18 June 1968): 4.

<sup>73</sup> The manager of the printing house originally refused to print the issue which appeared only two days after the protest ended: "Ko nas je sprečio" (Who Prevented Us), *Susret*, spec. vol. (11 June 1968): 4.

<sup>74</sup> *Student* defied the ongoing censorship already during the protest: "Zabrana *Studenta* – kao pre rata" (Banning of *Student* – Just Like Before the War), *Student*, spec. vol. 4 (18 June 1968): 3.

wished to see the realization of their June goals for human socialism. Their number dropped, but still amounted to a credible force.

The movement was now confined to the two Belgrade humanistic faculties and art academies. Consequently, the Faculty of Philosophy transpired into the major target of the regime's countermeasures which attempted to restrain the released energy.<sup>75</sup> As early as August, the authorities launched an enduring campaign against the *Praxis* professors, impugned for instigating the student rebellion.<sup>76</sup> At the same time, the central Belgrade student union began to distance itself from its own branch at the Faculty of Philosophy where most of the movement's radicals were stationed. The tension increased when the latter, faced with unfulfilled promises, imposed as the true inheritor of the June values.<sup>77</sup>

And so did the youth journals. Both acted as opinion leaders and watchdogs of rank-and-file youth politics, attaching a major part of their identity to the newborn momentum.<sup>78</sup> *Susret* still encouraged the processes, while *Student* became the mouthpiece of their chief proponent, the politicized share of the Belgrade University, from where most of the staff came. The two new co-editors appointed at the end of 1968, Aleksandar Ilić and Alija Hodžić, studied at the Philological and Philosophic

---

<sup>75</sup> Boris Kanzleiter, *Die "Rote Universität"*, 327-35.

<sup>76</sup> Immediately after the unrest, the Party branch at the Faculty's Department of philosophy and sociology where they were stationed was dissolved. The full campaign would last for seven years. In its repressive 1975 finale, eight Belgrade professors were expelled from the university. At the same time, Zagreb group of *Praxis* philosophers were considered to be regime's allies against the Croatian nationalists, a fact that nicely points to the huge disparity between different republican contexts. For a detailed account of the Belgrade campaign, see: Nebojša Popov, *Contra Fatum: Slučaj grupe profesora Filozofskog fakulteta u Beogradu* (Contra Fatum: The Case of Group of Professors at the Belgrade Philosophical Faculty) (Beograd: Mladost 1989).

<sup>77</sup> The friction was present ever since the end of the June protest. While most students hailed Tito's speech and began to dance folk dances, the students of the Faculty of Philosophy at first refused to end the strike. Popov, *Sukobi*, 66-74.

<sup>78</sup> "Susret exceeds all that strive to be labeled as the youth press ... let alone the rest." *Susret* 86 (2 Oct. 1968): 3.

Faculty respectively.<sup>79</sup> The likes of Lazar Stojanović or Ljubiša Ristić represented the Art academies.

Together they embarked upon the mythologization of epic proportions whereby the June unrest became a general metaphor of all aspirations. Informal collective bodies established at the time were cited as the perfect example of direct self-management.<sup>80</sup> In turn, *Susret* and *Student* derided youth and student unions for their bureaucratic manners, leaving behind another lasting attribute: the antagonism of the youth journals towards their own publisher.<sup>81</sup>

Other June lessons were also adopted. *Syndicalist* issues were always placed into a broader perspective.<sup>82</sup> The early climax of the movement dictated the need to tackle chief political problems of Yugoslav state. Ideas matured literally over night. What was previously implicit, steadily articulated into the coherent critique of the system that was no more content with simply acknowledging the growing rift between the official theory and actual practice. Rather, the journals insisted on the consistent implementation of the launched initiatives.<sup>83</sup>

In June 1969, students tried to pay tribute to the anniversary of the unrest, and point to its futile results.<sup>84</sup> Ultimately, cornered by the Party, the student union called of the planned assembly, and the related special issue of *Student* never appeared. A similar fate befell the collection of documents on the protest assembled by part of the staff.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>79</sup> The duo was appointed when the June ideas were still strong within the student union. Ilić, interview.

<sup>80</sup> Coincidentally, only the student union outlets at the humanistic faculties adopted the model and were commend for it. “Demokratija” (Democracy), *Student* 9-10 (1 April 1969): 1.

<sup>81</sup> *Susret* 91 (11 Dec. 1968): 3; “Molba za prijem u neki viši CK” (Application for Some Higher CC); “Otvoreno pismo mladoj aktivistkinji” (Open Letter to a Youth Activist), *Susret* 95 (5 March 1969): 4, 7, 19.

<sup>82</sup> See: “Napomena o reformi univerziteta” (Support to *Student*), *Student* 22 (5 Nov. 1968): 1.

<sup>83</sup> “Otuđivanje akcije” (Alienating the Action), *Student* 20 (15 Oct. 1968): 3; *Susret* 87 (16 Oct. 1968): 3; “Napred u pošumljavanje otoka” (On with the Forestation of Islands), *Student* 24 (19 Nov. 1968): 2.

<sup>84</sup> *3000 Words Manifesto*, adopted at the occasion, criticized the current political situation in an obvious allusion to the famous Prague Spring document. Arsić and Marković, '68: *studentski bunt i društvo*, 130-38.

<sup>85</sup> The project was headed by Hodžić who was closely affiliated to *Praxis*. Hodžić, interview; “Umesto uvodnika” (Instead of the Editorial), *Student*, spec. issue (17 June 1969): 1.

By then, the narrative about the “lost revolutionary chance of June” was firmly in place.<sup>86</sup>

*Student*'s oppositional tone initiated a series of conflicts, yet, even at its most extreme, stayed within the official paradigm. Indeed, the Belgrade youth journalists were by and large Party members and did not question the basic postulates of the system. At least on paper, they still believed in its unused potential.<sup>87</sup> Along with their readers, they tried to align with the working class, and lead the resolute fight against “Stalinist deviations.”<sup>88</sup>

In short, they offered a crash course in self-management socialism, albeit, the one infused by the *Praxis* Marxism, oblivious of all market and national ideas.<sup>89</sup> Withstanding the regime's crusade, the latter became an ever growing force within *Student*, especially, when its junior member Hodžić remained the sole editor in the autumn of 1969.<sup>90</sup>

For the most part, the Belgrade youth press voiced this collective effort to rejuvenate Yugoslav communism by its own means.<sup>91</sup> In retrospect, however, youth journalists rightly assert that the existing ideological diversity could not be reduced to

---

<sup>86</sup> The authorities were accused of criminalizing key actors, namely, *Praxis* professors and the students allegedly under their influence: “Da li su lipanjska gibanja bila negativna” (Was the June Movement Negative), *Susret* 93 (10 Jan. 1969): 8; “Poziv na javnu raspravu” (A Call for a Public Debate), *Student* 15 (13 May 1969): 3.

<sup>87</sup> In retrospective, however, the journalists polarize on the issue. While Hodžić or Klarin stress this reformist faith, others, like Ilić or Stojanović, deny it. Stojanović, interview; Klarin, interview; Hodžić, interview.

<sup>88</sup> Wishing to provide a parallel to the June protest, *Susret* treated the workers' strikes as a legitimate political acts and inner critique of the system. See: “Da li štrajkovi jačaju ulogu radničke klase” (Do Strikes Reinforce the Role of the Working Class), *Susret* 98 (18 April 1969): 7-11.

<sup>89</sup> See Klarin's editorials or *Student*'s long-lasting series, *Read Again*, which reprinted texts regarded as crucial contribution to the critical thought. In general, both journals showed little enthusiasm for market socialism, acquiring an inherent anti-reformist dimension: *Susret* 94 (19 Feb. 1969): 3; *Susret* 95 (5 March 1969): 3; “Etičke antinomije revolucionarne egzistencije” (Ethical Antinomies of the Revolutionary Existence), *Student* 5 (4 March 1969): 8; “Tržišna privreda, ali i njena kontrola” (Market Economy, but also its Control), *Student* 5 (4 March 1969): 1.

<sup>90</sup> “Revolucija, Birokratija...” (Revolution, Bureaucracy...), *Student* 29/30 (24 Dec. 1969): 3.; “Ne ‘liberalno’ već demokratski” (Not ‘Liberal’, but Democratic), *Student* 13-14 (28 April 1969): 1, 3.

<sup>91</sup> Hodžić, in particular, sustains this *Praxis* view about a humanist-reformist movement. Hodžić, interview.

revisionist Marxism that prevailed at the Philosophic Faculty.<sup>92</sup> The mantle of self-management allowed some to flirt with the controversial part of the leftist interwar tradition. The traits of social-democracy were present at the Faculty of Philology. Anarchism was influential at the Art Academies.<sup>93</sup>

Ideologies aside, *Student* hoped to see the birth of the critical autonomous university.<sup>94</sup> Together with *Susret*, it advocated the freedom of expression and opposed the violation of press laws, fighting the rising censorship in media and culture at large.<sup>95</sup> Like public forums, both journals tackled taboos, turning into ghettos of media freedom.

### 5.2.5. Showdown

If, ever since the June 1968 unrest, the Belgrade youth journals strived to reaffirm their attained autonomy, the authorities were just as anxious to put them under control. The June prosecutions thus proved to be merely a prelude to a more systematic campaign that resumed the following autumn.<sup>96</sup> Typically, the unions would issue informal warnings which were then parroted by the mainstream media.<sup>97</sup> In a recurring pattern, the youth and student unions would complain that their press organs

---

<sup>92</sup> A good insight into a range of perspectives is available in: Malavrazić, *Šezdeset osma – lične istorije*, 149-219. Also: Ilić, interview; Hodžić, interview.

<sup>93</sup> Stojanović, interview.

<sup>94</sup> Looking back, Hodžić's associate, Ilić, insists, not without grounds, on this wider dimension of the journal. At the same time, he claims to have left the journal because he was bothered by the rigid *Praxis* Marxism which began to engulf the atmosphere. Ilić, interview.

<sup>95</sup> "Samokritika jednog hroničara" (Self-Critique of a Chronicler), *Student* 9-10 (1 April 1969): 2; See also extracts from the discussions on socialist culture: "Mišljenje kao opasna delatnost" (Thinking as a Dangerous Activity), *Student* 25 (9 Dec. 1969): 8.

<sup>96</sup> Already in November 1968 both journals were put on hold for two weeks, following the formal discussions on their "dubious" editorial policies. See: "Evo nas opet" (Here We Go Again), *Student* 22 (5 Nov. 1968): 2; "Kameoloni" (Chameleons), *Susret* 90 (27 Nov. 1968): 3.

<sup>97</sup> Shortly before, major Belgrade dailies accused both journals for the antagonism towards the Party. For resolute journals' responses see: "Odgovor" (Response), *Student* 20 (22 Oct. 1968): 1-2; "Oživljena metoda citatologije" (Revived Method of Citatology), *Susret* 88 (30 Oct. 1968): 2-3.

had “privatized” and detached from the readers.<sup>98</sup> This referred to the small circle of staff, ambiguous criticism and “defective” interests that neglected “veritable” youth concerns which, more often than not, remained undefined.<sup>99</sup> The Party big-shots were less cryptic and openly indicted the youth journalists for spreading enemy propaganda.<sup>100</sup> Within a dazzling range of accusations, from nationalism to anarchism, the clear favorite was their alleged alliance with the “extremists from the Faculty of Philosophy.”<sup>101</sup>

Backed by their loyal publishing councils, the staff was not intimidated.<sup>102</sup> They spurred public debates about their policies, using the opportunity to defend the chosen course.<sup>103</sup> By early 1969, nearly a third of the printed *Student* issues were devoted to the disputes with the Party officials. Some were responses to the attacks on *Student*. Others were initiated by the journal itself, including a criticism of the Rector of the Belgrade University.<sup>104</sup> In these heated altercations, the staff never recoiled.<sup>105</sup> Quite the reverse, they ardently defended those accused of providing them with inspiration,

<sup>98</sup> Compare: “Stav Univerzitetskog odbora” (The Stance of the University Committee); *Student* 22 (5 Nov. 1968): 3; “Zaključci Gradskog komiteta Saveza omladine povodom revije *Susret*” (The Youth Union City Committee’s Conclusions on the *Susret* journal), *Susret* 90 (27 Nov. 1968): 4.

<sup>99</sup> See also: “Uvodnik” (Editorial), *Susret* 89 (30 Oct. 1968): 3.

<sup>100</sup> See the attack on *Student* by the member of the Republican Presidium: “Četiri pitanja redakcije *Studenta*” (Four Questions of the *Student* Editorial Board), *Student* 13-14 (28 April 1969): 5-6.

<sup>101</sup> “Saopštenje Univerzitetskog komiteta SK” (LC University Committee’s Memo), *Politika* (7 Jan. 1970): 6.

<sup>102</sup> Both councils protected the editors till their deposition; *Student*’s even ignored the official requests to resign: “Izjava povodom raspuštanja redakcije *Susreta*” (Statement on the Dissolution of the *Susret*’s Editorial Board), *Student* 16 (20 May 1969): 2; “Saopštenje Saveta” (Council’s Memo), *Student* 25 (9 Dec. 1969): 3.

<sup>103</sup> During the 1968/69 season *Student* organized debates at 18 faculties with regular questions about *Student*: “Okrugli Stol na Filozofskom fakultetu” (Round Table at the Philosophical Faculty), *Student* 1 (7 Jan. 1969): 10.

<sup>104</sup> The Rector was berated for not honoring the self-immolation of Jan Palach. “Kako je rektor BU odao poslednju počast Janu Palahu” (How the Rector of BU Paid the Last Respects to Jan Palach), *Student* 3 (18 Feb. 1969): 2. See also the correspondence with the Interior Minister: “Otvoreno pismo Radovan Stijačiću” (Open Letter to Radovan Stijačić), *Student* 2 (14 Jan. 1969): 2.

<sup>105</sup> The fierce dispute with the member of the Republican Presidium stands out in particular: “Odgovor ‘Studenta’ Orhanu Nevzatiju” (*Student*’s Answer to Orhan Nevzati), *Student* 15 (13 May 1969): 16; “Lična zahvalnost Orhanu Nevzatiju” (Personal Gratitude to Orhan Nevzati), *Student* 16 (20 May 1969): 3.



meaning *Praxis* Marxists.<sup>106</sup> In turn, students from the “defiant” faculties praised “the country’s most progressive journal.”<sup>107</sup>

With journalists’ self-esteem running high, the conflict could be resolved only by some autocratic decree. In May 1969, the Belgrade youth union brusquely deposed *Susret*’s editorial board, circumventing in the process its publishing council.<sup>108</sup> In a dramatic statement copied throughout the youth press, the dismissed editors lamented the arbitrary nature of the decision and accompanying charges.<sup>109</sup> The youth union was not bothered. Determined not to take chances, it resurrected *Susret* as a consumerist magazine for teenagers, not dissimilar to the despised *Mladost*.<sup>110</sup>

*Student*’s editors endured in office six months longer, due to the more autonomous student union that could not so easily abandon the movement to which it contributed – at least, not without the push from its Party mentor. Yet in November 1969, the University Party Committee decided it had had enough and demanded a full editorial renewal. The student union swiftly adopted the provision thus bringing the conflict to its high point. *Student*’s staff was resolved not to give in without the fight.<sup>111</sup> In a hierarchical *salto mortale* they renounced their own publisher, raising in the process crucial questions on the nature of democratic-centralism and political procedure.<sup>112</sup>

The forthcoming union’s assembly should have sealed *Student*’s fate, but, instead, dragged on for a fortnight, ending in a spectacle that confirmed the journal’s close ties

<sup>106</sup> “Očigledan dokaz” (Obvious Proof), *Student* 13-14 (28 April 1969): 2.

<sup>107</sup> In the journal’s debate on the situation at the University, the students most vocal in its defense were those who guarded the June values, whereas those who admonished them criticized *Student*: “Okrugli sto ‘Studenta’ na Likovnoj Akademiji (*Student*’s Round Table at the Art Academy), *Student* 25/26 (26 Nov. 1968): 10.

<sup>108</sup> *Zbornik: Dokumenti Jun-Lipanj 1968*, 460-69.

<sup>109</sup> “*Susret* – Izjava br.101” (*Susret* –Statement no. 101), *Student* 16 (20 May 1969): 2.

<sup>110</sup> The depoliticized *Susret* was re-launched in the autumn of 1969; two years later it turned into a tabloid.

<sup>111</sup> Moljković, ed., “*Slučaj*” *Student: Dokumenti*, 21-27. See also: “*Student* u ostvarivanju politike Saveza Studenata” (*Student* in the Realization of the Politics of the Student Union), *Student* 22 (18 Nov. 1969): 3.

<sup>112</sup> They also protested against the pre-directed and contradictory accusations: “Političko praznovjerje” (Political Superstition); “Nastavak dogovora” (Continuation of the Agreement), *Student* 25 (9 Dec. 1969): 2-3.

with the student movement. Deputies from the rebellious faculties, many of them *Student's* journalists, defied the joint attack of their union, Party, and the mainstream media who accused “the extremist students” of political sabotage.<sup>113</sup> Though heavily outnumbered, they engaged in this unequal contest and embarrassed the regime for two whole weeks, until, finally, in January 1970, the editorial board was removed, after no less than four exhausting sessions.<sup>114</sup>

Three months later *Student* reemerged cleansed of the leftist radicals, Philosophic Faculty and its formative features.<sup>115</sup> Like its publisher, the journal returned to narrow *syndicalist* concerns, losing all relevance and reputation.<sup>116</sup>

But the Belgrade student movement outlived its organ for almost a year, and even found a substitute. The student union's outlet at the Philosophic Faculty remained its stronghold, in a continuous conflict with the pacified Belgrade student union. Stripped of the media voice, it decided to print its own internal journal on mimeo machine. Banned in April 1970, before being released, *Frontisterion* heralded new, more aggressive student vibes. The journal satirized Yugoslavia's unprincipled foreign policy, alluding to Tito's autocratic behavior.<sup>117</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> “Ne biraju sredstva” (They Use All Means), *Večernje novosti* (26 Dec. 1969): 2; “Metoda nasilja” (Method of Violence), *Borba* (26 Dec. 1969): 6; “Bukači” (Troublemakers), *Komunist* 667 (1 Jan. 1970): 8.

<sup>114</sup> The first three sessions held daily from 25<sup>th</sup> till 27<sup>th</sup> December, all failed. The first was interrupted by a drunken brawl among the gathered crowd; the second was prolonged by the squabble over the responsibility for the incident and the related false media coverage; the third simply did not meet the quorum due to the holidays. The overthrow finally succeeded after a two-week delay, following the fourth January session. Throughout, a fuming debate went on between the union officials and the defiant students who denied the assembly's legitimacy, questioning the autonomy of their union and its press. Ilija Moljković, who was among the active *Student's* staff at the assembly, later gathered the transcripts that provide valuable insights about the dispute. *Student* also printed excerpts during the fortnight break: “V sednica Skupštine Saveza studenata Beograda” (5<sup>th</sup> Session of the Belgrade Student Union Assembly), *Student* 1, suppl. (6 Jan. 1970): 1-32; Moljković, ed., “*Slučaj*” *Student: Dokumenti*, 43-202.

<sup>115</sup> Not surprisingly, few believed the opening editorial that boasted how the journal would not relinquish its right to tackle politics: “Treći način” (The Third Way), *Student* 2 (31 March 1970): 1.

<sup>116</sup> Again in full control, the student union turned away from social problems and, instead, dwelled on the university reform and the student status, but its solutions lagged behind those in other cities. Arsić and Marković, '68: *studentski bunt i društvo*, 158-62.

<sup>117</sup> *Frontisterion* 1 (1970).

By then, the radicalized union's outlet already embarked on its final political offensive. Led by the infamous president Vladimir Mijanović, nicknamed "Vlada Revolution," students protested against the US invasion in Cambodia and staged a hunger strike in solidarity with starving Bosnian miners. These volatile actions prompted police reaction which peaked with the arrest of Mijanović, charged, among others, for the publication of *Frontisterion*.<sup>118</sup>

Pending the upcoming verdict, Mijanović's colleagues organized in October 1970 a second student strike, demanding his release. With no media support or encouragement from the faculty, the strike ended with no results.<sup>119</sup> Mijanović was sentenced to 20 months imprisonment and the organized Belgrade leftist student movement dispersed quickly thereafter.<sup>120</sup> Individual actions that persisted for a while were met with repression and had no wider impact.<sup>121</sup>

### 5.2.6. Nationalist aftermath: 1970/71

Oddly enough, as the cutting edge of the student turmoil moved to Zagreb and Ljubljana, *Student's* political relevance resurfaced for one last time, with the telling ideological twist. At first it seemed that the new staff simply followed their predecessors when, in late 1970, they deplored the ongoing crusade against the youth cultural journal *Vidici* where part of the former editorial board found refuge.<sup>122</sup> But

<sup>118</sup> Boris Kanzleiter, *Die "Rote Universität"*, 356-66.

<sup>119</sup> *Student's* neutral coverage of the strike, endorsed solely by the two art academies and Philological faculty, was a far cry from the heroic days of June. The journal disputed the harsh court verdict, but equally reproved the "extremist students." Such detached quality underlined *Student's* treatment of all informal student activities. See: "Ekstremni studenti i ekstremne sudije" (Extreme Students and Extreme Judges), *Student* 13 (20 Oct. 1970): 3.

<sup>120</sup> Popov, *Sukobi*, 194-98.

<sup>121</sup> In 1972, the so called Trotskyite six were charged for their international connections and illegal attempt to form a party. In the final 1974 act, leftist philosophy students sketched a document in which they condemned the prosecution of Belgrade professors, and were subsequently prosecuted for it: Popov, *Contra Fatum*, 110.

<sup>122</sup> Already in September 1969 Ilić and Stojanović became the editors of *Vidici*. See: "Zabrana" (The Ban), *Student* 11 (6 Oct. 1970): 3; "Opet zabrana" (The Ban Again), *Student* 13 (21 Oct. 1970): 2.

instead of *Praxis* Marxists, the incentives were now providing the professors from the Law Faculty, who maintained that the media repression focused on Serbia alone.<sup>123</sup>

Behind the fresh argument stood the growing resentment towards the launched reform of the Yugoslav federation, deemed injurious for Serbian interests. The refurbished *Student* agreed.<sup>124</sup> In a staggering contrast to its Zagreb counterparts, the journal transpired into the major opponent of the proposed amendments granting greater autonomy to the republics. Consequently, it abhorred the tiniest expressions of national (economic) emancipation or the related efforts to decentralize the Yugoslav student union.<sup>125</sup> The constitutional revision surpassed social inequality on the scale of social evils – the shift that nicely illustrated new amended ideology.<sup>126</sup> While the tacit centralist tones of their leftist precursors drew from the internationalist egalitarianism, *Student's* new editorial board openly flirted with Serb nationalism.<sup>127</sup>

By spring 1971, *Student* headed the anti-amendment struggle, revisiting the old media conflict, this time restricted to the Croatian press alone that advocated the changes.<sup>128</sup> The journal was the sole medium which reported from the notorious constitutional debate held at the Law Faculty, which cost one of the participants a

---

<sup>123</sup> See among others: “O ugroženoj slobodi” (On Endangered Freedom), *Student* 13 (20 Oct. 1970): 2; “Za poštivanje ustavnih sloboda” (For the Respect of Constitutional Freedoms), *Student* 18/19 (24 Nov. 1970): 2.

<sup>124</sup> Six months later, staff would utilize a similar line of reasoning, objecting to the prosecution of its own issues.

<sup>125</sup> See for instance: “Himna ili bajka” (An Anthem or a Fairytale), *Student* 17 (17 Nov. 1970): 3; “Jedno društvo ili šest društava” (One Society or Six Societies), *Student* 2/3 (19 Jan./16 Feb. 1971): 2; “U ovom broju ne govorimo...” (In this Issue We Do Not Speak...), *Student* 4 (23 Feb. 1971): 3.

<sup>126</sup> The editorials utilized the radical leftist vocabulary, labeling the revision as a rephrased form of statism. See: “O novoj ustavnoj reformi” (On the New Constitutional Reform); “Zašto je srce zaigralo” (Why the Heart Skipped a Bit), *Student* 7 (16 March 1971): 2; 3; “O novoj ustavnoj reformi” (On the New Constitutional Reform); “Lomljenje svesti” (Breaking the Conscience) *Student* 8 (23 March 1971): 3.

<sup>127</sup> For example: “Što se sve pripisuje Srbiji” (What Is Imputed to Serbia); “Ono što nam ostaje” (What Is Left to Us), *Student* 10 (6 April 1971): 3.

<sup>128</sup> “O VUS-u na gradele” (On VUS on the Grill), *Student* 4 (23 Feb. 1971): 2.

two-year prison sentence for spreading Serb nationalism.<sup>129</sup> The attempt to publish proceedings from the student assembly, equally hostile to constitutional changes, was censored in advance.<sup>130</sup> During the next few months, three other *Student's* issues would be banned as well, the first of which, ironically, was dedicated to the freedom of the speech.<sup>131</sup>

*Student's* staff objected the prosecution.<sup>132</sup> Suddenly, they revived from oblivion the memorable June experiences to which the regenerated dissent was artificially compared.<sup>133</sup> Unlike in June 1968, however, the latter never translated into a movement. Yet, the staff was on their feet, matching their forerunners. Aggravated by the cautious conduct of the chief editor, his deputy, Milorad Vučelić, staged a mutiny, eventually forcing him to resign.<sup>134</sup> As the staff inimitably instituted a collective decision-making, the Belgrade student union, which thus far approved their endeavor, typically retreated.<sup>135</sup> *Student* was still able to publish one more contested issue, dedicated to the (US) underground counterculture which inspired the staff's "struggle against the break-up of the state."<sup>136</sup> A few references to "bureaucrat" Tito, along with

---

<sup>129</sup> Mihajlo Đurić, a professor at the Faculty, invoked a taboo, questioning the existing republican borders: "O ustavnim amandmanima" (On the Constitutional Amendments), *Student* 10 (6 April 1971): 6-9.

<sup>130</sup> The prepared special issue was banned before it saw the light of day. The student union backed up the endeavor and, following the verdict, joined the protests, posing questions on its right to public work and media freedom: "Saopštenje" (The Statement); "Suđenje Savezu studenata Beograda" (Belgrade Student Union on Trial), *Student* 15 (6 May 1971): 1, 3.

<sup>131</sup> About the case: "Kratka hronologija i metodologije jedne zabrane" (Short Chronology and Methodology of a Ban), *Student* 18 (19 Oct. 1971): 5. *Student* was again prosecuted in November for transferring an open letter to Tito, originally published in Ljubljana's *Tribuna*.

<sup>132</sup> The furious staff resolutely resisted the charges: "Mogućnost neslobode" (Chance for Non-Freedom); "Dokumenti" (Documents), *Student* 21/22 (30 Nov./7 Dec. 1971): 2; 3.

<sup>133</sup> Even the old heroes, *Praxis* professors, coyly reemerged, and the issue of social inequality gained prominence. For the references to June, movement and massive student dissent see: "Na korak u desno – korakom u levo" (For a Step to the Right – Step to the Left), *Student* 13/14 (27 April/4 May 1971): 4; "Studenti u akciji" (Students in Action), *Student* 15 (6 May 1971): 3; *Student* 21/22 (30 Nov. 1971/7 Dec. 1971): 2.

<sup>134</sup> Coincidentally, Vučelić was a Law student. See: "Dokumenti" (Documents), *Student* 19 (2 Nov. 1971): 3.

<sup>135</sup> "Zaključci" (Conclusions), *Student* 24 (14 Dec. 1971): 1. "Saopštenje UO" (UC Communication), *Student* 25 (21 Dec. 1971): 3.

<sup>136</sup> See in turn: "Kalendar andergrounda i besa" (Calendar of the Underground and Rage), *Student* 5 (2 March 1971): 12-13; "Underground," *Student* 23 (3 Dec. 1971): 11.

the cover collage that merged Yugoslav and US national symbols sufficed for the final ban.

In December 1971, *Student's* editorial board collectively resigned, if only to precede the inevitable deposal and legal prosecution.<sup>137</sup> By then, the student union had more than it could take and, amidst the oppressive political climate, installed an outsider as the new editor, appeasing its press organ once and for all. After the student movement had already collapsed, the political decline of the Belgrade youth press was now finally completed.

### 5.3. ZAGREB YOUTH PRESS AND THE STUDENT MOVEMENT

The student politicization in Zagreb progressed in the exact reverse of this Belgrade scenario: after slow rise, came the late 1971 peak followed by the abrupt demise. The thriving Zagreb youth journals of the late 1960s closely complement this outline. Their fluid profile reflects this extremely complex course that carried on for four years and evolved in three distinct stages: radical-leftist, syndicalist and nationalist.<sup>138</sup>

#### 5.3.1. The ambivalent June 1968 in Zagreb

The first, radical-leftist one lasted till the early 1970 and was dominated by *Omladinski tjednik*, the newly launched organ of the Zagreb youth union. This vibrant

<sup>137</sup> “Zašto odlazimo” (Why Do We Leave), *Student* 25 (21 Dec. 1971): 3; Milorad Vučelić, interview. “Ćirilica” (Cyrillic), Happy Tv, Belgrade, 14 March 2011.

<sup>138</sup> As many as six new publications appeared in the latter part of the 1960s. Next to the sole previously existing journal, the student union’s *Studentski list*, this section will focus on the central organ of the Zagreb youth union *Omladinski tjednik*, freshly launched at the very end of 1967. *Tlo*, initiated in 1969 by the Croatian youth union, can be ignored since it scarcely distinguished from the mainstream press. Finally, the social-cultural monthly *Polet* (started in 1966), along with the new specialized publications, including satirical journal *Paradoks* (1966), theatrical journal *Prolog* (1968), or musical *Pop-Express* (1969), will be discussed later on.

reformist body gave the editor Antun Vujić relative freedom to pressure for the execution of the broad self-management agenda.<sup>139</sup> The narrow circle of staff that gathered around him consisted mostly of the leftist student activists from the Zagreb's Faculties of Philosophy and Political Science. Over the next two years, they endowed new aggressive qualities to the proverbial calls for direct youth politicization.<sup>140</sup>

The worldwide student turmoil reverberated even stronger than in Belgrade, to a large extent thanks to Vujić's deputy, Žarko Puhovski. He freshly returned from his Frankfurt studies with stacks of New-Left literature and first-hand insights into this "progressive" phenomenon.<sup>141</sup> There Puhovski met student leaders, such as Hans-Jürgen Krahl or Daniel Cohn-Bendit, and enrolled in the "ideologically akin youth organizations" that were profusely presented on the journal's pages.<sup>142</sup>

The international student revolt provided *Omladinski tjednik* an excuse for discussing contentious internal matters. The acclaimed autonomy of the German SPD's youth auxiliary embodied what was seen as a perfect relation between the Yugoslav youth union and the Party.<sup>143</sup> Dutschke and the Socialist German Student Union reminded about the need to integrate the university with social reform.<sup>144</sup> Likewise, the resentment towards the Springer press would stir *Omladinski tjednik*'s

---

<sup>139</sup> The union's chair Đuro Despot was Vujić's close friend and secured the needed protection as the staff tackled wide range of issues from the youth union to the society at large. Vujić, interview by author, 27 Oct. 2011, Zagreb, digital recording.

<sup>140</sup> The core, five-member staff assembled in less than three months and comprised of Nenad Prelog, Žarko and Nenad Puhovski, Krešimir Fijačko, Inoslav Bešker. Some time later they were joined by Petar Kvesić.

<sup>141</sup> Puhovski approached the phenomenon with great theoretical depth, insisting on its analytical assessment, absent from the mainstream press: "'Zlatna mladež' Evrope" (Europe's 'Golden Youth'), *Omladinski tjednik* 20 (22 May 1968): 4.

<sup>142</sup> Puhovski joined the Socialist German Student Union and the *Jungsozialisten*, the youth branch of the German Social Democratic Party (SPD). Žarko Puhovski, interview by author, 13 May 2011, Zagreb, digital recording.

<sup>143</sup> "U partiji ili mimo nje" (With or Without the Party), *Omladinski tjednik* 14 (10 Apr. 1968): 3.

<sup>144</sup> "Razbijač izloga slobodnog svijeta" (Crashing the Shop-Windows of the Free World), *Omladinski tjednik* 15 (17 April 1968): 4.

doubts about its own media surroundings.<sup>145</sup> Finally, the French May raised short-lived hopes for the wishful student-worker revolutionary alliance.<sup>146</sup>

Back in Zagreb, there were less reasons for enthusiasm. Quite the contrary. When the unreformed Zagreb student union staged, in March 1968, a human rights procession, *Omladinski tjednik* dismissed “this charade” as a miserable proxy for genuine youth politics, ridiculing its obligatory attendance and VIP after-party.<sup>147</sup>

On the constant lookout for tinges of rebellion, the journal was in many ways ahead of its readers. Once the news about the Belgrade June unrest reached Zagreb, two of its staff joined the small expedition that was on its way to the capital to witness the revolution on the spot.<sup>148</sup> After rapturous welcome, eighteen-year-old Inoslav Bešker delivered a fiery speech that left Belgrade students chanting in exaltation: “Zagreb-Belgrade.”<sup>149</sup>

Upon hearing that back in Zagreb radical leftists were summoning in response, the group returned home and joined their frail efforts to spread the dissent.<sup>150</sup> *Omladinski tjednik*'s pre-prepared commemorative issue on Marx was briskly redesigned to present the theoretical background of the student rebellion. Translated essays of Marcuse, Che Guevara or Bakunin reiterated the same concerns raised by the students

<sup>145</sup> “Studenti i svijet štampe” (Students and the World of the Press), *Omladinski tjednik* 16/17 (24 April 1968): 5.

<sup>146</sup> “Akcija i domašaji protesta” (Action and Reach of Protests), *Omladinski tjednik* 20 (22 May 1968): 4.

<sup>147</sup> The article also referred to the student union's president as “bureaucratic Dutschke.” Such allegations contradicted *Studentski list*'s special issue which eulogized the event. Compare: “Izvolite odložiti transparent” (Lay Down the Banner), *Omladinski tjednik* 21 (29 May 1968): 1. “Bakljada protesta i solidarnosti” (Torch-light Rally of Protest and Solidarity), *Studentski list*, spec. issue (28 May 1968): 1-4.

<sup>148</sup> Amidst the imposed media embargo, Bešker and Prelog drove to Belgrade with six other students, including two youth cultural journalists, *Polet*'s Mladen Martić and *Prolog*'s Slobodan Šnajder, who both owned cars, a rare commodity at the time. The future *Studentski list*'s film expert Vladimir Roksandić noticed this paradox between utopian goals and elitist means as he declined to “drive to the revolution.” More in: Malavrazić, *Šezdeset osma – lične istorije*, 656, 676-86; “Intervju: Šime Vranić”, *Gordogan*, 2-3 (2004): 36;

<sup>149</sup> Inoslav Bešker, interview by author, 27 Nov. 2010, Zagreb, Skype recording.

<sup>150</sup> About the same time the group of Belgrade students came to Zagreb's *Praxis* headquarters to exchange the news: Berislav Jandrić, “Prilog proučavanju studentskih demonstracija na Filozofskom fakultetu u Zagrebu 1968.” (Contribution to the Research of the Student Demonstrations at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb in 1968), *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, vol.1, 2002, 20.



worldwide.<sup>151</sup> The journal's June issue was less explicit on the current Belgrade episode. Puhovski's editorial commended its unconventional features, seeing it as the outcome of the common global crises.<sup>152</sup>

Though nowhere near *Student's* antagonism, the June issue managed to disrupt *Omladinski tjednik's* harmony with the publisher. Together with its Party mentors, the Zagreb youth union exerted pressure on the journal's staff to ensure the traumatic Belgrade scenario would not repeat.<sup>153</sup>

The fear was largely unfounded. The two Zagreb June rallies proved a feeble copy of the Belgrade original.<sup>154</sup> The majority of those present never distinguished between the two sides engaged in chaotic disputes.<sup>155</sup> On one, there were the radical leftist students from the Faculties of Philosophy and Political Science. Encouraged by the Zagreb group of *Praxis* professors, they identified with the Belgrade struggle for humanist communism, but their influence was inferior in comparison. Facing them were the local Party heads who were troubled by the re-born Marxist zeal that interfered with the ongoing economic reforms. Eventually, they contained the potential explosion, with the considerable help of the Zagreb student union which, to the contempt of the leftist radicals, sabotaged the rallies.

---

<sup>151</sup> "Anarhistički poredak" (Anarchist Order), "Problem sile u opoziciji" (The Problem of Violence in the Opposition); "Stvoriti dva, tri, mnogo Vijetnama" (Create Two, Three, Many Vietnams); "Studenti još nisu rekli sve" (Students Have Not yet Said Everything); *Omladinski tjednik* 22 (5 June 1968): 8; 9; 10; 11.

<sup>152</sup> The journal repeated *Student's* allegations about the behavior of the police and the press: "Demonstracija kao alternativa" (Demonstration as an Alternative), *Omladinski tjednik* 22 (5 June 1968): 1.

<sup>153</sup> Puhovski, who exceptionally edited the issue, was informed about Tito's speech and managed to hold the ground: Puhovski, interview. For the external pressures see September issue: "S manje romantike gledati na omladinsko rukovodstvo" (Less Romantic View of Youth Officials); "Jedna druga panorama" (Another Panorama), *Omladinski tjednik* 23 (12 Sept. 1968): 3; 6-7.

<sup>154</sup> Only in the new millennium, the two titles, useful primarily as sources, first broke the imposed silence on the Zagreb 1968 events: Jandrić, "Prilog proučavanju studentskih demonstracija": 7-44; "1968", *Gordogan*, 2-3 (2004): 32-80. See also a recent input: Hrvoje Klasić, *Jugoslavija i svijet 1968* (Yugoslavia and the World: 1968).

<sup>155</sup> The gathered students applauded all speakers, regardless whether they supported the Belgrade students or the opposing claims. More about the polarized disputes in: "Intervju Šime Vranić": 36-42; "Kakva je Vaša slika događaja" (How Do You See the Events), *Gordogan*, 2-3 (2004): 45-54; 69-70; 78-80.

While notably milder than in Belgrade, the consequent repressive measures stand as a testament to the *Omladinski tjednik*'s rebellious spirit. Among the four students charged for the organization of the protest was one of its own, the Belgrade speaker – Inoslav Bešker.<sup>156</sup>

### 5.3.2. Leftist radicalism with no reception: 1968-1969

Despite the June fiasco, the journal's aspirations rose in the upcoming autumn. The emblematic October cover beautifully summed up the mixture of influences which underlined *Omladinski tjednik*'s prose. "Radically or Not at All," screamed the headline, placed above the image of a fist taken from the Christopher Logue's anti-capitalist poster poem "Know Thy Enemy," recently published in the British underground journal *Black Dwarf*. With a slight adjustment: the hammer and sickle on the signet ring now replaced the original image of Che Guevarra.<sup>157</sup>

If watered down, the message stayed more or less the same: *Omladinski tjednik* demanded thorough reforms that should transform each facet of Yugoslav society.<sup>158</sup> And it was the youth that should take the lead in this struggle to reclaim the forgotten revolutionary goals.<sup>159</sup> The project had global relevance as well. The love affair with the New Left persisted throughout the period, and, with time, broadened to include violent guerrilla and Black revolutionary liberation movements.<sup>160</sup>

<sup>156</sup> Altogether three *Praxis* professors and four students were prosecuted. *Zbornik: Dokumenti Jun-Lipanj 1968*, 213-215.

<sup>157</sup> "Radikalno ili nikako" (Radically or Not at All), *Omladinski tjednik* 27 (9 Oct. 1968): 1.

<sup>158</sup> "Pred dokumentom politizacije omladine" (Before the Document of Youth Politicization), *Omladinski tjednik* 38-39 (25 Dec. 1968): 1; "Sumrak forsirane politizacije" (The Twilight of Forced Politicization), *Omladinski tjednik* 62 (1 Oct. 1969): 3.

<sup>159</sup> "Jesmo li išta naučili na iskustvima studentskog pokreta '68-70'" (Did We Learn Anything from the Experiences of Student Movement 68-70), *Omladinski tjednik* 82 (11 March 1970): 7.

<sup>160</sup> See in turn the inflating parallels between the local and global situation and the enthusiastic reports about the new type of Afro-American aggressive resistance: "Napredni pokret mladih i kriza državne vlasti" (Progressive Youth Movement and the Crises of State Authority), *Omladinski tjednik* 42 (5 Feb. 1969): 2; "King ili Che" (King or Che), *Omladinski tjednik* 57 (21 May 1969): 10; "Prenesimo rat u Ameriku" (Bring the War to America); "Crne Pantere" (Black Panthers), *Omladinski tjednik* 79 (18 Feb. 1969): 6.

*Omladinski tjednik* claimed to represent those who wished to see the birth of a leftist momentum comparable to the one in Belgrade. However, the feedback from below was missing. The journal spoke of the burgeoning student movement, while the latter was little more than a wishful thinking, confined to the youth union itself.<sup>161</sup> On the other hand, it is questionable to what extent its aspirations went beyond the organizational frames. *Omladinski tjednik* became the radical voice of its publisher, the Zagreb youth union, but, unlike *Student*, never fully detached from it, constantly switching between random calls for unrestrained political action and the institutional urge to channel it.<sup>162</sup>

The spirit of June 1968 nevertheless lived on.<sup>163</sup> *Omladinski tjednik* exposed divergences from the proclaimed official values, not afraid to name the culprits.<sup>164</sup> In an embryonic form of investigative journalism, young workers were encouraged to utter their discontent.<sup>165</sup> An informal alliance was formed with those, including Belgrade's *Student* or *Susret*, who suffered for their critical engagement.<sup>166</sup>

But the understanding of what the June represented, and, above all, where it should lead to, was not the same. Where *Student* asked for more social equality,

<sup>161</sup> See the rising discourse on the movement: "Kongres i omladinski pokret" (Congress and Youth Movement), *Omladinski tjednik* 33 (20 Nov. 1968): 2; "Pred jedinstvenim programom omladine i partije" (Before the Joint Youth and Party Program), *Omladinski tjednik* 48 (19 March 1969): 3; "Prema komunističkom pokretu samoupravljača" (Towards Self-management Communist Movement), *Omladinski tjednik* 36 (11 Dec. 1968): 2.

<sup>162</sup> Articles emphasized the wish to integrate the movement with the union: "Pred jedinstvenim programom omladine i partije" (Before the Joint Youth and Party Program), *Omladinski tjednik* 48 (19 March 1969): 3; "Revolucionarni omladinski pokret" (Revolutionary Youth Movement), *Omladinski tjednik* 56 (14 May 1969): 1. See also: Vujić, interview.

<sup>163</sup> "Lipanjski krijesovi studenata" (Students' June Bonfires), *Omladinski tjednik* 33 (20 Nov. 1968): 5.

<sup>164</sup> These centered on the futile promises of youth political participation: "Više hrabrosti" (More Courage), *Omladinski tjednik* 45 (26 Feb. 1969): 1; "Izborni debakl" (Electoral Debacle), *Omladinski tjednik* 52 (16 April 1969): 2; "Kvorumitis 1 i kvorumitis 2" (Quorumitis 1 and Quorumitis 2), *Omladinski tjednik* 53 (23 April 1969): 2; "Radi se o SSRNH" (It is about SSRNH), *Omladinski tjednik* 80 (25 Feb. 1970): 4.

<sup>165</sup> Over two long series of interviews workers discussed contentious issues such as worker strikes or student unrest: "Samoupravljanje i one stvari..." (Self-Management and Those Other Things...), *Omladinski tjednik* 37 (18 Dec. 1968): 3; "Plaće nema, e pa šta je" (No Salary, So What), *Omladinski tjednik* 61 (24 Sept. 1969): 3.

<sup>166</sup> "Lipanj u prologu" (June in Prologue), *Omladinski tjednik* 36 (11 Dec. 1968): 19; "Slučaj 'Susreta' – slučaj mladih" (The *Susret* Case – the Youth Case), *Omladinski tjednik* 57 (21 May 1969): 12; "Uvodnik bez lista" (Editorial without the Journal), *Omladinski tjednik* 58/59 (4 June 1969): 2.

*Omladinski tjednik* called for the return of surplus labor back to the workers.<sup>167</sup> The two classic Marxist formulas basically pleaded for opposite things. *Omladinski tjednik* asked for the implementation of the economic market reform and, as such, contradicted the utopian egalitarianism of *Student*.

No matter how miniscule, this disparity indicated the major, if frequently missed difference between the Zagreb and Belgrade radical leftists. Moreover, it was among the reasons for the weaker Zagreb impact of the June unrest and the subsequent leftist fervor.<sup>168</sup> Its implications, however, including the potential centralism of the Belgrade student movement, were not verbalized at the time. With the national question still off the radar, all internal ideological differences could be harmonized by common appeals for humanist socialism. Party reformists, revisionist Marxists or proto-hippies all marched under the same self-management banner.<sup>169</sup> This is precisely why, in January 1970, the new editor could become Puhovski, closely affiliated to the *Praxis* circle.<sup>170</sup>

By then, the Party and the mainstream media already instigated public discussions on *Omladinski tjednik*'s policies. Many objected to the snotty, condescending tone. Others were surprisingly positive, praising the journal's progressive features. With hindsight, the editors attest to the substantial reputation they enjoyed at the highest Party levels, which helped them to survive in office despite frequent rows with various actors.<sup>171</sup> For one, the staff believed to be the antidote of the "boulevard press," the common pejorative term used to label the mainstream media.<sup>172</sup> The anger aimed primarily at the main Croatian republican publisher *Vjesnik*, disparaged for a variety

<sup>167</sup> "Prema novim odnosima omladine i partije" (Towards the New Relations of Youth and Party), *Omladinski tjednik* 32 (13 Nov. 1968): 3, 9.

<sup>168</sup> Interestingly, the difference was also confirmed by the contemporary youth union's study: "Mlada štampa" (Young Press), *Omladinski tjednik* 67 (5 Nov. 1969): 3.

<sup>169</sup> Vujić, interview.

<sup>170</sup> Puhovski succeeded Vujić within the usual bi-annual rotation and was appointed by the youth union. Puhovski, interview.

<sup>171</sup> Looking back, both Vujić and Puhovski agree on this. Vujić, interview; Puhovski, interview.

<sup>172</sup> Bešker, interview; Puhovski interview.

of reasons, from its absolute media monopoly to cheap commercialist culture.<sup>173</sup> The mutual animosity climaxed in early 1970 when, responding to the latest wave of criticism, the “local Springer” temporarily halted its printing services to *Omladinski tjednik*.<sup>174</sup>

As elsewhere, such attacks anticipated those from the higher echelons which, ultimately, led to Puhovski’s removal in April 1970. The reason lay in the journal’s satirical section where an apparently witty cinema program was reprinted from a Slovene newspaper. Ineptly phrased, it made it seem as if the content of an untitled feature film referred to the newsreel about Tito’s visit to Tanzania.<sup>175</sup> The joke was that the movie in question was a *blaxplotation* about the “black boss and his gang that ruled the world.”

The Party heads were not amused. *Omladinski tjednik* had already been reproached for similar misdeeds in the past. This time, however, Tito’s authority was clearly jeopardized. Less than three months since he took over, Puhovski was deposed and detained for seventeen days.<sup>176</sup> The fact that he was released, with no charges, after his mother made a few calls to the local Party big-shots, revealed the semi-oppositional nature of the endeavor.<sup>177</sup> But regardless of this farcical overtone, the scandal proved to be the turning point. Along with Puhovski, the journal’s whole

---

<sup>173</sup> “Vjesnikova potraga za pozadinom” (*Vjesnik*’s Search for the Background), *Omladinski tjednik* 28 (5 June 1968): 2-3; “Embargo ili kritički duh malograđanina” (Embargo or Provincial Critical Spirit), *Omladinski tjednik* 68 (22 Oct. 1969): 2; “U čemu je greška” (Where Is the Mistake), *Omladinski tjednik* 88 (22 April 1970): 2.

<sup>174</sup> The first crises emerged a year before when *Omladinski tjednik* voiced the grievances of *Vjesnik*’s own young employees. With this experience behind, in January 1970 *Vjesnik* nervously reacted to the fresh tirade against its cultural policy. *Omladinski tjednik* protested the imposed censorship with a blank cover. See in turn: “Borit ćemo se za naša prava” (We Will Fight for Our Rights), *Omladinski tjednik* 45 (26 Feb. 1969): 5; “Oportunitet” (Opportunism), *Omladinski tjednik* 46 (5 March 1969): 1; “Kultura koja život gura” (Culture that Pushes Life), *Omladinski tjednik* 82 (11 March 1970): 4; *Omladinski tjednik* 83-84 (25 March 1970): 1.

<sup>175</sup> The movie in question was the 1968 crime flick *The Split*, starring young Gene Hackman. “Plexus”, *Omladinski tjednik* 87 (15 April 1970): 12.

<sup>176</sup> Despite the serious charges, the youth union reached the decision with a lean majority, in that way acknowledging the acquired autonomy of the staff. See: “O nama samima” (About Us), *Omladinski tjednik* 89-90 (29 April 1970): 1.

<sup>177</sup> Puhovski, interview.

political section departed. Stripped off of its voice, the insolent wave of radical leftist politicization in Zagreb ended, without ever transpiring into a fully-fledged movement.<sup>178</sup>

### 5.3.3. Detour: The Croatian Spring

*Omladinski tjednik* would soon experience a major political shift, following the escalation of reformist policies of the Croatian Party leaders that led to the outbreak of a wide movement known as the Croatian Spring.<sup>179</sup> Under the new editor, the youth union's official Goran Grubišić, the journal brusquely espoused the commenced efforts for greater Croatian republican autonomy.<sup>180</sup>

Echoing the new rhetoric, the journal's agenda was reduced along the republican/national lines. The economic reform was now supposed to return the surplus labor back to the Croatian working class alone, deemed particularly exploited.<sup>181</sup> In its pages the Croatian Party reformists emerged as the principal progressive force in the country.<sup>182</sup> Finally, the Belgrade press replaced *Vjesnik* as the

---

<sup>178</sup> These included Fijačko, Nenad Puhovski and Inoslav Bešker, who had spotted the program in the first place, and consequently went to serve the army. Bešker, interview.

<sup>179</sup> On the treatment of the Croatian Spring and the student movement, in: Marko Zubak: "The Croatian Spring 1967-1971: Testing the Pitfalls of the Croatian Historiography and Beyond", *East Central Europe/L'Europe du Centre Est, Eine wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift* 1 (Feb. 2006), 191-226.

<sup>180</sup> "Pregled jednog pregleda" (Overview of an Overview), *Omladinski tjednik* 99 (23 Sept. 1970): 5; "Pošteno i dalekovidno" (Fair and Far-sighted), *Omladinski tjednik* 119 (17 Feb. 1971): 2; "Amandmani, štampa i političari" (Amendments, Press, and Politicians), *Omladinski tjednik* 123 (17 March 1971): 2; "Hrvatska je jaka" (Croatia is Strong), *Omladinski tjednik* 127 (14 April 1971): 2.

<sup>181</sup> "Hrvatski sindikat" (Croatian Workers' Union), *Omladinski tjednik* 114-115 (13 Jan. 1971): 7; "Hrvatska radnička balada" (Croatian Workers' Ballad), *Omladinski tjednik* 127 (14 April 1971): 2; "Manjak ili ceh" (Shortage or a Fee), *Omladinski tjednik* 137 (15 Sept. 1971): 2.

<sup>182</sup> Consequently, the journal increasingly deplored Croatian hard-liners who resisted the decentralizing trends. For the support of new Croatian policies and derogation of its opponents see in turn: "Hrvatsko sutra" (Croatian Tomorrow), *Omladinski tjednik* 101 (7 Oct. 1970): 1; "Pismo Savki Dabčević Kučar" (A Letter to Savka Dabčević Kučar), *Omladinski tjednik* 102 (14 Oct. 1970): 3; "Otvoreno ljubavno pismo novoj hrvatskoj vladi" (Open Love Letter to the New Croatian Government), *Omladinski tjednik* 137 (15 Sept. 1971): 2; "O sukobu s Milutinom Baltićem" (On the Conflict with Milutin Baltić), *Omladinski tjednik* 143 (13 Oct. 1971): 8; "Anticitati" (Anti-Citations), *Omladinski tjednik* 144 (10 Nov. 1971): 2.

new media arch-enemy.<sup>183</sup> Even the former alliance dissolved as Belgrade *Student* was denounced for its centralist aspirations and anti-Croatian sentiments.<sup>184</sup>

For at least a year, the new strategy somewhat schizophrenically intertwined with the old one.<sup>185</sup> The lingering New Left veterans, however, were increasingly confined to the cultural sections, until in autumn 1971 they, finally, left the journal.<sup>186</sup>

Paradoxically, during this process, *Omladinski tjednik* lost a large part of its formative identity. The journal was now barely different from the other mainstream newspapers.<sup>187</sup> Instead of radicalizing the agenda itself, it merely mediated the political liberalization that evolved around it.<sup>188</sup> By necessity, it was stripped of the links with the youth politicization that converted it into a relevant media in the first place. Indeed, when the genuine student political uproar occurred in Zagreb, it was another journal, student union's *Studentski list* that would become its mouthpiece. Prior to that, however, it had to undergo a drastic transformation of its own, in a process that deeply polarized the whole local student constituency and transformed the political life of the country.

---

<sup>183</sup> "Ljubavni slučaj" (Love Affair), *Omladinski tjednik* 99 (23 Sept. 1970): 1; "Sveci blago dijele" (Saints Give the Treasure), *Omladinski tjednik* 105 (4 Nov. 1970): 2; "Osjetljivost *Ekonomске Politike* na 'jarke nacionalne boje'" (*Ekonomска Politika*'s Sensibility to "Sharp National Colors"), *Omladinski tjednik* 118 (10 Feb. 1971): 2.

<sup>184</sup> The journal disclosed hidden motives behind *Student*'s rejection of constitutional reform, poorly disguised by egalitarian claims: "Sve od sebe" (One's Best), *Omladinski tjednik* 116-117 (3 Feb. 1971): 2; "'Era desperatera' iz njihovih pera" (The 'Era of Desperados' in Their Own Words); "Ne prodavajte nam maglu kolege iz 'Studenta!'" (Don't Fake, Colleagues from *Student!*), *Omladinski tjednik* 129/130 (28 April 1971): 2, 5.

<sup>185</sup> Within a single fortnight, *Omladinski tjednik* thus first criticized and then approved of Nixon's visit to Yugoslavia: *Omladinski tjednik* 99 (23 Sept. 1970): 3; "Dvije poruke" (Two Messages), *Omladinski tjednik* 101 (7 Oct. 1970): 1.

<sup>186</sup> Among these were Kvesić, Prelog, and Bešker, who had previously returned to the journal from the army. A strong imminent break was first signaled with a series of "national covers" in March 1971 that featured a map of Croatia and Republican Party president Savka Dabčević Kučar. By November 1971, the New Left was openly proclaimed dead. See in turn: *Omladinski tjednik* 127 (14 April 1971): 1; *Omladinski tjednik* 131 (12 May 1971): 7; "Kako sam 11.XI 1971 putovao u Beograd na razgovor s redakcijom New Left Review o anarhizmu, što sam vidio, što sam mislio" (How I Travelled to Belgrade on November 11, 1971 to Talk with the Editors of *The New Left Review* on Anarchism, What I Saw, and What I Thought), *Omladinski tjednik* 146-147 (17 Nov. 1971): 15.

<sup>187</sup> In that sense, the journal resembled the youth journal *Tlo*, launched by the Croatian youth union in 1969.

<sup>188</sup> For instance, one of its leading writers Darko Stuparić, former editor of *Polet*, was now working for *Vjesnik*.

### 5.3.4. Syndicalist intermezzo: *Studentski list* and the reform of the university

Throughout the major part of the period leading up to the Croatian Spring, *Studentski list* remained in the shadow of *Omladinski tjednik*, bearing the brunt of the radical leftists' disdain of its publisher, unreformed Zagreb student union.<sup>189</sup> Not without arrogance, *Omladinski tjednik* looked down on its limited syndicalist interests alone.<sup>190</sup> This began to change in mid 1969, when a part of the staff from the freshly disbanded cultural journal *Polet* moved to *Studentski list* where they formed a quality cultural section.<sup>191</sup> Slowly, the “serious” part of the paper revived as well, by turning to what the radical leftists earlier regarded as a sign of de-politicization – the reform of the Zagreb University.

Leaning on the new Rector's incentive, the new guard of student officials sought to promote students into co-creators of the educational process.<sup>192</sup> Though hardly troublemakers, they were not afraid to revise formal proposals.<sup>193</sup> These activists became *Studentski list's* core authors and used it to elaborate their ideas for an adequate student representation in the university bodies.<sup>194</sup>

<sup>189</sup> Its issue on the Zagreb June 1968 rallies conveyed the prevailing skepticism: *Studentski list*, spec. issue (10 June 1968).

<sup>190</sup> Next to the ex-staff, the jokes at the expense of its trivial nature attest the pervasive condescendence: Puhovski, interview; *Omladinski tjednik* 58-59 (4 June 1969): 16; “Plexus”, *Omladinski tjednik* 65 (22 Oct. 1969): 12.

<sup>191</sup> For the discussion of *Polet* see segment 5.5.5. *Studentski list's* cultural section was headed by Hrvoje Turković and proved seminal to the increased relevance of the journal. Hrvoje Turković, interview by author, 2 May 2011, Zagreb, digital recording.

<sup>192</sup> Another reason why the 1968 protest never made a big impression in Zagreb was precisely the fact that the acclaimed physicist Ivan Supek was already appointed as the Rector of the Zagreb University and initiated the ambitious self-management reform for its greater autonomy. Ivan Supek, “Pobjeda grupe crvenih radikala” (Victory of the Group of Red Radicals) in Milovan Baletić, ed. *Ljudi iz 1971: Prekinuta šutnja* (People from 1971: Broken silence), (Zagreb: Vjesnik, 1990), 146-62.

<sup>193</sup> “Stavovi sveučilišnog odbora SS o reformi Sveučilišta” (The Stance of the SS University Council on University Reform), *Studentski list* 16 (20 May 1969): 7; “Reforma sveučilišta ne bez krvi” (University Reform Not without Blood); “Antistatut” (Anti-statute), *Studentski list*, spec. issue (23 Sept. 1969): 1; 3-4.

<sup>194</sup> Among them were Damir Grubiša, Ivan Pađen, and Dag Strpić. See among others: “Savez studenata i koncepcija reforme sveučilišta” (Student Union and University Reform Concept), *Studentski list* 1/2 (13 Jan. 1970): 3; “Demokratizacija upravljanja” (Management Democratization), *Studentski list* 10 (7 April 1970): 3.



When one of them, Dag Strpić, was appointed as the chief editor in September 1970, the staff rejected its transmission role, urging for a pervasive action.<sup>195</sup> They professed to represent a new leftist force engaged in the creation of autonomous self-management university.<sup>196</sup> Their syndicalist focus suddenly turned into a plus and was held superior to abstract issues contemplated by Belgrade or Ljubljana students.<sup>197</sup>

The problem which they ignored, though, was the same as the one which previously hindered *Omladinski tjednik*. The student movement they referred to did not exist outside the narrow circle of union activists. *Studentski list* might have pronounced its independence from the Party, but remained closely tied with its publisher, the Zagreb student union.<sup>198</sup>

As a whole, the journal espoused the Croatian reformist course, but insisted on its deep socialist nature.<sup>199</sup> Despite such firm leftist credentials, *Studentski list* was never in tune with the Belgrade student movement, especially following its centralist turn.<sup>200</sup> The gap between them was widely disclosed during the debate over the future statute of the Yugoslav student union which resonated the wider constitutional one. Here, *Studentski list* advocated the decentralizing “principle of alliance,” whereby the

---

<sup>195</sup> At the same time the activists drafted their comprehensive proposals and managed to push them through. See respectively: “300 dana za 300 godina” (300 Days for 300 Years), *Studentski list*, spec. issue (22 Sept. 1970): 2; “Slobodno sveučilište istraživača” (Free University of Researchers), *Studentski list* 16 (13 Oct. 1970): 20; “Akcija ante portas!” (Action in Sight!), *Studentski list* 21 (17 Nov. 1970): 2.

<sup>196</sup> “Imamo li prava ne sudjelovati” (Do We Have a Right Not to Participate), *Studentski list* 16 (13 Oct. 1970): 7; “Studenti traže vodstvo” (Students are Looking for Leadership), *Studentski list* 20 (10 Nov. 1970): 2.

<sup>197</sup> “Od revolta do političkog pokreta” (From Revolt to Political Movement), *Studentski list* 3 (17 Feb. 1970): 3.

<sup>198</sup> See: “Nismo mi ničiji pomladak” (We are Nobody’s Offspring), *Studentski list* 22-23 (24 Nov. 1970): 2;

<sup>199</sup> As the national momentum thrived, *Studentski list* affirmed something called “the leftist” Croatian identity. In the new, tense political climate, that sufficed to cause anxiety at the state level. See in turn: “Zid (5)” (Wall (5)), *Studentski list* 16 (13 Oct. 1970): 5; “Potez očajnika” (The Move of a Desperate Man), *Studentski list*, spec. issue (22 Sept. 1970): 3; “Za čiste račune” (For a Clean Sheet), *Studentski list* 25 (15 Dec. 1970): 4; “Hrvatska i Hrvati” (Croatia and Croatians), *Studentski list* 1-3 (12 Jan. 1971): 8-9; “Repriza (1)” (Rerun (1)), *Studentski list* 4-5 (16 Feb. 1971): 6-7; “Klasa kao nacija (1)” (Class as Nation (1)), *Studentski list* 9 (16 March 1971): 2.

<sup>200</sup> “Lipanjski zahtjevi u političkom sistemu” (June Demands in Political System), *Studentski list* 17 (20 Oct. 1970): 2-3; “Opasnost (za beogradski ‘Student’) od predstojeće ustavne reforme” (Danger (for the Belgrade Student) from the Pending Constitutional Reform), *Studentski list* 15 (6 May 1971): 3.

federal decrees could not be imposed upon the republican legislation.<sup>201</sup> Met with great suspicion across the country, the proposal would be soon exchanged for a more extreme one, once the new collective actor came to the scene.

### 5.3.5. Takeover and the birth of the national student movement: 1970/1971

Ironically, what brought about the downfall of Strpić and his peers was the adoption of their own demands for greater student representation. As a result, a series of electoral student assemblies were called in Zagreb in the autumn of 1970. Feeding off the invigorated political life in Croatia, these turned into a political arena. At the decisive December election for the student pro-rector the student union's official surprisingly lost to the candidate of the nationalist students who grumbled about the former's privileges.<sup>202</sup> This unexpected triumph of declared Catholic, Ivan Zvonimir Čičak, prompted the birth of the Croatian student movement which would grow into the most radical proponent of the Croatian Spring, leading the ongoing fight for Croatian national emancipation.

At first, however, it needed to resist the anxious attempt of the Zagreb student union which desperately tried to refute Čičak's appointment.<sup>203</sup> *Studentski list* firmly embraced the campaign. Harsh slanders for hustling, nationalist and religious extremism left no space to the ever louder group that gathered around Čičak.<sup>204</sup> After the initial shock passed, *Studentski list*'s rhetoric toned down a bit. A few contending,

<sup>201</sup> "Politička jesen i Savez studenata" (Political Autumn and Student Union), *Studentski list* 17 (20 Oct. 1970): 8; "Osnovna koncepcija organizacije – udruživanje" (Basic Organizational Concept – Joining), *Studentski list* 21 (17 Nov. 1970): 14.

<sup>202</sup> *Preporod hrvatskih sveučilištaraca*, 29-30; 41-43.

<sup>203</sup> Student officials used Čičak's unusual public confession of his religious beliefs to defame him. This, in turn, only widened the odium of part of the students against the union leaders, perceived as apparatchiks, and fake revolutionaries. Ponoš, *Na rubu revolucije - studenti '71*, 71-88; 95-110.

<sup>204</sup> "Saopćenje predsjedništva Skupštine Saveza Studenata Zagreba" (The Announcement of the Zagreb Student Union Assembly's Presidency); "Biografija Ivana Zvonimira Čička" (Ivan Zvonimir Čičak's Biography); "Političari, komedijaši i mi" (Politicians, Comedians, and Us), *Studentski list* 27 (29 Dec. 1970): 3.

if indirect, voices were admitted, revealing the unparalleled political atmosphere that emerged in the meantime.<sup>205</sup>

As the two Zagreb student fractions confronted each other, a raging dispute evolved on the journal's pages about the nature of the rising Croatian student movement.<sup>206</sup> Its advocates, the so called "rightists," claimed to represent the student constituency and the Croatian nation as a whole.<sup>207</sup> They derided their opponents, the union officials, as centralist Party apparatchiks "scared off by the newly created spontaneous momentum."<sup>208</sup> The "leftist", on the other hand, comprising of the union's activists and supported by a share of the leftist radicals, exposed their rivals' anachronistic focus on the national issues alone which excluded them from the global student concerns.<sup>209</sup> In all this, there was never any doubt where the journal's heart lay. When *Omladinski tjednik* began to hesitate, *Studentski list* continued to berate the new movement.<sup>210</sup>

Yet, it was the other side that enjoyed the greater support. Before long, *Studentski list* would get the taste of its own biased medicine. Ever since Čičak's election, national students requested the removal of the journal's "partial editorial board."<sup>211</sup>

---

<sup>205</sup> From the mid February the journal hosted weekly student debates. The staff, however, never talked directly to Čičak, but rather, reprinted the interview he gave to a minor faculty journal. See in turn: "Ja nisam studentski prorektor nego student prorektor" (I am Not Student's Provost but Student-provost), *Studentski list* 7 (2 March 1971): 8; "Razgovori studentski" (Student Talks), *Studentski list* 4-5 (16 Feb. 1971): 10-11.

<sup>206</sup> See among others: "Ponovno izbori na filozofskom fakultetu" (Elections on the Faculty of Philosophy yet again); "Zbor je završen" (The Assembly is Over); "Podrška Savezu studenata" (Support for the Student Union), *Studentski list* 1-3 (12 Jan. 1971): 2; 4; 5; "Od izbora do ostavke" (From Election to Resignation), *Studentski list* 4-5 (16 Feb. 1971): 8-9.

<sup>207</sup> "Programska ili praiskonska demokracija" (Programmatic or Primeval Democracy), *Studentski list* 9 (16 March 1971): 12-13.

<sup>208</sup> "Tko će povesti studente" (Who Will Lead the Students), *Studentski list* 11 (30 March 1971): 3.

<sup>209</sup> Puhovski, now writing for *Studentski list*, opposed the positive account of the movement published in his former journal: "Nekoliko napomena o božanstvu nekostanjeistostanje i njegovom proroku" (A Few Remarks on the Deity Somestatesamestate and Its Prophet), *Studentski list* 6 (23 Feb. 1971): 6.

<sup>210</sup> While biased, the staff showed superior theoretical argumentation in the process. This was obvious in the exchange between the leftist radical Plančić and prominent movement representative Jure Juras: "Do mišljevine i natrag" (To the Thought and Back); "Naše alternative danas" (Our Alternatives Today), *Studentski list* 8 (9 March 1971): 5; 6-7.

<sup>211</sup> "Razgovori studentski" (Student Talk), *Studentski list* 8 (9 March 1971): 9; "Zbor studenata od 27. ožujka" (Student Assembly on 27 March), *Studentski list* 12/13 (20 Apr. 1971): 6.

With no executive power, they could do little more. Until, finally, in April 1971, they assumed control of the Zagreb student union in what was nothing short of a minor putsch.<sup>212</sup> At the key elections, its representatives literally ousted the old student leadership from the hall before the votes were even cast.<sup>213</sup>

Their next move was to take over *Studentski list*, not bothering to wait for the staff's mandate to end. Aware of these intentions, the journal's staff performed a cunning maneuver. They proclaimed autonomy from the student union, placing the journal under the auspices of the newly founded daughter company in charge of publishing.<sup>214</sup> The latter conveniently began to operate a couple of days prior to the April assembly, just in time for the staff to refuse to hand over the keys.<sup>215</sup>

The deadlock was resolved after the nationalist students staged yet another coup. According to them, they simply waited one morning for the cleaning lady and entered *Studentski list*'s premises to take what was rightfully theirs.<sup>216</sup> A more trustworthy account, however, comes from the deposed journalists and tells a dramatic story where the nationalist students illegally broke into the journal's offices during the night, and next day physically evicted the old staff.<sup>217</sup> In any event, their spectacular incursion indicated the increased reputation of *Studentski list* which rocketed in the past year.

---

<sup>212</sup> Vesna Pusić, "Korijeni hrvatskog političkog identiteta" (The Roots of Croatian Political Identity), *Erasmus: časopis za kulturu demokracije*, 15 (1996): 4–6;

<sup>213</sup> Cuvalo, *The Croatian National Movement 1966–1972*, 151.

<sup>214</sup> More on the incident in Ponoš, *Na rubu revolucije - studenti '71*, 124–125.

<sup>215</sup> The first and last issue published by *Universitas* came out at the end of March. See respectively: Dag Strpić, interview by author, 12 Nov. 2010, Zagreb, digital recording; *Studentski list* 11 (30 March 1971); Ponoš, *Na rubu revolucije - studenti '71*, 122.

<sup>216</sup> See also: "Saopćenje Predsjedništva SSSZ o zbivanjima oko 'Studentskog lista'" (Memo of the Presidency of SUUZ on the Events around *Studentski list*), *Studentski list* 12/13 (20 Apr. 1971): 14.

<sup>217</sup> Strpić testifies how he and his colleagues circled around the journal's premises during the night to prevent the expected foray. Yet these were eventually broken into with the help of an internal mole. Strpić, interview.

### 5.3.6. National students in charge and the consequent repression

The new student constituency was unique in many ways. Made up of political outsiders, it differed from all rival student political factions of the time. Unlike their leftist adversaries, its supporters came mostly from provincial Croatian regions. They studied at different faculties and showed dubious communist commitment.<sup>218</sup> By the same token, within its ranks there were simply no journalists who could fill the vacant place. This was quickly realized by the new head of the student union, Dražen Budiša, who asked in vain a part of the former crew to return.<sup>219</sup>

What the renewed staff lacked in skills, they hoped to make up in national pathos.<sup>220</sup> They filled the journal with inciting speeches of the new student leaders and their informal allies, intellectuals from the cultural national institution *Matica Hrvatska*.<sup>221</sup>

No matter how inferior in quality, the policy was in accord with the general trend. Over the next eight months, *Studentski list* would serve as the platform of the rampant Croatian student movement.<sup>222</sup> Sharing its aggressive style and messages, it admitted a range of voices that strived to confirm Croatian sovereignty.<sup>223</sup> The long list of the journal's enemies stretched from the Croatian Party conservatives who opposed the

<sup>218</sup> Impressed by these differences, the literature overlooks that these revolutionary methods were very much akin to the spirit of 1968. The other parallels also include the struggle for the autonomy of the university, the de-bureaucratization of the student union and direct challenge to the political monopoly of the Party. See: Zubak, "The Croatian Spring 1967-1971: Testing the Pitfalls of the Croatian Historiography and Beyond", 220-22.

<sup>219</sup> Those designated as "centralists", including some culture writers, were crossed from the list of potential writers. Turković, interview.

<sup>220</sup> The first two covers of the new series featured the map of Croatia and the 17<sup>th</sup> century letter written by the Croatian national hero Petar Zrinski. *Studentski list* 12/13 (20 Apr. 1971): 1; *Studentski list* 14 (27 Apr. 1971): 1.

<sup>221</sup> Next to each other, stood speeches by Budiša and prominent economist Marko Veselica: "Energično se suprotstavljamo bilo nacionalnoj bilo vjerskoj diskriminaciji" (We Firmly Oppose both National and Religious Discrimination); "U susret suvremenoj transformaciji Hrvatske" (Facing Contemporary Transformation of Croatia), *Studentski list* 12/13 (20 Apr. 1971): 13; 5.

<sup>222</sup> The opening editorial stated that, in contrast to the former "isolated group of bureaucrats and their media guardians" the journal would reinstall its links with the student movement. "Riječ urednika" (Word from the Editor), *Studentski list* 12/13 (20 Apr. 1971): 3.

<sup>223</sup> Students formulated their own variants of the proposed reforms: "Zaključci s rasprave o amandmanima" (Conclusions from the Debate on Amendments); "Hrvatski je narod u svojoj domovini" (Croatian People Are in Their Homeland), *Studentski list* 23/24/25 (23 Nov. 1971): 3; 6.

national-liberal course to the anti-Croatian Belgrade media. Every effort to impede the launched constitutional reforms was rebuked and instantly countered with more radical suggestions.<sup>224</sup> In turn, the support for the Croatian Party reformists was conditioned on their willingness to execute the proposed policies.<sup>225</sup>

Wary of these national aspirations which surpassed its own, the Croatian Party reluctantly accepted the new student movement whose inability to compromise, however, made sure that the truce did not survive the summer.<sup>226</sup> Whereas *Omladinski tjednik* closely reflected this swinging mood of the Party, *Studentski list* remained loyal ambassador of the movement, even as it lost provisional official support.<sup>227</sup> Moreover, it opposed all ambitions to establish continuity with the previous student upsurge.<sup>228</sup> Instead, the Croatian student movement was identified as an entirely new political actor, fully at odds from the utopian egalitarianism of its leftist opponents, in Zagreb or elsewhere.<sup>229</sup>

<sup>224</sup> See the emotional call for the debate on constitutional amendments and its later radical formulations: *Studentski list* 16 (11 May 1971): 1; “Hrvatska hoće biti suverena u gospodarstvu, politici i kulturi” (Croatia Wants to Be Sovereign in Economy, Politics and Culture), *Studentski list* 17 (25 May 1971): 13.

<sup>225</sup> See Dražen Budiša’s cover text, originally delivered as speech. *Studentski list* 20 (28 Sept. 1971): 1.

<sup>226</sup> Initially, the Croatian Party reformists favored the old student contingent. They embraced the new leadership only in April, seeing this as a convenient way to restrain this potentially problematic new force. That they failed was obvious already in the autumn. Almost all available accounts of the Croatian Spring regularly miss this dynamic dialectic, since both the opponents and the advocates of the process blur the differences between those who initiated it and the students who radicalized it. See for example: Savka Dabčević-Kučar, *’71: Hrvatski snovi i stvarnost* (’71: Croatian Dreams and Reality) (Zagreb: Interpublic, 1997), vol. 2., 760-63.

<sup>227</sup> Following the Party, *Omladinski tjednik* was at first suspicious towards the new movement. Since Čičak’s election, it slowly revised its attitude for the better and temporarily defended its radical methods, only to ultimately condemn its destructive extremism: “Dijalektika sveučilišnih gibanja” (University Movements Dialectics), *Omladinski tjednik* 112-113 (23 Dec. 1970): 2; “Susreti na sveučilištu” (University Encounters), *Omladinski tjednik* 116-117 (3 Feb. 1971): 6-7; “Partija i omladina još jedno” (Party and Youth still the One), *Omladinski tjednik* 126 (7 April 1971): 2; *Omladinski tjednik* 143 (13 Oct. 1971): 8.

<sup>228</sup> Aware of its past *Omladinski tjednik* insisted that the youth politicization progressed in a straight line: “Nakon desete i još deseta sjednica” (After 10<sup>th</sup>, another 10<sup>th</sup> Session), *Omladinski tjednik* 126 (7 April 1971): 2; “Očevi, djeca, revolucija” (Fathers, Children, Revolution), *Omladinski tjednik* 146-147 (10 Nov. 1971): 1.

<sup>229</sup> Both of its leaders, Čičak and Budiša, openly rejected the June protest which, they claimed, was manipulated by the Party centralist hard-liners. *Preporod hrvatskih sveučilištaraca*, 88-94, 178.

Not surprisingly, it was in the journal's premises where the national students decided to launch their most ambitious action – the student strike in November 1971.<sup>230</sup> Staged in the extremely tense atmosphere where a conservative backlash was expected at any moment, it posed an unorthodox request: an instant change in the system of foreign currency distribution, considered detrimental for the Croatian economy.<sup>231</sup> A special issue, like those of *Student* from June 1968, was saturated with dramatic cries that explained the motives and course of the strike, elsewhere labeled as extreme and harmful.<sup>232</sup>

A swift showdown that ensued did not allow for equal resistance though. The strike prompted the inevitable end of the whole Croatian Spring. Before long, Tito summoned the Croatian Party reformists and forced them to resign, among others, for “failing to control the national extremists.” All those who endorsed the democratic-national course found themselves in the dock facing rigorous measures. Among the worst hit were the national student leaders who were immediately apprehended and later sentenced to long-term imprisonment.<sup>233</sup> The ruthless suppression also dispersed the student left, which, ever since its April defeat had stayed on the scene.

By extension, the breakdown of the Croatian Spring deeply affected the Zagreb youth press. The harsh Party report granted it a section of its own, acknowledging its links with the radical student politicization. The youth journals were proclaimed to be

---

<sup>230</sup> Ponoš, *Na rubu revolucije - studenti '71*, 177.

<sup>231</sup> Originating from regions with the high percentage of guest workers in West Germany, these students shared great interests in economic issues. While Party reformists asked them to stop the action, they refused to yield, and threaten to disown them, should they give up the launched reforms. Marin Knezović, “Štrajk hrvatskih sveučilištaraca u jesen 1971. u onodobnom tisku” (Croatian Student Strike in the Autumn of 1971 in the Press), *Radovi* 28 (1995): 231; More on strike in: Ponoš, *Na rubu revolucije - studenti '71*, 179-194.

<sup>232</sup> Here too, *Studentski list*'s approach differed from *Omladinski tjednik* which voiced Croatian Party's warnings about the latent dangers of the endeavor. See in turn: “Štrajk” (Strike); “Tijek događaja” (The Course of Events), *Studentski list* 26, spec. issue (26 Nov. 1971): 3; 9; “Studentski pokret i politička stvarnost” (Student Movement and Political Reality); “Avanturizam i politikantstvo – neprihvatljivi” (Adventurism and Petty Politics – Unacceptable), *Omladinski tjednik* 147 (1 Dec. 1971): 2-3; 4.

<sup>233</sup> Ponoš, *Na rubu revolucije - studenti '71*, 119-126.

the focal point and the most zealous agent of the whole process. *Omladinski tjednik*, along with the republican youth journal *Tlo*, was arraigned for succumbing to the injurious influence of the Croatian Party leaders.<sup>234</sup> *Studentski list* was charged for the April coup and subsequent endorsement of the movement that “turned young people into an assault squad of the ravaging nationalistic policies.”<sup>235</sup>

Subsequent repression went beyond the usual editorial removals and surpassed those in other cities. A severe blow replaced the prosperity from the late 1960s. The Zagreb youth journals were either extinguished, or deprived of normal funding which condemned them to minor existence.<sup>236</sup> In the succeeding years, they relinquished all meaningful political engagement. While a marginal share of leftists tried to continue their actions thereafter, the repressive milieu made their efforts pointless, if not utterly absurd.

#### 5.4. LJUBLJANA YOUTH PRESS AND THE STUDENT MOVEMENT

In contrast to both Belgrade and Zagreb, the student politicization in Ljubljana only marginally affected the local youth press before the autumn of 1970. The reason was simple. Prior to that, there was no movement to reflect upon.<sup>237</sup>

---

<sup>234</sup> Ibid., 256-58.

<sup>235</sup> *Hrvatsko proljeće: Presuda partije – Izvještaj o stanju u Savezu komunista Hrvatske u odnosu na prodor nacionalizma u njegove redove* (The Croatian Spring: Party’s Verdict – Report on the Situation in the League of Communists of Croatia about the Rise of Nationalism in Its Ranks) (Zagreb: Dom i svijet, 2003), 177-82, 187.

<sup>236</sup> Following a six-month suspension, *Tlo* was abolished in 1972 after producing only three issues. *Omladinski tjednik* was published on and off from 1972 till 1976, while *Studentski list* struggled even to establish normal publishing rhythm.

<sup>237</sup> The late outbreak was partly due to a minor student upsurge that occurred in 1964, prompted by the ban of Ljubljana journal *Perspektive*, a kind of *Praxis*’s forerunner. Some interpretations see the whole later movement as a subdued replay of these events. See: Dimitrij Rupel, *Od vojnog do civilnog društva* (From Military to Civil Society) (Zagreb: Globus, 1990).



### 5.4.1. Late bloomer

Until then, the student journal *Tribuna* scarcely differed from the preceding years.<sup>238</sup> Focusing on cultural matters, it stood out solely by the provocative group of young poets whose attempt to produce revolutionary culture is discussed later on in the chapter.<sup>239</sup>

This is not to say that the trends addressed elsewhere were completely absent. The affinity for the global student revolt was equally strong and colored with the same New Left shades.<sup>240</sup> Students learned about the uprisings of their Western colleagues from reporters directly on the scene.<sup>241</sup> Punchy headlines announced their protests as if they had been convened in Ljubljana.<sup>242</sup> The call for action, however, remained unanswered.<sup>243</sup> Instead, poor feedback of local solidarity actions left the editors frustrated, which, in turn, further alienated the readers who questioned their motives.<sup>244</sup>

---

<sup>238</sup> The city youth organ *Mladina* can be ignored. By the time of student movement, *Mladina* renounced its political ambitions and turned into a general interest magazine for teenagers.

<sup>239</sup> The initiative provoked the first official debates on the journal's policies at the end of 1968: "Sredstva javnega obveščanja kot samostojen soustvarjalec samoupravnog socializma" (Means of Public Information as an Independent Co-Creator of Self-management Socialism), *Tribuna* 4 (20 Nov. 1968): 7-8.

<sup>240</sup> Even *Mladina* contributed. In one of its last political efforts, the extensive series ranked the global student movements according to the New Left criteria, namely, their ability to reflect on the general social problems and detach from the institutional politics. See: "Dolga vroča pomlad gre h koncu" (The Long Hot Spring Goes to an End), *Mladina* 24 (17 June 1968): 13.

<sup>241</sup> The resilience of Italian students made *Tribuna*'s reporter painfully aware of the pseudo-revolutionary domestic youth politics. His colleague reported amidst the May conflict with the Paris police where he received a number of baton blows. See: "Ob študentskih nemirih v Italiji" (On Student Unrests in Italy), *Tribuna* 17 (1 April 1968): 7; "Pariška pomlad" (Paris Spring), *Tribuna* 20 (20 May 1968): 5.

<sup>242</sup> "Velikonočni marš 1968" (1968 Long-Night March), *Tribuna* 18 (15 April 1968): 1.

<sup>243</sup> The context differed as well. Unlike in Belgrade, Ljubljana student union co-signed *Tribuna*'s letter of support to Polish students and the related dispute never occurred: "Odpri pismo rektoratu Varšavske univerze in ambasadi Ljudske republike Poljske v Beogradu" (Open Letter to the Rector of the Warsaw University and the Polish Embassy in Belgrade), *Tribuna* 18 (15 April 1968): 1.

<sup>244</sup> Readers warned that such actions merely repeated official truisms and had nothing to do with revolutionary fervor: "Protestno pismo Dimitriju Ruplu" (Protest Letter to Dimitrij Rupel), *Tribuna* 19 (29 April 1968): 2.

Similarly, a minor student rally convened in June 1968 never reached the intensity of the one that burst out in the capital a day earlier.<sup>245</sup> Due to its restricted demands, limited to the students' financial concerns, *Tribuna* too fell short of the historic experience of Belgrade's *Student*. The lack of genuine grievances left the journal with not much to complain against.<sup>246</sup> If anything, it condemned Ljubljana students and their union for refusing to confront deeper social problems.<sup>247</sup>

In the long run, however, the protest planted seeds that would flourish once the actual events were underway.<sup>248</sup> The intuitive empathy with the prosecuted Belgrade students and their journal would, eventually, revive *Tribuna*'s own interest in student politics and the youth press.<sup>249</sup> The event also prompted the thorough reform of the Ljubljana student union which dominated the student affairs in the following year.<sup>250</sup> While the surrounding debates hardly inspired, the consequences did. Once reorganized, the union was ready to absorb various rank and file initiatives that

---

<sup>245</sup> The reason why the existing accounts date the outbreak of the Ljubljana student movement to June 1968 had more to do with the impact of the Belgrade protest, than with the actual local rally when nothing much occurred. For paradigmatic example see: Baškovič et al., *Študentsko gibanje 1968-72*, 7-39.

<sup>246</sup> See: "Komunika organizacijskog odbora študentskog zborovanja" (Circular Letter of the Student Assembly's Organizational Committee); "Odlomki z zborovanja v študentskem naselju" (Fragments from the Rally in the Student Campus), *Tribuna* 22 (17 June 1968): 4, 6-7.

<sup>247</sup> "Sindikalizem in neodločnost" (Syndicalism and Indecision); "Družba, ki se razkraja" (Dissolving Society); "Poseči v korenine problema" (Get to the Roots of the Problems), *Tribuna* 22 (17 June 1968): 1,3,12.

<sup>248</sup> The limited magnitude of the protest failed to make an immediate impression. The first analysis appeared in March 1969, with the "academic" youth journal *Problemi* contributing to the discussions. See: "Dediščina junija" (The June Heritage), *Tribuna* 3 (4 Nov. 1968): 1-2; "Realnost in utopija" (Reality and Utopia), *Tribuna* 10 (5 March 1969): 3; "Beograjski, zagrebški ali ljubljanski študentski avantgardizem" (Belgrade, Zagreb or Ljubljana Student Avant-garde), *Problemi* 80 (Aug. 1969): 1-2.

<sup>249</sup> Unlike in June, when *Tribuna* praised the commitment rather than the ideas of the Belgrade June protesters, the removal of *Student*'s editorial board stirred the flood of supporting reactions. Shortly before, the journal condemned the repression of the youth press, including Maribor's *Katedra*. See: "Dileme študentskega tiska" (Dilemmas of the Youth Press), *Tribuna* 1 (22 Nov. 1969): 12-13; "Pismo beograjskim prijateljem" (Letter to the Belgrade Friends); "Sokrat umira v Beogradu" (Socrates Dies in Belgrade), *Tribuna* 5 (31 Jan. 1970): 3.

<sup>250</sup> *Tribuna* espoused the process and the related incoherent discussions about the reform of the university. See: "Reorganizacija ZŠ ima dva osnovna namena" (The Reorganization of SU Has Two Chief Goals) *Tribuna* 5 (4 Dec. 1968): 4; "Reforma študija na univerzi" (Study Reform at the University), *Tribuna* 14-15 (4 June 1969): 3.

subsequently amounted to a movement.<sup>251</sup> It is the support for this kind of grass-roots youth politics that turned *Tribuna* into an alternative political medium.<sup>252</sup>

#### 5.4.2. Adopting the movement: 1970/71

In the autumn of 1970, *Tribuna* drastically changed its outlook, adopting the new *underground* design.<sup>253</sup> Content instantly matched up as students were swiftly promoted into a political force to reckon with. With the dissent still in the embryonic stage, *Tribuna* created an illusion of a long protest motion lasting since last May.<sup>254</sup>

The journal imputed a wider meaning to just about any informal student cause. The Literary Marathon, a minor cultural event held in November, was compared to Woodstock and labeled as “the movement.”<sup>255</sup> The manifestation ultimately politicized due to a few philosophy students, freshly returned from the capital, who organized a “teach-in” on the ongoing Belgrade trial against Vlada Mijanović, giving full support to its victim.<sup>256</sup>

Among them was Darko Štrajn who penned his impressions in *Tribuna*, condemning the political prosecutions at large.<sup>257</sup> His report opposed the news fed to the public by the mainstream press.<sup>258</sup> Doubts about the latter deepened as the debate

<sup>251</sup> Bašković et al., *Študentsko gibanje 1968-72*, xxxix.

<sup>252</sup> Already in May 1970, *Tribuna* reprinted the first student resolutions on global politics: “Resolucija akcijske skupine ob Košarki ‘70” (Resolution of the Action Group on Basketball ‘70), *Tribuna* 12-13 (19 May 1970): 5.

<sup>253</sup> For the discussion of *Tribuna*’s groundbreaking design see Chapter 7.

<sup>254</sup> The October cover featured an extended chronology. In November *Tribuna* reiterated the May resolutions: “Še pomnite, tovariši?” (Do You Remember, Comrades?), *Tribuna* 1 (15 Oct. 1970): 1; “Zakaj protestiramo in kaj nas resnično skrbi” (Why Do We Protest and What Really Trouble Us), *Tribuna* 6, suppl. (19 Nov. 1970): 2.

<sup>255</sup> The journal fervidly promoted the event and reprinted texts from its internal bulletin with subtitles such as *Everybody must get stoned*: “Naša velika sobota” (Our Big Saturday), *Tribuna* 4 (5 Nov. 1970): 3; “Maraton – to je gibanje” (Marathon – That’s a Movement); “Maraton” (Marathon), *Tribuna* 6 (19 Nov. 1970): 1; 2.

<sup>256</sup> See editor’s note: “Teach-in na FF” (Teach-in At the PF), *Tribuna* 5 (12 Nov. 1970): 3.

<sup>257</sup> Darko Štrajn, interview by author, 8 Apr. 2011, Ljubljana, Skype recording; “Kaj se pravzaprav dogaja v Beogradu” (What Really Goes On in Belgrade), *Tribuna* 5 (12 Nov. 1970): 4.

<sup>258</sup> *Tribuna* kept covering the trial and the following strike: “Študentska organizacija študentsko gibanje” (Student Organization Student Movement), *Tribuna* 8 (10 Dec. 1970): 5; “Svoboda kritike v

provoked a distorted coverage of the Marathon itself. From then on, the issue of controlled media resided in the journal's agenda.<sup>259</sup> The chic New Left jargon took roots: before long, *Tribuna* reported from another "teach-in," dedicated to the "fraudulent" mainstream media.<sup>260</sup>

The student activists found in *Tribuna* a suitable forum for the expression of their defiant leftist ideas. The most outspoken, future editor Jaša Zlobec, relentlessly reproached opportunistic Yugoslav foreign policy for sacrificing true communist ideals for short-term benefits.<sup>261</sup> In turn, the journal opened up to the radical student wing from the Ljubljana Faculty of Philosophy. As its efforts slowly outgrew the union, *Tribuna* clearly favored the former, complementing its discourse on "the student movement" with the criticism of the student union.<sup>262</sup>

The shift was complete in spring 1971. *Tribuna's* special April issue covered a series of highly irregular, extra-institutional student actions.<sup>263</sup> In less than a month, Ljubljana students demonstrated against the congested city traffic, the visit of the conservative French prime minister, and, finally, distributed leaflets which accused

---

karanteni ali študentu so znižali kazen" (Freedom of Criticism in Quarantine or Student's Sentence Reduced), *Tribuna* 15 (Jan. 1971): 3.

<sup>259</sup> The related articles habitually appeared ever since *Tribuna* transferred the first student resolution on the press, adopted at the Marathon: "Prisotni na" (Present At), *Tribuna* 6 (19 Nov. 1970): 3; "Antentina logika" (*Antena's* Logic), *Tribuna* 8 (10 Dec. 1970): 7; "Spoštovani tovariš glavni urednik" (Dear Comrade Chief Editor), *Tribuna* 11 (24 Dec. 1970): 7.

<sup>260</sup> "Teze za razpravo na študentski tribuni o informiranju" (Points for the Student Debate on Informing); "Denarna kazen za politične napake" (A Fine for Political Errors), *Tribuna* 21-22 (17 April 1971): 2; 16.

<sup>261</sup> The issue remained *Tribuna's* trademark throughout the period: "Razprodaja vrednot" (Sale of Values), *Tribuna* 4 (5 Nov. 1970): 2; "O tem, kak se izda revolucijo" (On How to Betray the Revolution), *Tribuna* 11 (24 Dec. 1970): 4; "Namesto zadušnice" (Instead of Requiem), *Tribuna* 7 (26 Nov. 1970): 3.

<sup>262</sup> "Teze za študentsko gibanje" (Theses For the Student Movement); "Možnosti za revolucionarno akcijo na univerzi" (Prospects for the Revolutionary Action at the University), *Tribuna* 6, suppl. (19 Nov. 1970): 1-3; "Klasična' orijentacija IO SŠ LVZ" (IO SU LVZ's "Classic" Orientation), *Tribuna* 20 (1 April 1971): 3.

<sup>263</sup> "Zakaj bomo še šli na cesto" (Why We Will Go on the Streets Again); "Odprto pismo slovenski javnosti" (Open Letter to the Slovenian Public); "Dogodki ob obisku Chabana-Delmasa in po njem" (The Events During and After Chaban-Delmas' Visit), *Tribuna*, spec. issue (May 1971): 3.

the Party of betraying its original ideals.<sup>264</sup> All these emerged independently from the journal, but the intertwined roles of its staff were increasingly obvious. They were part of the student delegation that reproached the employees of the major daily *Delo* for its fabricated news. The environmental rally spilled into the city centre due to *Tribuna*'s lector whose metaphorical call for the resistance to police earned him a criminal charge.<sup>265</sup>

This string of protests was too assertive not to provoke a state reaction. After hindering the rallies, police ransacked the Faculty of Philosophy, arresting a member of *Tribuna*'s staff who authored the graffiti that called for urban guerrilla warfare.<sup>266</sup> The apprehension of Franko Adam, in May 1971, led to the week-long occupation of the Faculty. In a belated replay of June, the latter was turned into an *anti-university* where critical Marxists held lectures, while students pondered upon the meaning of their protest and general problems of society.<sup>267</sup>

*The Occupation Manifesto* heavily drew from the Belgrade June 1968. The document indentified the Ljubljana students as a novel revolutionary agent that should re-install the once progressive tradition of the Party, considered corrupted and stripped of its initial qualities.<sup>268</sup> But their main goal was to establish the student movement as a new mode of living and, in that sense, was in full accord with the West European trends.<sup>269</sup> By the same token, as the next autumn would reveal, it was also the least rooted in the local constituency.

---

<sup>264</sup> A detailed look at these actions is available in: Ilich, ed., *Pričevanja študentske pomladi*, 61-76; Baškovič et al., *Študentsko gibanje 1968-72*, 141-52.

<sup>265</sup> Ibid.

<sup>266</sup> Ilich, ed., *Pričevanja študentske pomladi*, 78-92; Baškovič et al., *Študentsko gibanje 1968-72*, xlv.

<sup>267</sup> Mihevc, *Študentske kritike in predstave*, 150-56.

<sup>268</sup> Collectively written, and later reprinted in *Tribuna*, the document summarized points brought out in *SP*. Due to their specific status students are able to analyze the society and with their counter-politics ignite a true self-management. "Manifest zasedene filozofske fakultete" (Manifest of the Occupied Philosophical Faculty), *Tribuna* 24 (Oct. 1971): 7-8.

<sup>269</sup> More on the student siege as a sub-cultural colony in: Baškovič et al., *Študentsko gibanje 1968-72*, 152-53; Ilich, ed., *Pričevanja študentske pomladi*, 124-51.

When the siege began, *Tribuna*'s circulation was already halted for some time. The “problems with the printing house” emerged after the spring issue and would persist till the end of the academic year.<sup>270</sup> Nevertheless, the journal maintained its presence throughout the siege. Next to the works of Mao, Đilas or Trotsky, *Tribuna* became a part of an improvised “student’s revolutionary library.”<sup>271</sup> Students organized debates on the youth press and the media at large. Displeased with the way their siege was treated, they adopted a special decree that refuted the “sensationalist and tendentious” mainstream media.

Meanwhile, the student union’s branch at the Philosophic faculty decided to print its own internal journal *SP*. The twelve mimeographed issues created during the occupation were written by the core group of student activists, nearly all current or future *Tribuna* journalists. They show a striking resemblance to those historic issues of *Student* or *Studentski list* produced during their own respective crises.<sup>272</sup> *SP* provided the chronology of the student siege, discussed their plans, allowing a range of radical voices to be expressed.<sup>273</sup>

Feeding on Dutschke, the protesters launched their own “march through the institutions,” trying to instill them with the lost, socialist content. The maxim found its finest expression in *Tribuna* itself. During the occupation, the editor Jože Konc invited

---

<sup>270</sup> “Kje su meje (ne)svo-bode?” (Where are the Borders of (Non) Freedom?), *Problemi* 101 (May 1971): 42-44.

<sup>271</sup> *Tribuna*'s editorial office moved to the occupied faculty. Ilich, ed., *Pričevanja študentske pomladi*, 130-36.

<sup>272</sup> These include cultural authors like Andrej Ule, Milan Dekleva, Andrej Medved, Matjaž Kocbek, and new young political writers such as Jaša Zlobec, Marjan Pungartnik, Darko Štrajn or Bobi Cizej. The issues were published each day of the siege, from 25<sup>th</sup> of May till 3<sup>rd</sup> of June. The newly formed Action Committee of the Occupation appeared as its co-publisher. More on *SP* in: Baškovič et al., *Študentsko gibanje 1968-72*, 153-54.

<sup>273</sup> See among others: “Zakaj smo tu in zakaj nam gre” (Why Are We Here and What Is It All About); “Kakšni ste naša logika in taktika” (What Are Our Logic and Tactics), *SP* 2 (25 May 1971): 4; 7; “Kako se organizirati” (How to Organize), *SP* 5 (28 May 1971): 7; “Študentski protest” (Student Protest); “Gibanje ali upor” (Movement or Revolt), *SP* 7 (29 May 1971): 2; “Kaj storiti” (What to Do), *SP* 11 (2 May 1971): 6.

its leaders to take over the editorial board in the following year.<sup>274</sup> Some, including Jaša Zlobec, Bobi Cizej or Franko Adam, already entered the journal. The rest, like the future executive editor Mladen Dolar, Darko Štrajn and Marjan Pungartnik, joined them during the siege. Together they formed a tightly-knit journalist-activist group that would write another epic chapter in the history of the Yugoslav youth press.

### 5.4.3. Radicalization: 1971/72

The recruits instantly announced their intention to continue where *SP* stopped and turn *Tribuna* into the vanguard of the Ljubljana student movement. A special October issue paid homage to the May occupation, reprinting key articles from *SP*.<sup>275</sup> “*The time came for a wide youth revolt....*” – spelled out the opening editorial.<sup>276</sup> Rosa Luxemburg’s quote adorned the captions: *Freedom is always the freedom of the one who thinks differently.*<sup>277</sup>

The journal’s links with the movement reached a new level. Rather than being just its mouthpiece, *Tribuna* now formulated crucial directives and tactics.<sup>278</sup> In turn, the relation with the publisher deteriorated. The staff resisted all official attempts to appropriate the movement, which arose “spontaneously from the state institutions.”<sup>279</sup> If anyone, it was the staff that was entitled to such a claim. *Tribuna*’s articles, Dolar argued, spoke more about the student movement than any of the union’s documents.<sup>280</sup>

<sup>274</sup> Mladen Dolar, interview by author, 23 Apr. 2011, Ljubljana, digital recording; Štrajn, interview.

<sup>275</sup> Next to the Manifesto, see also: “Kronologija dogodkov v zadnjem mesecu” (Chronology of the Last Month’s Events); “Svoboda svobodne univerze” (Freedom of the Free University), *Tribuna* 24 (Oct. 1971): 1-2.

<sup>276</sup> “*Ahead lies a bright opportunity... We are certain that we are the best, irreplaceable.*” See in: “Otroci sveta združimo se” (Children of the World Unite), *Tribuna* 1 (10 Oct. 1971): 1.

<sup>277</sup> *Tribuna* 6 (24 Nov. 1971): 1.

<sup>278</sup> Numerous articles testify to the unity between *Tribuna* and the movement: “Kam študentsko gibanje” (Where Heads the Student Movement), *Tribuna* 6 (24 Nov. 1971): 3; “In kaj sedaj” (And What Now), *Tribuna* 15 (16 March 1972): 1.

<sup>279</sup> “Prove Yourself Alive,” *Tribuna* 1 (10 Oct. 1971): 4.

<sup>280</sup> Dolar criticized the student union’s collection of documents that misrepresented the student politics in the past year. See respectively: Milena Dežman, ed., *Zbornik dokumentov 70/71* (Collection of Documents '70/71) (Ljubljana: IO SŠ LJVZ, 1971); *Tribuna* 5 (16 Nov. 1971): 1.

Yet, to his surprise, within a few months, the momentum rapidly declined.<sup>281</sup> From a few thousand who participated in the siege, it was now reduced to some thirty people, concentrated around *Tribuna* alone. The journal literally became a single, isolated mainstay of the movement which survived solely because its staff reflected on it.<sup>282</sup>

*Tribuna*'s staff deliberated on the incurred crises.<sup>283</sup> Through various visions, the same belief came through: it was time to raise the stakes. Formerly condemned, the hunger strike of a student dissatisfied with the end of the May siege became the sole act that urged forward.<sup>284</sup> Four months after it was drafted, the *Occupation Manifesto* seemed outdated, pseudo-revolutionary and barely distinguishable from the official vocabulary.<sup>285</sup> Instead, Zlobec invoked direct confrontation with the system. There should be no more restraints: "For too long they were concerned if someone wrote fuck!"<sup>286</sup> This kind of verbal fireworks became inherent to the journal that demanded action, of the kind for which "the balls were needed."<sup>287</sup>

In October 1971, two editorial letters to Tito pushed *Tribuna*'s obsession with foreign policy into a dangerous realm. The staff broke the unwritten taboo and openly criticized Tito, asking for the explanation behind his visit to reactionary Shah of

<sup>281</sup> Baškovič et al., *Študentsko gibanje 1968-72*, xk-xli.

<sup>282</sup> In retrospect, both Dolar and Štrajn confirm their disappointment with the weak response from below. Even the "academic" youth journal *Problemi*, staffed by the 1968 generation, now criticized the student movement. *Tribuna*'s sole media ally was a newly founded student radio *Radio Študent* discussed in the next chapter: Štrajn, interview; Dolar, interview; "Revolucionarnost?" (Revolutionary?), *Problemi* 103-104 (Sept.-Oct. 1971): 7-10.

<sup>283</sup> The whole editorial board contributed, including Štrajn, Cizej, Adam, and the two editors, Zlobec and Dolar.

<sup>284</sup> Conversely, the rationale behind the "institutional march" was openly questioned: "Ob koncu neke namišljene idile" (At the End of Some Imaginary Idyll), *Tribuna* 1 (10 Oct. 1971): 5.

<sup>285</sup> "Križa študentske organizacije" (The Crisis of the Student Organization), *Tribuna* 6 (24 Nov. 1971): 2.

<sup>286</sup> "My Life is My Revolution", *Tribuna* 11 (21 Nov. 1971): 1-2.

<sup>287</sup> Likewise, the movement "not ready to risk injuries or death is worth a shit." See in turn: "Rasti, rasti" (Rise, Rise), *Tribuna* 1 (10 Oct. 1971): 5. "Bodimo realisti, zahtevajmo nemogoče" (Be Realistic, Demand Impossible), *Tribuna* 7-8 (11 Dec. 1971): 15.



Iran.<sup>288</sup> A month later, a group of students, prompted by the editor Zlobec and comprising mainly of *Tribuna*'s staff, formed their own section within the Party, with the intention to serve as an elitist pressure group.<sup>289</sup> This effort to create a Party vanguard, not dissimilar to the early *Komsomol*, abruptly ended as the members were "convinced" to eliminate their splinter cell, while Zlobec earned his first Party caution.<sup>290</sup>

The endeavor nicely illustrates the synthesis of realpolitik and utopia typical for both the movement and its organ. The major share of *Tribuna*'s staff were Party members, versed in self-management discourse.<sup>291</sup> On the flip side, the latter was used as a flexible frame into which related ideological streams could be fitted, from revisionist Marxism to critical theory.<sup>292</sup>

Under the aegis of the all-embracing doctrine, there were also those harder to harmonize with the official paradigm.<sup>293</sup> In 1970, the founder of the Amsterdam's *Provos* Roel Van Duyn spent time in Ljubljana infusing *Tribuna*'s staff with anarchist ideas.<sup>294</sup> Cizej and Štrajn introduced the US political counterculture in its broad range. Jerry Rubin's Yippie Bible *Do It!* was published in installments with its appropriate

<sup>288</sup> "Odrpno pismo Titu" (Open Letter to Tito); "Cenjeni Predsednik Josip Broz Tito" (Honorable President Josip Broz Tito), *Tribuna* 3 (25 Oct. 1971): 1; 2.

<sup>289</sup> More on the group, named *13<sup>th</sup> of November* in: Baškovič et al., *Študentsko gibanje 1968-72*, 263-276.

<sup>290</sup> *Tribuna* announced the endeavor, its founding decree and proceedings: "Dovolj nam je" (We Had Enough), *Tribuna* 4 (8 Nov. 1971): 2; "Gibanje 13.november" (The Movement of the 13<sup>th</sup> of November); "Študentko gibanje in Zlobčev program" (Student Movement and Zlobec's Program), *Tribuna* 7-8 (11 Dec. 1971): 4; 5-6.

<sup>291</sup> During the occupation of the Faculty, student activists entered the Party en masse. Dolar, interview. See also: "Proti perverziji levičarske parole" (Against the Perversion of Leftist Slogan), *Tribuna* 11 (21 Jan. 1972): 2.

<sup>292</sup> See: "Fenomenologija ideološko-političnega prodora jugoslavenskega srednjega razreda" (Phenomenology of Ideological-Political Breakthrough of the Yugoslav Middle Class); "Politika in utopija" (Politics and Utopia); *Tribuna* 7-8 (11 Dec. 1971): 8-9; "Marx i market" (Marx and the Market), *Tribuna* 9 (24 Dec. 1971): 3.

<sup>293</sup> Dolar, more of an intellectual, in retrospect claims to be enthused with structuralism, ever since his 1969 stay in Paris. Zlobec, the man of action, was absorbed with Trotsky. See in turn: Dolar, interview; "Lev Trocki: Izdana revolucija" (Betrayed Revolution), *Tribuna* 13 (28 Feb. 1972): 4;

<sup>294</sup> Van Duyn even wrote two articles: "Zapis o holandskem študentskem gibanju" (Note on the Dutch Student Movement), *Tribuna* 2 (22 Oct. 1970): 3; "Roel Van Duyn," "Kabouter's Message," *Tribuna* 19 (March 1971): 8; "Roel Van Duyn – Razvoj panične znanosti" (Roel Van Duyn – Evolution of the Panic Science), *Tribuna* 5 (16 Nov. 1971): 7.

subtitle: *Scenarios of the Revolution*.<sup>295</sup> Bobby Seale, Eldridge Cleaver and other Black Panthers became recognizable figures.<sup>296</sup>

As a whole, *Tribuna*'s staff aspired to be a part of the wide global force drawn to humanism, rather than power.<sup>297</sup> If the May siege was compared to the struggle in Vietnam, the current crisis resembled the recent apathy surrounding Western students.<sup>298</sup> In the Yugoslav context, *Tribuna* found itself in a twofold discrepancy. Perceived as a forerunner of the journal's own utopian pursuit, the Belgrade student movement was already in its dying stages. *Tribuna* could thus only evoke the egalitarian June demands, while objecting the ensuing prosecutions.<sup>299</sup> Conversely, the staff showed nothing but contempt towards the Croatian student movement whose nationalist contours was regarded as an aberration in the common student struggle.<sup>300</sup>

The student politicization finally succumbed in spring 1972. With no allies and receptive base, the attention turned once again to the university reform.<sup>301</sup> The journal revitalized syndicalist initiatives, previously considered of secondary importance.<sup>302</sup> The project of an alternative university played on the familiar reformist ideas, yet,

<sup>295</sup> For the first of the 18 sequels see: "Jerry Rubin: Do it!," *Tribuna* 3 (25 Oct. 1971): 1-2.

<sup>296</sup> "Manifest za črnsko revolucionarno partijo" (Manifest for the Black Revolutionary Party), *Tribuna* 5 (16 Nov. 1971): 5; "Underground: Podtalje" (Underground), *Tribuna* 12 (17 Feb. 1972): 7-8; "Zakaj nismo rasisti" (Why Are We Not Racists), *Tribuna* 13 (28 Feb. 1972): 7; "Vsi črni moški vsem črnim ženskam" (All the Black Men to All the Black Women), *Tribuna* 14 (6 March 1972): 7.

<sup>297</sup> "O realizmu v politiki" (On Realism in Politics), *Tribuna* 9 (24 Dec. 1971): 1.

<sup>298</sup> "Zdaj študentje" (Now, Students), *Tribuna* 3 (25 Oct. 1971): 3.

<sup>299</sup> As late as 1972, *Tribuna* demanded the release of the prosecuted Belgrade Trotskyites. *Tribuna* 16 (20 March 1972): 1; "Študentje in politika (II)" (Students and Politics (II)), *Tribuna* 17 (24 March 1971): 6.

<sup>300</sup> Neither did the student strike leave a better impression. But, however unsympathetic, *Tribuna* was eager to enter into a dialogue and interviewed Čičak when he was still a *persona non grata* in Zagreb. See in turn: "Ajde, da malo frikujemo" (Let's Freak Out a Bit), *Tribuna* 8 (10 Dec. 1970): 16. "I.Z. Čičak", *Tribuna* 18 (March 1971): 2; "O taktiki študentskega gibanja" (On the Tactics of the Student Movement), *Tribuna* 19 (March 1971): 2; "Stavka hrvatskih študentov" (Croatian Student Strike), *Tribuna* 7-8 (11 Dec. 1971): 14.

<sup>301</sup> The recent PhD thesis on the Ljubljana student movement centers precisely on these initiatives that were present in the student agenda throughout the period (creating a new kind of university was among the motives for the 1971 siege). For a detailed insight in the process and the 1972 project of alternative university see: Mihevc, *Študentske kritike in predstave*, 147-50; 158-63, 166-69.

<sup>302</sup> Initially in the shadow of direct political aims, they now took over the major role. From the otherwise rich bibliography see: "Nekaj splošnih alternativ alternativne univerze" (Some General Alternatives of the Alternative University), *Tribuna* 19 (14 April 1972): 5; "Kaj je lahko alternativna univerza" (What Could Be the Alternative University), *Tribuna* 21 (4 May 1972): 7.

framed as a part of the student subculture, managed to induce the last rebellious outburst.<sup>303</sup> Zlobec called for the burning of student passes; his younger colleague proposed a new occupation.<sup>304</sup> Under the growing pressure, the student movement, however, soon perished and periodic actions that continued for a while fell short of producing any significant impact.<sup>305</sup>

#### 5.4.4. Showdown

While it might have failed to move the readers, *Tribuna*'s aggressive policy took its toll nonetheless. Affiliated to the movement and increasingly detached from the publisher, the staff entered in a yearlong clash with the authorities. The methods, known from elsewhere, stretched from (in)formal forms of pressure to the enforced editorial removals.

Preceded by their reputation, the editors found it increasingly difficult to publish their journal. An open boycott of the printing houses began in spring 1971.<sup>306</sup> The workers' councils simply declined to print *Tribuna*, supposedly offended by the content, though obviously acting under a management order.<sup>307</sup> To prevent this, the

---

<sup>303</sup> As the result, students founded a new student journal of the academic type: *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, novo antropologijo in domišljijo* (Journal for the Criticism of Science, New Anthropology and Imagination).

<sup>304</sup> Pavel Zgaga bluntly described his educational utopia: "People will farm in the morning, make music in the afternoon and fuck wherever and whenever they want to." See: "Alternativna univerza je – alternativne univerze ni" (Alternative University Is – There Is No Alternative University), *Tribuna* 22 (11 May 1972): 2.

<sup>305</sup> In 1974, the police arrested the authors of the Ljubljana declaration on political prosecutions, jointly drafted by Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana philosophy students: Puhar, *Peticije, pisma in tihotapski časi*, 96.

<sup>306</sup> "Kje su meje (ne)svobode?" (Where are the Borders of (Non) Freedom), *Problemi* 101 (May 1971): 42-44.

<sup>307</sup> "Samoupravljanje v tiskarnah" (Self-management in Printing Houses), *Tribuna* 1 (10 Oct. 1971): 7.

staff requested in vain their own printing facilities.<sup>308</sup> Eventually, a solution was found in an outdated, provincial printing office, run by an estranged former partisan.<sup>309</sup>

On a more visible level, the Ljubljana student union and its Party patron instigated public debates on the journal's profile. They indicted *Tribuna* for its closed circle of staff that came from the Faculty of Philosophy alone and, allegedly, neglected real student interests.<sup>310</sup> As the staff refused to yield, firmer measures were taken.<sup>311</sup> During 1971/72, four *Tribuna*'s issues were legally prosecuted, each reiterating one of the journal's key concerns.

The letters to Tito protested his "unsavory" foreign policy causing the first ban, which had a dubious effect as it only enhanced *Tribuna*'s fame.<sup>312</sup> On the down side, each article was now subjected to the strict eye of the district attorney. Before long, a side-comment on the neo-Stalinist insurgence that distorted the original values of the Slovenian Party brought about the second ban.<sup>313</sup> After barely surviving the first incident, Zlobec was now forced to resign. But his disposal was merely a spectacle for the authorities. His replacement came from the inner ranks of the staff, while Zlobec continued to write.<sup>314</sup> In fact, his diatribe against the brutal political prosecution of the

---

<sup>308</sup> "Predlog za študentsko tiskarno" (A Proposal for the Student Printing House), *Tribuna* 12 (17 Feb. 1972): 2.

<sup>309</sup> Looking back, Dolar stresses that they maintained good relations with the printing workers. Dolar, interview.

<sup>310</sup> "Prva tribuna o Tribini" (The First Forum on *Tribuna*) *Tribuna* 10 (5 Jan. 1972): 5; "Diskusijam o *Tribuni* na rob" (Debate on *Tribuna*), *Tribuna* 13 (28 Feb. 1972): 2.

<sup>311</sup> The staff insisted on its right to engage with social issues. "Ali je *Tribuna* študentski list?" (Is *Tribuna* a Student Journal?), *Tribuna* 10 (5 Jan. 1972): 3.

<sup>312</sup> Editors anticipated the sanction, so by the time police stormed their office, the vendors were already on the streets. Štrajn, interview.

<sup>313</sup> "Univerzitetni komite med CK in študentsko levico ter pojavi slovenskega neostalinizma" (University Committee between the CC and the Student Left and the Advent of the Slovenian Neo-Stalinism), *Tribuna* 9 (24 Dec. 1971): 7. The court eventually allowed a reprint of the second censored issue, without the liable text.

<sup>314</sup> Zlobec was replaced by Cizej. Dolar, interview.

Croatian nationalist student leaders, ironically *Tribuna*'s ideological enemies, led to the third prohibition of the journal in May 1972.<sup>315</sup>

By then, the sweeping editorial change was inevitable. In the emergent oppressive atmosphere, the next "counter-cultural" issue on Wilhelm Reich served the purpose. Its disputable cover showed Lenin touching the female breasts with the pertinent message: *Comrades, Don't Forget about Love*.<sup>316</sup> The cartoon, taken over from the German leftist magazine *Konkret*, available in the city library, mocked the revolution according to the court.<sup>317</sup> As a result, the entire editorial board was dismissed; the publication was discontinued for six months with Zlobec ousted from the Party.<sup>318</sup>

A number of reasons contributed to such ardent defiance of *Tribuna*'s staff. By entering the Party en masse, they formed their own cell within the journal. This unique strategy meant that the Party had to deal with an inner schism.<sup>319</sup> Indeed, one of the letters to Tito was collectively signed by *Tribuna*'s Party members who acted as a faction, defying the court's decision.<sup>320</sup>

Moreover, the journal enjoyed the support of the publishing council whose members protected its "socialist policies" from each attack of the Party and the general media.<sup>321</sup> Even the Party and student officials lacked firmness.<sup>322</sup> They often

---

<sup>315</sup> Besides, *Tribuna* defended a local student official who was attacked for delivering a favorable speech at the Zagreb student strike. "Povampirjeno oblasništvo" (Oppression out of Control), *Tribuna* 22 (11 May 1972): 3.

<sup>316</sup> *Tribuna* 23-24 (26 May 1972).

<sup>317</sup> The issue, prepared in advance, was considered "safe" since it did not deal with current politics. The staff, however, was oblivious of the imminent visit of the Soviet delegation which made the issue susceptible to the charge of ruining friendly political relations. Štrajn, interview; Dolar, interview.

<sup>318</sup> Baškovič et al., *Študentsko gibanje 1968-72*, 253.

<sup>319</sup> Ibid., 243; Štrajn, interview.

<sup>320</sup> Six Party members, including both of the editors, signed the letter, while the journal filed a legal complaint: "Sklep sodišča" (Court's Conclusion), *Tribuna* 6 (24 Nov. 1971): 8; Also: "O realizmu v politiki" *Tribuna* 9: 1.

<sup>321</sup> The body insisted that the staff merely pointed to the disparity between the official ideology and Tito's visit. The councilors also argued that the journal disapproved the internal Party relations, rather than the Party itself and was always critical towards nationalist ideas. See respectively: "Ob zaplembi tretje številke" (On the Confiscation of the Third Issue), *Tribuna* 6 (24 Nov. 1971): 4; "Stališče Sveta Tribune ob zaplembi 9. številke" (The Publishing Council's View on the Confiscation of the 9th Issue), *Tribuna* 11 (21 Jan. 1972): 2.

balanced their allegations against the radical extremists within the journal, with praises to its valuable political initiatives and general self-management orientation.

The repression intensified only as the conservative swing prevailed at the state level in 1972, leading to the final downfall.<sup>323</sup> When it was resurrected a year later, *Tribuna* was but a shadow of its former radical self. Firmly tied to its publisher, the pacified student union, its tenacity to contravene the ruling political truism evaporated for good.

## 5.5. THE CULTURE OF THE STUDENT MOVEMENT

Not by chance, the presented review thus far dealt exclusively with the politics of the youth press. The latter became a radical media opposed to the establishment, primarily as the organ of the student movements which endorsed and contributed to their defiant political ideas. Its cultural side, the only one which sporadically excelled in the past, played a secondary role in this process.<sup>324</sup>

At the same time, however, with its obligatory cultural pages, the youth press can provide valuable insights into the cultural legacy of the Yugoslav student rebellion. Before offering some closing comparative remarks, I will thus present the telling ways in which the journals struggled to provide the cultural equivalent to the launched

---

<sup>322</sup> Dolar stresses their hesitant conduct, namely of Lenart Šetinc and Gojko Stanič. Dolar, interview.

<sup>323</sup> Since the late 1971, the University Party Committee frequently reproved *Tribuna*'s editors. With the Council's support, however, they managed to retain their position until May 1972. For typical charges and specific relation between the Committee and *Tribuna*, see: Baškovič et al., *Študentsko gibanje 1968-72*, 290-309.

<sup>324</sup> This does not mean that the cultural sections did not thrive as well. For example, journals like *Studentski list* sustained cultural sections of high quality where a range of young writers and critics established their reputation in a variety of fields. Still, the question at stake here is if and how they differed from the remainder of the cultural media, apart from being written by younger staff. As the former example shows, this was not always the case.

political initiatives.<sup>325</sup> As with the previous sections, their efforts are worth mentioning only when they confronted the present cultural norms.

If followed closely, their appraisal can enrich the preceding political narrative with this neglected aspect of the Yugoslav student movements, almost completely ignored by the literature. By the same token, it will prepare the ground for the subsequent analysis of the youth subcultures in the sixth chapter.

### 5.5.1. Politicization of cultural youth journals

In so far as it transgressed the mainstream, the cultural youth press of the period primarily turned to a politicization of culture, observable on two different levels. Most visibly, politics literally infiltrated narrowly specialized cultural journals which began to incorporate the ideas of the surrounding student movements, often to the extent to which they were developed.<sup>326</sup>

Zagreb's social-cultural monthly *Polet* emerged into a theoretical supplement of *Omladinski tjednik* during its radical leftist phase.<sup>327</sup> The journal offered deep sympathetic insights into the global student uprising, spurring one of the earliest debates about the Yugoslav New Left and the accepted range of informal youth politics.<sup>328</sup> In doing so, *Polet* added a brand new argument in the promotion of self-management reforms: the youth was entitled to make mistakes.<sup>329</sup>

---

<sup>325</sup> Consequently, the emphasis is divided between the innovative features of their cultural policy and the attempts to forge new, distinctive youth cultural expression.

<sup>326</sup> On a different plane, politics affected academic youth journals of the fourth type, such as Ljubljana's *Problemi* or the newly launched federal student journal *Ideje*, which claimed to be launched as the outcome of the student movement. See: "Uvodnik" (Editorial), *Jugoslavenski studentski časopis Ideje* 1 (1970): 3-6.

<sup>327</sup> *Polet* was a youth journal of a second type, issued by the Croatian republican youth union from 1966 till 1969. Its editor Darko Stuparić would later become a head of another youth journal *Pop-Express*. Prominent youth journalists, including *Omladinski tjednik*'s Žarko Puhovski, or young film and theatre critics Hrvoje Turković and Mladen Martić who ended up having important roles in *Studentski list*, wrote for *Polet*.

<sup>328</sup> As early as January 1968, *Polet*'s journalist argued for the need for a new type of youth politics, confronting the youth official who insisted that politicization should remain within the institutions. Enchanted with worldwide student revolt *Polet* published in May an extensive 16-page supplement

The reasons behind *Polet*'s suspension in early 1969 are not entirely clear. Its publisher, the Croatian youth union, claimed that it wished to re-launch another, cheaper journal.<sup>330</sup> Still, there was nothing indecisive about the journal's response. *Polet*'s last threefold issue openly problematized the official narrative about the rule of the working class, coming closest of all the Zagreb youth journals to the egalitarianism of June 1968.<sup>331</sup>

Another Zagreb cultural publication, semi-student literary journal *Razlog*, also suffered for its political aspirations.<sup>332</sup> In June 1968, after complementing the discussion of the global student revolts with the testimonies of injured Belgrade students, *Razlog* was provisionally banned, and soon dissolved. Consequently, its opinion poll on the Zagreb June protest remained in the drawer for good, and with it, the harsh accusations of the Zagreb radical leftists who vilified the rigid behavior of the local Party.<sup>333</sup>

The best example, however, came from Belgrade. Though specialized in “literature, film, visual arts, philosophy, theatre and music,” the cultural student monthly *Vidici* promptly reacted to the June crisis. Engulfed by the revolutionary

---

where it issued methodological provisions for its analysis. See in turn: “Postoji li naša nova ljevica?” (Is There Our New Left?), *Polet* 15 (Jan. 1968): 14-15; “Konformizam jednog avangardizma” (Conformity of Avant-gardism), *Polet* 16 (Feb 1968): 10-11; “Jedan mogući program za ‘novoljevičarsko’ mišljenje i djelovanje” (Potential Program for the ‘New Left’ Thought and Action), *Polet* 20 (June 1968): 12-13; “Trajne vrijednosti i neopravdane osude studentskih pobuna” (Permanent Values and Biased Attacks on Student Revolts), *Polet* 19 (May 1968), suppl., 2-4.

<sup>329</sup> “Strah pred radom i pogreškom” (Fear from Work and Mistake); “O angažmanu mladog intelektualca” (On the Engagement of Young Intellectual), *Polet* 16 (Feb 1968): 5.

<sup>330</sup> In retrospect, the participants offer contradicting accounts about the motives behind the termination of *Polet*. *Omladinski tjednik*'s Vujić claims that *Polet* was just too expensive. The editor Stuparić or Puhovski argue that the republican youth officials were dissatisfied with the journal's policies. See: Vujić, interview; Puhovski, interview; “Riječ uredništva” (The Word of the Editorial Board), *Polet* 25/26/27 (Jan./Feb./March 1969): 1-2.

<sup>331</sup> “Radnici – studenti, studenti – radnici” (Workers – Students, Students – Workers); “Ekonomika i politika” (Economy and Politics); “Princip socijalne nejednakosti” (The Principle of Social Inequality), *Polet* 25/26/27 (Jan./Feb./March 1969): 8-20; 22-27; 28-31.

<sup>332</sup> Issued by the Zagreb University's Student Centre, rather than the student union, *Razlog* is a borderline youth publication, but its telling fate justifies to be mentioned.

<sup>333</sup> See in turn: *Razlog* 57 (1968); For more on the reasons and the re-print of *Razlog*'s poll in: “Suočjenje s krucijalnim pitanjima” (Confronting Crucial Issues); “Kakva je vaša slika događaja” (What Is Your View of the Events), *Gordogan* 2-3 (2004): 44-45; 46-80.



enthusiasm, its special issue featured informal student anthem *March of the Red University*, incidentally authored by the journal's secretary.<sup>334</sup> Alongside evocative slogans like "Revolution is not finished," *Vidici* provided a theoretical pretext for the most contested elements of the protest: spontaneous and anarchistic forms deemed similar to a "happening."<sup>335</sup> As will be seen, the wording was not accidental.<sup>336</sup>

The big break came a year later, in the autumn of 1969, when part of the *Student's* staff took over the journal.<sup>337</sup> They re-conceptualized it so drastically that the new editor Ilić was forced to publicly defend the "useless politicization" of which the ex-contributors accused him.<sup>338</sup> Following the subsequent removal of *Student's* editorial board, *Vidici* transpired into the most radical Belgrade youth journal reaching beyond the fading student movement.<sup>339</sup>

A series of its thematic issues blurred the margins between culture and politics.<sup>340</sup> In September 1970 *Vidici* exposed Stalinist repression, presenting the wide palette of Soviet cultural dissent, from Joseph Brodsky to Daniel and Sinyavsky.<sup>341</sup> When the

<sup>334</sup> The poem paraphrased Mayakovski's *Left Manifesto*. See: "Koračnica crvenog univerziteta" (March of the Red University), *Vidici*, spec. issue (June 1968): 3.

<sup>335</sup> "Spontani pokret" (Spontaneous Movement); "Privremena estetika demonstracija" (Provisional Aesthetics of Demonstrations), *Vidici*, spec. issue (June 1968): 1; 2.

<sup>336</sup> *Vidici's* regular June issue was indicted for a text complaining about the status of intellectuals in Yugoslavia. However, despite facing legal measures, *Vidici* revisited the legacy of the June protest throughout the next year. See: "Zlo od poređenja" (Evil Comparison), *Vidici* 121/122, (May-June 1968): 27; *Zbornik: Dokumenti Jun-Lipanj*, 396-97.

<sup>337</sup> These were headed by *Student's* co-editor Ilić who, in retrospective, claims to be estranged by its dominant humanist Marxism and thus left the *Student's* editorial board a couple of months prior to its forceful removal. In any event, Ilić became *Vidici's* editor within a regular rotation, using the last glimpse of liberal climate within the Belgrade student union. After the December showdown, other *Student* journalists, like Lazar Stojanović or Ljubiša Ristić, followed him and moved to *Vidici*. Malavrazić, *Šezdeset osma – lične istorije*, 173-74; Ilić, interview.

<sup>338</sup> Looking back, Ilić prefers to state his goal as the defense of culture from the politicization of regime. At the time, his choice of words was different though. See: "Vidici Komentar" (*Vidici* Commentary), *Student* 16/17 (18 May 1971): 13; Ilić, interview.

<sup>339</sup> This is not to say that *Vidici* did not support radical students. The journal reprinted the opening essay from the book on Belgrade unrest and provided the chronology of the Ljubljana student turmoil viewed, unlike the one in Zagreb, positively: "Predgovor za knjigu o junu 1968." (Preface for the Book on June); "U kafani mrak" (Darkness in the Coffee House), *Vidici* 150/151 (April/ May 1970): 2-4; 4.

<sup>340</sup> The October 1970 issue, with the Yugoslav flag on the cover, was a negative commentary of the Croatian Spring as it clearly alluded to its supposed nationalistic nature. See: *Vidici* 146 (Dec. 1970).

<sup>341</sup> The long list encompassed Boris Pasternak, Anna Akhmatova, Pavel Litvinov or Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. See: "Glas komunista opozicionara u SSSR-u" (The Voice of Communist Opposition in

issue was charged with ruining friendly relations with the Soviet Union, the editors resisted the censorship, standing up in defense of the freedom of expression.<sup>342</sup> In June 1971 *Vidici* revisited the other side of the totalitarian spectrum. The controversial issue on Nazism had oblique intention to reveal its semantic likeness to Stalinism. All the copies, packed with Hitler's photos, were immediately destroyed for they "disturbed the general public."<sup>343</sup>

In fear of Ilić's liability for repeated offence, this issue was formally edited by his assistant, an aspiring filmmaker Lazar Stojanović who, ironically, soon ended up in prison for a similar reason.<sup>344</sup> His directorial debut *Plastic Jesus* examined the analogies between the totalitarian ideologies in the home context and became the sole prohibited feature film of the Yugoslav cinematography.<sup>345</sup> The film's stunning parallels openly probed the cult of Tito, presenting a major step from the revisionist Marxism of the Belgrade student movement.

Being a tiny circulation journal, *Vidici* somehow survived the first wave of repression, only to be swept by it in the standard pattern. After having its funds withheld, printing declined, and editorial premises wrecked, the staff faced legal prosecutions which ended with the "Nazi-issue" scandal.<sup>346</sup> Quickly thereafter the journal ceased to exist for an indefinite period of time.<sup>347</sup>

---

the USSR); "Demonstracija na Puškinovom trgu" (Demonstration at Pushkin Square); "Pismo Hruščovu" (Letter to Khrushchev); *Vidici* 142/143 (June/Sept. 1970): 2; 7.

<sup>342</sup> See the protest against the arrest of *Vidici*'s contributor Božidar Borjan for trying to issue an independent philosophical journal *Krug* (Circle): "Vreme bez milosti" (Merciless Times), *Vidici* 144 (Oct. 1970): 14.

<sup>343</sup> Stojanović, interview.

<sup>344</sup> Ibid.; Ilić, interview.

<sup>345</sup> The leading role in the film was played by Tomislav Gotovac, who would later have a major influence on the seminal Zagreb's youth journal *Polet*. More on the film in: Pavle Levi, *Disintegration in Frames: Aesthetics and Ideology in the Yugoslav and Post-Yugoslav Cinema* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007): 46-52.

<sup>346</sup> See among others: "Zašto *Vidici* nisu izlazili" (Why Were *Vidici* Not Published), *Vidici* 145 (Nov. 1970): 13.

<sup>347</sup> *Vidici* reappeared after two whole years, in May 1973, rejecting the former policies and all social ambitions. It regained (theoretical) relevance only by the end of the decade: "Čemu naši *Vidici*" (Why Our *Vidici*), *Vidici* 153 (May 1973): 2.

### 5.5.2. Political art: political theatre and *the black film*

Alternatively, the youth journals espoused artistic phenomena which seemed to reflect the ideas congruent with the student movement. In the spring of 1968 a group of young theatre enthusiasts at the Zagreb student union founded *Prolog: The Journal for the Theatre, Other Cultural and All Social Issues*.<sup>348</sup> Its opening *Manifest* explicated the unusual subtitle. *Prolog* was interested in the theatre rooted in the present, responsive to the political issues, and, preferably, a constituent of the student movement.<sup>349</sup> The editors, mostly radical leftists, treated theatre as a social phenomenon and an expression of a surrounding reality and cultural politics.<sup>350</sup>

Two of them were among the students who travelled to Belgrade to learn about the June revolt first hand.<sup>351</sup> Their commitment served as an excuse for the temporary suspension of *Prolog* during which the editors disparaged their mentors as crude apparatchiks, enjoying a wide support of other journals.<sup>352</sup> Indeed, the infatuation with political theatre overcame the youth theatre buffs everywhere, who dwelled on the theatre's potential to forge political consciousness.<sup>353</sup> It was time for the local student companies to move to the streets, and engage the public at large.<sup>354</sup>

<sup>348</sup> These included Slobodan Šnajder, Darko Gašparović and Vlado Roksandić, all active in the youth press proper. "Sve Prologove Drame" (All *Prolog*'s Plays), *Prolog* 50 (1981): 87-97.

<sup>349</sup> See *Prolog*'s manifesto: "Zašto istupamo?" (Why Do We Step Forward), *Prolog* 1 (1968): 3-5.

<sup>350</sup> *Prolog*'s staff organized debates on cultural policy: "Teatar, kultura – kulturna politika" (Theatre, Culture – Cultural Politics), *Prolog* 2 (1968): 35-49; "Politička drama danas" (Political Drama Today), *Prolog* 4 (1969): 3-49.

<sup>351</sup> "Treba opet pisati Manifest" (*Manifesto* Must Be Re-Written) *Gordogan*, 2-3, 2004: 36.

<sup>352</sup> See among others: "O čemu se zapravo radi" (What Is It Really About), *Studentski list* 19 (12 Nov. 1968): 9; "Lipanj u prologu" (June in *Prolog*), *Omladinski tjednik* 36 (11 Dec. 1968): 19; "Prolog ili epilog" (Prolog or Epilogue), *Omladinski tjednik* 31 (6 Nov. 1968): 3.

<sup>353</sup> Young Belgrade theatre critic Dragan Klaić revisited the issue in both *Student* and *Vidici*: "Stil ili politički čin" (Style or Political Act); "Anketa" (The Poll), *Vidici* 130-131 (April/May 1969): 10-11.

<sup>354</sup> See for example the debates on Zagreb student theatre festivals, or the appeal by *Student*'s Ljubiša Ristić, future proponent of the genre: "Na raspuću" (At the Crossroad), *Omladinski tjednik* 60 (17 Sept. 1968): 7; "Festival i politika" (Festival and Politics), *Omladinski tjednik* 45 (26 Feb. 1969): 7; "Program za jedno novo pozorište na Univerzitetu" (Program for a New University Theatre), *Student* 25/26 (26 Nov. 1968): 5.

Key protagonists of the genre, like Peter Weiss or Julien Beck rendered theoretical background.<sup>355</sup> *Susret*, in turn, reminded about the paradigmatic local example: the actor Stevo Žigon's recital from Büchner's play *Danton's Death*, preserved as one of the most memorable moments of the June protest. The persuasiveness of his performance, the text which so perfectly matched the ambience, erased boundaries dividing art from social activism.<sup>356</sup> Ecstatic students hailed Robespierre's final cry as Žigon's own personal comment: "*There can be no agreement, no truce with people for whom the Republic was a speculation and Revolution no more than a trade.*"<sup>357</sup>

In each issue, *Prolog* published political plays by domestic authors. Set amidst an imaginary youth journal, the editor Slobodan Šnajder's *Miniature Golf* bemoaned the political apathy of the youth. Aleksandar Popović's *Second Door to the Left* explicitly tackled the Belgrade June protest.<sup>358</sup> When the latter, along with a few other plays, was removed from the repertoire, the youth journalists protested the surrounding campaign, acclaiming the censored works.<sup>359</sup> Ultimately, the fascination with the political theatre died with the leftist movement. In the 1970s *Prolog* relinquished its social commitment and increasingly focused on theater alone, breaking contact with the youth press proper.

<sup>355</sup> "Peter Weiss i politički teatar" (Peter Weiss and Political Theatre), *Omladinski tjednik* 46 (5 March 1969): 10; "Pozorište i revolucija" (Theatre and Revolution), *Susret* 86 (2 Oct. 1968): 15.

<sup>356</sup> Krunoslav Stojaković, "Teatar pod utjecajem filozofije: Kazalište i studentski protesti u Jugoslaviji 1960-tih godina" (Theatre Under the Influence of Philosophy: Theatre and Student Protests in Yugoslavia in the 1960s), in Tomić and Atanacković, eds., *Društvo u pokretu*, 71.

<sup>357</sup> "Društvo mora da služi duhovom životu čoveka" (Society Must Serve the Spiritual Life of Humans), *Susret* 99 (1 May 1969): 16.

<sup>358</sup> Prominent student theatre *SEK*, whose leader was also *Prolog*'s founder, performed both plays: "Minigolf" (Miniature Golf), *Prolog* 1 (1968): 38-61; "Druga vrata levo" (Second Door to the Left), *Prolog* 3 (1969): 73-91.

<sup>359</sup> Dragoslav Mihajlović's play *When Pumpkins Blossomed* suffered the same fate. See: "Agencija 'Pssst'" ('Hush' Agency), *Student* 19 (28 Oct. 1969): 2; "Suprotstaviti se na vreme" (Oppose in Time), *Student* 21 (11 Nov. 1969): 5; "Tantuz liliput je protiv" (*Tantuz Lilliput is against*), *Vidici* 133/134 (Sept./Oct. 1968): 7.

The youth journals equally welcomed the emergence of *the black film*.<sup>360</sup> A common term for the part of the modern leanings within the contemporary Yugoslav cinematography, *the black film* showed less attractive sides of socialist reality, filled with misery, poverty and vulgarity.<sup>361</sup> The youth journalists approved. Movies of mostly Serbian directors, like Dušan Makavejev, Aleksandar Petrović or Živojin Pavlović were enthusiastically received.<sup>362</sup> Especially popular was the youngest, Želimir Žilnik, a former editor of the Novi Sad's cultural youth journal *Polje*, held in high esteem for his *Early Works*, perhaps the most ambitious cinematic attempt to reflect on the failure of the Belgrade student unrest.<sup>363</sup> The youth press heavily promoted this eccentric crossbreed of underground and avant-garde that drew from young Marx and *Praxis* and spoke of "the growing pains of leftism."<sup>364</sup>

Like other *black films*, *Early Works* posed similar questions as those raised by the radical leftist students.<sup>365</sup> In an artistically relevant manner, they questioned the conventional official truths.<sup>366</sup> Their critical edge and readiness to confront the betrayed revolutionary promises suited the interests of the youth press.<sup>367</sup> This, in turn,

---

<sup>360</sup> Though the youth press was traditionally opened to film, the interest failed to result in the specialized publication until the mid 1970s. Zagreb's *Film* remained the sole specialized film youth journal which strived to affirm the marginalized cinematic phenomena. See: *Film* 1 (July/Aug. 1975).

<sup>361</sup> Daniel J. Goulding, *Liberated Cinema: The Yugoslav Experience, 1945-2001* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002): 66-83.

<sup>362</sup> Pavlović, in particular, who at the time was going through a creative boom was much-admired. For reviews and interviews see among others: "Buđenje Pacova" (The Rats Woke Up), *Studentski list* 4 (20 Feb. 1968): 8; "Kad budem mrtav i beo" (When I am Dead and Gone), *Vidici* 123 (Sept. 1968): 9; "Revolucija je anarhistički čin" (Revolution Is an Anarchistic Act), *Susret* 97 (2 April 1969): 12-13.

<sup>363</sup> "O 'Ranim radovima' dok nije kasno" (On *Early Works* till It Is Not Too Late), *Omladinski tjednik* 45 (26 Feb. 1969): 8; "U obranu Žilnika" (In the Defense of Žilnik), *Polet* 19 (May 1968): 35.

<sup>364</sup> *Susret's* film critic Bogdan Tirnanić even appeared in the film playing one of the three students who hopelessly tried to raise revolution in the Vojvodina province. See: "Rani radovi" (*Early Works*), *Susret* 100 (16 May 1969): 16.

<sup>365</sup> On the ties between *the black film* and Marxist revisionism see: Levi, *Disintegration in Frames*, 1-56.

<sup>366</sup> In a similar manner *Student's* series of real-life interviews *It Would Be Better*, co-written by Lazar Stojanović, exposed social misery: "Porodica Pantelić" (Pantelić Family), *Student* 10 (12 March 1968): 8.

<sup>367</sup> Not by chance, Makavejev and Žilnik shot documentaries on the June revolt which were subjected to censorship. The similar fate also hit Pavlović's literary diary of the unrest: Živojin Pavlović, *Ispljuvak pun krvi* (Spit Full of Blood) (Beograd: Grafički atelje Dereta, 1990).

enabled youth journalists to recognize in them a potential area for political action.<sup>368</sup> At the same time, however, they acclaimed them for their innovative means and artistic value. This is why the admiration survived the fading of the leftist fervor and consequent change in political climate.<sup>369</sup>

Regardless of the motives, the support for *the black film* amidst the wider campaign against its alleged hostile intentions acquired direct political connotations.<sup>370</sup> The youth critics sneered at such claims, echoed by the mass media.<sup>371</sup> To circumvent the censorship, they reprinted parts of the incriminated scenarios, from Žilnik's social documentaries to Makavejev's *Mysteries of the Organism*, a phantasmagoric tale of sexual and political oppression which epitomized all controversial in the Yugoslav contemporary cinema.<sup>372</sup> They petitioned against the launched political repression, defending the accused directors and their right to artistic freedom.<sup>373</sup>

<sup>368</sup> See Inoslav Bešker's positive review of Petrović's movie, regarded progressive irrespective of its artistic qualities: "Efektna stražnjica" (Attractive Backside), *Omladinski tjednik* 52 (16 April 1969): 2.

<sup>369</sup> The persistence on aesthetic criteria drove the youth press to ridicule official favoritism of "socially acceptable" films. At the time, their attacks focused on the harshly criticized high-budget WWII spectacle featuring Yul Brynner. See: "Plivati protiv Neretve" (Swim against Neretva), *Omladinski tjednik* 72 (10 Dec. 1969): 9; "Bulajićeva filmovana ofanziva" (Bulajić's Film Offensive), *Student* 26 (16 Dec. 1969): 9. Turković, interview.

<sup>370</sup> Novi Sad's *Neoplanta film* company which produced Žilnik's and Makavejev's controversial films gathered two volumes of negative press reviews of its films: '66-'71 *Dokumentacija: Za internu upotrebu* ('66-'71 Documents: For Internal Use), vol.1, 2 (Novi Sad, 1971). More on campaign also in: Goulding, *Liberated Cinema*, 78-83.

<sup>371</sup> "Crnomrčenje o 'crnom filmu'" (Blackening the 'Black Film'), *Omladinski tjednik* 57 (21 May 1969): 11.

<sup>372</sup> Turković translated in *Prolog* the English version of the informally banned Makavejev's script handed to him by director himself. See respectively: "Rani Radovi" (Early Works), *Susret* 90 (27 Nov. 1968): 15; "Pioniri maleni..." (Little Pioneers...); "Nezaposleni ljudi" (Unemployed People), *Vidici* 145 (Nov. 1970): 4-5; "Dušan Makavejev: Misterije organizma" (Mysteries of Organism), *Prolog* 17 (1972): 121-163. Also: Turković, interview.

<sup>373</sup> Along with other filmmakers, Turković signed the ironical protest memo drafted by Žilnik: "Pozdrav snagama koje grle našu kinematografiju tako snažno da se sve teže diše" (Greetings to the Forces that Embrace Our Cinematography so Strong That It Breaths Ever so Harder), *Studentski list*, spec. issue (23 Sept. 1969): 16.

### 5.5.3. The search for an authentic student culture

While the preferred option of the youth journals was to politicize the existing cultural forms, the other was to seek original ones that could translate the political into cultural emancipation and result in some indigenous youth expression.

The most ambitious attempt dated from the late 1968 and involved a group of young Slovene lyricists. Gathered around the surrealist group *OHO* they published their provocative poetry in *Tribuna* and *Problemi*. Poems, like Ivo Svetina's *Slovenian Apocalypse* or Vojin Kovač Chubby's *Ode to LSD*, questioned the ruling ideological and aesthetic cannons. As a kind of proxy for the missing political turmoil, these aimed to perturb the traditional cultural patterns and spread the anti-institutional struggle into the new arena.<sup>374</sup>

They succeeded insofar as they provoked the conservative backlash of the cultural authorities that accused *Tribuna* of ideological blasphemy.<sup>375</sup> In its theoretical proclamations that demanded some form of cultural revolution, the project showed inherent flaws. However raucous, *Tribuna*'s cultural manifestos were hermetic, blurry and with little social or artistic relevance.<sup>376</sup>

Like no other youth journal, *Tribuna* kept insisting on the cultural dimension of the Ljubljana student movement.<sup>377</sup> But rhetoric aside, its artistic production, traceable

<sup>374</sup> More concretely, these poems disturbed the official perspective about the WWII or touched upon generational issues with urban slang. Academic youth journal *Problemi* endorsed the project in its thematic issue *Katalog*. See: "Preservativi" (Condoms), *Katalog, Problemi* 69-70 (June-Aug. 1968): 138-39; "Slovenska apokalipsa 442" (Slovenian Apocalypse 442), *Tribuna* 2 (23 Oct. 1968): 10.

<sup>375</sup> *Tribuna*'s counter-reaction paraphrased the Prague Spring spoof of the Bolshevik War propaganda poster, which called for the signing of the 2000 words Manifesto. Instead, *Tribuna* asked for the endorsement of *Katalog*, above the image of the conservative hard-liner who replaced the original Red Army trooper: "Jsi take podepsal Katalog?" (Did You Sign the *Katalog*), *Tribuna* 2 (23 Oct. 1968): 2.

<sup>376</sup> In addition, they were mutually contradictory: "Manifest" (Manifesto) *Tribuna* 1 (9 Oct. 1968): 11; "Manifest kulturne revolucije" (Cultural Revolution Manifesto); "Kulturna revolucija na Slovenskem" (Slovenian Cultural Revolution), *Tribuna* 2 (23 Oct. 1968): 2.

<sup>377</sup> Indeed, its formative actions, from the Literary Marathon to the May siege, strived to affirm alternative lifestyle. See: "Zdaj študentje" (Go Students), *Tribuna* 3 (25 Oct. 1971): 3.

in four “cultural” issues of *SP* was futile.<sup>378</sup> It was revolutionary only in name, leaving few relevant works behind and, consequently, faded altogether.<sup>379</sup> A similar fate befell all other appeals that occasionally evoked the emergence of some distinct (leftist) youth culture. As a rule, they were all utopian, but also exempted from creative repercussions.<sup>380</sup> They asked for the disruption of established forms, but rarely offered alternatives. What the unique student culture should consist of remained unclear.

In the search for authentic youth culture, the leftist youth journalists were hindered by their principal contempt towards mass culture.<sup>381</sup> Their Marxist humanism drove them to a rigid anti-consumerist crusades against the mainstream media that imported cheap capitalist entertainment.<sup>382</sup> *Omladinski tjednik* persistently ridiculed mainstream youth magazine *Plavi Vjesnik* for its sensationalism, lack of taste, and hunger for profits.<sup>383</sup>

Such intellectual disdain had a damaging effect for the status of the whole pop-culture. Nowhere was this more visible than in the treatment of rock music, discussed in detail in the following chapter. The latter was allowed to infiltrate the youth press

---

<sup>378</sup> The issues were co-written by “the group for the production of revolutionary literature”. See: *SP* 4 (27 May 1971); *SP* 6 (28 May 1971); *SP* 8 (29/30 May 1971); *SP* 10 (31 May 1971).

<sup>379</sup> Next year standard culture was ousted from *Tribuna* altogether, thus prompting the never realized incentive for the creation of a specialized, cultural student journal, named precisely *SP*: “Koncept in usmeritve *SP*” (Concept and Direction of *SP*), *Tribuna* 7-8 (11 Dec. 1971): 4.

<sup>380</sup> “Prijedlog programa rada kulturne redakcije Studentskog lista” (Program Proposal for the *Studentski list* Cultural Section), *Studentski list* 21/22 (26 Nov. 1968): 6.

<sup>381</sup> See: “Teze o masovni kulturi” (Theses on Mass Culture), *Tribuna* 6 (19 Jan. 1970): 3.

<sup>382</sup> “Kome treba antikomunistička propaganda” (Who Needs Anti-communist Propaganda), *Omladinski tjednik* 79 (18 Feb. 1970): 2; “Ben Quick – Junak našeg doba?” (Ben Quick – The Hero of Our Time?), *Polet* 17 (March 1968): 3.

<sup>383</sup> “Licemjerje, neukus” (Hypocrisy, Bad Taste), *Omladinski tjednik* 58/59 (4 June 1968): 4; “Intervjuirao sam instituciju” (I Interviewed an Institution), *Omladinski tjednik* 60 (17 Sept. 1968): 11.



only when it confirmed its social commitment.<sup>384</sup> Pop-culture, local or Western, was not good by default. The youth press asked for its critical engagement.<sup>385</sup>

#### 5.5.4. Underground counter-culture: the bridge between politics and culture

One solution to the problem was imported from abroad. The Western political underground was hugely influential in the framing of local student movements. In its other scope, it provided a wishful bridge between politics and culture. Politicized Yippies proved more relevant than Hippies who puzzled the youth journalists with their apolitical escapism. In contrast, Yippies' anarchic "theatrical" mix of sex, drugs and revolution promised to subvert the society.<sup>386</sup> Jerry Rubin's manifesto *Do It* slipped into each and every youth journal.<sup>387</sup> But unlike Dutschke, he resided on the cultural pages, next to the equally popular *Black Panthers* figures like Eldridge Cleaver or Angela Davies.<sup>388</sup>

Over the years, the youth journals presented a short syllabus of US and British underground counter-culture. They introduced their readers with pioneer works such as Richard Neville's *Play Power* or Kathy Boudin's *The Bust Book*.<sup>389</sup> Tuli

---

<sup>384</sup> The formula applied equally to those less politically committed journals. *Susret*'s page on fashion was written by the drama student Borka Pavičević and served as a front for the promotion of progressive generational spirit: "Četvrta dimenzija" (Fourth Dimension), *Susret* 79 (3 April 1968): 22; "Jedan drugi način" (Another Way), *Susret* 88 (30 Oct. 1968): 22.

<sup>385</sup> There were no more than a few exceptions among the politically progressive youth journals. *Susret* and *Omladinski tjednik*, in its post-leftist phase, stripped of the utopian pathos, began to look more favorably on pop-culture.

<sup>386</sup> Readers could marvel over their slogans like "we'll fuck on the beaches" and "LSD for everybody." See: "Jipi se spremaju na Čikago" (Yippies Head for Chicago), *Susret* 89 (13 Nov. 1968): 16; "Vote for Me", *Polet* 24 (Dec. 1968): 28-29; "God is a Yippie!", *Student*, spec. issue (16 Dec. 1971): 25.

<sup>387</sup> Along with the *Tribuna*'s yearlong series, see: "Baš to! Scenario za revoluciju" (Do it! Scenarios of the Revolution), *Omladinski tjednik* 118 (10 Feb. 1971): 10; "Do It", *Student*, spec. issue (16 Dec. 1971): 3-6.

<sup>388</sup> Cleaver's *Soul on Ice* was presented as an important literature event: "Soul on Ice", *Omladinski tjednik* 89-90 (29 April 1970): 89-90.

<sup>389</sup> Many were published in installments. See: "Knjiga o Čuzi" (The Bust Book), *Omladinski tjednik* 63 (8 Oct. 1969): 15; "Play Power: Snaga igre", *Omladinski tjednik* 124 (24 March 1971): 11; "Angela", *Tribuna* 12-13 (31 Dec. 1970): 2; Tuli Kupferberg's 1001 series, discussed in the next chapter, became the pattern to emulate: "101 način osvajanja duše i tela" (101 Way to Conquer Soul and Body), *Susret* 88 (30 Oct. 1968): 15; "Kako voditi ljubav na 101 način" (How to Make Love in 101 Ways), *Susret* 99 (1 May 1969): 22.

Kupferberg, Frank Zappa, or Timothy Leary became household names.<sup>390</sup> The value and meaning of such texts depended on the surrounding context which, in turn, indicated the wide semantic stretch within which underground was understood and applied. But wherever it surfaced, the term denoted the contested nature of anything labeled by it, something worth fighting for.<sup>391</sup>

The problem appeared with its translation in the home context. Western underground counter-culture typically received fragmentary and unconvincing local interpretations.<sup>392</sup> In contrast to what its title suggested, merely 3 out of 32 pages of the *Student's YU underground* issue were original.<sup>393</sup> Amongst the range of *Tribuna's* essays on alternative lifestyles, only one, the *Ljubljana Commune Manifesto* was of domestic origin.<sup>394</sup>

The most creative was the Zagreb youth press, thus hinting to the path it would follow in the next decade. Various satirical columns went as far as offering advice on how to harass socialist citizens by hoax phone calls.<sup>395</sup> *Studentski list's* hitch-hiker travelogue of its young contributor was written in an untainted underground style: “*I hitch-hike across Europe, I have long hair and beard. Some people say that I am a*

---

<sup>390</sup> *Tribuna* named its section after Frank Zappa's definition of the freaks as those who “reject the usual patterns of thinking.” See: “Kaj je to ‘Freaking Out’” (What Is ‘Freaking Out’), *Tribuna* 9-10 (17 Dec. 1970): 16.

<sup>391</sup> *Omladinski tjednik* used it at first to back up its leftist-reformist drive. The shift towards national agenda deprived it of the utopian political component, which, consequently, led to the less rigid treatment of pop-culture. *Tribuna's* specialized section was at first broadly understood to include everything from dirty linguistics to ridiculing Croatian nationalism but steadily acquired serious tones, probing solely into alternative political lifestyles. Belgrade *Student* used it as the inspiration for the ongoing centralist fight against the constitutional changes. Compare in turn: “Ne laj balavče” (Do Not Yap, Brat), *Omladinski tjednik* 116-117 (3 Feb. 1971): 12; “Iz zgodovinske besede fuk” (From the History of the Word Fuck), *Tribuna* 7-8 (11 Dec. 1971): 16; “Ekološka rubrika” (Ecology Column), *Tribuna* 19 (14 April 1972): 10.; “Američki priručnik za kontragerilu” (American Manual for Contra-guerilla), *Student* 11 (6 Oct. 1970): 7.

<sup>392</sup> Youth press's original reflections on the phenomena like communes or drugs were rare and cautious. “Droga nije izlaz!” (Drugs Are Not the Way Out!), *Omladinski tjednik* 93 (9 Sept. 1969): 11.

<sup>393</sup> “Podzemne aktivnosti u Jugoslaviji” (Underground Activities in Yugoslavia), *Student*, spec. issue (16 Dec. 1971): 20-21.

<sup>394</sup> “Manifest komune G7” (Commune G7 Manifesto), *Tribuna* 15 (Jan. 1971): 7.

<sup>395</sup> “Telefon history” (Telephone History), *Omladinski tjednik* 124 (24 March 1971): 12.

*beatnik. I say nothing. I'm here to dupe you all.*"<sup>396</sup> *Omladinski tjednik*'s Pero Kvesić wrote brilliant short stories on urban everyday life whose main characters were his friends, youth journalists.<sup>397</sup>

One issue permeated all of the above: the birth of adolescent sexuality. By and large, the original counter-cultural input of the youth press remained confined to the whiff of sexual revolution which blew through the journals. These advocated sexual liberties, in their widest span, at times, perceived as a vital part of the broader political emancipation. Or, rather, as "a prerogative of other freedoms" in the era calling for an "immediate sexual revolution."<sup>398</sup> Occasionally, the discourse showed surprising theoretical ambitions.<sup>399</sup> For the most part, however, it resembled its American prototype in as much as it was predominantly male and sexist. Moreover, it often resorted to less utopian, consumerist paradigm, precisely the one which was scorned at other fields.<sup>400</sup>

The youth press's pursuit of a distinct student culture thus dissolved into an uneven breach between the utopian desire to disrupt the elite culture and ideological rejection of the mass consumerism. While it managed to avoid the latter, it remained greatly bound to the former. Indeed, with the self-imposed restrictions, its own alternative cultural vision remained rather vague. It was not before the birth of the local punk rock subculture that the youth press would be able to cross that bridge, and

---

<sup>396</sup> "Europom up and down" (Across Europe Up and Down), *Studentski list* 17 (14 Oct. 1969): 11.

<sup>397</sup> "Moby Dick", *Omladinski tjednik* 67 (5 Nov. 1969): 7; "Tramway-story", *Omladinski tjednik* 112-113 (23 Dec. 1970): 18; "Mačke padaju" (Cats Fall), *Omladinski tjednik* 133 (2 June 1971): 13.

<sup>398</sup> "Seks kao subverzija" (Sex as Subversion), *Omladinski tjednik* 79 (11 Feb. 1969): 13; "Dolje seksualna kontrarevolucija" (Down with the Sexual Counterrevolution), *Omladinski tjednik* 62 (24 Sept. 1969): 7; "Pravila za jednu seksualnu revoluciju" (Rules for a Sexual Revolution), *Susret* 96 (19 March 1969): 19.

<sup>399</sup> For rare translated exceptions see essays by Germaine Greer or Wilhelm Reich: "Varnost" (Safety), *Tribuna* 16 (20 March 1972): 7; "Funkcija orgazma" (The Function of the Orgasm), *Tribuna* 23-24 (26 May 1972): 6.

<sup>400</sup> A few lascivious "alibi" images would occasionally accompany articles on the film coverage of sex, or eroticism: "'Nova' umetnost erotike" ('New' Erotic Art), *Susret* 78 (20 March 1968): 16-17.

stay critical, while at the same time reflect a new youth sensibility. Before resuming with the analysis of this period, the presented review needs to be shortly summarized.

## 5.6. COMPARATIVE CONCLUSION

### 5.6.1. Political alternative media

In his unique overview of different media strategies of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century social movements, Dieter Rucht placed their affinity for the alternative media in a wider perspective.<sup>401</sup> Rucht showed how the liaison between the two emerged as one of the four possible historical responses of the activists when faced with the ignorance of the mainstream media. Since the latter is traditionally concerned with creating consent, its framing typically diverged from those of the movements. In turn, the protesters searched for new, alternative media outlets with which they could counter dominant representations. Though deeply ingrained in the Western experiences, Rucht's fourfold scheme is surprisingly enlightening for the formative links that forged between the Yugoslav youth press and the respective local student movements between 1968 and 1972.

The advent of relevant political youth journals was supposed to reflect the ongoing reform of the youth unions and politically empower the youth. However, once launched, the new political voices grew louder, developing a momentum of their own that could not be controlled. Using its protected institutional place, this marginal media thus became the vanguard of youth politicization. The reverse is equally true: Frustrated how they were depicted by the mainstream media, Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana students turned to their youth journals to voice their discontent.

---

<sup>401</sup> Dieter Rucht, "The Quadruple 'A': Media Strategies of Protest Movements since the 1960s" in Dieter Rucht et al., eds., *Cyberprotest: New media, Citizens and Social Movements* (London: Routledge, 2004), 25-48.

The manner and the extent of the journals' commitment mirrored the strength and color of the local politicization.<sup>402</sup> In some places, they served as the mouthpiece of the existing political streams.<sup>403</sup> Elsewhere, faced with docile constituency, they created dissent from the scratch. As the momentum faded, they interpreted and mythologized the ongoing events, trying to sustain the fading momentum. Occasionally, the ideas they advocated were expressed elsewhere, though not in such aggressive way.<sup>404</sup> At other times, their initiatives failed to generate significant feedback, but contravened the rules nonetheless, if not by content then by the way in which they were conveyed.

Structurally though, the youth press everywhere played an array of similar roles. From its ranks came the leading movement intellectuals that diagnosed problems and formulated solutions, thus contributing to the building of their distinct identity and meaning.<sup>405</sup> They provided mobilizing information, giving incentives to transform theory into practice. Once the movements formed, the journals recorded student activities, filling the gaps left by the mainstream media. Combining the roles of journalists and activists, the staff was frequently personally involved. They participated in the major political upheavals, profoundly influencing their course.

In doing so, the youth press turned into an insubordinate alternative media that tackled the existing political stalemate from the margins. Balancing among different political factions, the journals voiced various student concerns in the broad range from

---

<sup>402</sup> This directly relates to the assertion of alternative media scholars that their vitality often depends on the strength of the surrounding radical movement. Atton, *Alternative Media*, 81.

<sup>403</sup> Della Porta claims that service organizations such as newspapers that are involved in political mobilization and contribute to a movement's aim should be considered a part of its organizational structure. See: Donatella della Porta and Mario Dani, *Social Movements: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 146.

<sup>404</sup> As seen, students were influenced by various intellectual semi-dissident groups. More on the link between the rebel Belgrade students and the *Praxis* professors see in: Svetozar Stojanovic, *The Fall of Yugoslavia: Why Communism Failed* (Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 1997), 45.

<sup>405</sup> Movement intellectuals are individuals who through their activities articulate the knowledge interests and cognitive identify of social movements. See: Ron Eyerman and Andrew Jamison, *Social Movements: A Cognitive Approach*, (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press: 1991), 450.

non-institutional opposition to relevant pressure groups. As they strived to broaden political participation, they pointed to an engulfing abyss between the proclaimed state goals and actual accomplishments.

It is by looking at this seminal political role of the youth press, that the stunning, yet frequently overlooked complexity of the surrounding process surfaces. The student politicization from the late 1960s and early 1970s was a much more diverse phenomenon than its common perception, narrowed to the 1968 student unrest in Belgrade, would suggest.

### 5.6.2. Contesting ideologies: from leftist solidarity to national rivalry

Two early threads present in the whole of Yugoslav youth press was its univocal support for the youth union's reform and the global student rebellion. Whereas the former promoted the need to democratize politics, the latter proposed models how to do so.<sup>406</sup> With regards to both, the youth journals ended up ahead of their publishers, pushing for more strident formulations.

Subsequent evolution varied across the republics, dictating the future agenda.<sup>407</sup> The politicization radicalized most rapidly in the capital, standing in close contact with *Praxis* revisionist Marxism. The Belgrade youth journals happily served as the organ of the evolving leftist movement, conveying its contradictive pleas for self-management democracy and utopian communism. Calls for more freedom exchanged with little tolerance for national or market ideas. Once crushed, the political

---

<sup>406</sup> The two issues were directly linked as the journalists were fascinated by the worldwide revolutionary atmosphere that provided the incentives to transform frustrating domestic social and political state. Indeed, how could one best discuss the inefficiency of bureaucratic youth organizations, if not by celebrating the spontaneous European youth, or heroizing their leaders, blessed with features not akin to Yugoslav youth politics. See: Marko Zubak "Pripremanje terena: odjek globalnog studentskog bunta 1968. godine u jugoslavenskom omladinskom i studentskom tisku" in Radmila Radić, *1968: Četrdeset godina posle*, 419-452.

<sup>407</sup> While the early climax of the Belgrade movement immediately posed serious political issues, in Zagreb and Ljubljana syndicalist agenda had more time to develop.

aspirations recurred in a new form that included nationalist ideas, though failed to generate significant feedback from below.

In Zagreb it was the other way around. While the leftist drive coincided with the one in the capital, it never reached the same intensity. Its major advocate, *Omladinski tjednik*, remained louder than the constituency it claimed to represent. In a staggering contrast to Belgrade, it was the second, national political student wave which fully exploded. In a process that divided the local student community, it again found its voice in the student journal. Such contrasting outcome was pre-determined from the start. After the June 1968 events Zagreb leftists were always hindered by the latent centralizing and anti-reformist undertones of the Belgrade egalitarian ideas.

Finally, in Ljubljana the youth press radicalized in yet another pattern. After first endorsing informal ideas from below, *Tribuna* slowly infiltrated their envoys into its own ranks. By the end it hosted the leftist student thrust which scarcely existed outside the journal. Always secluded, *Tribuna* did not feel the potential centralist nuances that troubled the Zagreb journals and stayed immune to national concerns. Moreover, due to the belated outburst it managed to incorporate more aggressive New Left ideas and tactics and in that regard came closest to the West European student trends.

The cultural youth journalists across the three cities worked hard to match this eruption. While they influenced certain art forms with their political concerns, they were less successful in finding authentic, youth cultural expression that would fully correspond to the new political ideas.<sup>408</sup> In this respect, they reiterate the chief political focus of the Yugoslav student movements that evade the ruling global narrative of the late 1960s student revolt that insist on the enduring prevalence of the

---

<sup>408</sup> As shown, Western political underground counterculture granted one, if marginal, outlet. However, here too the youth press was only partially successfully, more in its presentation than appropriation.

cultural over political dimension. As seen, their unorthodox cultural incentives only randomly encouraged, supplemented or extended political explosion.

While new political messages posed serious challenges to the authorities, they remained firmly within the official doctrine. By and large, the rebellious Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana students believed in the reformative potential of the state doctrine and wished to see its execution, ascribing to it different meanings in accord with their specific agenda.<sup>409</sup>

The concept of self-management proved elastic and open to interpretations, inviting the journals to engage in a fierce semantic struggle. Consequently, the staff tried to integrate it with other ideas that would give it a new tone, from the related ones like the New Left, to those less consistent, including anarchism. Moreover, the inherent contradictions of communist Yugoslavia enabled mutually opposing demands to refer to the same principles. While ideologically at odds, both Belgrade leftists and Croatian nationalists claimed to revitalize Yugoslav self-management socialism: the first asked for the reinstatement of the workers' rule, the second for the national emancipation of Yugoslav peoples.<sup>410</sup>

Complementing this progress, a dynamic interaction evolved between the youth press across the country. Following the first repressive measures after the June unrest, mutual solidarity emerged between the Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana youth journals. In part, it was motivated by shared, if not identical, leftist leanings. In addition, their staff supported each other without too much thinking, perceiving to be

---

<sup>409</sup> This is partially confirmed in retrospective by many contemporary actors who insist on their hidden, alternative ideas. See in particular: Malavrazić, *Šezdeset osma – lične istorije*; Milovan Baletić, ed., *Ljudi iz 1971: Prekinuta šutnja* (People from 1971: Broken Silence), (Zagreb: Vjesnik, 1990)

<sup>410</sup> Marko Zubak, "Yugoslavya'da 1968 ve 1971 Öğrenci Hareketleri: Komünist Gençleştirirnenin İki Hatası," (1968 and 1971 Student Movements in Yugoslavia: Two Failures of Communist Rejuvenation) in Y. Doğan Çetinkaya (Ed.), *Toplumsal Hareketler: Tarih, Teori ve Deneyim*, (Social Movements: History, Theory and Experience), (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2008), pp. 389-415.



in the same disadvantaged position and confronted with the same adversary in the shape of mainstream media, youth officials or Party authorities.<sup>411</sup>

Copious examples demonstrate how an attack on each youth journal was instantly echoed in different places. The Belgrade and Zagreb youth press readily reprinted *Tribuna*'s revolutionary cultural proclamations.<sup>412</sup> *Student* compassionately objected the suspension of Zagreb's *Polet* and *Prolog*.<sup>413</sup> In turn, the removal of *Student*'s editorial board, stirred the politicization of *Tribuna*, while deposed *Susret*'s ex-editor Mirko Klarin was instantly offered a job in *Omladinski tjednik*.<sup>414</sup>

Till 1970 these affections crossed republican borders. Once political visions started to differentiate, the journals developed distinct identities tied to their respective movements and, consequently, followed their separate fates. As a result, the harmony was interrupted. With the advent of national agenda, the former camaraderie disintegrated into rivalry, and open animosity. By 1971 the Belgrade and Zagreb youth journals harshly attacked each other.<sup>415</sup>

### 5.6.3. Confrontations

The politicization of youth press had an instant effect on its popularity. Over four years, its circulation multiplied many times, reaching peak in moments of crises. At their best, *Student* produced 70,000 copies, *Omladinski tjednik* and *Studentski list* 30,000; while *Tribuna*'s banned issues rose to 8,000. While nowhere near to those of

<sup>411</sup> Vujić, interview; Stojanović, interview.

<sup>412</sup> "Manifest kulturne revolucije" (Cultural Revolution Manifesto); "Manifest" (Manifest) *Student* 27 (10 Dec. 1968): 6; 7. See also a wide appeal against the campaign: "Hajka se nastavlja" (Crusade Continues), *Omladinski tjednik* 34/35 (4 Dec. 1968): 4.

<sup>413</sup> "Problematična omladinska štampa" (Problematic Youth Press), *Student* 22 (5 Nov 1968): 2.

<sup>414</sup> See in turn: "Pismo beograjskim prijateljima" (Letter to the Belgrade Friends); "Divide et impera"; "Sokrat umira v Beogradu" (Socrates Dies in Belgrade), *Tribuna* 5 (31 Jan. 1970): 1-3; "Pridruži se zaveri i prenesi rat kući" (Join the Conspiracy and Bring the War Home), *Omladinski tjednik* 63 (8 Oct. 1969): 8.

<sup>415</sup> See among others: "Beogradskom 'Studentu' na znanje i spomen umjesto svakog drugog reagiranja" (A Notice to Belgrade 'Student' instead of any Other Reaction), *Studentski list* 22/23 (24 Nov. 1970): 4.

the daily press, these increased numbers point to a distinguishing feature of all alternative media. In certain critical times, their popularity rises, as they fill the gaps left by the mainstream media and contain information unattainable elsewhere.

By the same token, political radicalization spurred conflicts at three different levels. First, the youth journalists began to understand themselves as the remedy of the mainstream media, thus elevating a common feature of the global student protests to a model of their own.<sup>416</sup> Second, utilizing the new youth self-management paradigm, they sought to emancipate from their respective student or youth unions, refusing to serve merely as a “transmitter.”<sup>417</sup> Finally, the journals entered into a lasting strife with the highest power structures which desperately tried to restrain the new voices. To do so, however, they had to circumvent the fact that the Yugoslav students found the unused potential for their “Great Refusal” in the official state doctrine.<sup>418</sup> In other words, their administrative measures had to step over their own socialist postulates to which the Yugoslav communists held so dearly.

As a result, the repression was all but linear. Between the initial attacks and the ultimate showdown, a complex struggle went on, full of negotiations. Judging from the autonomous conduct of the journals’ publishing councils, the authorities seemed ill-prepared to wrestle with the institutional opposition.<sup>419</sup> Moreover, the reformist elements within the youth unions often hoped to reach some kind of compromise,

---

<sup>416</sup> As could be seen, the journals openly confronted its misleading and superfluous writings on a wide range of issues.

<sup>417</sup> The youth press typically radicalized the reformist ideas of their own publishers.

<sup>418</sup> Jürgen Habermas, *Toward a Rational Society: Student Protest, Science and Politics* (London: Polity Press, 1989), 31.

<sup>419</sup> As noted earlier, publishing councils protected the editors till their deposition. The *Student’s* Council, for example, even ignored the official requests to resign. Conversely, the staff refused to renounce their right to engage with political issues. They claimed they were bound to speak up and propagate the core state values, amidst the silent majority. See in turn: “Izjava povodom raspuštanja redakcije *Susreta*” (Statement on the Dissolution of the *Susret’s* Editorial Board), *Student* 16 (20 May 1969): 2; “Saopštenje Saveta” (Council’s Memo), *Student* 25 (9 Dec. 1969): 3; “Ali je *Tribuna* študentski list?” (Is *Tribuna* a Student Journal?), *Tribuna* 10 (5 Jan. 1972): 3.

rather than to resort to force.<sup>420</sup> As long as it lasted, the liberal political climate also played its part, as could be seen from the dithering behavior of the Party officials who frequently balanced their attacks with words of praise.

Ultimately, the journals paid the price for their defiant writings. Unimaginable a few years earlier, legal prosecutions became widespread, with almost each journal being hit at one point. Defiant editors were frequently forced to step down and, occasionally, punished more severely as consequent measures included even prison sentences.

#### 5.6.4. Youth journalists

As a rule, all major publications were created in their heyday by a small circle of staff which had a crucial impact on their policies. The journals would flourish once a good writing team was formed. A few core writers, joined by a group of frequent contributors, typically set the main tone. Likewise, the departure of a single editor often meant drastic change in the journal's profile, and, very likely, decline in quality.<sup>421</sup>

Most prominent authors of the period rarely thought of themselves as professional journalists and only a few would go on to have a related career.<sup>422</sup> Yet, with the sole exception of the Croatian national students, they were hardly outsiders.<sup>423</sup> Indeed, maneuvering within aspects of high politics required ideological fluency. In order to expand and re-interpret the self-management agenda, one needed to be familiar with the official vocabulary.

---

<sup>420</sup> Editors testify about the internal fractional conflicts between the liberals and conservatives within their respective unions. Ilić, interview; Hodžić, interview; Klarin, interview.

<sup>421</sup> For example, the radical leftist phase of the Zagreb youth press abruptly ended following Puhovski's deposal with its proponent, *Omladinski tjednik*, turning in another political direction.

<sup>422</sup> These include Mirko Klarin, Petar Kvesić or Inoslav Bešker. Vujić, interview; Puhovski interview; Stojanović, interview; Štrajn interview; Dolar, interview.

<sup>423</sup> The Croatian students with their new nationalist ideology and dubious inclinations towards the Party were the only See:

The core of the staff thus fall into three main groups. Many were youth activists, and, most commonly Party members. Yet one should not equate them with typical youth officials since only exceptionally they held important institutional positions.<sup>424</sup> More often they belonged to the estranged, progressive wings of their respective youth/student unions, located at troublesome faculties which espoused radical ideas. Others, frequently with strong cultural background, behaved as intellectual guerillas, seeing in writing a suitable channel for the expression of their radical ideas.<sup>425</sup> Last but not least, a range of young writers, critics, artists and academics, asserted themselves in the cultural sections of the journals.

### 5.6.5. Epilogue

In the process with numerous overlaps, the political youth press and the student politicization shared the same fate. As the repression in the early 1970s precluded divergent student politics, the youth journals, like their readers, gave up meaningful political engagement. Challenging ideological statements of pivotal significance for the transformation of the youth press into a relevant media lost all credibility. Counter-hegemonic potential, the desire to provoke and experiment vanished or was limited to hermetic fields of high culture alone.

The youth press failed to prosper under the new circumstances. In the ensuing years the journals faced three equally bad options. Hit by direct bans or reduced subsidies, many disappeared, some before the political collapse. Others, following the removal of troublesome editors, returned to the old “mouthpiece of the Party”

---

<sup>424</sup> *Student's* Alija Hodžić, *Tribuna's* Darko Štrajn, or *Omladinski tjednik's* Inoslav Bešker, were all active members of the local student unions with stronger institutional affiliation. They regularly used their position to provide the bridge with the publisher in the ongoing disputes. Štrajn, interview; Hodžić, interview.

<sup>425</sup> See: Puhovski, interview; “Intelektualna gerila – početak ili kraj revolucionarnog pokreta mladih” (Intellectual Guerilla – Beginning or the End of the Revolutionary Youth Movement), *Omladinski tjednik* 46 (5 March 1969): 4.

principle, fulfilling the traditional tasks in compliance with the expectations of the new conservative youth authorities. The remaining few turned to the mainstream pattern and converted into general interest magazines, a move that secured a higher circulation, but had an equally deteriorating journalistic effect.

This threefold course, death, transmission or imitation, marginalized the youth press once again, leading to its crisis that lasted until one journal in the latter part of the 1970s found the way to maintain the alternative legacy in a new manner.

## 6. CHAPTER: THE VOICE OF PUNK-ROCK (1977-1980)

This chapter has a few interrelated aims. First, the youth press will be portrayed as the place of creation and presentation of the local punk-rock culture and the youth lifestyles created around it in the second half of the 1970s. Parallel to it, I will elaborate the innovative methods used in the new orientation, as well as the wider frame within which they originated. Thirdly, I will decode these representations and tactics as “alternative,” varying from a simple experiment to complex symbolic resistance generated by the appropriation of Western cultural forms within a different context that added new meanings to their original semantics. Just as in the preceding chapter, the attention is again divided between the text and the creators, the youth press and its journalists.

The chapter is structured accordingly. The first two sections provide the basic outline and status of the Yugoslav rock-culture and describe its treatment in the youth press prior to the late 1970s. The central portion is taken by the case study of Zagreb weekly *Polet*, the chief representative of the new approach. Substituting previous political commitment with a sub-cultural one, it managed to revitalize into a veritable alternative youth medium. In doing so, it introduced many media novelties, opposed to the mainstream norms that need to be presented next to is coverage of punk-rock. Finally, the concluding part turns to analogous events in other centers where *Polet* became a reference for youth journals that tried to follow its course. The focus, however, is on another outlet whose role in the promotion of local punk-rock subculture was comparable, yet independent to that of *Polet*. The review of Ljubljana’s *Radio Študent* will reaffirm the fascinating interplay of differences and similarities between the processes in individual republics.

The outlook of this chapter is shaped by two minor drawbacks. Firstly, while the selected time span works perfectly in the case of *Polet*, it disrupts the processes in other centers. For one, the Belgrade rock-scene which failed to form before the early 1980s, is to a large extent excluded from the analysis. Likewise, the role of images is only briefly mentioned. Along with other visuals, it will be dealt with in more detail in the final chapter, placed within the wider framework of graphic innovations and experiments in the youth press.

## 6.1. YUGOSLAV YOUTH PUNK-ROCK SUBCULTURE

### 6.1.1. Concept and research literature

Before proceeding, the composite guiding concept needs to be carefully defined.<sup>1</sup> In this chapter I refer to the youth punk-rock subculture in the broadest possible scope. The term here covers different variants of rock music in their twofold capacity, as a form of pop-culture that embraces music along with the attached set of values, and as a core element around which distinct youth lifestyles are shaped, comprising of various *codes*, such as slang, clothes or image.

Such an extensive frame was conditioned by the analysis that joins these various, not always easily identifiable facets. Concretely, I look at the youth press's treatment of punk rock, observed primarily as a cultural practice with profound social impact. Though not free of deficiencies, the definition is far from arbitrary since it unites the two dominant Western academic perspectives on rock. The first centers around music

---

<sup>1</sup> The concept of subculture has a rich intellectual history. Though the term is somewhat outdated, I will use it nevertheless, since, due to the legacy of the Birmingham CCCS, it became deeply intertwined with the treatment of punk, which is one of the backbones of this chapter. For the fascinating history of theoretical thinking on subcultures, see: Ken Gelder, *Subcultures: Cultural Histories and Social Practice* (London: Routledge, 2007).

and emerged within the cultural studies; the second traces its sociological effects upon audiences and became a part of the youth studies.<sup>2</sup>

The question is could such complex conceptual frame be applied in a communist setting where rock penetrated second-hand and against the hostile background? The answer is affirmative, provided that a new distinction is made. Rock itself is a fluid phenomenon whose form and meaning change according to the context and manner in which it was adopted.<sup>3</sup> If implemented then, this compelling frame should exhibit new dimensions that rock acquired in a new, Yugoslav communist milieu.

The supposition received many confirmations and is the major lesson to be learned from the evolution of rock in the communist Europe. Though often praised for contributing to the final collapse of the regime, the available scholarship, with the exception of GDR, is surprisingly fragmentary.<sup>4</sup> The attempts at reading the (life)style are even rarer.<sup>5</sup>

Yugoslav rock is by no means an exception in this respect.<sup>6</sup> While the existing literature surpasses that on the student movement, it is far from satisfactory and habitually devoid of academic merits. If we try to follow the aforementioned distinction, one can distinguish between the two main approaches. The major share of works treated rock as a cultural-artistic field and was closely bond with rock

<sup>2</sup> Roy Shuker, *Understanding Popular Music* (London: Routledge, 1994), 76-77.

<sup>3</sup> Andy Bennett, *Cultures of Popular Music* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 2001), 68-71.

<sup>4</sup> Artemy Troitsky, *Back in the USSR: The True Story of Rock in Russia* (Boston: Faber and Faber, 1988); Timothy W. Ryback, *Rock around the Bloc: A History of Rock Music in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Sabrina P. Ramet, ed., *Rocking the State: Rock Music and Politics in Eastern Europe and Russia* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1994).

<sup>5</sup> With its huge interpretative capacity, punk attracted the biggest interest. About the East-European punk see in: Michael Boehlke and Henryk Gericke, eds., *ostPUNK! – Too Much Future: Punk in der DDR 1979-89* (Berlin: Künstlerhaus Bethanien, 2005); Anna Szemere, “The Politics of Marginality: A Rock Musical Subculture in Socialist Hungary in the Early 1980s,” in Reebee Garofalo, ed., *Rockin’ the Boat: Mass Music and Mass Movements* (Boston: South End Press, 1992), 93-114.

<sup>6</sup> Yugoslavia is either absent or just briefly discussed in the aforementioned body of work. For English literature on Yugoslav rock see: Sabrina P. Ramet, “Shake, Rattle, and Self-management. Making the Scene in Yugoslavia,” in *Rocking the State*, 103-132; Gregor Tomc, “We Will Rock YU. Popular Music in the Second Yugoslavia,” in Dubravka Djurić and Miško Šuvaković, eds., *Impossible Histories: Historical Avant-gardes, Neo-avant-gardes and Post-avant-gardes in Yugoslavia, 1918-1991* (Cambridge, Mass./London: The MIT Press, 2003), 442-65.



journalism. Reflecting predominantly on the ongoing trends, the authors were deeply intertwined with the scene itself, affected by its ups and downs.<sup>7</sup> The recent revival of interest multiplied the number of titles, but, as a rule, lacked scholarly ambitions and rarely contributed something new.<sup>8</sup> The cultural history of Yugo-rock is thus yet to be written.<sup>9</sup>

The other group of studies, touching upon the wider social impact of rock is academically more sound, though not necessarily centered around music. Rock itself had but a marginal place in the otherwise prolific tradition of empirical research of the youth's interests and values, stretching back to early 1970s.<sup>10</sup> The situation changed

---

<sup>7</sup> Accordingly, until recently, very little was known about the rock-beginnings from the 1960s. The first works which emerged in the early 1980s were at odds if the rock culture actually exists or not. Conversely, the best titles both coincide and refer to the time of the major rock expansion in the late 1970s and early 1980s. By far the most compelling study of the New Wave scene till this day dates from 1983. The volume recognized a wider context of the new phenomenon, viewing it as a subculture and an art form, at times awkwardly speaking about the rock literature, elsewhere more successfully, as with rock photography and design. See: David Albahari, ed., *Drugom stranom: Almanah novog talasa u SFRJ* (On the Other Side: The Almanac of the New Wave in SFRY) (Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1983).

<sup>8</sup> After the dissolution of the state a long pause occurred, finally interrupted in the mid 2000s. In comparison with just one title from the 1990s, now many biographies, interviews and memoirs involving original participants were published, whereby the revival of interest concerned principally the New Wave. See in turn: Siniša Radaković, ed., *Mala enciklopedija hrvatske pop i rock glazbe* (A Small Encyclopedia of Croatian Pop and Rock Music) (Rijeka: Nema problema produkcija, 1994); Petar Janjatović, ed., *Ilustrovana YU Rock enciklopedija 1960-2000* (Illustrated YU Rock Encyclopedia, 1960-2000) (Novi Sad: Prometej, 2001); Bogomir Mijatović, *NS Rockopedija. Novosadska rok enciklopedija 1963-2003* (NS Rockopedia: Novi Sad's Rock Encyclopedia) (Sremska Kamenica: Switch, 2005); Velid Đekić, *91.decibel: Vodič rock'n'rol Rijekom* (91 Decibel: A Guide through the Rock'n'Roll Rijeka) (Zagreb: Meandarmedia, 2009); Darko Glavan and Hrvoje Horvat, *Prljavo kazalište: Sve je lako kad si mlad. Autorizirana biografija* (Prljavo kazalište: Everything is Easy When You Are Young. Authorized Biography) (Zagreb: Minerva/Europapress Holding, 2001); Hrvoje Horvat, *Johnny B. Štulić: Fantom slobode* (Johnny B. Štulić: Phantom of Freedom) (Zagreb: Profil, 2005); Igor Mirković, *Sretno dijete* (Happy Child) (Zagreb: Fraktura, 2004); Branko Kostelnik, *Moj život je novi val: Razgovori s prvoborcima i dragovoljcima novog vala* (My Life Is New Wave: Interviews with the New Wave Pioneers and Volunteers) (Zaprešić: Fraktura, 2004); Kruno Petrinović, ed., *Branimir Štulić: Kad Miki kaže da se boji. Prilozi za biografiju Johnnyja B. Štulića*: (Branimir Štulić: When Miki Says He Is Afraid. Contributions to the Biography of Johnny B. Štulić:) (Zagreb: Umjetnička organizacija *Uradi nešto*, 2006).

<sup>9</sup> In that sense, several articles stand out for their analytic profile, theoretical basis, or desire to counter the accepted non-problematic nostalgia. See respectively: *15 dana: Ilustrirani časopis za umjetnost i kulturu* 5-6 (2008); Natalja Kyaw, "Računajte na nas. Pank i novi talas: Novi talas u socijalističkoj Jugoslaviji" (Count on Us. Punk and New Wave: New Wave in Socialist Yugoslavia), in Đorđe Tomić and Petar Atanacković, eds., *Društvo u pokretu. Novi društveni pokreti u Jugoslaviji od 1968. do danas* (Society in Movement: New Social Movements in Yugoslavia from 1968 till Present) (Novi Sad: Cenzura, 2009), 81-102; Denis Kuljiš, "Mistifikacija jugoslavenskog kraja stoljeća" (Mystification of the Yugoslav End of the Century), *Gordogan* 2 (21), no. 2-3 (46-47) (winter-spring 2004): 227-31.

<sup>10</sup> For a rare exception see: Darko Glavan et al., *Pop glazba i kultura mladih: sondažno istraživanje publike rock-koncerta* (Pop Music and Youth Culture: A Survey of the Rock Concert Audience)

with the minor subcultural turn in the 1980s, launched by the early translations of key authors like Dick Hebdige, Mike Brake or Stuart Hall.<sup>11</sup> This theoretical input fell on fertile ground of the already developed urban youth subcultures which soon received their own interpretations.

Three authors emerged in the process, each focusing on one locality, Belgrade, Zagreb, and Ljubljana. While their studies widely differ in methods, approach and focus, if read critically, they manage to provide a preliminary insight into the late Yugoslav youth subcultures.<sup>12</sup> First, each recognized the importance of the new wave

---

(Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti SSOH, 1978). It should be mentioned that these studies were conducted and published within the network of youth institutions, from special research bodies within the Zagreb and Belgrade youth union, to the editions of Ljubljana University Center. Despite its dated nature, this literature indicates an early awareness of the existence of distinct youth culture, with its specific aspects such as leisure. See among others: Miro A. Mihovilović, *Struktura i funkcija omladinskih klubova u Zagrebu: Slobodno vrijeme omladine* (Structure and Function of Youth Clubs in Zagreb: Youth Leisure) (Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 1970); Ante Fulgosi and Furio Radin, *Stilovi života zagrebačkih srednjoškolaca* (Lifestyles of Zagreb's High-school Youth) (Zagreb: CDD SSOH, 1982); Nenad Fanuko et al., *Fragmenti omladine* (Fragments of the Youth) (Zagreb: RZ RK SSOH, 1988); Vlasta Ilišin et al., *Ogledi o omladini osamdesetih* (Essays on the Youth in Eighties) (Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 1990); Dragomir Pantić, *Interesovanja mladih. Deo 1, Priroda interesovanja; deo 2, Rezultati istraživanja* (Youth Interests. Vol. 1, The Nature of Interests; vol. 2, Research Results) (Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1980; 1981); Borisav Džuverović, *Kultura i omladina* (Culture and Youth) (Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1982).

<sup>11</sup> Hebdige's seminal study was translated a year after the original. Other mentioned authors were available by the mid decade, some, like Hall, within a newly launched yearly almanac on subcultures. The latter could in fact be considered the fourth type of youth press, since it was published in the form of an annual periodical under the authority of the Serbian youth union. Between 1985 and 1989 four yearbooks were published. See respectively: Dik Hebdidž, *Potkultura: značenje stila* (Subculture, The Meaning of Style) (Beograd: Rad, 1980); Mike Brake, *Sociologija mladinske kulture in mladinskih subkultur* (The Sociology of Youth Culture and Youth Subcultures) (Ljubljana: Republiška konferenca ZSMS, Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS, 1984); Džon Klark et al., "Podkulture i klasa" (Subcultures and Class), *Podkulture* 1 (1985): 21-92; Simon Frith, *Zvočni učinki: Mladina, brezdjelje in politika rock'n'rolla* (Sound Effects: Youth, Leisure, and the Politics of Rock) (Ljubljana: Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS, Republiška konferenca ZSMS, 1986); *Potkulture* (Beograd) 1-4 (1985-1989).

<sup>12</sup> Notwithstanding the existence of a certain tradition, all three key authors, Ines Prica, Benjamin Perasović and Gregor Tomc, testify to the grave difficulties in scientific legitimization of youth subcultures. This was the reason why their works emerged independently of each other, without mutual references and historical insights. Due to their importance, however, they need to be represented in more detail. Prica's depiction of the Belgrade subcultural scene from the mid-1980s focused mostly on the role of images and music in the formation of dominant codes of the three youth subcultures. Informed by subcultural theory and CCCS, her analysis transgresses its narrow geographical and time span, providing some insights in the formation of the scene in early 1980s. The most recent work, by Perasović, chronologically looks at the youth subcultures in Croatia, from 1970s to 1990s. This unique, insider's ethnographic portrayal written by the participant-observer focus on the self-identity of the subcultural actors. Well versed in theory, Perasović also refers to certain conceptual problems such as the inadequate narrow view of subculture in the local context, arguing instead for the fluidity of its borders. Finally, after introducing a threefold division between subpolitics, subcultures and countercultures (standing respectively for alternative politics, culture and their amalgam), Tomc traces

of punk-rock as the integrative principle of the evolving youth lifestyles in late socialism. Secondly, they are all, more or less, aware, that the incorporation of foreign (sub)cultural forms transforms their original connotative meanings, though not always follow the implied repercussions. And finally, they all point, if not explicitly, to the subversive potential of the new music and the related subcultures.<sup>13</sup> This is exactly why only the Slovenian punk subculture, understood as the forerunner of the future democratization and eventual independence, received more systematic attention.<sup>14</sup>

Having in mind the scholarly void, it is no wonder that the role of the youth media was completely ignored. Its indispensable part in transmitting, mediating and creating the new culture remained thus almost completely unrecognized.<sup>15</sup> Likewise, the

---

their cyclic appearance in the 20<sup>th</sup> century Slovenia. For the thesis itself, Tomc is, however, more important as the author of essays on Slovenian punk-subculture. See respectively: Ines Prica, *Omladinska potkultura u Beogradu: simbolička praksa* (Youth Subculture in Belgrade: Symbolic Practice) (Beograd: Etnografski institut SANU, 1991); Gregor Tomc, *Druga Slovenija: Zgodovina mladinskih gibanj na Slovenskem v 20. stoletju* (The Other Slovenia: History of Youth Movements in Slovenia in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century) (Ljubljana: Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS, Knjižnica revolucionarne teorije, 1989); Benjamin Perasović, *Urbana plemena: Sociologija subkultura u Hrvatskoj* (Urban Tribes: Sociology of Subcultures in Croatia) (Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 2001).

<sup>13</sup> Such “resistant” reading is the reason why the research of youth subcultures is one of the few branches within the youth studies that survived the fall of communism. In fact some important theoretically sound works emerged then, whereby one can observe a shift from subcultures to lifestyles. About the post 1990 situation see: Gregor Tomc, Peter Stanković and Mitja Velikonja, eds., *Urbana plemena: Subkulture v Sloveniji v devetdesetih* (Urban Tribes: Subcultures in Slovenia in the 90s) (Ljubljana: ŠOU, Študentska založba, 1999); Inga Tomić-Koludrović and Anči Leburčić, *Skeptična generacija: Životni stilovi mladih u Hrvatskoj* (Skeptical Generation: Youth Lifestyles in Croatia) (Zagreb: AGM, 2001).

<sup>14</sup> The collection of relevant documents was published already before the fall of the regime. On the other hand, Gregor Tomc, the founder of punk band *Pankrti* was a sociologist who went on to have a university career and became a pioneer in the study of local subcultures. On Slovenian punk see: *Punk pod Slovenci* (Punk in Slovenia) (Ljubljana: Republiška konferenca ZSMS, Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS, 1985); Gregor Tomc, “The Politics of Punk,” in Jill Benderly and Evan Kraft, eds., *Independent Slovenia. Origins, Movements, Prospects* (London: Macmillan, 1994), 113-34; Gregor Tomc, “A Tale of Two Subcultures: A Comparative Analysis of Hippie and Punk Subcultures in Slovenia,” in Breda Luthar and Marusa Pusnik, eds., *Remembering Utopia: The Culture of Everyday Life in Socialist Yugoslavia* (Washington: New Academia Pub., 2010), 165-98; Peter Lovšin, Peter Mlakar and Igor Vidmar, eds., *Punk je bil prej: 25 let punka pod Slovenci* (Punk Was Before: 25 Years of Punk in Slovenia) (Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba and ROPOT, 2002); Alenka Barber-Kersovan, *Vom “Punk-Frühling” zum “Slowenischen Frühling”. Der Beitrag des slowenischen Punk zur Demontage des sozialistischen Wertesystems* (Hamburg: Krämer, 2005).

<sup>15</sup> The aforesaid exception is a recent article on the first Yugoslav rock magazine *Džuboks*. Although, lately, several collections of texts by renowned rock journalists appeared, they are of little help since they are of commemorative nature, assembled after their death. See: Вучетић, “Рокењрол на Западу Истока - случај *Цубокс*”: 71-88; Dražen Vrdoljak, *Moje brazde: Bilješke o hrvatskoj zabavnoj, pop i jazz glazbi* (My Grooves: Notes on Croatian Easy Listening, Pop and Jazz Music) (Zagreb: VBZ, 2008); Petar Popović, *Rokopisi* (Rockwritings) (Beograd: Zepter Book World, 2008); Branko

studies of youth subculture only incidentally mentioned the relevance of the youth press, while failing to engage in its analysis.<sup>16</sup>

### 6.1.2. Rock culture in communist Yugoslavia: overview

So what does this literature tell us about the Yugoslav punk rock subculture? In short, how can one define its place within the Yugoslav communism? A detailed overview would take us too far. In order to avoid repetition I will provide only the basic outline.

Above all, Yugoslav rock culture should not be easily compared with that in the rest of the communist world. It has been noted that the *Komsomol* impeded the emergence of any kind of informal youth practices, let alone those deriving from the West such as rock. Its totalitarian ambitions, coupled with the habitual animosity towards pop-culture, inevitably rendered such practices oppositional and subversive, making their appropriation exceedingly difficult.

The unorthodox Yugoslav context differed to a large extent in that respect. More permeable to foreign influences, with higher level of consumerism and a considerably larger culture industry, it facilitated the emergence as well as the incorporation of rock in the new environment. While neither the Party nor its youth auxiliary developed a specific discourse on rock, they tolerated the new music to a great extent, along with other forms of mass culture.<sup>17</sup> As a result, in both forms, as an expression of pop-culture and in its subcultural reflection, rock culture developed earlier and stronger

---

Vukojević, *Kako je bio rokenrol: Izabrani tekstovi, 1975-1991* (How Rock and Roll Happened: Selected Texts, 1975-1991) (Beograd: Društvo ljubitelja popularne kulture, 2005).

<sup>16</sup> While Prica completely ignores them, Perasović and Tomc dedicate them a few paragraphs. One should mention here the recent, unique attempt at critical analysis of the mentioned, mainstream magazine for teenage girls *Tina*, in the manner of Angela McRobbie: Reana Senjković, *Izgubljeno u prijenosu. Pop iskustvo soc kulture* (Lost in Transfer. Pop Experience of Soc-Culture) (Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju, 2008).

<sup>17</sup> Tomc, "The Politics of Punk," 117.

than in the rest of the communist Europe. And it was not oppositional per se. Indeed, until the late 1970s the authorities did not have much to worry about.

The first rock music could be heard as early as the 1960s. New music was accessible primarily through *Radio Luxemburg* or records bought or ordered from abroad. Proto-rock bands soon formed, happy to imitate and play cover versions of Western standards. Those who tried to create local variant and preferred vernacular over English sounded less convincing and made compromises with the pop-scene.<sup>18</sup>

After a transitional period, in the mid 1970s, the so called second generation brought rock to another level. The seminal role here was played by *Bijelo Dugme* whose unique blend of folk elements with hard rock *Led Zeppelin* style became known as “shepherd rock” and received huge following, turning rock into a mass phenomenon.<sup>19</sup> The Slovenian band *Buldožer* progressed in a different direction. Their psychedelic songs and outrageous theatrical acts, influenced by Frank Zappa, proved that domestic rock could be both provocative and rooted in the Western pattern alone.<sup>20</sup> Yugoslav rock was no more illusion, though still an exception.

It is against this background that the so called New Wave rock scene crystallized in the second part of the 1970s. Stylistically, the term covered a range of new diverse acts stretching from orthodox punk, garage rock, to more pop-oriented or art-rock, all of them echoing the worldwide trend of bringing rock back to its roots. The enduring

---

<sup>18</sup> On rock beginnings, see: Ljuba Trifunović, *Vibracije* (Vibrations) (Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1986); Siniša Škarica, *Kad je rock bio mlad. Priča s istočne strane (1956-1970)* (When Rock Was Young. The East Side Story (1956-1970)) (Zagreb: VBZ, 2005); Darko Glavan, “Pretpovijest hrvatskog rocka” (Prehistory of Croatian Rock); Goran Bakić, “Hrvatski rock začinjavci” (Croatian Rock Pioneers) in Radaković, ed., *Mala enciklopedija hrvatske pop i rock glazbe*, 7-10; 11-14.

<sup>19</sup> Not surprisingly, the first Yugoslav rock monograph was dedicated to this Sarajevo rock band and its fame, used by the authors to rebuff the outsider’s academic claims that domestic rock culture does not exist. See respectively: Darko Glavan and Dražen Vrdoljak, *Ništa mudro. Bijelo dugme: autorizirana biografija* (Nothing Wise. *Bijelo Dugme: Authorized Biography*) (Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti SSOH, 1981); Mišo Kulić, *Rok-kultura u izazovu* (Rock-Culture Facing Challenge) (Sarajevo: GK Književne omladine BiH, 1980).

<sup>20</sup> Tome, “We Will Rock YU,” 451-55.

delay between the Western idiom and Yugoslav resonance narrowed or completely vanished. New streams brought several novelties that provided rock with fresh, empowering contours. Simplicity, energy, authenticity were key new elements that helped to democratize and rejuvenate the rock scene.<sup>21</sup>

Instead of a few exceptional actors of the past, a range of exciting bands formed, often by youngsters, in late teens or early twenties. Regular live performances in youth clubs, marked by an unprecedented atmosphere, eroded the distance between the performers and audience. While previously lyrics typically discussed banal love troubles, now they were firmly drowned in the immediate surroundings. Songs spoke about everyday youth life with its ups and downs. Their pessimistic, ironic tone tackled generational issues from the position of marginal underprivileged actors.<sup>22</sup>

In short, Yugoslav rock gained increasingly problematic counters. In addition, the scene varied regionally. Ljubljana became the main centre of punk. Zagreb favored more mellow New Wave sound exemplified by bands like *Film*, *Prljavo Kazalište* or *Azra*. Finally, Belgrade achieved high artistic, almost avant-garde standards, though not before the 1980s.<sup>23</sup>

Finally, this is the period when youth lifestyles became inextricably intertwined around rock music. The situation radically differed from the one in the past. During the sixties, small creative nucleus was reflected in the narrow subculture, comprising of a small group of urban, mostly educated youth that had access to rock.<sup>24</sup> In the 1970, the base gradually widened and one could speak of a broad Yugoslav rock culture as the needed commodities became more readily available to the interested

<sup>21</sup> Darko Glavan, "Na koncertu lekcije iz sociologije" (At the Sociology Lecture Concert), in Albahari, ed., *Drugom stranom*, 15-19.

<sup>22</sup> See also: Dragan Kremer, "To nije poezija, a ovo je uvod" (That Is Not Poetry, and This Is an Introduction), in Albahari, ed., *Drugom stranom*, 7-8.

<sup>23</sup> Throughout its existence, Yugoslav rock culture was a deeply urban phenomenon. See: Ramet, "Shake, Rattle, and Self-management. Making the Scene in Yugoslavia," 105.

<sup>24</sup> Tomc, *Druga Slovenija*.

audience at large. With the decade approaching its end, the culture continued to grow. Only now, along with its massification, certain fragmentation began to occur. In what was before a common undifferentiated rock *tribe*, one could now detect the growth of distinct recognizable subcultures, with specific features, almost coinciding with those in the West, naturally with their own specificities.<sup>25</sup> In both Zagreb and Ljubljana, the youth media played a pivotal role in this twofold complex process.

## 6.2. ROCK CULTURE AND THE STUDENT MOVEMENT: *POP-EXPRESS*

During the student movements, the youth journals failed to provide an adequate cultural response to their major political aspirations. They managed to politicize existing elite forms, but fell short when it came to inventing new ones. Ideological skepticism and the intellectual backgrounds of the main leaders led to the widespread aversion towards mass-culture, with a partial exception of film.

Rock music, along with the rest of the pop-culture, could infiltrate the youth press, only if it proved political commitment and ambition to destroy the existing social relations. Rare existing articles dwelled on the revolutionary potential of rock.<sup>26</sup> It was the likes of Pete Seeger and Arlo Guthrie, much more than *The Beatles* or *The Doors*, who attracted sporadic attention, with their protest anti-war songs regarded as the means of political resistance.<sup>27</sup> In such an over-politicized and highly intellectualized context, rock culture, for the most part, remained outside the youth press's agenda. If

<sup>25</sup> Perasović, *Urbana plemena*, 180-91.

<sup>26</sup> "Pop-Gerila Muzika Revolucije" (Pop-Guerilla, Music of the Revolution), *Omladinski tjednik* 48 (19 March 1969): 11; "Pop muzika kao politički faktor" (Pop-music as Political Agent), *Omladinski tjednik* 89/90 (9 Dec. 1970): 11.

<sup>27</sup> "Blues na temu Vijetnama" (Vietnam Blues), *Polet* 16 (Feb. 1968): 19-21; "Vietnam", *Susret* 76 (21 Feb. 1968): 12-13; "Vietnam" v Ameriški protestni pesmi" (Vietnam in American Protest Song), *Tribuna* 15 (4 March 1968): 8-9.

not completely removed it was marginalized at best.<sup>28</sup> Thanks to one Zagreb journal, not fully.<sup>29</sup>

### 6.2.1. Breakthrough: the first youth rock journal

The first color issue of *Pop-Express*, in the edition of 8,000 copies and with Jimi Hendrix on the cover, appeared in February 1969. The moment proved historic for the youth press in at least two aspects. The caption, “Yugoslav music newspaper,” revealed its innovative focus.<sup>30</sup> Even the founding itself was specific, as the journal was initiated outside the youth organization. After months of preparations, four young rock enthusiasts already active on the scene, either as journalists or DJs, presented their concept of a specialized music journal to the *CKD*, the cultural branch of the Zagreb youth union.<sup>31</sup> Responding to the reformist goal to absorb the youth’s popular interests, the centre supported the project, provided that founders were joined by Darko Stuparić, ex-head of the recently extinguished youth journal *Polet*, as a mentor and editor-in-chief.<sup>32</sup>

At first, *Pop-Express*’s relations with the youth press proper were minimal. The whole spring series literally arose as a semi-private endeavor of the founders who produced ninety percent of the content. Conceived to match the British music press of

---

<sup>28</sup> Only two political youth journals, *Susret* and *Omladinski tjednik*, had a section on rock, written by journalists that would build up their reputation in the unique magazine discussed below. See among others: “Jugoslavensko muzičko ‘podzemlje’” (Yugoslav Music Underground), *Omladinski tjednik* 89/90 (29 April 1970): 15; “Kako dati ime muzici” (How to Name Music), *Susret* 99 (1 May 1969): 20-21.

<sup>29</sup> Apart from the three sketchy encyclopedic entries noted below, *Pop-Express* is completely absent from the literature. See: Škarica, *Kad je rock bio mlad*, 51; Radaković, ed., *Mala enciklopedija hrvatske pop i rock glazbe*, 154; Novak, *Hrvatsko novinarstvo u 20. stoljeću*, 651-652.

<sup>30</sup> *Pop-Express* 1 (10 Feb. 1969): 1.

<sup>31</sup> The initiators were DJ Ranko Antonić, journalist Veljko Despot, Pavle Werner and Ivica Đukić, who were joined by blues&soul expert Toni Nardić. Veljko Despot, interview by author, 14 Dec. 2010, Rovinj, e-mail.

<sup>32</sup> *CKD*, an acronym for Centre for the Cultural Activities, was the Zagreb youth union’s sister-body in charge of its cultural program. From 1966 till 1968, *CKD* published a social-satirical journal *Paradoks*. See: *Paradoks* (Zagreb) 1968-1988.



the time, it kept at a distance from all political ambitions.<sup>33</sup> Indeed, it is next to impossible to find traces that *Pop-Express* was produced in a socialist state, let alone that the youth union stood behind it. If anything, it resembled mainstream magazines that dealt with mass-culture, and stood out only by its quality and distinct profile.<sup>34</sup>

Staffed by the music insiders with numerous contacts, *Pop-Express* instantly made a mark with its detailed, up-to-date, and often firsthand coverage of the pop-rock music. Youngsters, headed by Veljko Despot, frequently commuted to London, returning with exclusive reports and interviews with the rock giants, such as The Rolling Stones or The Who.<sup>35</sup> They reviewed records unavailable on the local market and eagerly introduced new upcoming trends, especially *underground*, a somewhat misplaced term used to label non-commercial heavy garage rock.<sup>36</sup> The extensive network of correspondents stretched from Italy to Czechoslovakia and comprised immediate role-models. Andy Gray, chief editor of the *New Musical Express* or Radio Luxemburg's DJ Tony Prince wrote for *Pop-Express*.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> The very first editorial openly renounced all programmatic ambitions which, in the vocabulary of the time, also meant all ideological ambitions. See: "Informacije" (Information), *Pop-Express* 1 (10 Feb. 1969): 2.

<sup>34</sup> *Pop-Express* was the second Yugoslav magazine dedicated to pop-music and as such preceded by Belgrade's *Džuboks*, published between 1966 and 1968. The latter mostly translated from the foreign press and was edited, due to the lack of specialized personnel, by famous Belgrade DJ Nikola Karaklajić. See: Вучетић, "Рокенрол на Западу Истока - случај *Џубокс*."

<sup>35</sup> Despot made initial contact with *The Beatles* in 1967 while attending a language course in London, where he witnessed public recordings of their album. He was the first East-European journalist who interviewed them for *Plavi Vjesnik* and founded the Beatles Fan Club which received regular section in *Pop-Express*. Among the number of interviews Despot conducted for *Pop-Express* some, including the one with, the then less known, psychedelic band *Pink Floyd*, remained unpublished. See in turn: Despot, interview; "Stonsi: bili i ostali Rock grupa" (The Stones: Always Were and Always Will Remain a Rock Group), *Pop-Express* 6 (21 April 1969): 4-5; "Who," *Pop-Express* 9 (2 June 1969): 4-5; "Jugoslavenski Beatles fan klub" (Yugoslav Beatles Fan Club), *Pop-Express* 1, (10 Feb. 1969): 17.

<sup>36</sup> "Poznajemo li underground muziku" (Do We Know the Underground Music), *Pop-Express* 5 (7 April 1969): 9; "Oni su stvarali underground" (They Were Creating Underground), *Pop-Express* 9 (2 June 1969): 3.

<sup>37</sup> Being the first directly available sources of rock'n'roll both media enjoyed a cult status. *Pop-Express* regularly transferred their music-charts and followed ongoing events there. For the Gray's and Prince's individual contributions see among others: "20 odgovora na 20 pitanja" (20 Answers to 20 Questions), *Pop-Express* 2 (24 Feb. 1969): 10; "Miljenik žena širom svijeta" (Popular Among Women All Around the World), *Pop-Express* 11 (25 Oct. 1969): 3; "Colorful Radio Luxemburg", *Pop-Express* 4 (24 March 1969): 15; "Tony Prince: Potrebna mi je vaša pomoć" (Tony Prince: I Need Your Help), *Pop-Express* 8 (19 May 1969): 14.

In this sense, *Pop-Express* convincingly documented a major breakthrough of rock within the Yugoslav environment. At the same time, however, it pointed to a considerable delay in its incorporation. Not that its home contributors were not established, as they included a range of prominent figures, from chansonnier Arsen Dedić to proto-rock group *Mi*.<sup>38</sup> However, in the part dealing with the local scene, the magazine was left open for a significantly broader genre range, from jazz to schlager. The disproportion between the domestic and foreign idiom is nicely revealed by the somewhat odd mixture where next to each other stood the reports from Woodstock and the Opatija festival, the local answer to San Remo.<sup>39</sup>

The reason is evident. By the end of the 1960s, Yugoslav rock was still a fragile phenomenon, on the margins of the existing music scene. *Pop-Express* could thus, at best, praise the ongoing transition from the first to the second generation of performers, from imitative bands to tentative attempts to build up original style.<sup>40</sup> In the absence of a better one, the journal did not turn away from the present scene. Rather, it interweaved with it, trying to raise and shape standards.<sup>41</sup> Its critical approach endorsed “progressive” tendencies, however widely understood.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> “Kako smo osvojili Sovjetski Savez” (How We Conquered Soviet Union), *Pop-Express* 3 (10 March 1969): 7; “Mi smo *Mi*” (We Are *Mi*), *Pop-Express* 2 (24 Feb. 1969): 17.

<sup>39</sup> “Opatijski vedri dani” (Opatija’s Vivacious Days); “Tri dana mira i muzike” (Three Days of Peace and Music), *Pop-Express* 10 (18 Oct. 1969): 3-4.

<sup>40</sup> “Propada li ili tek nastaje jugoslavenska pop muzika” (Is Yugoslav Pop Music Dying or Only Emerging), *Pop-Express* 11 (25 Oct. 1969): 3; “Underground nalazi sljedbenike i među našim grupama” (Underground Finds Its Followers among Our Groups As Well), *Pop-Express* 20-21 (6/27 Dec. 1969): 8.

<sup>41</sup> Aside from linking with the institutions such as the city radio or youth club *Kulušić*, *Pop-Express* founded an association that gathered proficient music professionals. See: “Na pop valu Miljenka Jelače” (On the Miljenko Jelača’s Pop Wave), *Pop-Express* 2 (24 Feb. 1969): 19; “Klub *Pop-Expressa*” (*Pop-Express* Club), *Pop-Express* 5 (7 April 1969): 4.

<sup>42</sup> See among others: “A naša pop muzika” (And What about Our Pop Music), *Pop-Express* 2 (24 Feb. 1969): 5; “Nešto se, ipak događa” (Something is Going on After All), *Pop-Express* 20-21 (6/27 Dec. 1969): 4.

### 6.2.2. Rock culture

In both variants, though, whether writing on Janis Joplin or Ivica Percl, the coverage was to a large degree limited to the music itself, celebrities and show-business. The enforced de-ideologization brought aesthetic and consumption aspects to the fore. New values and models of behavior stayed in the background.<sup>43</sup>

Certain changes in that respect occurred in the autumn 1969. Not by accident, these coincided with the renewal of staff, filled up from the ranks of the youth press proper. Among the recruited was Mirko Klarin, deposed ex-head of the Belgrade *Susret* and a fallen veteran of the student movement who now became the assistant editor.<sup>44</sup> Almost instantly, a subtle thematic shift could be observed as a number of articles tried to provide the music with a specific context, frame it as the expression of a broader youth culture.

On one hand, the political *underground* was brought in, mostly from the youth press proper. Excerpts from canonical texts such as Jeff Nuttall's *Bomb Culture* illustrated a slightly artificial attempt to turn the new music into the soundtrack of the student movement.<sup>45</sup> Imported and half-hearted at best, the effort to politicize rock remained unrelated with the local situation and ultimately failed.<sup>46</sup> The integration of pop-culture and political engagement never materialized. Yugoslav rock remained stripped from the adjacent belief system.

---

<sup>43</sup> Pop-Express only exceptionally reported on nightlife. See articles on jazz jam sessions and the emergence of first nightclubs: "Disko Eksplozija" (Disco Explosion), *Pop-Express* 12 (1 Nov. 1969): 3; "Lijevo votka – desno jazz" (Votka on the Left – Jazz on the Right), *Pop-Express* 4 (24 March 1969): 10.

<sup>44</sup> *Pop-Express* 10 (18 Oct. 1969): 3.

<sup>45</sup> Nuttall, the founder of the previously portrayed underground magazine *International Times (IT)*, drew links between the emergence of the alternative social norms and the threat of potential nuclear cataclysm, linking music with the notions like social protest and subculture. For the article on *IT* and the beginning of the series from *Bomb Culture* that continued until the final issue, see: "It", *Pop-Express* 11 (25 Oct. 1969): 13; "Mašta je došla na vlast" (The Imagination Came to the Power), *Pop-Express* 12 (1 Nov. 1969): 1, 15.

<sup>46</sup> "Pop muzika revolucionara" (Pop Music of the Revolutionaries), *Pop-Express* 10 (18 Oct. 1969): 5.

Another counter-cultural hero, the anarchist poet and founder of *The Fugs*, Tuli Kupferberg, made a more lasting impact. Kupferberg's humorous suggestions from *1001 Ways to Make Love* touched on sex and soon received domestic adaptation.<sup>47</sup> With it, a dash of sexuality flew through *Pop-Express*, concealed, among other, in the newly-launched readers' letters and everyday literary anecdotes on intimate encounters.<sup>48</sup> Behind the latter, under a transparent pseudonym, stood another autumn acquisition: Pero Kvesić from *Omladinski tjednik*. The journal's discourse on sexuality was just as male and sexist as the one in the rest of the youth press. Yet, unlike the former, it was devoid of all theory and never reached beyond the de-tabooization of the sexual act and jargon.<sup>49</sup>

For many it was too much. A few dirty, jovial expressions and (un)disguised allusions sufficed for the 13<sup>th</sup> issue to be temporarily banned, charged with a "heinous moral offense" that "inflicted harmful effects on the upbringing of the youth."<sup>50</sup> The subsequent court trial turned into a spectacle that perfectly exhibited the faltering attitude of the regime towards new youth culture. Everything that happened that November day, from the preparation of the charges to the final sentence, pointed to the amateur approach that failed to anticipate the united and prompt reaction of the youth opposition.

The first to be thrown out of the small congested courtroom was none other than Kvesić, the author of some of the incriminating material who, encouraged by the fact

---

<sup>47</sup> For the original and the later adaptation see: "101 način vođenja ljubavi" (101 Ways to Make Love), *Pop-Express* 10 (18 Oct. 1969): 16; "101 savjet seksualnim revolucionarnim početnicima" (101 Advice to the Sexual Revolutionary Beginners), *Pop-Express* 15 (22 Nov. 1969): 16.

<sup>48</sup> See among others: "Zašto Željka nije htjela" (Why Željka Wouldn't), *Pop-Express* 10 (18 Oct. 1969): 14; "Jasmina," *Pop-Express* 12 (1 Nov. 1969): 14.

<sup>49</sup> The following excerpt illustrates a typically dominant male perspective and level of discourse: "We know how to suppress sexual frustration. With the right hand. We will unmask this. Definitely. With the left hand." In: "Ljubavno iskustvo 69" (Love Experience 69), *Pop-Express* 16 (29 Nov. 1969): 10.

<sup>50</sup> A list of "sins" discussed on the trial on November 13, 1969, included inviting the girls to come to a party and enjoy free love, invented term with sexual resonance and the question whether penis is needed to lose virginity. See: "Mali oglasi srca" (Heart's Classifieds); "Problemi duše, srca i tijela" (Problems of the Soul, Heart and Body), *Pop-Express* 13 (8 Nov. 1969): 2, 14.

that his father was working two rooms away, shoved the microphone under the judge's nose. Soon he was joined by the journal's photographer who managed to take a few snapshots while the guards chased him away.<sup>51</sup> In the heated atmosphere the editors pointed out that the major share of the indicted sentences were actually taken over from the mainstream press. The defense closed with the counter-attack typical for the youth press of the time: "The trial condemned not the journal but the whole youth generation and wished to impose tutorship upon it."<sup>52</sup> Under the weight of overwhelming evidence, the charges crashed and the journal was acquitted.

In this battle, *Pop-Express* was not alone anymore. By now it was already an equal constituent of the youth press and, as such, defended by others. *Omladinski tjednik* tauntingly called the whole incident a hypocritical theatrical happening.<sup>53</sup> Likewise, *Studentski list* sent its drama critic to report on the case.<sup>54</sup>

The trial is important for it laid bare the threshold of the regime's tolerance towards rock, as well as its immanent subversive nature. As long as *Pop-Express* focused solely upon music it could escape supervision. The moment it attached other (sexual) contents to it, problems mushroomed. Even in such minuscule scope, the attached worldview proved a more troublesome ingredient of rock culture than the music itself. The counter-cultural capacity of *Pop-Express* should not be overrated, however. The regime's paranoia notwithstanding, the journal kept its narrow specialized focus throughout the new broader scheme, with only a sporadic forays into the accompanying lifestyle.

---

<sup>51</sup> Kvesić, present at the hearing also as the journalist of *Omladinski tjednik*, testifies: "It was a total happening. Such events were rare at the time in the press and the relatively small courtroom was crowded. Literally everybody came to have some fun, and the female judge banned the recording of the proceedings.?"; Petar Kvesić, interview by author, 15 Nov. 2010, Zagreb, digital recording.

<sup>52</sup> "Nevini smo" (We Are Innocent), *Pop-Express* 14 (15 Nov. 1969): 1.

<sup>53</sup> "Tresla se brda" (Much ado...), *Omladinski tjednik* 69 (19 Nov. 1969): 5.

<sup>54</sup> "Pop u sudnici" (Pop in the Courtroom), *Studentski list* 22 (18 Nov. 1969): 10.

### 6.2.3. Media innovations

Some of its contributions lay elsewhere. *Pop-Express* introduced many novelties in media promotion and placement as well as graphic design. Attempting to turn the journal into a recognized brand, the editors initiated a range of extra-curricular activities. Events like annual awards for the best performer, DJ challenges with go-go girls, or own broadcast on the city radio were equally unprecedented in the youth press and media at large.<sup>55</sup> And if this did not suffice, *Pop-Express* found a sponsor in *Pepsi-Cola*, an ideologically dubious move, but one that proved exceptionally popular with the staff.<sup>56</sup> Such innovative marketing strategies were conditioned by the uncertain existence of the journal. Not envisaged by the youth union's program, *Pop-Express* could not count on unconditional subventions. Unlike the rest of the youth press, it needed to think about the sales.<sup>57</sup>

This is why the legal acquittal for *Pop-Express*, while a clear fiasco for the regime and its outdated understanding of the moral, was no more than a bitter victory. The provisional withdrawal from the distribution caused great financial damage and contributed to the ongoing operational difficulties the journal faced from the onset.<sup>58</sup> Its unique visual outlook, discussed in the next chapter, managed to surface despite constant problems with the printing houses.<sup>59</sup> Especially detrimental was a silent boycott of the mainstream distribution network. Rightfully perceiving it as a superior contender to its own entertainment press, *Vjesnik*'s kiosks kept copies of *Pop-Express*

<sup>55</sup> “‘Zlatni gramofon’ *Pop-Expressa*” (*Pop-Express*’ “Golden Gramophone”), *Pop-Express* 10 (18 Oct. 1969): 7; “Najveći događaj u historiji jugoslavenske pop muzike” (The Biggest Event in the History of the Yugoslav Pop Music), *Pop-Express* 22 (10 Jan. 1969): 1; “Prvi okršaj” (The First Challenge), *Pop-Express* 23 (17 Jan. 1969): 6.

<sup>56</sup> While its logo adorned every second page, a fridge full of *Pepsi-Cola* stood in the editorial premises, which was for many a sufficient motive to begin to write. See: Kvesić, interview. *Pop-Express* 10 (18 Oct. 1969): 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15.

<sup>57</sup> Accordingly, the first nine color issues cost 4 dinars, four times the price of *Omladinski tjednik*.

<sup>58</sup> Despot, interview.

<sup>59</sup> Graphic editor, Zoran Pavlović, remembers the condescending attitude of the employed technicians: „We will print this junk of yours“. Zoran Pavlović, interview by author, 28 Oct. 2010, Samobor, digital recording.

under the counter.<sup>60</sup> Unfair market competition, coupled with the staff's firm resolution to shape rather than indulge to the mainstream taste, could only lead to losses, and an eventual extinction in January 1970, less than a year from the journal's advent.<sup>61</sup>

Its significance, however, cannot be overstated. With *Pop-Express*, rock culture for the first time gained a pivotal place in the official youth press. The journal legitimized rock as a genuine interest of the socialist youth that should not be abandoned to the mainstream press. Its ground-breaking reach into the new culture reflected its current state, where channels were accessible, but insufficient for the consolidation of the internal variant. The reception to a great extent did not go beyond consumption alone. From *Pop-Express*, one does not learn much about the broader impact or values of rock, nor about its audiences.

And yet, the journal hinted at many future traits, from the subversive potential of rock lifestyle to its close links with the market. Last but not least, *Pop-Express* emerged as the birthplace of the new kind of knowledge and authority. It is not by chance that one of its outstanding representatives, Darko Glavan, began his illustrious career here, while still a freshman. His cerebral approach to rock would soon erase borders between high and low art.<sup>62</sup> In the years to come, rock criticism would build on this very input.

---

<sup>60</sup> To counter these problems in distribution, the editors organized news vending amongst the high-school kids. See in turn: Despot, interview; Novak, *Hrvatsko novinarstvo u 20. stoljeću*, 651.

<sup>61</sup> The initial graphic editor Mihajlo Arsovski points to the rising discord between the embryonic market and the editors' enlightenment zeal, which added to the final collapse. Deep preferences are revealed by the covers and posters which, in 90% of cases, feature foreign, rather than domestic stars. Mihajlo Arsovski, interview by author, 15 Nov. 2010, Zagreb, *Skype* recording.

<sup>62</sup> See: "Prilog historiji protestne pjesme" (A Contribution to the History of the Protest Song), *Pop-Express* 17 (6 Dec. 1969): 7; "Underground zvuk koji osvaja" (Captivating Underground Sound), *Pop-Express* 19 (20 Dec. 1969): 7; "1969 – Godina afirmacije mnogih muzičkih pravaca" (1969 – The Year of the Affirmation of Numerous Musical Trends), *Pop-Express* 20-21 (6/27 Dec. 1969): 12-13.

#### 6.2.4. The birth of rock journalism

During the next half a decade the story of rock and the youth press was limited to this endeavor. Rock critics like *Omladinski tjednik*'s Darko Glavan and Dražen Vrdoljak, or *Omladinske novine*'s Sloba Konjević profited from the cultural exchange with the West to establish a new genre.<sup>63</sup> Building on official tolerance towards what seemed to be a trouble-free imitation of rock, they managed to codify a new legitimate cultural field, specific and potentially subversive.<sup>64</sup>

Their literary critical and hip knowledgeable prose was informed by *New Musical Express* and *Melody Maker* and set around subjective concepts such as integrity.<sup>65</sup> Their assertive positive judgments on the value of a particular rock group or singer could not be verified, at least not with any pre-existing knowledge, and consequently, not easily de-legitimized. Unlike, for example, literary critics who moved within checkable set of references, they were thus mapping entirely new territory, which by and large eluded the scrutiny of the young official bureaucrats formally in charge of their writings.

But from early on, these writers did not confine themselves to youth journals, even if many of them started out there.<sup>66</sup> Rather, they wrote for a range of other mainstream

---

<sup>63</sup> After *Pop-Express* was shut down, Glavan moved to *Omladinski tjednik* where he was soon joined by Vrdoljak. Both continued writing for the Zagreb youth press following its political collapse, thus confirming the principally unproblematic nature of the new music. See: "Nove zvijezde rocka" (New Rock Stars), *Omladinski tjednik* 158 (7 Nov. 1972): 22; "Zappa govori" (Zappa Speaks), *Omladinske novine* 151 (16 May 1972): 27.

<sup>64</sup> These journalists frequently wrote about their profession and the rules that should guide rock criticism. See: "Neukus ili izrugivanje" (Bad Taste or Mocking), *Omladinski tjednik* 83/84 (25 March 1970): 15; "Znamo li da slušamo" (Do We Know How to Listen), *Omladinske novine* 52 (12 April 1975): 23; "Na pragu dileme (I)" (On the Threshold of Dilemma), *Omladinske novine* 149 (16 May 1972): 27.

<sup>65</sup> From the early 1970s both journals could be ordered by post, and by the second part of the decade became available in specialized bookstores with foreign literature.

<sup>66</sup> Among others, next to Glavan and Vrdoljak, celebrated Belgrade rock critic Petar Popović began his career in *Susret*. See: Internet: <http://svrakopis.wordpress.com/2009/03/18/pronalazac-i-sakupljaczvezda>.



magazines, or worked as radio DJs.<sup>67</sup> Within the youth press itself, the place of rock culture remained ghettoized at best. When not ignored, it was confined to a single page and treated more as an accessory than an essential element of the new youth culture. All this changed with the onset of New Wave and its main media sponsor, Zagreb's youth journal *Polet*.

### 6.3. THE *POLET* REVOLUTION

The lion's share of the following section will portray the many ways in which this extraordinary journal covered the emerging, increasingly rebellious rock scene, providing it with the crucial support in its formative phase. However, *Polet's* importance stretches beyond punk-rock. Matching the wider youth subculture it helped to construct with innovative media tactics, *Polet* conducted a minor journalistic revolution which needs to be presented in total.<sup>68</sup>

#### 6.3.1. Beginnings: a new type of youth press

The launching of *Polet* was a part of the wider attempt of the Croatian youth union to revitalize its stumbled press, in deep crises since the end of the student movement. Two years had passed between the original 1974 initiative and the first October 1976 issue, used by the union to revive its sister-body *Center for Social Activity (CDD)*,

---

<sup>67</sup> Sloba Konjević and Dražen Vrdoljak were eminent DJs who introduced rock to radio with their specialized broadcast shows. See: "Kritičarski rad ne pamtim po neugodnostima" (I Do not Recall that Reviewing Was Unpleasant), *Slobodna Dalmacija* (4 March 2003): 10.

<sup>68</sup> It is remarkable that, despite its immense relevance, *Polet* had not yet attracted the attention it deserves. Next to a few Perasović's side comments, only Mirković's book on the New Wave touches upon *Polet's* role. Recently, a few newspaper articles, all listed below, written by *Polet's* editors, provide valuable insights into the (in)formal relations between the authorities and the staff and the exerted methods of pressure.

placed in charge of its publishing activities.<sup>69</sup> In fact, *CDD* first restored *Pitanja*, a former academic journal which now re-conceptualized into a cultural-social monthly concerned with youth and pop-culture, thus alluding, on the theoretical level, to the policies that would become *Polet*'s own trademark.<sup>70</sup>

The very name, *Polet*, identical to the 1968 journal, signaled the intention to lean on the “progressive” tradition of the late 1960s.<sup>71</sup> And the people involved in its founding, from the *CDD* officials to the first editor, Petar Kvesić, were all veterans of the leftist Zagreb student movement.<sup>72</sup> The latter's appointment, however, suggested the different route the journal would take. Kvesić was not a typical envoy of the political cohort. Reputed for his short stories on everyday urban youth, he stood for its underdeveloped cultural wing, embodying a rare attempt to match the alternative political vision with the appropriate cultural form.<sup>73</sup>

The political tribunes of the previous decade had but a minor place in the new journal. The core of its staff comprised two new groups. The first one, including Kvesić's successors, Ninoslav Pavić and Denis Kuljiš, began their careers after the

---

<sup>69</sup> The slow process was initiated at the Croatian youth union's congress in 1974 where new principles for the union's publishing activities were set. More about this and the following restoration of the *CDD* in: *Smjernice informativne i nakladne djelatnosti SSOH* (Directives on the Informative and Publishing Activities of the SLYC) (Zagreb, CDD, 1974, photocopied); “Izvještaj o radu Saveza socijalističke omladine hrvatske između dva kongresa” (Report on the Work of the SLYC Between Two Congresses), *Polet* 70 (28 Aug. 1977): 70; *Izvještaj o radu SSOH između 8. kongresa mladih SRH i 9. kongresa SSOH* (Report on the Work of SLYC between the Eighth Congress of Youth SRC and Ninth Congress of SLYC) (Zagreb: CDD, 1978), 77.

<sup>70</sup> Launched in 1975, the journal took a serious approach to phenomena such as film, comics or fashion, and included the first theoretical articles on youth (sub)cultures, although rarely on punk-rock itself. See for example: Slobodan Drakulić, “Esej o omladinskoj kulturi” (Essay on Youth Culture), *Pitanja* 3 (1977): 45-51; Slavenka Drakulić, “Komuna i njena ograničenja” (Commune and Its Limitations), *Pitanja* 6-7 (1977): 38-47; Žarana Papić, “Ogledi o ponašanju mladih” (Insights on Youth Behavior), *Pitanja* 8-9 (1979): 4-18; Ted Polhemus and Lyn Procter, “Moda i anti moda” (Fashion and Antifashion), *Pitanja* 8-9 (1979): 19-53.

<sup>71</sup> *Polet*, meaning zeal, was a frequent name in the youth press, but the original inspiration came from the 1968/69 monthly. See: “Ponovo Polet” (Polet Again), *Polet* 1 (27 Oct. 1976): 3.

<sup>72</sup> The new *CDD* head, Dag Strpić, and the chief of its publishing section, Inoslav Bešker, were both prominent youth journalists during the previous, “political” period of the youth press. See: Dag Strpić, interview by author, 12 Nov. 2010, Zagreb, digital recording; Inoslav Bešker, interview by author, 27 Nov. 2010, Zagreb, Skype recording.

<sup>73</sup> Kvesić was a local proto-hippie who was heavily inspired by US underground counterculture. See among others: “Ljubavna Hipi-pjesma” (Love Hipi Poetry), *Studentski list* 74-75 (7 Jan. 1969): 12.

political collapse, mostly in the cultural sections of the remnants of the Zagreb youth press.<sup>74</sup> Unlike their predecessors, they were sympathetic towards pop culture, a quality that would soon manifest itself in a new way. The second group came directly from the high-school newspapers, recruited by editors in the pursuit of fresh, authentic voices. Some of them were still in elementary school and did not last long. Others, like Predrag Figenwald or Zoran Franičević, obtained important, editorial positions in years to come.<sup>75</sup>

The forming of a new generation of journalists was the one programmatic goal that *Polet* successfully achieved. Little in the dreary list of its initial objectives hinted at the future progress.<sup>76</sup> But while the documents remained silent, the journal spoke clearly. In the very first issue, long before the new platform materialized, one of the *Polet*'s high-school *wunderkinds*, Vlatko Fras, articulated the journal's ambition to distance itself from the established tradition. His assertive criticism of boring youth publications that imitate rather than take chances, superbly anticipated *Polet*'s whole agenda.<sup>77</sup> To be young, Fras preached, meant being different, not afraid to pursue one's own interests, attitudes or style, however immature these might be.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Along with Kvesić, both Pavić and his high-school colleague Kuljiš wrote for the post-1971 *Omladinski tjednik* which was periodically revived. For a while, they edited even more irregular *Studentski list* in early 1976. *Polet*'s other leading authors like Nenad Polimac or Goran Pavelić also wrote in the Zagreb youth press. The acquaintances made in these journals proved crucial for their arrival to *Polet*. Kvesić, interview.

<sup>75</sup> Vlatko Fras and Sven Semenčić came from the same background. See: Vlatko Fras, interview by author, 5 Nov. 2010, Zagreb, digital recording.

<sup>76</sup> *Polet* was supposed to spread official ideology, inform on the youth union's activities, enhance "the information flow" between the officials and membership, educate young journalists and cover vaguely defined areas of youth's interests. See: *Odluka o ostvarivanju osnivačkih prava i dužnosti prema tjednim novinama SSOH Polet* (Decision on the Realization of Founding Rights and Obligations to SLYC's Weekly Paper *Polet*) (Zagreb, 1977, photocopied), 1-3; Tadić, *Rasprava o djelovanju Saveza socijalističke omladine*, 27.

<sup>77</sup> Fras's programmatic article is worth quoting at length: "Whenever I browse through the high-school journals with their same old content written in the same old style, a pale copy of serious newspapers, I ask myself: do they really all agree that Pink Floyd is progressive? Is this generation really so content that they are all annoyed by the idiocy of *Great Gatsby*? Why do our papers prefer dull news and attitudes instead of fresh critical view about the events that surround us? Probably because it is always the same sort of people who take up this game... These poseurs, dressed in teenage models of elitist culture, strut on their vanity catwalk, not noticing that no one gives a damn.... Guys are afraid that someone might, God forbid, think that an eager pimply adolescent hides behind the lines.... (but) this

While Frás offered the method, an incident involving another adolescent demonstrated the level upon which it was implemented. Upon hearing that a teenage girl was not allowed to take part in the youth union's initiation ceremony because she wore jeans, *Polet* readily exploited the outdated dress code. Before long, the disdained garment was decorating its cover, expressing strong empathy with the denim misfortunes.<sup>79</sup> In the correspondence that ensued, the journal seized the momentum to make its mission clear. *Polet* will be a youth forum with no guaranteed privileges for the elders. Each failure to honor their rights would be reported. All those ignorant of the youth (cultural) code could be targeted.<sup>80</sup>

Herein lay *Polet's* initial recipe. The journal utilized the good old generational conflict, framed in the new apolitical terms. Political debates of the past were replaced by the seemingly trivial generational concerns where critical space could be easily conquered and a growing dichotomy between the youth and the adults directly conveyed. This type of struggle against the system's flaws represented a new kind of anti-establishment revolt, fought at the lowest possible level and around quite different issues.<sup>81</sup> The real challenge was to come up with the perfect issue. To achieve that, the two fresh inputs, the interest in pop-culture and the restless young voices, needed to be

---

*very puberty, with its lucidness and charm, can often make up for qualities acquired through routine and experience.... One does not grow up simply by imitating adults, especially not their stupidity. Anyway, being adult is not a big deal... I only want a journal that deals with fascinating issues, from a "sandwich affair" in our school, to comics that we consume much more than Bergman.... All these should have a personal mark and warn about problems that mainstream press does not want us to see... discuss mass culture, since school fills us enough with traditional one... With lots of humour, less "normal" and more weird one... This will not make us our parents' and teachers' darlings.... They will try to censor us. But Polet is here to point how it should be done and to show the way to do it... There are some of us who are not afraid."* See: "Dečki se boje biti mladi" (Guys Are Afraid to Be Young), *Polet* 1 (27 Oct. 1978): 21.

<sup>78</sup> *Polet* praised the newspapers who took Frás's instructions seriously, and if they were reproached for this, it reprinted the incriminated texts: "Nesklad jednog žubora" (Disharmonious Gurgle), *Polet* 29/30/31 (27 May 1977): 32; "Forenoz," *Polet* 56 (6 March 1978): 12-13.

<sup>79</sup> As if the criticism of the decision was not enough, a fortnight later *Polet* put her photo on the cover, showing where its heart was. See respectively: "Veliki – mali, kako kome pali" (Big – Small, Whichever You Prefer), *Polet* 5/6, (2 Dec. 1976): 3; *Polet* 8 (17 Dec. 1976): 1.

<sup>80</sup> "Sukob generacija" (Clash of Generations), *Polet* 29/30/31 (27 May 1977): 29; "Lumpanje, edukacija" (Partying, Education), *Polet* 66 (15 May 1978): 8.

<sup>81</sup> As such, the approach represented a perfect starting point for the future embracement of punk. See, "Istinita legenda o *Poletu*" (The True Legend of *Polet*), *Globus* 962 (15 May 2009): 97-103.

united. The opportunity presented itself with the advent of New Wave punk-rock scene that exploded in the late 1970s.

Before proceeding further, a short historical outline should be provided. In contrast to the previous decade, when many journals transformed into alternative political media, in the late 1970s *Polet* was alone in the new process. Therefore it calls for a holistic approach which levels the existing differences across the covered five year span, dividable in three distinct periods.

In the described early phase, during Kvesić's short editorial reign, *Polet* asserted itself as the agent of the discriminating high-school youth. After Pavić replaced him as editor, the journal kept the profile entering into a transitional phase that ended with the arrival of his assistant Kuljiš. The two devised a sweeping editorial change that transformed *Polet* into a new type of youth journal, borrowing from *New Musical Express* and Warhol's *Interview* alike. These guiding principles remained unaltered once the key roles were taken over by the journalists who learned their craft in *Polet*, headed by the last editor of the period Zoran Franičević.<sup>82</sup>

This sketchy chronology presents the researcher with the crucial question of continuity or rupture across different editorial periods.<sup>83</sup> Numerous changes notwithstanding, the arguments prevail in favor of the former. The ensuing (r)evolution remained firmly embedded in the early ideas and staff without which it

---

<sup>82</sup> Translated in dates and volumes, starting in October 1978, Kvesić edited the first 17 issues and supervised another 60, setting *Polet* on a firm footing. After he left for military service in March 1977, Pavić formally took over and with his assistant Kuljiš, who joined the following spring, implemented the major editorial shift in the autumn of 1978. As the two left the journal in March 1979, the new editors became journalists raised within *Polet*. Following a short editorial spell of Ratko Bošković, Franičević stayed in charge till the end of 1980 when he was deposed. These editors embody the three main assets that shaped *Polet*: liaison with the alternative tradition of the past, fresh favorable attitude towards pop-culture and, finally, teenagers that provided it with a new suitable form.

<sup>83</sup> In retrospect, editors differ on the issue and in how they value their own contribution, typically favoring the period when they served as editors. Accordingly, Kvesić regards the whole *Polet* as a unit. Kuljiš, the architect of the 1978 change, insists on the major break with the previous concept. Finally, Franičević's assistant Semenčić, while acknowledging the legacy of his mentors Kuljiš and Pavić, stresses the new qualities that arose after they departed. See: Pero Kvesić, interview by author, 15 Nov. 2010, Zagreb, digital recording; Denis Kuljiš, interview by author, 11 Nov. 2010, Zagreb, digital recording; Sven Semenčić, interview by author, 10 Nov. 2010, digital recording.

would be inconceivable. Conversely, over time, the fundamental shift radicalized the new tendencies granting them another dimension.

### 6.3.2. *Polet* and the New Wave

#### 6.3.2.1. *New voices*

The birth of the New Wave provided *Polet* with the ideal testing ground for generational conflict between the distinct youth culture and the adult establishment. What was at first a hectic practice, with the major redesign in autumn 1978, became a master plan, a conscious editorial decision to turn the journal into the organ of the new music and its adjoining lifestyle.<sup>84</sup> Accordingly, the standard one page dedicated to the rock-culture turned into eight, spreading to nearly half of the journal.<sup>85</sup>

*Polet* resembled in many ways the scene it helped to construct. It leaned on the existent media tradition just as the New Wave was rooted in the established rock culture. Indeed, one could hardly find more distinguished experts than *Polet's* initial rock critics. Glavan and Vrdoljak were both veterans of the genre, indispensable for legitimizing rock as a recognized, if marginal cultural field.<sup>86</sup>

For the new musical landscape to arise, however, a fresh perspective was needed. Key figures became recent high-school graduates, Vlatko Fras and Sven Semenčić, whom Pavić and Kuljiš suddenly appointed as rock editors. The sole criterion: both possessed great *subcultural* capital – they obtained records from abroad, read *New*

<sup>84</sup> “Tajna *Poletovog* neuspjeha” (The Secret of *Polet's* Failure), *Polet* 103 (23 May 1979): 17; Kuljiš, interview.

<sup>85</sup> Semenčić, interview.

<sup>86</sup> Referred to as “the professor” and “the encyclopedist” respectively, both wielded indubitable authority and ridiculed ignorant rock writing. It was these two who popularized *Bijelo Dugme* and *Buldožeri*, both of which were, besides *Leb i Sol*, the only existent groups that the new journalist guard approved of. See among others: “Svašta se svira, a piše još gore” (Bad Music Is Being Played, and Even Worse is Being Written), *Polet* 12 (14 Jan. 1978): 15; “Od 'zabranjeno plakatirati' do 'zabranjeno tiskati’” (From “Post no Bills” to “Not Print”), *Polet* 21 (1 April 1977): 14.

*Musical Express*, visited concerts and rock-clubs, in short, they lived rock.<sup>87</sup> Most importantly, they had what the editorial duo particularly appreciated: youthful enthusiasm and radical ideas. Their desire to break with the established rock aesthetics found a perfect match in the editorial quest for some authentic youth cultural form to which they could attach their journal to.<sup>88</sup> These new writers happily exploited the given media freedom. Attentive to the current global trends, they engaged in a true punk crusade. Like gatekeepers of taste they promoted the new sound that wished to bring rock back to its roots.

In a paraphrase of the whole scene, *Polet* thus turned the existing hierarchy upside down and imposed new authorities. The young were now the ones who dictated trends to their more established colleagues, reproving them for being outdated.<sup>89</sup> Still, the conflict was a friendly one. After some reluctance, the mentors were eventually re-educated. Glavan in particular welcomed the new genre, giving it the much needed legitimacy.<sup>90</sup> In years to come the journal became the major advocate of the domestic new punk-rock wave, forced to build upon small resources amidst gray surroundings.

### 6.3.2.2. Active promotion

Newly formed local bands, literally unheard-of and active for no more than a few weeks, received their initial promotion on *Polet's* pages. Though with limited repertoire and questionable skills, journalists attended their garage rehearsals, accompanying them by words of praise.<sup>91</sup> Big interviews, analysis, and images of these unknown actors appeared with lame excuses, securing them media space they

<sup>87</sup> Semenčić, interview; Fras, interview.

<sup>88</sup> Kuljiš, interview.

<sup>89</sup> Fras, interview.

<sup>90</sup> Glavan wrote a whole series of articles on punk, which he soon compiled in the first Yugoslav book on punk. See: Darko Glavan, *Punk: Potpuno Uvredljivo Negiranje Klasike* (Punk: Utterly Insulting Negation of Classics) (Gornji Milanovac: Dečje novine, 1980).

<sup>91</sup> "Muzika iz zagrebačkih podruma i drvarnica – tu se rađaju zvijezde" (The Music from the Zagreb's Cellars and Wood-sheds – Here the Stars Are Born), *Polet* 58 (20 March 1978): 1.

could otherwise hardly get.<sup>92</sup> When the lead singer of *Film* was featured on the cover, the only apparent reason was a small article in which he complained of being thrown out from a posh night club.<sup>93</sup> Headings like “Something is happening” stirred commotion and inflated the ongoing artistic turmoil.<sup>94</sup>

But *Polet* went beyond passive coverage and actively set trends. Fras and Semenčić embraced the creative manipulative roles played out by the punk gurus Malcolm McLaren or Vivienne Westwood.<sup>95</sup> Confident that foreign experiences would be translated to the home ground, they embarked on the project of creating a local scene, comparable to that in London. Providing important initial impulses, they searched for original future stars which they could present to the audience at large.<sup>96</sup> Faced with the outdated norms, they persuaded their friends to redesign their image, ideas and music.<sup>97</sup> Some could hardly wait. Others were literally thrown on the stage in the hope they would somehow pull it through.

Finally, *Polet* organized events where numerous bands played in public for the first time.<sup>98</sup> Its first open-air gig in May 1978, in front of the local high-school, pointed to the democratic nature of the whole venture: anyone who applied could perform.<sup>99</sup> The second concert in October, celebrating *Polet*'s transfer to offset printing, occurred in the city's sport hall, reflecting the fact that by then the veritable

---

<sup>92</sup> Actors, such as *Prljavo Kazalište*, remember in gratitude the crucial assistance they received from *Polet* during their rise: Kostelnik, *Moj život je novi val*, 129.

<sup>93</sup> *Film* was a particular favorite of the journal, made popular before it ever appeared on stage. “Upomoć! Ja sam na ulici” (Help! I Am Out on the Street), *Polet* 90 (21 Feb. 1979): 1, 11.

<sup>94</sup> “Nešto se događa” (Something is Going On), *Polet* 73 (10 Oct. 1978): 1.

<sup>95</sup> On both in: Jon Savage, *England's Dreaming: Sex Pistols and Punk Rock* (London: Faber & Faber, 1991), 8-25, 38-39.

<sup>96</sup> Fras, interview.

<sup>97</sup> Semenčić recalls how he encouraged his neighbor Branimir Štulić, a future frontman of the band *Azra*, to cut his long hair for a *Polet* photo shoot: “Kad je *Polet* ošišao Čupka, rodio se Đoni” (When *Polet* Gave Čupko a Haircut, Đoni Was Born), *Jutarnji list* (16 May 2009):78-80.

<sup>98</sup> The staff organized *Azra*'s tour when the band was known only locally: “*Azra* među Ličanima” (*Azra* in Lika), *Polet* 74 (18 Oct. 1978): 2.

<sup>99</sup> “Rock maraton. Bio nam je potreban!” (Rock Marathon. We Needed It!), *Polet* 66 (15 May 1978): 14-15.



stars were already born.<sup>100</sup> And since *Polet* created them, they were to a large extent its own.

In all this, there appeared to be confusion about what punk really was as bands with the tiniest punk flavor, sound-wise closer to garage rock or pop-rock, were labeled as punk.<sup>101</sup> However, the practice was not due to the ignorance. Both Fras and Semenčić were in touch with British rock press, whose critical and self-conscious style they tried to emulate. Besides, they had first-hand punk impressions gained during their inter-rail trips to London.<sup>102</sup> Indeed, they were well acquainted with the original punk idiom, often more so than the performers. Loose semantics was conditioned primarily by the ambition to provide leadership and portray new trends larger and rougher than they really were.<sup>103</sup>

In fact, a firm relationship was forged with British punk bands, frequently quoted as reliable authority. Still, in contrast to the previous decade, they were no longer idolized, nor copied. Instead, a conviction prevailed that “in Zagreb one could hear the best punk-rock east of London.”<sup>104</sup> The dominant attitude was that of synchrony and equality, not of subordination. As soon as it was released, the first single of suburban punk-rockers *Prljavo kazalište* was placed at the top of the *Polet*'s music chart, ahead of British giants *The Clash*. The confirmation soon came from the respectable British source: *Melody Maker*'s enthusiastic report on Yugoslav punk-rock would receive legendary status, equal to Habermas's footnote on the *Praxis* journal a decade before.<sup>105</sup>

<sup>100</sup> On both concerts see more in: Mirković, *Sretno dijete*, 41-53.

<sup>101</sup> “Punk u HNK” (Punk in the National Theatre), *Polet* 72 (3 Oct. 1978): 20-21.

<sup>102</sup> Mirković, *Sretno dijete*, 42-43.

<sup>103</sup> Fras, interview; Semenčić, interview.

<sup>104</sup> “Najbolji punk istočno od Engleske” (The Best Punk East of England), *Polet* 66 (15 May 1978): 15.

<sup>105</sup> Chris Bohn, “Non-aligned Punk,” *Melody Maker* (22 March 1980): 10.

Images played an important part in *Polet's* coverage of the New Wave. A group of photographers meticulously recorded its unique ambience, trying to stylize individual actors or shoot live concerts showing anonymous audience in contact with the musicians.<sup>106</sup> The interests reached beyond music, grasping into the overall sociological effects of the new scene. Sympathetic accounts greeted the emergence of vibrant nightlife, from student parties to youth clubs.<sup>107</sup> Once more, the actions overlapped with the writings whereby motives were often prosaic. Eager to have fun, *Polet's* journalists opened up long closed clubs. Semenčić turned *Lapidarij* into a regular weekly spot. Fras brought punk-rock into *KSET*, a student club of the faculty where he studied.<sup>108</sup> Ultimately, the renowned Student Centre Gallery embraced the new sound, opening up its premises to the New Wave bands, transpiring in the most important concert venue.<sup>109</sup>

### 6.3.2.3. *The making of meaning*

In the absence of the official rock discourse *Polet* was able to pose as the ultimate interpreter of the new scene, the one that shaped its meanings and set the tone for the future narrations.<sup>110</sup> Following its predecessors, it approached rock as a serious art form helping to erode the difference between high and low culture. And if the censors thought differently, *Polet* stood up for their heroes. When *Prljavo kazalište's* album

<sup>106</sup> *Polet* rock photography is discussed in the final chapter. For large centerfold portrayals of *Film* and *Prljavo Kazalište* see: "Punk u HNK," 20-21; "Novi Film" (The New Film), *Polet* 99 (24 April 1979): 20-21.

<sup>107</sup> "Žurka, tulum, tulumiška" (Clubbing, Party, Bash); "Kamo izaći... u Zagrebu" (Where to Go Out... In Zagreb), *Polet* 80-81 (13 Dec. 1978): 26-27.

<sup>108</sup> "Poletove večeri u Lapidariju" (*Polet's* Nights in *Lapidarij*), *Polet* 110 (21 Nov. 1979): 7; "Azra!," *Polet* 65 (8 May 1978): 15; Fras, interview; Semenčić, interview.

<sup>109</sup> "Hod po trećoj liniji" (Walking the Third Line), *Polet* 121 (12 Feb. 1980): 12-13. For more on the Student Centre Gallery's concert program see in: Branko Kostelnik, "Savska 25" (Savska Street 25), *15 dana: Ilustrirani časopis za umjetnost i kulturu* 5-6 (2008): 42-50.

<sup>110</sup> By doing so, *Polet* acquired central semantic role, characteristic for the whole music press. Simon Frith, *Sound Effects: Youth, Leisure, and the Politics of Rock* (London: Constable, 1983), 165.

was taxed as *trash*, the journal mocked the label, claiming the role of cultural arbiter.<sup>111</sup>

Jam-packed with elusive notions like honesty or authenticity, *Polet's* rock prose was by and large stripped from ideology and as such free from a direct influence from above. Yet, ever so often, its support ran against periodical mainstream media campaigns that treated the new punk music as social deviance. *Polet's* staff actively countered such writings entering into a semantic struggle in which they enjoyed a big advantage.<sup>112</sup>

Punk-rock offered a vast amount of references from which to choose from in order to integrate it within the ruling ideology and defend it as essentially socialist. *Polet's* journalists opportunely wrapped up their support in the self-management vocabulary. Mistreatment of punks evoked a strong rhetoric of socialist injustice.<sup>113</sup> The need for new youth clubs was translated into an essential right for the self-management of free time.<sup>114</sup>

At the same time, however, with its huge capacity for semantic play, the New Wave and punk retained great subversive potential.<sup>115</sup> The first issue of the new 1978 *Polet* series featured a photo of a youngster whose cheek was pierced with a safety pin decorated with a star.<sup>116</sup> The image, remarkable in its own right, is reminiscent of what Dick Hebdige called *bricolage*, typical for punk, whereby familiar everyday

---

<sup>111</sup> "Neki (jako) talentirani dječaci... i njihovi staratelji" (Some (Very) Talented Young Boys... and Their Guardians), *Polet* 104 (10 Oct. 1979): 16-17.

<sup>112</sup> "Bauk punka kruži Jugoslavijom" (The Dread of Punk Is Spreading over Yugoslavia), *Polet* 84-85 (17 Feb. 1979): 17; "Sex Pistols Evergreeni" (*Sex Pistols' All Time Favourites*), *Polet* 79 (22 Nov. 1978): 2.

<sup>113</sup> "Opet! Opet! Segregacija u Jabuci" (Again! And Again! Segregation in *Jabuka*), *Polet* 84-85 (17 Feb. 1979), 11.

<sup>114</sup> "Kamo kreće zagrebački rock" (Where Is Zagreb's Rock Heading), *Polet* 58 (20 March 1978), 22; "Od ljeta do sada" (From Summer to Now), *Polet* 72 (3 Oct. 1978): 17.

<sup>115</sup> Iain Chambers, *Urban Rhythms: Pop Music and Popular Culture* (London: Macmillan, 1985), 185.

<sup>116</sup> *Polet* 72 (3 Oct. 1978): 3.

objects are detached from their original meanings and placed in a new and seemingly absurd setting.<sup>117</sup>

The context of communist Yugoslavia offered two diametrically opposite readings of this *bricolage*. On one level, it firmly embedded the new style into the fabric of state doctrine, portraying its adherents as patriotic, ideologically conscious subjects. Being punk was thus a new, updated way of being a loyal communist. However, the image also clearly reduced an archetypal communist symbol to the piece of jewelry, indicating that it had lost all of its ideological baggage and could be used as a mere decorative item. While seemingly legitimizing punk, *Polet* was simultaneously undermining the core principles of the ruling worldview. Once the red star stopped symbolizing the new society, turning instead into an object of consumption or spectacle, the whole system is virtually turned on its head.

The example nicely illustrates how *Polet*, while addressing local issues, added new, substantially different dimensions to the original punk form.<sup>118</sup> The journal accepted punk as a potentially commercial form of pop-culture, doing the equivalent of what Hebdige designated as incorporation. Yet, as shown, and contrary to Hebdige's assertion, neither *Polet* nor punk were deprived in the process.<sup>119</sup> Regardless of the original intentions, a different milieu assigned both *Polet* and the New Wave strong political connotations as they both expanded democratic horizons.<sup>120</sup> With the newly formed one-chord wonders, the scope of those who could appear in the public arena vastly expanded. Their rough exciting sound and bold lyrics affirmed street values and shook the stale structures. While taking punk seriously

<sup>117</sup> Dick Hebdige, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (London: Routledge, 2002), 103-104, 123.

<sup>118</sup> On punk's different global outlooks and different adherent meanings see: Bennett, *Cultures of Popular Music*, 68-72.

<sup>119</sup> Hebdige claims that market incorporation renders styles meaningless, which cannot pass the test of scrutiny in the communist context with different markets. Hebdige, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*, 96.

<sup>120</sup> Again, this is a feature of punk which had been noted by other scholars. See: Iain Chambers, *Urban Rhythms: Pop Music and Popular Culture* (London: Macmillan, 1985).

diminished the differences between mass and elite culture, focus on the surrounding lifestyle blurred the division between performers and audience. Even without being explicitly political, *Polet's* rock writers thus produced solid political meanings.

#### 6.3.2.4. Fluid boundaries

As mentioned, the Zagreb New Wave could not be reduced to punk alone. The latter was merely a part in its wider genre spectrum from garage to grassroots or art rock. Similarly, *Polet* should by no means be equated with the narrowly defined punk style, neither in terms of the covered musicians, nor targeted community. *Polet's* coverage did not run away from the mainstream music scene, but simply tried to reposition it and forge a new one. Marketing tactics even caused some dubious moves: the new off-set series was launched with the cover interview of major pop-star Zdravko Čolić, who epitomized all that the new scene ran against.<sup>121</sup> In general, however, only three renowned rock bands, *Bijelo Dugme*, *Buldožeri* and *Leb i sol* were truly accepted as the major rock band, precursors of punk, and classy jazz-rock attraction respectively.<sup>122</sup>

As for the audiences it stood for, these were stylistically diverse as documented by *Polet's* images. Moreover, the journal's intervention in late 1978 turned *Polet* into a direct subcultural protagonist, but one which partly contradicted punk. Namely, by the late 1970s, Zagreb youth fragmented into various intermingled subcultures in complex mutual relationship. With a fragile social base, genuine local punks were still few and far between. The main contrast was thus between disco-loving *šminkeri* (mods) and long-haired scruffy looking *hašomani* ("hash lovers") who listened to rock and were

<sup>121</sup> "Zdravko Čolić: Ne mogu se požaliti" (Zdravko Čolić: I Cannot Complain), *Polet* 72 (3 Oct 1978) : 13-15.

<sup>122</sup> See among others: "Uvod u buldožerologiju" (Introduction to "Buldožerology"), *Polet* 104 (10 Oct 1979): 15-16; "Leb i sol i Novi val" (*Leb i sol* and the New Wave), *Polet* 82-83 (27 Dec. 1978): 27.

like punks engulfed by moral panic, though had different aesthetic preferences and worldview.<sup>123</sup>

Once *hašomani*'s traditional Zagreb hangout, *Big Ben*, banned them from entering its premises in favor of better dressed *šminkeri*, *Polet* voiced their revolt. A beaten up journalist, a *hašoman* himself, alerted to the club's "anti-socialist" discrimination.<sup>124</sup> Readers' letters flooded *Polet*, reporting on similar incidents.<sup>125</sup> A fierce editorial spread the word on the upcoming turmoil, followed by an actual call for protest, disguised as a weather report.<sup>126</sup> The scandal, fatal for the editor Bošković, echoed the leftist 1968 rhetoric in an updated mode: How could socialism chose *šminkeri*'s foreign clothes over *hašomani*'s Che Guevarra T-shirts? In a politically suppressed climate, conflicts between subcultures acquired political meaning.

Yet, *Polet*'s animosity towards disco was tentative at best.<sup>127</sup> Nor did its agenda have much to do with the political motives of the previous decade. Official discourse, if at all, was typically employed in self-defense, and generally remained firmly in the background.

The ideology that *Polet* conveyed to its readers was of a different kind, defined by a distinct, rebellious youth attitude, rather than open political ambitions or a recognizable music style. *Polet* endorsed the marginalized status of punk to provide its readers with a source of antagonism, which could then be used to articulate a variety

---

<sup>123</sup> More on *hašomani* and the whole surrounding subcultural scene: Perasović, *Urbana plemena*, 188-222.

<sup>124</sup> "Kratka kosa, nisko čelo" (Short Hair, Low Forehead), *Polet* 105 (17 Oct. 1979): 3.

<sup>125</sup> "Što se zbiva u *Big Benu*" (What's Going On at *Big Ben*'s), *Polet* 109 (14 Nov. 1979): 1.

<sup>126</sup> "Ono što se događa u *Big Benu* je svinjarija" (What's Happening in *Big Ben* is an Outrage); "Hard Rain," *Polet* 110 (21 Nov. 1979): 3; "Događaj stoljeća" (The Event of the Century), *Polet* 110 (14 Nov. 1979): 23.

<sup>127</sup> "Paranoja subotnje noći" (Saturday Night Paranoia), *Polet* 119 (30 Jan. 1980): 19.

of generational issues.<sup>128</sup> The local New Wave scene was thus only the core part of the new youth cultural code which included other ingredients.

### 6.3.3. Sex & drugs & lifestyle

Discourses on sex and drugs featured prominently in *Polet's* agenda. Both are suggestive for the way in which the journal subverted mainstream values by applying punk-like tactics on “small” issues discovered in the beginnings. The journal opposed the ongoing moral panic against drugs, veiled in images of weird looking youth consuming lethal substances during mystic rituals or rock concerts. *Polet* ridiculed such “superficial clichés” as feeding the widespread bigotry.<sup>129</sup> To prove the point, the staff staged a bizarre public performance. While one of them pretended to be an agonized drug addict, a special undercover team reported aggressive citizens’ reactions.<sup>130</sup>

Against the background of deep social prejudices, *Polet's* feuilletons rooted this “false, imported” problem in the domestic context.<sup>131</sup> Yes, *Polet* argued Yugoslav youth use drugs and reasons for that lie in domestic society.<sup>132</sup> Polls suggested that

---

<sup>128</sup> Drawing on a variety of examples, Bennett points to the plurality of meanings that can be read into a punk style and thus accommodate a range of sensibilities, and classes. See: Andy Bennett, *Popular Music and Youth Culture: Music, Identity and Place* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), 9.

<sup>129</sup> See for example *Polet's* “breaking news” about six kilos of chocolate mousse found by the interviewed pop-star Zdravko Čolić, a joking allusion to the broadly exploited incident when drugs were found in the drums of the rock-band. “Furka tjedna no. 2” (Trend of the Week No. 2), *Polet* 72 (3 Oct. 1978): 2. See also: “O misticismu i drogama” (On Mysticism and Drugs), *Polet* 20 (25 March 1977): 15; “Nada i hašomani” (Nada and the *Hashomans*), *Polet* 72 (3 Oct. 1978): 27.

<sup>130</sup> “Provokacija drogom” (Drug Provocation); “Potamaniti gamad narkomansku” (Wipe Out Those Addict Bastards), *Polet* 57 (13 March 1978): 12-13, 23.

<sup>131</sup> For the view into the official attitude on drugs see: Slobodan Drakulić, “Narkomanije mladih” (Youth Drug Addiction), in *Revija za sociologiju: sociologijski tromjesečnik* 3, no. 3-4 (1973): 109-113.

<sup>132</sup> “Uzroci u vlastitoj kući” (Causes in Our Own House), *Polet* 53 (13 Feb. 1978): 23; “I tata i mama puše marihuanu” (Mum and Dad Smoke Pot Too), *Polet* 55 (27 Feb. 1978): 23.

smoking pot was becoming normal for a growing percentage of youth.<sup>133</sup> These real-life insights, unavailable to the mainstream media, scorned their dramatic cries about the supposedly mortal dangers facing those who tried it.<sup>134</sup>

One could only speculate whether *Polet's* efforts went beyond providing information. Goran Pavelić Pipo, informally referred to as “the editor of “sex&drugs&rock’n’roll,” came dangerously close.<sup>135</sup> Pavelić authored a series of articles on the subject which included a phrase book of narco-slang and a user-friendly table on the effects of various drugs. He left the closing words of his interview with an anonymous expert wide open to interpretation: “No one should prevent us from changing our perception according to our own wishes.”<sup>136</sup> Certain tolerance was indeed documented at the team-building trip ahead of the new off-set series in autumn 1978, when the whole *Polet* editorial board got stoned. Yet, for all except Pipo, this was the first experience of the kind.<sup>137</sup>

*Polet's* treatment of sex seemingly resembled the one from the late 1960s. The journal acknowledged adolescent sexuality as a normal part of everyday life, liberating it from the sensationalism of the mainstream media. The methods, though, were more sophisticated and less sexist. The youth audience were offered the much

---

<sup>133</sup> Such “shocking” responses were left with no comment, or met with apologetic approval. “Droge: s ove strane stvarnosti (1)” (Drugs: This Side of Reality (1)), *Polet* 72 (3 Oct. 1978): 25-26; “Droge: s ove strane stvarnosti (2)” (Drugs: This Side of Reality (2)), *Polet* 73 (10 Oct. 1978): 28-29.

<sup>134</sup> Not all drugs were treated equally. While a witty interview with a “dying” pot smoker deflated its dangers, glue sniffing was reproached as harmful: “Porodično duvanje” (Family Joint), *Polet* 114 (19 Dec. 1979): 21; “Tigar - domaća životinja” (Tiger – A Domestic Animal), *Polet* 105 (17 Oct. 1979): 10-11.

<sup>135</sup> Pavelić testified about his intentions: “Drugs were discussed by those who had no basic information. I wanted to contextualize things, explain what was marijuana, heroin, cocaine, opiates, hallucinogens, physical and psychical dependence. Absolute ignorance dominated.” See: Goran Pavelić, interview by author, 9 Nov. 2010, Zagreb, digital recording.

<sup>136</sup> The table, taken over from *Playboy*, claimed to be “based on real experiences” and stated that some drugs do not cause addiction. See: “Tabela droga” (The Table of Narcotics), *Polet* 56 (6 March 1978): 22; “Raščišćavanje pojmova” (Defining the Terms), *Polet* 72 (3 Oct. 1978): 25-26; “Stručnjak za droge tvrdi: informacije nisu dostupne” (Drugs Expert Claims: Information Is Not Available), *Polet* 74 (18 Oct. 1978): 27.

<sup>137</sup> Collective initiation of a kind took place in Otočec ob Krki where the editorial board (including Pavić, Kuljiš, Franičević, Pavelić, Bošković, Bakalović, Semenčić, and Trbuljak) gave a whole new meaning to brainstorming. See: “*Polet* je kriv za sve” (*Polet* Is to Blame for Everything), *Vox* 3 (June 2000): 73.



needed educational information, dressed up in accessible urban vernacular, different from both medical or vulgar lingo. The staff appealed for sexual enlightenment, warned against unprotected sex and listed the prices of contraceptives.<sup>138</sup> Opinion polls allowed the youth to discuss all aspects of sexuality, including masturbation.<sup>139</sup> Even a tiny step forward was made in regards to the social acceptance of homosexuality, illegal at the time.<sup>140</sup>

The second objective was to expose the hypocrisy underlying the ruling permissiveness towards nudity, accepted on the condition that it was imported and female. *Polet* challenged the idea that “our girls” were not morally corrupt with a variety of evidence.<sup>141</sup> Historical humoresques and 1930s images spoke about the uninhibited past, contemporary models stood for the present.<sup>142</sup> Here, like elsewhere, shock was the order of the day, *Polet*’s intentions provocative rather than pornographic.<sup>143</sup>

<sup>138</sup> “Ne prekidajte igru radi ručka” (Don’t Interrupt the Game for Lunch), *Polet* 38 (28 Oct. 1977): 5; “Oslobođeni seks rađa probleme” (Liberated Sex Causes Problems), *Polet* 44 (9 Dec. 1977): 12-13; “Abortusi” (Abortions), *Polet* 120 (6 Feb. 1980): 8-9.

<sup>139</sup> Noticeable change occurred over two years. In the first poll questions on masturbation shocked informants; later, they were made fun of: “Oslobođenom seksu lete misli” (Wild Thinking Liberated Sex), *Polet* 23 (15 April 1977): 12-13; “Da li dečki uopće ševe?” (Do Boys Screw at All?), *Polet* 77 (7 Oct. 1978): 21; “Što o seksu i stvarima oko seksa kažu sedamnaestogodišnjakinje” (What Do Seventeen-year-old Girls Say on Sex and Other Sex-related Things), *Polet* 75 (25 Oct. 1978): 20-21; “Grijesi mladosti” (Sins of Youth), *Polet* 97 (11 April 1979): 22.

<sup>140</sup> *Polet* published anonymous correspondence between two homosexuals, discussing their humiliating status. “Društveni prezir homoseksualnosti” (Social Scorn towards Homosexuality), *Polet* 56 (6 March 1978): 24; “Homići u izolaciji. Van na ulice!” (Queers in Isolation. Out on the Streets!) *Polet* 62 (17 April 1978): 23. In addition, *Polet* de-tabooed issues like prostitution or pornography: “Fuj, tako nešto nije za mlade” (Yuck, That Ain’t for the Youth), *Polet* 58 (20 March 1978): 14-17; “Kurve” (Whores), *Polet* 114 (19 Dec. 1979): 23.]

<sup>141</sup> See among others: “Razgolićene ljepotice naše svakidašnje” (Our Daily Nude Beauties), *Polet* 80-81 (13 Dec. 1978): 20-21. A nice example was a model Moni Kovačić who, due to public condemnation, made up a story about being forced to pose nude: *Polet* 146 (24 Dec. 1980): 15.

<sup>142</sup> The latter advertised a feuilleton on youth sexuality: “Indiskretni objektiv naših djedova” (Indiscreet Camera Lens of Our Grandfathers), *Polet* 24 (22 April 1977): 23; “Dokumenti kulture” (Documents of Culture), *Polet* 146 (24 Dec. 1980): 16-17; “Uvod u seks” (Introduction to Sex), *Polet* (31 Jan. 1979): 1.

<sup>143</sup> See a nude photo in the form of a puzzle, with usage instructions: “let the dirty-minded pig will put together”: *Polet* 88 (7 Feb. 1979): 3.

Conversely, the journal tackled proscribed male nudity.<sup>144</sup> The long term commitment eventually led up to the provisional court ban of *Polet*, when four explicit poolside photographs exposed an interviewed football goalkeeper.<sup>145</sup> The reason, a typical *Polet* pun: “*gol*” in “*golman*”, the Croatian synonym for goalkeeper, meant both *goal* and *naked*. Censors were not amused and swiftly pressed charges for obscenity, which, after a three-hour-long hearing, were turned into the guilty verdict: “images offended public morale and exerted harmful influence on the youth.”<sup>146</sup> *Polet* refused to give in. After all, this was the game that had already been won once before. Its next cover featured the city’s *discobolus* statue; on the inside, black squares concealed the incriminating body parts with the headline: “Men are something else.” *Polet*’s feminist sex expert elaborated in a way unimaginable for *Pop-Express*: Phallocratic culture had criminalized the “*Golman* issue” because it “demystified the symbol of power turning it into a mere reproductive organ.”<sup>147</sup>

Common threads tied these seemingly marginal, apolitical interests with the new rock scene. Like the latter, they supplied fresh, unfamiliar discourses that allowed provocation and tackling stereotypes. At the same time, they reflected the new sensibility of the youth, the very thing upon which *Polet*’s winning strategy was based. Read in this context, *Polet*’s New Wave displays features that frame it in much broader terms than the narrow subcultural ones. *Polet*’s story is then one of the new youth urban lifestyle, centered around rock, but stylistically undetermined. Its fluid

---

<sup>144</sup> The first debate was triggered by the illustration of a nude man. Two years later *Polet* attacked the organizers of Zagreb Music Biennale for condemning the unexpected stripping performance of conceptual artist, *Polet*’s favorite Tomislav Gotovac, on Zagreb’s central square. See: “Komparativna anatomija” (Comparative Anatomy), *Polet* 57 (13 March 1977): 14; “Pimpekart” (Dickart), *Polet* 103 (23 May 1979): 20.

<sup>145</sup> Interview had absolutely no connections with the images. See: “Tip-Top izglancan” (Polished to Perfection), *Polet* 127 (26 March 1980): 12-13.

<sup>146</sup> Despite obviously posing, intimidated goalkeeper accused *Polet* of tricking him into posing. *Polet* was even accused of nationalism since he was the only Serb in the team. See: *Vjesnik* (28 March 1980): 12.

<sup>147</sup> *Polet* 128 (2 April 1980): 1, 12-13.

external boundaries were wide enough to include all those ready to accept the core values, belated hippies as well as emerging punks.

As such, it was more akin to the John Irwin's concept of the *scene*, an urban world driven by libido and self-expression, built around excitement and leisure, where shock, fun and enjoyment played a prominent role.<sup>148</sup> This was a scene of which *Polet* was a crucial part, creating the much needed *buzz* that fostered local immediate interaction.

#### 6.3.4. Marketing strategy and media innovations

This brings us to the final point. *Polet*'s promotion of the New Wave was a part of the wider concept, envisaged and implemented by Pavić and Kuljiš in late 1978. Turning the journal into the organ of sex & drugs & rock'n'roll was a (marketing) strategy, a way to achieve the basic idea: to break out of the ghetto of the youth press and produce a new kind of journal that would be widely read and sold.<sup>149</sup> And do so in a radically different manner, influencing rather than imitating reactionary media mainstream.<sup>150</sup> The idea was in harmony with the New Wave scene as it introduced many innovations within the youth press and media at large.

*Polet*'s credo to dictate, rather than just follow trends, stretched beyond music.<sup>151</sup>

Its staff popularized new meeting places. During the second half of the 1970s, cafes

<sup>148</sup> John Irwin, *Scenes* (London/Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977), 21-22, 46, 59.

<sup>149</sup> See Pavić's account: "*Polet* 30 godina poslije. Kako su nastale prve privatne novine u Hrvatskoj" (*Polet* 30 Years after. How the First Croatian Private Newspaper Emerged), *Jutarnji list* (9 May 2009): 83-84.

<sup>150</sup> "We have been working hard to surprise you and offer you something new and the best we could come up with; something which is the product of years of experience (since the times we have pooped our pants). And now, as it appears, it will make a big noise in the... so-called mass-media's deeds and misdeeds. Information has leaked. We are so good that it was heard across the ocean. ...We received a letter from New York, from the *Life* magazine that heard we are about to publish on the same day as them and asked us to step in line... Not a single youth journal has yet tried to be a big paper... It is a big deal when you try to make a journal for all the young people....If you create a real image of the youth of today, and if more and more people read you." "Drž' se za *Polet*" (Hold On to *Polet*), *Polet* 72 (3 Oct. 1978): 3.

<sup>151</sup> Kuljiš, interview.

like *Zvečka* and *Kavkaz*, located amidst their daily route, became trendy hangouts for artists, journalists, musicians and actors. *Polet's* special correspondents reported on the lively ambience of the surrounding semi-pedestrian stretch, the so called “tobacco road.”<sup>152</sup>

Unlike their mentors, *Polet's* staff were known to their readers and became minor celebrities in their own right.<sup>153</sup> Frequently referred to by nicknames, they introduced themselves through group photos, and witty portrayals of friendly atmosphere in which *Polet* was created.<sup>154</sup> Readers learned details on their private life and mutual socializing. This new approach to media subjectivity obscured the border between the private and public. By the same token, it fully matched the New Wave's agenda.

Conversely, with young staff, often active participants, the anonymous audience acquired media standing and used it to articulate their own concerns. *Polet* addressed its readers as equals, constructing a sense of community, a close relationship, analogue to the one between rock performers and the audience.<sup>155</sup>

The new heroes, issues, or voices were not enough. For the concept to thrive, the image required refurbishing as well.<sup>156</sup> *Polet's* revolutionary visual design, discussed in detail in the next chapter, completely reversed the orthodox textual-visual ratio. The photos iconoclastically spread across entire pages, on the places reserved for crude political debates. Equally crucial was the enrichment and atypical use of language.

---

<sup>152</sup> The atmosphere received its finest elegy in the journal: “*The cool thing about this café is that you could take your drink outside and put it on the nearest parked car, without running into danger that the waitresses would shout at you or threaten to call the police. Standing in front of ‘Zvečka’ has another advantage. With the group of youngsters blocking the walking area, high school girls trying to pass by have to brush against you.*” “Duhanski put” (Tobacco Road), *Polet* 72 (3 Oct. 1978): 22.

<sup>153</sup> The reputation they gained brought them numerous privileges, like free entrance to clubs. Pavelić, interview.

<sup>154</sup> “Nagradni natječaj: Tko su ovi imbecili” (Prize Competition: Who are Those Imbeciles), *Polet* 100 (2 May 1979): 12-13; “Kako se pravi *Polet*? Uz pomoć čuda” (How is *Polet* Being Created? By Miracle!), *Polet* 100 (2 May 1979): 7-8.

<sup>155</sup> Predrag Figenwald, yet another among the *Polet's* teenager, the editor of readers' letters, communicated with his peers with a combination of slang and humor that accurately mirrored pulse of the youth.

<sup>156</sup> “*Polet* 30 godina poslije,” 83-84.

Specific informal argot, hitherto limited to fiction, now infiltrated serious issues. Colloquial expressions and simple vocabulary softened up their tone, approaching the readers in a laid-back manner. Conversely, the new insiders' language served as a strategy to exclude the older generation and officials from interfering.<sup>157</sup>

Finally, *Polet* backed up its marketing policy with alternative advertising, embarking on a range of creative promotional activities. Scarce finances conditioned guerilla tactics. Limited distribution was countered with the large network of news vendors. The practice became the journal's trademark, conspicuous for its aggressive tone and memorable custom-made slogans that occupied public space.<sup>158</sup> At times, the actions bordered with performance art. A friend of *Polet*, conceptual artist Tomislav Gotovac, shouted out its provocative titles dressed as *Superman*.<sup>159</sup>

These methods mirrored the do-it-yourself ethic of punk. *Polet's* concerts were a rudimentary form of promotional event-management organized by the staff themselves.<sup>160</sup> Innovative posters, T-shirts, badges with *Polet's* logo and accompanying catchy slogan were a huge success and immediately snapped up.<sup>161</sup> To strengthen the relationship with the readers, *Polet* launched various contests, like those for the cover photo or the new slogan.<sup>162</sup> The bizarre pinball championship started off as a joke, but illustrated *Polet's* subversive strategy. The editor Franičević

---

<sup>157</sup> This resonates Glasser's argument about the specific discourse of the US underground press, intelligible only to those inside the scene. See: Theodore L. Glasser, "Semantics of an Alternative: the Language of the Underground Press", *ETC: A Review of General Semantics* 31: 201.

<sup>158</sup> "Poletov image: Kolporter" (*Polet's* Image: News Vendors), *Polet* 121 (12 Feb. 1980): 22-23.

<sup>159</sup> Kuljiš, interview.

<sup>160</sup> *Polet's* first concert emerged through a joint venture: Semenčić gave the initial idea and secured premises, Fras acted as the roadie and placed in charge of bands, while Pavelić was a presenter, see: Semenčić, interview; Pavelić, interview.

<sup>161</sup> *Polet* 32-33 (23 Sept. 1977): 1; "Poletova majica" (*Polet's* T-shirt), *Polet* 66 (15 May 1978): 20.

<sup>162</sup> "Drž' se za *Polet*," 3; "Poletov natječaj za fotografiju" (*Polet's* Photo-contest), *Polet* 74 (18 Oct. 1978): 2.

was among the targeted pinball junkies, an ideologically dubious leisure activity to say the least.<sup>163</sup>

Such qualities were reproached once they penetrated the mainstream media. Pipo's "distasteful" facial expression was cut out from the journal's sole TV commercial, while a radio version only just escaped the same fate.<sup>164</sup> The campaign, nevertheless, easily made a mark in the midst of the surrounding tedious economic media propaganda of the late 1970s. The journal became a brand with which both the writers and audience strongly empathized.

If anything then, one could speak of the *Polet* subculture, or rather the *Polet* scene as one that united journalists and readers alike, able to understand the new youth codes and values. *Polet's* staff regularly identified with the journal, though in a various degree and in different periods.<sup>165</sup> Affections went both ways. Unlike its political predecessors, *Polet* was not only created, but also read by the youth.<sup>166</sup> The term *Poletovac* referred equally to the readers, as shown by numerous *Polet* related graffiti on the streets of Zagreb.<sup>167</sup>

Finally, though formally a republican journal, *Polet* focused mostly on Zagreb and only symbolically covered the other regions, typically their respective rock scenes.<sup>168</sup>

---

<sup>163</sup> See: "Fliperovo prvenstvo u *Poletima*" (Pinball Championship in *Polets*), *Polet* 87 (31 Jan. 1979): 21.

<sup>164</sup> The campaign for the *Polet's* major 1978 rock concert was the only one that involved other media. See: "Tajna *Poletovog* neuspjeha," 17.

<sup>165</sup> Looking back, each editor or journalist speaks about "his or her" *Polet*. Fras, Pavelić, Kuljiš or Semenčić all testify about special aura the job had. Semenčić for example after leaving *Polet* withdraw from private life for two years. See: Semenčić, interview.

<sup>166</sup> Despite the lack of data on the readers, the contributors to the letters section, the average readers were between 16 and 26 years old.

<sup>167</sup> "Kako postati *Poletovac*" (How to Become a *Polet* Person), *Polet* 67/68/69 (22 May 1978): 28.

<sup>168</sup> See for instance: "Riječki punk – hoće li se za njih ikada više čuti?" (Rijeka's Punk – Will We ever Hear about Them again?), *Polet* 60 (3 April 1978): 9.

Above all, it remained the journal of the Zagreb youth, with its staff, issues, images and language building up its distinct urban identity.<sup>169</sup>

The formula achieved the prime editorial goal. *Polet's* circulation kept increasing from the start and by the end of 1977 amounted to 20,000 copies. Once Pavić and Kuljiš took over, it reached an unparalleled 50,000, rendering *Polet* into a rare youth journal able to compete on equal market terms with the mainstream press.<sup>170</sup>

Such commercial success was deeply subversive for a couple of reasons. *Polet* represented here the seeds of media entrepreneurship which treated newspapers as a private product that could be edited at one's prerogative. In turn, the accumulated income diminished the dependence on the subsidies from the Croatian youth union, consequently causing strained relations.<sup>171</sup> Lastly, it necessitated a drastic editorial change that could be achieved only at the expense of boring, obligatory regime content, now limited to a few pages, often tinged with irony.

### 6.3.5. *Polet* and the authorities

How did the Croatian youth union and its patrons react to this divergence from program directives which grew with time? To a large extent unconvincingly and somewhat erratically. At first, *Polet's* novel style was looked upon kindly.<sup>172</sup> After many futile years following the political collapse, the Croatian youth union was more than content to have a well-read journal that could claim it represented authentic youth voices, while not causing open (political) problems. In fact, at the end of 1978 *Polet*

---

<sup>169</sup> Such great imbalance was frequently rebuked, and usually lessened by some temporary counter-action, or greater commitment that soon boiled down. See: Ajduković, "Analiza sadržaja *Poleta*" (Analysis of *Polet's* Contents), *Pitanja* 5, suppl. (Nov. 1980): 21-22.

<sup>170</sup> Kvesić, interview; Kuljiš, interview; Pavelić, interview.

<sup>171</sup> Kuljiš, interview.

<sup>172</sup> *Izveštaj o radu SSOH između 8. kongresa mladih SRH i 9. kongresa SSOH* (Report on the Work of SLYC between the Eighth Congress of Youth SRC and Ninth Congress of SLYC) (Zagreb: CDD, 1978).

was awarded the prominent state prize *The Seven Secretaries of SKOJ*.<sup>173</sup> Ironically, this was also when the new concept began to show loose ends.<sup>174</sup> The union's idea to use the journal to get in touch with the youth backfired as readers identified with the journal, rather than with the youth union that financed it. This incongruity soon generated tensions with the publisher. The pressure methods varied from commissioned content analysis, periodical debates about the journal, informal suggestions, all the way to the abrupt editorial changes.<sup>175</sup>

The youth union's officials increasingly expressed concerns regarding *Polet*'s continuous failure to deal with the social-political problems. They criticized the editors for neglecting the rural youth, the union itself, other regions, while discussing "irrelevant issues," such as sex, drugs and rock'n'roll.<sup>176</sup> The staff disagreed. Relying on the reader's recognition, they ignored such directives to a large extent, which was all the more easier since the authority itself was split.<sup>177</sup> The inert youth union could influence *Polet* only indirectly, through its sister-body, the *Center for Social Activity* (CDD), placed in charge of publishing. Unfortunately for the staff, when its proclamations failed to produce changes, the youth union hierarchy could be skipped and the Party could directly intervene through its emissaries.

In this complex command chain, contacts with the political bodies were the duty of the editor, who typically had Party connections and membership.<sup>178</sup> Acting as a link

---

<sup>173</sup> *Polet* 74 (18 Oct. 1978): 3.

<sup>174</sup> "Polet 30 godina poslije," 84.

<sup>175</sup> For the first see: Martina Selak, *Analiza omladinskih listova u SR Hrvatskoj* (The Analysis of Youth Papers in SR Croatia) (Zagreb, 1977, photocopied); Martina Selak, *Brojčani pokazatelji zastupljenosti pojedinih tema s obzirom na novu koncepciju "Poleta"* (Numerical Indicators of the Representation of Individual Themes Regarding the New Concept of *Polet*) (Zagreb, 1980, photocopied); Dean Ajduković, "Analiza sadržaja *Poleta*," 1-32.

<sup>176</sup> *Dokumenti Programsko-izborne sjednice RK SSOH* (Documents of the Programme-electoral Session of RC SLYC) (Zagreb: CDD, 1981); *Radni materijal Komisije za idejni rad, kulturu i informiranje RK SSOH* (Working Material of the Committee for Ideological Work, Culture and Information of RC SLYC) (Zagreb, 1981, photocopied).

<sup>177</sup> Ajduković, "Analiza sadržaja *Poleta*," 14.

<sup>178</sup> Kvesić was not a Party member, but was a leftist with strong contacts with his peers from the political phase of the youth press. See: Kvesić, interview.



between the publisher and the staff, he transferred instructions from above, while taking care that the latter did not go too far. The journal's celebrated 1978 series emerged through this kind of divided responsibility. The editor, Pavić, was an organizer who justified Kuljiš's creative ideas to his superiors, setting limits to the endorsed disobedience.<sup>179</sup> When the new guard of *Polet's* journalists took over, the chief negotiator became Zoran Franičević, the sole ideologist and authorities' favorite among the staff.<sup>180</sup>

*Polet's* journalists say they treated these instructions as a sort of genre code, and never excessively pondered upon them.<sup>181</sup> Indeed, in vast majority they were neither Party members nor youth activists. Cynical towards official politics, they were reluctant to engage in an open dialogue with the Party, perceiving reports on official politics, state apparatus and the youth union as obligatory homework. The ideological texts, internally referred as "*food for the lions*," were gladly consigned to the veterans from the political period employed in *CDD*.<sup>182</sup> *Polet's* staff desired new clubs, rather than a new union; their product was subculture, not sub-politics, and, as such, materialized by and large aside from the official discourse.

At the end of the day, however, it was politics that arbitrated. This is indicated by the removal of editors, who seldom managed to retain the position for the whole two year term.<sup>183</sup> The establishment seemed to neither understand, nor articulate the subversive dimensions of the new sub-pop-cultural policy and grasped anything that could be understood as political offence.

---

<sup>179</sup> Kuljiš, interview.

<sup>180</sup> Pavelić, interview; Semenčić, interview.

<sup>181</sup> Fras, interview.

<sup>182</sup> "*Polet je kriv za sve*," 73-77, 86; Kuljiš, interview.

<sup>183</sup> Tadić, *Rasprava o djelovanju Saveza socijalističke omladine*, 22.

*Polet* thus first fell into disfavor in late 1978 on account of a negative film review.<sup>184</sup> What was no more than a benign text pointing to the artistic failure of Lordan Zafranović's war film *Occupation in 26 Tableaux*, the film establishment denounced as a negation of WWII crimes.<sup>185</sup> During the aggressive media campaign, the editorial board visited the Party's cultural ideologist who tried to defend the journal against the hard-liners. After a night-long discussion, accompanied by schnapps and cigarettes, they found the *modus operandi* in a good-old self-critique.<sup>186</sup> The fact that the reviewer, Nenad Polimac, *Polet*'s acclaimed film expert and editor of the youth journal *Film*, stood by his claims despite counter-advice, demonstrates the gained self-confidence.<sup>187</sup> Amidst the attacks, the first editor, Kvesić, condemned the launched political crusade with matters of culture.<sup>188</sup> Meanwhile, pressures amassed and the second take on the self-critique, authored by a veteran of the student movement, CDD official Inoslav Bešker, was more in line with the rules of the genre.<sup>189</sup>

Party bigwig Bakarić nevertheless attacked the staff for its liberal and rightist deflections.<sup>190</sup> The new Croatian youth union leadership concluded that *Polet* should be improved and happily saw the designers of the journal's re-make, Pavić and Kuljiš, leave *Polet* by March 1979, only half a year after its advent.<sup>191</sup> However, neither this, nor other similar cases, resembled a classic showdown.<sup>192</sup> After being sent to finish

<sup>184</sup> "Pretenzije, plagijati, dosada" (Pretensions, Plagiarism, Boredom), *Polet* 74 (18 Oct. 1978): 13.

<sup>185</sup> A long list of the attackers includes *Vjesnik*'s critic Mira Boglić, *Večernjak*'s Jozo Puljević, and *Politika*'s Ostojić, who will later conduct a critical interview on *Polet* with the Party chief Bakarić.

<sup>186</sup> Party ideologist Ivica Račan acted in accordance with the new CDD's director Josip Čondić, a Party's operative with no journalistic experiences. See: "Polet je kriv za sve," 73-77.

<sup>187</sup> The whole process is described by two editors Pavić and Franičević: "Polet 30 godina poslije," 84-86; "Polet je kriv za sve," 76-77.

<sup>188</sup> "Iz Mire sto vragova vire" (Mira is Full of Beans), *Polet* 77 (7 Nov. 1978): 5.

<sup>189</sup> "Za diferencijaciju na idejnoj fronti" (For the Differentiation on the Ideological Front), *Polet* 78 (15 Nov. 1978): 6.

<sup>190</sup> "Polet 30 godina poslije," 84.

<sup>191</sup> "Odmetnuta omladina" (Renegade Youth), *Jutarnji list* (9 May 2009): 85.

<sup>192</sup> The sole exception was Polimac. After being forced to leave the journal following his film review, he had troubles finding a new job and even had to write under a pen name. Interview, Kuljiš.

obligatory military service, the journalists were simply reallocated to the lower positions in the mainstream newspapers. Pavić and Kuljiš went to *Vjesnik* and *Start*, where they soon dragged their colleagues.<sup>193</sup>

Instructions notwithstanding, *Polet*'s policy hardly changed. The new person in charge, Ratko Bošković, was a genuine product of *Polet*, elected directly by the staff.<sup>194</sup> Already contaminated with rebellious spirit, he lasted no more than ten issues. A cryptic call for the *hašoman*'s demonstrations during the Big Ben episode gave a whole new, political dimension to the already ideologized conflict between the two subcultures. What was disputable was not the *hašoman*'s lifestyle but the open cry for a public expression of dissatisfaction. Prohibited by the rules of the game, it re-set in motion the preventive social mechanism. In fear of potential violence, the Croatian youth union sent delegations to schools to warn against protests.<sup>195</sup> The *CDD* acted accordingly and suspended Bošković, escorting him off by yet another self-critique.<sup>196</sup>

His successor and the last editor of this period, Zoran Franičević, was known among the youngest cohort of *Polet*'s journalists as the sole youth activist with Party connections.<sup>197</sup> The reputation allowed him to withstand a bit longer than his predecessor, though incidents continued to multiply. After surviving the legal prosecution of the *Golman issue*, Franičević faced the scandal caused by *Polet*'s in-memoriam cover of John Lennon, a design strictly reserved for the highest state officials.<sup>198</sup> Different as they were, both incidents had the same cause: political

---

<sup>193</sup> See the on-line discussion between the involved editors: Internet: <http://vaseljena.blog.hr/2007/09/1623255681/vesovic-kuljis-besker-basic-babl-budalaj-lama.html>.

<sup>194</sup> "Polet je kriv za sve," 77, 86.

<sup>195</sup> Perasović, *Urbana plemena*, 205.

<sup>196</sup> See respectively: "Polet u pravu, Polet u krivu" (*Polet Is Right, Polet Is Wrong*), *Polet* 111/112 (28 Nov. 1979): 2; Inoslav Bešker, interview by author, 27 Nov. 2010, Zagreb, Skype recording.

<sup>197</sup> Semenčić, interview; Fras, interview; Pavelić, interview.

<sup>198</sup> The move was actually an adaptation of Semenčić's suggestion who wanted to do the same when *Joy Division*'s Ian Curtis passed away. See respectively: *Polet* 145 (17 Dec. 1980): 1; Semenčić, interview.

uncertainty surrounding Tito's illness and consequent death, in which such small transgressions were simply not tolerated.

The third crisis was just one too many. The fatal 1981 New Year's cover featured a portrait of a hysterical youngster staring at the readers.<sup>199</sup> Provocatively referred to as "The Eyes of Yugoslavia," it was interpreted as an unacceptable "view into the country's uncertain future." The editorial board was summoned to what turned out to be their last Party advisory meeting and Franičević was soon doing his military service. Despite various enticing bribes, the core of the team solidarized and collectively resigned.<sup>200</sup> With their departure, the first era of *Polet* ended. Franičević was replaced by an imposed outsider, with no previous affiliation with the youth press, let alone *Polet*.<sup>201</sup>

### 6.3.6. The school of journalism

Apart from the editors, *Polet's* staff never thought much ahead, nor dreamt of a professional career. For the majority, writing was more of a hobby, a chance to earn relatively good fees and gain fame.<sup>202</sup> Ironically, it is exactly this generation of youth journalists, much more than the previous political one, that ended up working in the mainstream press.

The reason was simple. Writing for *Polet* represented much more than a first career step. The journal offered a real-life crash course in journalism, stimulating creativity that would otherwise hardly develop. The experience contradicted the usual years-long route to the editorial posts, typically reached after one was already

---

<sup>199</sup> In line with the rock orientation, the model was an unknown rock singer. *Polet* 146 (24 Dec. 1980): 1.

<sup>200</sup> Semenčić, interview.

<sup>201</sup> After two months pause, the new editor became radio journalist from Dubrovnik Mime Rakela. *Polet*, 147 (11 Feb. 1981): 3.

<sup>202</sup> Pavelić, interview; Frás, interview.

accommodated to the system and could not contribute anything new. Instead, *Polet* provided a shortcut, allowing its journalists to skip the normal hierarchy and get the chance to shape trends.<sup>203</sup> Squeezed to the margins of the mediascape, *Polet* facilitated the emergence of new ideas, transgressions, experiments, even some minor private follies.<sup>204</sup>

The journal cherished a markedly different approach compared to the mainstream press. *Polet* was not afraid to take sides and was clearly more critical and analytical, a feature that was occasionally noticed and praised.<sup>205</sup> Its small and increasingly closed circle of staff fostered friendly interpersonal relations.<sup>206</sup> The good atmosphere and relaxed work ethic did not, however, run against professional standards. Subtle off-set technology, coupled by youthful vanity to equal the foreign media role-models, required discipline.<sup>207</sup> This is why *Polet's* journalists later easily adapted to the mainstream media and were able to color it with their creative ideas. Indeed, many left a long-term mark on the profession, traceable long after the fall of the system which brought them to the fore. Kuljiš founded the first Croatian oppositional news-week *Globus*. Pavić became the owner of the greatest media corporation *EPH*, in whose editions *Polet's* journalists still play central roles, among them: Polimac, Bošković, Bakalović, joined by the “second” *Polet's* generation active in the mid 1980s.

---

<sup>203</sup> Kuljiš draws a parallel with the only similar experience he had, while writing and editing the entire army bulletin all by himself during his military service. Kuljiš, interview.

<sup>204</sup> Pavelić, interview.

<sup>205</sup> Ajduković, “Analiza sadržaja *Poleta*,” 12; Compare with: Vesna Lamza, *Analiza “Starta”* (Analysis of *Start*) (Zagreb: Vjesnik, 1978); Vesna Lamza, *Sadržaj “Večernjaka”* (Contents of *Večernji list*) (Zagreb: Vjesnik, 1981).

<sup>206</sup> From a bureaucratic viewpoint, this feature was referred to as “growing elitism” which the youth union criticized and, counter it by organizing political seminars for young journalists, but to no avail. *Izvyještaj o radu SSOH između 8. kongresa mladih SRH i 9. kongresa SSOH*, 178.

<sup>207</sup> Fras, interview.

### 6.3.7. Reflections of *Polet*

Though isolated at the time, *Polet* in the ensuing years became a model for a range of other youth journals in two major aspects. First, rock-culture slowly came to dominate their cultural sections. Second, they more or less convincingly tried to emulate its new attitude to media in general. However, the rest of the youth press followed the path with considerable delay, adopting only certain elements. The same combination of media innovations, journalistic quality and crucial impact for the local punk-rock would not be repeated.

In fact one regional publication, Rijeka's youth journal *Val*, went the furthest in this respect.<sup>208</sup> Headed by *Polet*'s correspondent Goran Lisica, *Val*'s rock critics participated in the similar way in the birth of Rijeka's punk rock scene, affording it with the initial support.<sup>209</sup> They interviewed anonymous city bands and organized first punk concerts.<sup>210</sup> *Val*'s premises turned into an informal hangout for local Rijeka's musicians, with its staff becoming important parts of the scene they wrote about. Likewise, they too went on to accomplish prominent professional careers, while Lisica himself established the first private record company.<sup>211</sup>

On the longer run, *Polet*'s revolution changed the very concept of the central youth publication. To a varying extent, these transformed into youth news magazines, as illustrated by *Polet*'s city rival *Studentski list*. By the end of the decade, the latter turned into a youth medium inclined to urban pop-culture. Yet, its influence fell short

<sup>208</sup> More on *Val*'s impact on the Rijeka's thriving punk scene in: Velid Đekić, *91. Decibel: Vodič rock'n'roll Rijekom* (91th Decibel: Guide through Rijeka Rock and Roll) (Zagreb: Meandar Media, 2009), 51-54.

<sup>209</sup> See Lisica's report in *Polet*: "Buja dječurlija" (Youngsters Are Flourishing), *Polet* 140 (5 Nov. 1980): 14.

<sup>210</sup> In March 1978, Rijeka's punks *Parafi* shocked the mass at their debut concert with their unique interpretation of punk style. Impressed by images from the foreign press, they wore ragged jeans and were wrapped in padlocks and chains. See: Đekić, *91. Decibel: Vodič rock'n'roll Rijekom*, 48-49. See also *Val*'s review of *Parafi*'s first single: "Single Parafa" (Parafi Single), *Val* 79 (2 Nov. 1979): 10.

<sup>211</sup> Finally, following *Polet*, in 1981, *Val* redesigned into an urban journal of the Rijeka's youth. The rock orientation persisted and reached a new level. Two of its music editors established their own punk band *Via Victor Kunst* treating it as a pure media product. Ibid., 51-54.

of *Polet*'s.<sup>212</sup> The journal adopted the newly created scene, but never became its constituent the way *Polet* had done.<sup>213</sup>

## 6.4. RADIO ŠTUDENT

### 6.4.1. Extension of the youth press

While this thesis is limited to printed media, in the last part of the chapter I refer to one electronic youth medium whose importance for the local punk-subculture is comparable to that of *Polet*: Ljubljana's *Radio Študent*.<sup>214</sup> The extension is needed if one is to break with the narrow conventional perception of one and the same, undifferentiated Yugoslav punk rock culture. Besides, the transgression is not as great as it seems. *Radio Študent* is rooted in the same theoretical principles and emerged within the same institutional frame as the youth press. Although two decades later, in 1969, as its extension, within the set of reformist demands for the enhancement of student awareness. Accordingly, *Radio Študent* shared the same key features and marginal status as the youth press. Its three-hour-long daily program, broadcast on medium wave, could be heard only in certain parts of Ljubljana.<sup>215</sup>

Appearing at the time when the youth press acquired autonomous political voice, *Radio Študent* skipped several evolutionary stages. During the student politicization,

<sup>212</sup> Once *Polet* recovered from the 1981 editorial shift, the two Zagreb youth journals developed a rivalry which lasted throughout the following decade, with each, in their own specific periods, leading the way.

<sup>213</sup> For instance, *Studentski list* accepted punk-rock with a significant delay. For the beginning of the journal's series see: "Punk '77: Novac u anarhiji" (Punk '77: Money in Anarchy), *Studentski list* 1 (23 Feb. 1979): 23.

<sup>214</sup> *Radio Študent* survived to this day, but remarkably there is still no literature, nor primary sources on it. Apart from a couple of newspaper articles marking the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary and a few side comments in the articles on Slovenian punk, the only available material is a collection of documents which includes transcripts of some radio shows. See: *Punk pod Slovenci*.

<sup>215</sup> *Radio Študent* began broadcasting on May 9<sup>th</sup>, 1969, and according to its statute, is "a child of the student movement." Being an electronic media, it differed by its quicker, immediate and potentially more problematic nature. Next to the greater costs, this was the main reason behind its limited scope and the fact that similar outlets were formed in Zagreb and Belgrade only in the 1980s. For more on early beginnings, see: "Študent naj bo!" (Let It Be Študent!), *Mladina* 18 (2009).

its young leftist staff acted as *Tribuna*'s junior partner, transmitting its press releases, covering and supporting student activities. Following the deposition of *Tribuna*'s editorial board in 1972, it became the refuge for part of its journalists, until the final wave of repression overtook the radio itself.<sup>216</sup>

In the mid 1970s, *Radio Študent* thus became the victim of the profound crises that swept through the entire youth press. Even its traditional openness to new music trends, present from the onset, deflected into esoteria. Instead of rock in the manner of *Radio Luxemburg*, the new favored genre became improvised, experimental jazz, artistically interesting but stripped of any social relevance.<sup>217</sup>

#### 6.4.2. Punk and *Radio Študent*

Nothing indicated the punk-revolution that was about to erupt. Actually, when the first punk records crossed the Yugoslav border in 1976, playing punk was prohibited on the radio for its alleged implications with Nazism, an allusion that would become the leitmotif of all later moral panics against punk.<sup>218</sup> The situation, however, began to change once the local punk emerged in Ljubljana in the winter of 1977.

Meanwhile, a more liberal editorial board took over the radio, allowing new music editor Slobodan Valentinčič to annul the punk veto. Valentinčič readily announced the

<sup>216</sup> Among others, the *Tribuna*'s chief editor, enfant terrible, Jaša Zlobec, found a refuge here, feeding on the contacts established during the occupation of the Faculty of Philosophy, documented by the radio journalists by magnétoscope. Zlobec was also kicked out from the *Radio* when a new, conservative editorial board took over in 1974. See: "Radio, ki se je znal odzvati na družbene krize" (Radio That Knew How to Respond to Social Crises), RTV Slo (21 April 2009).

<sup>217</sup> The shift was facilitated by the launching of rival mainstream radio-station *Val 202* open to pop music, and a sudden change in taste of the chief music editor. For the *Radio Študent*'s lasting affections for the alternative music genres, which provided an ideal starting point for later acceptance of punk, see a three pages long official history of the radio: Peter Barbarič, "Zgodovina *Radia Študent* in nekaj osnovnih izpiskov iz zgodovine Radia" (History of the *Radio Študent* and a Few Basic Excerpts from the Radio's History), in *Evropski pilotski model praktičnega usposabljanja za integralnega radijca* (European Pilot Model for Practical Training of an All-round Broadcaster), 9. Available on the Internet: [http://www.radiostudent.si/projekti/leonardo/pdf/izbor\\_gradiva.pdf](http://www.radiostudent.si/projekti/leonardo/pdf/izbor_gradiva.pdf).

<sup>218</sup> Simultaneously with the first *Sex Pistols* record, *Radio* received a copy of *Spiegel* which associated the new phenomenon with Neo-Nazism. See: Ali H. Žerdin, "Kratki kurz zgodovine panka" (Short Course on the History of Punk) in Lovšin et al., eds., *Punk je bil prej*, 15-16.



debut concert of the local punks *Pankrti* held on October 18, 1977 in front of the suburban high-school. Mesmerized by the energy he had witnessed, Valentičič organized a rerun the very next day, extending the life of the band that believed it would not last more than a few hours.<sup>219</sup>

The love affair between punk and *Radio Študent* had officially begun. At first it seemed that others would join in. A thrilled *Mladina*'s reviewer compared *Pankrti* with the British models despite being hit in the forehead by the singer's shoe – one of many outrageous tricks that *Pankrti* pulled off that day.<sup>220</sup>

But the early signals that punk would become a new favorite of the Ljubljana youth press never materialized. Throughout the period *Mladina* exhibited sporadic interest in punk, and not necessarily positive.<sup>221</sup> *Tribuna*'s approach was even less affirmative. Following the end of the leftist student movement, *Tribuna* turned into an ultra-Marxist journal, ill-disposed to the whole pop-culture.<sup>222</sup> As such, regardless of its periodic rows with the regime, it was fully at odds with the youth's growing alienation from official politics.<sup>223</sup>

If deserted by the local youth journals, *Radio* found a more fitting partner in the Student Cultural Art Centre (*ŠKUC*) which, on the infrastructural level, did the same

<sup>219</sup> Kostelnik, *Moj život je novi val*, 19.

<sup>220</sup> "Domači punk-rockerji boljši od tujih: *Pankrti*" (Domestic Punk-rockers Better than the Foreign: *Pankrti*), *Mladina* vol., (3 Nov. 1977): 38.

<sup>221</sup> *Mladina* was a general interest magazine whose two (out of fifty) pages devoted to rock, and occasionally punk, were hardly its dominant trait. Moreover, despite some support of punk, the journal shared the ambivalent attitude of its publisher, the Slovenian youth union, articulating periodical warnings about the new phenomenon. For the early, positive articles see: "Punk in naša publika" (Punk and Our Audience), *Mladina* 50 (22 Dec. 1977): 38; "Mama, pelji me na žur v Koper" (Mum, Take Me to the Party in Koper), *Mladina* 24 (15 June 1978): 34-35; "Žura v Koprju ne bo!" (There Won't Be Any Party in Koper!), *Mladina* 31 (3 Aug. 1978): 12-13.

<sup>222</sup> The first sings of the future campaign against punk, pointing to its lack of class consciousness, nihilism and associations with Nazism, could be traced precisely in *Tribuna*. Such anti-punk orientation lasted until the summer of 1981 when a new, non-Party guard took over the journal. See: "O neki drugi strani David Bowiea" (On the Other Side of David Bowie), *Tribuna* 9 (26 Feb. 1979): 11; "Še o punku" (More on Punk), *Tribuna* 13 (9 April 1979): 7.

<sup>223</sup> On the punks' distrust in youth politics, in: Tomc, "The Politics of Punk," 119-20.

for punk what the radio had done media-wise.<sup>224</sup> ŠKUC's head, the eccentric avant-garde poet Petar Mlakar, instantly saw in *Pankrti* a cultural avant-garde of the working class that wiped out differences between high and mass art.<sup>225</sup> Actions followed. Mlakar smuggled *Pankrti* into the ŠKUC's visiting artistic program, securing the band its first official gigs in Belgrade and Zagreb.<sup>226</sup>

The two institutions closely cooperated and could be jointly observed. All the more so since they were soon united in the future ideologist of the Slovenian punk, Igor Vidmar.<sup>227</sup> Holding positions in both of these bodies, Vidmar became the link between the subculture and the Slovenian youth union, acting as a negotiator in fight for the autonomy of punk.

#### 6.4.3. Actions: Igor Vidmar

Vidmar's biography is not irrelevant if one is to contextualize his seminal impact on local punk, in many ways resembling that of *Polet*. During the early 1970s he worked as a political journalist at *Radio Študent*. Inspired by *Praxis*, Yippies and the progressive wing of the Party, Vidmar actively supported the ongoing student movement, failing to perceive its end. His 1974 protest against the expulsion of four

---

<sup>224</sup> Like other similar institutions, ŠKUC remains unresearched. Founded in 1971, within the frame of student union, ŠKUC imposed as the (counter)cultural wing of the over-politicized student movement. As such, it managed to retain relative autonomy and remained open to cultural self-initiatives from below. For example, its head, Mlakar, was not a Party member. About ŠKUC and its leaders, see: "Kdo je kdaj? Peter Mlakar" (Who is When? Peter Mlakar), *Mladina* 26 (2006); "Mladi ustvarjalec" (Young Artist), *Mladina* 9 (2 March 1978): 30.

<sup>225</sup> "Za počutje nadvse prijetno" (For a Rather Good Feeling), *Tribuna* 5 (16 Jan. 1978): 6.

<sup>226</sup> *Pankrti*'s 1978 concert at the Zagreb's Student Centre Gallery left a lasting impression on the Zagreb new eave scene, as illustrated by the famous line from a song of its leader, Johnny B. Štulić: *I shave my beard, moustache, to look like Pankrti*. Moreover, Mlakar himself performed with the punk bands. During one of his poetic performances, displeased with the reaction, he threw an empty bottle at the audience, apparently aiming for the bell-tower in the distance and was soon sent to the compulsory military service. See respectively: Mirković, *Sretno Dijete*, 28; Žerdin, "Kratki kurz zgodovine panka", 19-20.

<sup>227</sup> Besides, both institutions had neighboring premises at the student campus. See: "Radio, ki se je znal odzvati na družbene krize."

professors from the Ljubljana University turned him into one of its last casualties. Soon thereafter he was ousted from the Party and, consequently, from the radio.<sup>228</sup>

However, not all doors remained closed. Embodying the whole history of the youth press, Vidmar switched from direct political action to pop-culture. Inspired by Enzesberger's positive reading of Benjamin, he acknowledged its emancipatory potential that ran against the Frankfurt School's skeptic view of pop-culture as opium for the masses that so profoundly shaped the communist vision.<sup>229</sup>

First on his menu were comics.<sup>230</sup> However, having once heard punk, Vidmar claims to have recognized in its defiance the updated version of his former New Left engagement. In the new circumstances, it was punk that could create room for artistic freedom, individual autonomy, while facilitating critical stance towards reality.<sup>231</sup>

Shortly after *Pankrti*'s legendary concert, Vidmar befriended the band and became their manager.<sup>232</sup> As a privileged participant he used his status as head of the *ŠKUC*'s musical section to provide the subculture with the necessary infrastructure. In Vidmar local punk gained its chief concert promoter who, following the DIY principles, transformed established relations between the performers and the audience.

---

<sup>228</sup> Vidmar became a Party member, in 1969, at seventeen, within the wider rejuvenation campaign that ensued in the aftermath of the fall of the Prague Spring. A year later he came to the Radio and soon acquired one of the editorial positions. Aside from reporting on student sit-ins, Vidmar himself made speeches against the Cambodian War. In its aftermath, he fought in vain against the termination of the independent student union, and, against advices, participated in the final *Praxis* summer school in Korčula. See: Igor Vidmar, interview by author, 11 Dec. 2010, Ljubljana, e-mail.

<sup>229</sup> On the intellectual reasons behind Vidmar's criticism of the official (mis)understanding of mass culture see his speech at the youth union's culture plenum: Igor Vidmar, "ZSMS in punk" (ZSMS and Punk) in Samo Mihelin, ed., *O kulturni politiki ZSMS in dejavnosti mladih na področju kulture: Kulturni plenum ZSMS* (On Cultural Politics of ZSMS and Youth Activities in the Cultural Sphere: Cultural Plenum of ZSMS) (Ljubljana: RK ZSMS, 1981), 36-39.

<sup>230</sup> The fact that prior to Vidmar Zagreb rock critic Darko Glavan also promoted comics points to the similar social and artistic status of these two pop-cultural forms. For the discussion of comics see the following chapter.

<sup>231</sup> Vidmar states that he heard in punk an echo of the *Praxis*'s "relentless critique of the surrounding reality" which resonated the gap between theory and practice. This ideological connection with the student movement will prove crucial in the later framing of the Slovenian punk. See: Vidmar, interview.

<sup>232</sup> Vidmar, interview.

From the first 1978 concert, where *Pankrti* were joined by Rijeka's *Parafi* and Zagreb's *Prljavo Kazalište*, Vidmar opened up the scene to the regiment of bands, offering them a unique opportunity for stage performance.<sup>233</sup> With regular live acts, appetites whetted for more. Within two years, Vidmar brought to Ljubljana a true foreign punk attraction, *Siouxsie & The Banshees*.<sup>234</sup> The majority of concerts were organized under the umbrella of *ŠKUC*. But *Radio Študent* also co-organized events that occupied crucial city spaces. By the end of 1979 punk penetrated the main city sports hall.<sup>235</sup> A year and a half later the open-air rock festival *New Rock* conquered Križanke, a venue strictly reserved for classical music.<sup>236</sup>

Vidmar's role in the discographic affirmation of the Slovenian punk was equally important. Responding to the conservative record industry, he turned *ŠKUC* into a veritable punk label. In 1978 the institution released the first historical *Pankrti* single, recorded in Italian Gorizia, for fear of censors.<sup>237</sup> Apart from planning the endeavor, Vidmar contributed to co-production, the ideas for the cover-design, and, eventually, engaged in the semi-legal street distribution.<sup>238</sup> Amidst the ensuing attacks, he fervently asserted the progressive aesthetics and ideology of Ljubljana's one-chord wonders.<sup>239</sup> Seemingly, to no avail since he was forced to repeat his appraisals when

---

<sup>233</sup> On *ŠKUC*'s music and concert policies, see: "Punk je mrtev, živel punk" (The Punk Is Dead, Long Live the Punk), *BTZ* (29 Nov. 1978); "Kulturni plenum ZSMS" (ZSMS Culture Plenum), in *Punk pod Slovenci*, 117,190.

<sup>234</sup> The concert took place on 18<sup>th</sup> June, 1981. Žerdin, "Kratki kurz zgodovine panka", 35.

<sup>235</sup> For the contemporary insight in the organizational procedures and difficulties see: "Ljubljana je zaspana: Dokumenti" (Ljubljana Is Asleep: The Documents), *Problemi* 3 (196) (1980): 73-86.

<sup>236</sup> For a look at the festival, understood as a part of the emerging civil society, see: Igor Bašin, *Novi rock: Rockovski festival v Križankah: 1981-2000* (New Rock: Rock Festival at Križanke: 1981-2000) (Maribor: Subkulturni azil, 2006).

<sup>237</sup> Žerdin, "Kratki kurz zgodovine panka", 35.

<sup>238</sup> Vidmar, interview.

<sup>239</sup> Anticipating a political reaction, Vidmar issued a „warranty“ for this first Yugoslav punk record. Yet he was first compelled to counter an attack from the renowned cultural elitist, incidentally a former *Tribuna*'s editor. See in turn: "Garantni list' za prvo ploščo *Pankrtov*" (A "Warranty" for the First *Pankrti* Single); "Pismo D. Rupelu" (A Letter to D. Rupel), in *Punk pod Slovenci*, 118-120.

*Pankrti*'s LP was taxed as thrash.<sup>240</sup> Progress was noticeable nevertheless. Despite controversial lyrics and fierce sound, the album was released by the major state record company.<sup>241</sup> With *Pankrti* entering the mainstream scene, Vidmar turned his attention to the second generation of Ljubljana's punks. His compilation *New Punk Wave 78-80* gathered less known bands like *Berlinski Zid* (Berlin Wall) and *Grupa 98* who recorded their hard-core songs in the small improvised studio of *Radio Študent*.<sup>242</sup>

#### 6.4.4. *Rock Front: politics of punk*

As of spring 1978, Valentičič invited Vidmar to return to *Radio* where he ended producing two shows dedicated to punk.<sup>243</sup> First *Be Here Now*, followed by *Rock Front* a year later, instantly acquired cult following.<sup>244</sup> Simultaneously, the radio began broadcasting from the new stereo UKV transmitter that allowed its program, after nine years of limited coverage, to be heard in all of Ljubljana.<sup>245</sup> The combination rendered *Radio Študent* into the bastion of punk, the crucial medium that presented new music to the audience at large in its sensitive formative stage. But the radio was much more than a compassionate observer. Just like *Polet* it served as the ideologue which shaped the meaning. Yet, the one that somewhat differed.

<sup>240</sup> In his radio-show Vidmar criticized the tax as the regime's defense mechanism against the punk's violation of bureaucratic manners. "Apologija šunda" (The Apology of Trash), in *Punk pod Slovenci*, 143-44.

<sup>241</sup> The recording itself was organized by *ŠKUC*, while the record was published in February 1980, on the official Day of Culture. For more on the project, including songs such as *Total Revolution* and *Count with Us* which subverted common Party slogans see the movie: *Glazba je časovna umetnost, "Pankrti" – Dolgcajt* (Music Is the Art of Time, *Pankrti* – Boredom) (Ljubljana: Nord Cross Production, 2006).

<sup>242</sup> Another compilation with the third generation of bands was issued the following year. Hear respectively: *Novi punk val 78-80* (New Punk Wave 78-80) (Ljubljana: ZKP RTVLJ, 1981); *Lepo je... v naši domovini biti mlad* (It Is Nice... to Be Young in Our Homeland) (Ljubljana: ZKP RTVLJ, 1982).

<sup>243</sup> Already from late 1977, Vidmar wrote sporadic texts on punk in *Mladina*: See: "Punk in naša publika" (Punk and Our Audience), *Mladina* 50 (22 Dec. 1977): 38.

<sup>244</sup> In accordance with the existing music policy, Vidmar broadcasted the first show in alternation with a jazz expert. The second one, launched on 4<sup>th</sup> Nov., 1979, already had a regular, weekly schedule. Vidmar, interview; "Rock fronta št. 1" (Rock Front No. 1), in *Punk pod Slovenci*, 138.

<sup>245</sup> Barbarič, "Zgodovina Radia Študent," 9.

What was then punk for Vidmar and *Radio Študent*?<sup>246</sup> Musically, it was a modernizer of pop-culture, considered the third crucial phase in the history of Yugo-rock that synchronized the local and global scene.<sup>247</sup> Though heavily drawing from British origins, Slovenian punk had authentic social and musical grounds, incomparable to those in its homeland.<sup>248</sup> The genuine idiom was borrowed precisely because its rebellious poetics, aesthetics and principles were suitable for coping with domestic problems.

This was a crucial input. Punk could not be reduced to music alone. A major step forward made by the *Rock Front* broadcast was precisely in the affiliation of music with political commentary.<sup>249</sup> Vidmar treated punk as a complex subculture, committed lifestyle that comprised the whole ideology: values, image, distinct dressing, behavioral and expressive codes, all of which had social relevance.<sup>250</sup> Punk's simplicity, spontaneity, iconoclasm, ability to provoke and shock, all spoke about the present and democratized the existing stagnant social structures.

The new school of critics that gathered around *Radio Študent* followed this semantic lead. Like Vidmar they were educated by the progressive writing of widely accessible *New Musical Express*.<sup>251</sup> Peter Barbarič and Marjan Ogrinc placed music within a wider social context and searched for idiosyncratic qualities of

---

<sup>246</sup> Some transcripts of Vidmar's radio shows are also available in the contemporary press, where, at times, he independently expressed his ideas, often in a more coherent manner.

<sup>247</sup> "Pogledi" (Perspectives), *Mladina* 3, suppl. (26 March 1981).

<sup>248</sup> "Dnevnikova okrogla miza o punk rocku" (*Dnevnik's* Round-table on Punk Rock), *Ljubljanski dnevnik* (30 March 1981): 18; "Trenutak ljubljanske „rock kulture“, ali po domače: Kaj hudiča se dogaja?" (A Moment in Ljubljana's "Rock Culture", or in Plain Language: What the Hell Is Going On?), *Rock Fronta* (9 Dec. 1979), in *Punk pod Slovenci*, 141-42.

<sup>249</sup> "Punk je mrtev, živel punk" (29 Nov. 1978); "'Glasba mladih' in 'glasba za mlade'" (The "Youth's Music" and the "Music for the Youth"), in *Punk pod Slovenci*, 117, 130-31.

<sup>250</sup> "Poskus dopisovanja brez nevarnosti" (Attempt to Correspond Free of Risk), in *Punk pod Slovenci*, 133-37.

<sup>251</sup> Peter Barbarič, interview by author, 26 Nov. 2010, Ljubljana, e-mail.

persuasiveness or sincerity.<sup>252</sup> Unlike *Polet's* teenagers, they came from a social science background and were well-versed in New Left jargon, articulating punk at high theoretical level, often at odds with the base.<sup>253</sup> Hebdige went hand in hand with Enzensberger. Punk was a critical practice that facilitated the emergence of alternative lifestyles, as well as the semantic structure which could be theorized upon as a symbolic resistance against the repressive system.<sup>254</sup>

Such strong ideological overtones crucially shaped not just the coverage of *Radio Študent*, but the future comprehension, status and growth of the local punk as a whole. Coming into existence nearly simultaneously with its media narration, Ljubljana punk subculture remained greatly dependent on its first chronicler.<sup>255</sup>

The legacy went in two ways. The approach worked to legitimize punk on a political and cultural plane. At the same time, it left less room for the spontaneous reactions from below that elsewhere had more time to emerge.<sup>256</sup> The disproportion with the rank and file manifested in certain asceticism which ostracized harmony and fun from punk.<sup>257</sup> Both were seen as residues of pop, and as such in disharmony with the punk's critical agenda.

Accordingly, *Radio Študent* applauded only the punk side of the Zagreb New Wave. Despite acknowledged common roots, Ljubljana punk scene was perceived as a

---

<sup>252</sup> More on the contrast between the new and older, more objective criteria, such as proficiency, see: Peter Barbarič, "Poskus opredelitve kriterijev vrednotenja punka" (An Attempt to Define the Criteria for Evaluating Punk), in *Punk pod Slovenci*, 47-57.

<sup>253</sup> On politicization of punk: Gregor Tomc, "Sociologija punka u socijalizmu: Slovenija" (Sociology of Punk during Socialism: Slovenia), *15 dana: Ilustrirani časopis za umjetnost i kulturu* 5-6 (2008): 11.

<sup>254</sup> From early 1980s Marjan Ogrinc theorized on punk following rock sociologists and the Birmingham CCCS. He also personally translated authors like Mike Brake or Simon Frith. For Ogrinc, punk was an attempt of solving collective problems, a first mass socially engaged musical subculture which reacted against the anomalies of the system by creating ones' identity through politicized unconventional lifestyle. Marjan Ogrinc, "Punk kot diskvalificirana supkultura" (Punk as Disqualified Subculture), in *Problemi* 221 (1981): 42-44.

<sup>255</sup> Vidmar's presence in discussions on punk continued once punk penetrated other media. See for example: "Prizma" (Prism), *Mladina* 1 (28 Jan. 1982): 21-32.

<sup>256</sup> Marjan Ogrinc, "Ni nam do tega da bi postali zgodovina" (We Don't Want to Become History), in *Punk pod Slovenci*, 97-98.

<sup>257</sup> Thought this altered with time, in the *Radio's* narration fun had a much less role than in reality. Barbarič, interview; Barbarič, "Poskus opredelitve kriterijev vrednotenja punka," 57-59.

separate, closed unit, detached from all pop, hippy or disco elements.<sup>258</sup> The latter in particular, with its *šminkeri* audience were rigidly denounced as futile conformism.<sup>259</sup> Ambivalence notwithstanding, contacts with *Polet* were strong, while the journal was widely read by Ljubljana youth.<sup>260</sup>

Punk's later progress through the Ljubljana youth press nicely reveals this heavy intellectual baggage. The subculture thus first penetrated the unlikely candidate, academic youth journal *Problemi* which in the early 1980s dedicated three special issues to punk.<sup>261</sup> Co-edited by Vidmar and *Pankrti*'s founder Tomc who was a graduate sociologist in his civilian life, the volumes presented authentic punk production from below, from lyrics to fanzines and graphic-novels. Backed by few theoretical pieces, these were treated seriously and positioned as art, rather than entertainment.<sup>262</sup> While the issues integrated *Problemi* within the youth press proper, they also revealed the tension within the subculture itself, pointing to the discrepancy between the interpreters and the core constituency.<sup>263</sup>

---

<sup>258</sup> Strong preferences for punk led to the conflict between the *Radio* and the mainstream pop-cultural magazine *Stop*. In the ensuing correspondence, *Stops*'s writer tellingly equated the whole local punk with Vidmar, identifying him as the person who invented both the subculture and its conflicts. "V znamenju punka/Pop festival – Moste '79" (Dominated by Punk/Pop Festival – Moste '79), *Stop* (June 1979): 56-57; "Poskus dopisovanja brez nevarnosti," 54.

<sup>259</sup> Here too, the reality contradicted the narration, while the contempt towards *šminkeri* and disco was often more of a pose. Vidmar testifies that he and the frontman of punk band *Lubljanski psi* regularly visited the sole city disco: Vidmar, interview.

<sup>260</sup> Looking back, Vidmar partially distances from *Polet* and Zagreb scene, while Barbarič confirms their strong influence. *Polet*'s journalists also speak of regular mutual meetings. Some, like Semenčič, mention that they introduced Vidmar to the basic punk cannon. Barbarič, interview; Vidmar, interview; Semenčič, interview; Fras, interview.

<sup>261</sup> *Problemi* showed interest in punk as early as 1977, when the veteran of the student movement, Jaša Zlobec, positively reviewed *Pankrti*'s single, which Vidmar then used as a reference to point its high value: Jaša Zlobec, "Kdo se boji *Pankrtov*" (Who's Afraid of *Pankrti*), in *Problemi Literatura* 176 (1977): 46-49.

<sup>262</sup> The entire series, initiated by Mlakar, a member of the journal's editorial board, represented a major breakthrough. *Problemi*'s chief editors, Slavoj Žižek and Mladen Dolar, were both Party members and provided punk with a new, if somewhat inapt medium. In the face of the state censorship, they defended the texts from the Party critics. See: *Problemi* 205-206 (1981); *Problemi* 221 (1982); *Problemi* 230 (1983).

<sup>263</sup> Since 1981, *ŠKUC*'s visual arts section also produced its own punk fanzine whose first issue was originally presented in Vidmar's radio show and consequently banned. However, the authors of the fanzine that *Problemi* transferred in the second special issue confronted the editors, Vidmar included, for censoring certain parts. Though censorship was caused by the Party and had nothing to do with editors, the clash reflected a rising fragmentation within the subculture.



#### 6.4.5. Aftermath: the authorities and moral panic

Political connotations of Ljubljana punk resonated just as loudly. Framed in such a manner, it was a matter of time before the authorities would get the message and perceive it as an adversary, or to use the adopted Birmingham CCCS's subcultural terminology, take this (badly disguised) symbolic threat for real.<sup>264</sup> Open attacks did not start before 1981, but should be mentioned since they bestowed the relationship between *Radio Študent* and local punk with a new quality.<sup>265</sup> As if copied directly from Stanley Cohen's notebook, a major Ljubljana weekly launched a wide moral panic against punk, arbitrarily linking the whole subculture with Neo-Nazism.<sup>266</sup> The campaign received legal extension with three alleged teenage Nazis put on trial, while police raids harassed the city's resident punks.<sup>267</sup> By now allergic to such allegations, Vidmar stood prepared.<sup>268</sup> In the ensuing witch hunt, he headed the resistance and uncompromisingly defended the prosecuted punks.<sup>269</sup> In doing so, Vidmar himself hardly refrained from provocations which eventually led him twice to prison.<sup>270</sup>

The "Nazi-punk affair," as the scandal became known, drove *Radio Študent* into a conflict with its superiors. Hitherto, the Slovenian youth union showed little interest in punk, sharing the Party's incomprehension of pop-culture. Such ignorance facilitated a

<sup>264</sup> Ogrinc, "Ni nam do tega da bi postali zgodovina," 97-98.

<sup>265</sup> As indicated earlier, the liaison between the *Radio Študent* and punk did not end by the 1980, but in fact reached its climax the following year.

<sup>266</sup> "Kdo riše kljukaste križe?" (Who is Drawing Swastikas?), *Nedeljski dnevnik* (22 Nov. 1981): 3.

<sup>267</sup> The campaign was instigated by the Party head France Popit who, irritated by the aggressive arrival of punks into the city center, reproached them as sluggards and bon vivants. More on campaign in: Tomc, "The Politics of Punk," 120-23.; Ingrid Bakše, *Ne čakaj na maj* (Don't Wait for May) (Ljubljana: Karantanija, 1989), 61.

<sup>268</sup> For an earlier resolute Radio's responses to such attempts in: "O neki drugi strani pisanja o Davidu Bowieju, ali: kaj je boljše – fašist ali stalinist? [Odgovor: „Oboje je boljše“ – J.V. Staljin]" (On Another Aspect of Writing about David Bowie, or: Which Is Better – Fascist or Stalinist? [The Answer: Both Is Better – J.V. Staljin]), in *Punk pod Slovenci*, 123.

<sup>269</sup> Vidmar reacted in his *Rock Front* on the very day the initial article came out: "Sedaj gre zares" (Now It's for Real), in *Punk pod Slovenci*, 226-228.

<sup>270</sup> Though reputed for his strong leftist leanings and „Nazi-punks fuck off“ insignia, Vidmar received his first one month sentence in 1982 for wearing the badge with the crossed-over swastika. He reiterated the experience two years later after overzealously celebrating the acquittal of prosecuted punks by playing *Das Lied den Deutschen*, performed by *Nico*, staging it as a "drill in social self-defense", (successfully) inviting citizens to report him. See: Žerdin, "Kratki kurz zgodovine pank", 49-50.

paradoxical situation where punk was often supported on the lowest level, despite occasional informal pressures from above.<sup>271</sup> Suddenly cornered and forced to speak out, the union reached for a compromise. In principle it acknowledged punk as a potentially liberating form of youth mass culture in line with self-management.<sup>272</sup> At the same time, however, it mounted a yearlong campaign for the so called “differentiation” between the healthy and destructive elements of punk.<sup>273</sup> In practice, the formula translated into cleansing punk from all troublesome values.<sup>274</sup>

For Vidmar the situation was somewhat new. While the former discursive void allowed interpretative freedom, he was now forced to debate with union leaders and contest their contradictory accusations.<sup>275</sup> Where the youth union demanded supervision, Vidmar advocated self-initiative; what the regime condemned as anarchism, he saw as desirable opposition to the stalemate.<sup>276</sup> In this, he was supported by the radio whose heads opposed the ongoing criminalization of punk.<sup>277</sup>

---

<sup>271</sup> Prior to that, the youth union only sporadically and informally exerted pressure. For example, the president, Boris Bavdek, suggested in vain to *ŠKUC* not to produce the first *Pankrti*'s single and removed the band from the list of performers]. The first (contradictory) official stance on punk from the highest ranks of ZSMS was presented only at the cultural plenum in April 1981. See: Tomc, “The Politics of Punk,” 119-26.

<sup>272</sup> Slavoj Žižek, *Problemi*'s chief editor, in the first special punk issue, coined the negative version of this premise, defining the Slovenian punk as the symptom of the undeveloped self-management: *Problemi* 205/206 (1981): 1.

<sup>273</sup> The campaign was initiated precisely in *Mladina*, by the youth official Srečo Kirn, thus uncovering the journal's dependence on the ambivalent standpoint of its publisher, until the 1982 changes. See: “Mladi nismo dovolj oboroženi za razredni boj” (The Youth Are Not Sufficiently Armed for the Class Struggle), *Mladina* (12 Nov. 1981): 4-5; “Pogledi na nekatere pojave v množični kulturi” (An Outlook on Certain Phenomena in Mass Culture), *Mladina* 51 (24 Dec. 1981): 12-14.

<sup>274</sup> Yugoslav official context could more easily integrate music, than the attached anarchism. See: Tomc, “Sociologija punka u socijalizmu: Slovenija,” 11.

<sup>275</sup> “Ponovno o brkatem nadrealizmu” (Again on Macho Surrealism), *Rock fronta* (15 Nov. 1981), in *Punk pod Slovenci*, 226-228.

<sup>276</sup> See the discussion within the youth union in: “Prizma” 1, *Mladina*, 21-32.

<sup>277</sup> *Radio*'s editorial board, its communist cell and chief editor Uroš Makhavec sent out protest letters and organized radio-debates, remonstrating the attacks on punk and Vidmar, following the established pattern of the youth press's fight against the mainstream media and the youth union. See: “Okrogla miza o punku na Radiu Študent” (Round-table on Punk at *Radio Študent*); “Odprto pismo dežurnemu uredniku *Nedeljskega dnevnika*” (Open Letter to the Editor of the Day of *Nedeljski dnevnik*), in *Punk pod Slovenci*, 252-59, 285-87.

Eventually, punk subculture was officially embraced at the Slovenian Youth Union's 11th Congress, in what turned out to be the beginning of its wider reform.<sup>278</sup>

Overall, *Radio Študent* co-created punk as a rebellious form of pop-music and mass youth subculture. In the process, it asserted itself into an alternative subcultural media opposed to the musical and political establishment. While their approaches differed, like *Polet* it became an enclave of media freedom fostering a strong bonding among its journalists and listeners.<sup>279</sup> Experiments and innovations focused on punk, but reached beyond as *Radio* offered indispensable professional training: its staff would become crucial protagonists of the future journalistic and music scene.<sup>280</sup>

## 6.5. COMPARATIVE CONCLUSION

### 6.5.1. Belgrade exception: *Džuboks*

Before offering concluding remarks, a noticeable exclusion of the Belgrade youth press from this chapter needs to be explained along with its lesser impact on the local punk-rock scene. The latter differed from those in Zagreb and Ljubljana for it partly preceded its media representation. As early as 1977 the Belgrade *Student Cultural Centre* (SKC) began hosting bi-weekly rock forums. These soon became a meeting place for Belgrade rockers where, among others, *Sex Pistols* record was presented on

<sup>278</sup> In December 1982, shortly following the Nazi-punk affair, referred to by the youth officials as crucial for their changed attitude, *Radio* and ŠKUC together with the youth union jointly organized a solidarity concert against the imposition of martial law in Poland. For the key steps in this “process of differentiation of punk” see: Blaž Vurnik, *Med Marxom in punkom: Vloga Zveze socialistične mladine Slovenije pri demokratizaciji Slovenije (1980-1990)* (Between Marx and Punk: The Role of the League of Socialist Youth of Slovenia in the Democratization of Slovenia (1980-1990)) (Ljubljana: Modrijan, 2005), 247-59.

<sup>279</sup> Both Vidmar and Barbarič testify about their strong identification with the *Radio*, confirming punk's aptness for testing the media freedoms, due to the lack of a supreme authority. Vidmar interview; Barbarič, interview.

<sup>280</sup> During the late 1970s, the likes of Bernard Nežmah and Nada Viodek began to host radio-shows in a new, relaxed manner. In the subsequent decade *Radio* fostered innovative advertising, resembling the one of *Polet*. In turn, support of punk was replaced by that of the avant-garde artistic collective *Neue Slowenische Kunst* and Laibach, which both received the initial support on the Radio: See among others: “Radio, ki se je znal odzvati na družbene krize.”

the day of its British premiere.<sup>281</sup> With the arrival of new program editors, Nebojša Pajkić and his assistant Momčilo Rajin, the *SKC* became a lively concert venue that served as a springboard for anonymous Belgrade bands.<sup>282</sup>

However, despite the accumulated energy, the program was devoid of stronger media support and to a large extent developed outside the new punk-rock trends.<sup>283</sup> The Belgrade New Wave consequently formed with considerable delay, failing to receive a stronger impetus before the very end of the covered period.<sup>284</sup> More importantly, the Belgrade youth press played a marginal role in this process, facing a huge obstacle, absent in both Zagreb and Ljubljana.

In Belgrade alone, a mainstream music magazine *Džuboks* was issued already from 1974.<sup>285</sup> Designed according to the British *Melody Maker*, it covered Western and Yugoslav pop-rock in its wide scope.<sup>286</sup> The magazine quickly noticed the birth of

---

<sup>281</sup> Founded in 1968 and opened in 1971, the *SKC* was renowned for its art gallery that had a seminal influence for the development of Yugoslav conceptual art, instigating, among others, the career of Marina Abramović. Along with similar student institutions, the *SKC* thus far remained unresearched. A sketchy basic overview see in: Slavko Timotijević, ed., *Ovo je Studentski kulturni centar: Prvih 25 godina: 1971-1996* (This is the Student Cultural Centre: The First 25 Years: 1971-1996) (Beograd: Studentski kulturni centar, 1996).

<sup>282</sup> Freshly appointed in 1977, Pajkić invited Rajin to join him, impressed by his *SKC* exhibition of rock record covers. Pajkić himself would later write a scenario for the key New Wave film *The Promising Boy*, while Rajin began to write for the rock journal *Džuboks* and supervised the *SKC*'s concert program. More about the *SKC* rock events in: Momčilo Rajin, "Drugo vreme, drugo mesto" (Another Time, Another Place), *15 dana: Ilustrirani časopis za umjetnost i kulturu* 5-6 (2008): 14-19.

<sup>283</sup> The first concert that Rajin managed was the previously mentioned Ljubljana ŠKUC's visit, featuring *Pankrti*. During the next years, Rajin organized concerts of stylistically diverse new Belgrade bands, such as *Zvuk ulice* or *Limunovo drvo*, which introduced important future actors, but failed to create enough of the momentum. *Spoljni program u doba velikih talasa. Hronografija 1977-1980* (External Program in the Time of Great Waves. Chronology 1977-1980), Internet: [http://www.skc.org.rs/images/stories/pdf/novi\\_talas/SPOLJNI-PROGRAM-U-DOBA-VELIKIH-TALASA-HRONOGRAFIJA-1977-1980.pdf](http://www.skc.org.rs/images/stories/pdf/novi_talas/SPOLJNI-PROGRAM-U-DOBA-VELIKIH-TALASA-HRONOGRAFIJA-1977-1980.pdf)

<sup>284</sup> It was not before 1980 that the three main Belgrade New Wave groups formed. During the subsequent decade, *Šarlo Akrobata*, *Idoli (Idols)* and *Električni orgazam (Electric Orgasm)* would create some of the artistically most successful records of the entire Yugoslav rock, in the tradition of avant-garde and post-punk.

<sup>285</sup> *Džuboks* should not be confused with the journal of the same name published from 1964 till 1966. In the first years, the new *Džuboks* was issued as an 80 page monthly. In 1979 it turned into a biweekly with a slightly diminished volume. Keeping in mind its unique thematic interest, it is remarkable that *Džuboks* hitherto failed to attract the attention of the scholars.

<sup>286</sup> After somewhat hesitant beginnings, *Džuboks*, from 1977 on, covered rock culture in its whole range and effects, from the audience to fashion and affiliated pop-cultural art forms. As far as music itself, *Džuboks* followed a variety of genres, including classic or symphonic rock, heavy metal, reggae or country.

British punk, but treated it equally with other trends, far from becoming its partisan promoter.<sup>287</sup>

With regards to its Zagreb and Ljubljana variants, *Džuboks* trailed after the events and approached them neutrally. Away from the new punk-rock centers, its staff did not become actively engaged.<sup>288</sup> Even the first *SKC*'s gigs received a minor attention in the journal, incomparable to the enthusiasm that *Polet*'s teenagers showed towards their own rock environment.<sup>289</sup>

Rajin, who was at the same time *Džuboks*'s journalist and *SKC* concert manager, avoided the "conflict of interests".<sup>290</sup> And within the magazine itself, a certain generation gap in taste existed. When the Yugoslav New Wave exploded, the magazine was dominated by rock critics formed on older aesthetics. Their favorites were *Led Zeppelin*, *Yes* and *Genesis*, along with their local hard-rock copycats that were despised by *Polet* or Vidmar.<sup>291</sup>

The punk rock came to the fore only when the new Zagreb and Ljubljana bands already penetrated the mainstream scene and their proponents obtained stronger positions within *Džuboks*, both of which occurred in 1980.<sup>292</sup> Almost simultaneously,

---

<sup>287</sup> Following the first 1977 texts, punk and new wave slowly gained prominence in the next two years with the launched series and the London column, both dedicated to the new streams. See in turn: "Punk? Ko, kome, zašto i kako svira" (Punk? Who, to Whom, Why and How Plays), *Džuboks* 41 (Dec. 1977): 35-42; "Šta je novo u novom talasu" (What Is New in the New Wave), *Džuboks* 45 (April 1978): 73-74; "Pismo iz Londona" (Letter from London), *Džuboks* 50 (Sept. 1978): 26-27.

<sup>288</sup> *Džuboks* published its first article about the Zagreb rock scene at the time when *Polet* already launched its rock offensive, whereby the first texts were written by *Polet*'s staff. See: "Nešto novo na zagrebačkoj sceni" (Something New on the Zagreb Scene), *Džuboks* 52 (Nov. 1978): 28-19; "Najdinamičniji rock centar" (The Most Dynamic Rock Centre), *Džuboks* 84 (14 March 1980): 22-24.

<sup>289</sup> See for example: "O aktivnosti Studentskog kulturnog centra u Beogradu" (On the Activities of the Student Cultural Centre in Belgrade), *Džuboks* 42 (Jan. 1978): 10; "Aktivnosti Studentskog kulturnog centra u Beogradu" (Activities of the Student Cultural Centre in Belgrade), *Džuboks* 61 (27 April 1980): 19.

<sup>290</sup> Considering its wide circulation, distribution and reputation of the objective media, *Džuboks* did a lot for the future promotion of the New Wave in the rest of the country.

<sup>291</sup> Looking back, Fras remembers his contempt for the outdated music tastes of *Džuboks*'s critics who favoured hard-rock bands like *Smak* that never reached the level of *Bijelo Dugme*. On the other hand, Rajin insists on *Džuboks*'s objective criteria that was shaped on foreign standards which led the journal to ignore local phenomena. See: Fras, interview; Rajin, interview.

<sup>292</sup> In 1980, *Džuboks* began systematically presenting key Zagreb new bands and regularly reported from their concerts. The Ljubljana events were also covered, indicatively by *Radio Student*'s Igor

close collaboration emerged between *Polet* and *Džuboks*, whose staff visited each other sharing their rock experiences.<sup>293</sup> As much as this unorthodox relationship illustrated *Polet*'s detachment from its traditional role, it indicated the lack of Belgrade youth journals that could pose as its rock partner.

Confronted with serious competition and still drowned in the crisis, the Belgrade youth press failed to assert itself in this regard. Whereas *Student* remained blind to rock throughout the period, *Omladinske novine* introduced a specialized column from early on.<sup>294</sup> Yet, when punk emerged, its treatment of rock was dubious to say the least.<sup>295</sup> Disenchanted by uninspiring ambience, Rajin declined the offer to write for them for fear of being inhibited by ideological constraints.<sup>296</sup>

The sole exception came from the outside. At the beginning of 1980, Belgrade photographer Dragan Papić initiated in the Belgrade youth journals a media art project that drew from Warhol and McLaren alike.<sup>297</sup> Papić published there a series of conceptual photographs of the Belgrade band *Dečaci*, while they still not performed

---

Vidmar. See among others: "Momak u najboljim godinama" (Guy in His Best Years), *Džuboks* 81 (1 Feb. 1980): 8-10; "Vrlo jako običan rokenrol bend" (Very, Very Ordinary Rock and Roll Band), *Džuboks* 85 (28 March 1980): 12-13; "Ljubljana je pospana" (Ljubljana Is Asleep), *Džuboks* 78 (21 Dec. 1980): 45.

<sup>293</sup> *Polet* even advertised itself in *Džuboks*. The mutual relationship climaxed with a shared support of joint concerts of the Zagreb and Belgrade New Wave bands. *Džuboks* 99 (10 Oct. 1980): 47; "Mladosti, o mladosti" (Youth, oh Youth), *Džuboks* 104 (19 Dec. 1980): 20-26; "Zimske olimpijske igre" (Winter Olympics), *Džuboks* 106 (16 Jan. 1981): 26-28.

<sup>294</sup> Launched in 1973, by the Serbian Youth Union, *Omladinske novine* succeeded the extinct *Susret*. Its rock column, established already in 1974, was initially authored by prominent radio DJs Sloba Konjević and Zoran Modli, both of whom wrote for *Džuboks* as well. See: "Znamo li da slušamo" (Do We Know How to Listen), *Omladinske novine* 52 (12 April 1975): 23.

<sup>295</sup> In striking contrast to *Polet*, *Omladinske novine* embraced the moral panic that linked drugs with rock music. Likewise, the journal's first serious discussion on rock culture was penned by a participant of a Marxist conference: "Hoću da budem blesav" (I Want to Be Stupid), *Omladinske novine* 119 (11 Feb. 1978): 1, 11; "Drugi svet droga" (The Other World of Drugs), *Omladinske novine* 134 (7 Oct. 1978): 6.

<sup>296</sup> Momčilo Rajin, interview by author, 20 Sept. 2012, Belgrade, Skype recording. Indicatively, the first serious discussion of punk in the Belgrade youth press came in the form of the interview with Rajin. See: "Umetnost zihernadli" (The Art of Safety Pins), *Omladinske novine* 201 (22 Dec. 1979): 16. "Da li si ga oprao pankom, dragi?" (Did You Wash Him with Punk, Dear?), *Omladinske novine* 266 (2 Nov. 1980): 14.

<sup>297</sup> Ninoslava Vićentić, "Opšte odlike umetnosti i uloga medija: Iznošenje društveno-angažovanog stava beogradskog Novog talasa" (General Features of Art and the Role of the Media, Revealing socially engaged of the Belgrade New Wave), *Kultura* 133 (2011): 328-338.

for a single time.<sup>298</sup> The campaign left deepest traces in *Vidici*, whose new editorial board was akin to pop-culture.<sup>299</sup> In April 1980, the journal produced the first single of *Dečaci*, by then already known as *Idoli*.<sup>300</sup>

This unique example of Belgrade punk-like youth media activism strongly contributed to the consequent fame of *Idoli* that soon affirmed in the new Belgrade rock scene.<sup>301</sup> Isolated, however, the project demonstrated much more the creative atmosphere around *SKC* where their participants met, than the rock leanings of the Belgrade youth press.<sup>302</sup> When the latter eventually embraced rock by the end of 1980, the Belgrade New Wave was already formed with *Džuboks* imposing as its chief promoter.<sup>303</sup>

### 6.5.2. Comparison

Punk-rock sub-cultures that developed in Ljubljana and Zagreb at the end of the 1970s were similar to a great extent. Drowned in the local context and filled with youth energy, both radicalized accepted aesthetical cannons and deeply democratized

<sup>298</sup> Photographs randomly printed in the marginalized *Omladinske novine* and *Student* were set in a different context, leaving their interpretation open to the imagination. See: *Omladinske novine* 208 (10 Feb. 1980): 1, 6; *Omladinske novine* 211 (1 March 1980): 10; *Omladinske novine* 213 (15 March 1980): 9. “Dečaci emancipuju ženu” (Boys Are Emancipating a Woman), *Student* 5 (12 March 1975): 15.

<sup>299</sup> “Dečaci kao Idoli” (Boys like Idols), Internet: <http://blog.dnevnik.hr/vaseljena/2007/03/1622229512/decaci-kao-idoli.html>

<sup>300</sup> The single would become the first recording of the Belgrade New Wave. Hear: *Pomoć, pomoć & Retko te viđam s devojkama* (Help, Help & I Rarely See You with Girls), *Vidici* 4 (1980).

<sup>301</sup> See: Rajin, interview; “Bečka karijera beogradskog rock idola” (Vienna Carrier of the Belgrade Rock Idol), *Nacional* 614 (21 Aug. 2007).

<sup>302</sup> Though inclined to pop-cultural theory, rock was not in the centre of *Vidici*’s interest. Moreover, soon after the historic single was issued, the editorial staff was dissolved. See: “Rečnik tehnologije” (Dictionary of Technology), *Vidici* 1-2 (1981).

<sup>303</sup> *Džuboks* in June 1980 praised the mentioned *Idoli*’s single for being “15 years ahead of its time.” The author of the review, Petar Luković, would soon present all three major Belgrade New Wave groups, until eventually, in March 1981, they jointly appeared on the *Džuboks* cover. Not surprisingly, Luković at the end of 1980 began to write rock columns for *Omladinske novine*. See in turn: “Singlovi” (Singles), *Džuboks* 90 (6 Jun 1980): 55; “Od Idola – do Idola” (From *Idoli* to *Idoli*), *Džuboks* 97 (12 Sept. 1980): 22-23; “Orgazam moje mladosti” (Orgasm of My Youth), *Džuboks* 99 (10 Oct. 1980): 46-47; “Meni je tvoj mozak drag” (I Like Your Brain), *Džuboks* 101 (7 Nov. 1980): 62-63; “Da li si ga oprao pankom, dragi?” (Did You Wash Him with Punk, Dear?), *Omladinske novine* 266 (2 Nov. 1980): 14.

relations on the music scene, turning into a core component of the genuine youth lifestyles.

The main difference was that in Zagreb, punk was one among many impulses that soon fused into wider rock-scene; in Ljubljana it developed into a distinct subculture with firm borders and clear-cut external features regarding both the audience and performers.<sup>304</sup>

Different as they were, both were clear symptoms of the crisis of socialism and the youth's escape from official political discourse, with profound subversive effects upon existing norms. In the somewhat paradoxical situation, where authentic youth political activity was outlawed, while the institutional space for authentic youth initiatives was still guaranteed – the emergence of punk culture, with its huge potential for cultural play, became key medium for the articulation of (socio-political issues), playing a part in articulating the disillusionment of the Yugoslav youth with the communism.<sup>305</sup>

The youth media had a crucial role in this process. Acting as its creative core, *Polet* and *Radio Študent* created subcultures and lifestyles from scarce available resources, problematizing what before was by and large a peaceful rock scenery. Attaching to the new music certain codes, values and ethics they became their first interpreters, determining its meanings. This overlap between the forging of subcultures and the associated reflexive processes made the two interdependent. Just as the two scenes differed, so did the related narratives.

Both media proved homologues to the scenes/subcultures they helped to materialize. While emerging from the bottom up, *Polet's* support of the New wave was (partly) driven by commercial considerations, and remained inclusive for all those

---

<sup>304</sup> As noted earlier, apart from Ljubljana, the only similar instance occurred in Rijeka. See: Đekić, 91. *Decibel: Vodič rock'n'roll Rijekom.*

<sup>305</sup> Anna Szemere, "The Politics of Marginality: A Rock Musical Subculture in Socialist Hungary in the Early 1980s," in Reebee Garofalo, ed., *Rockin' the Boat: Mass Music and Mass Movements*, 93-114.



who principally accepted the energetic rock life values. As such, it provided an overall insight into the urban youth sex & drugs & rock'n'roll lifestyle. Moreover its DIY principle was more a method than content, and included a wide range of effects. The ideology of editors was identical to those of the rock-critics and initiated a wider media revolution that changed the stale mainstream, and thus resambled the New Wave scene itself. If we search for theoretical models, *Polet's* cosmos is congenial to John Irwin's notion of the scene. Its projected identities resembled Lawrence Grossberg's fluid concepts that rely on the new rock-culture but are free from clear stylistic demarcations.<sup>306</sup>

*Radio Študent*, on the other hand, spoke of the homologous punk subculture, in the whole span of defined images, values and style, which openly knocked down the barriers between mass-cultural and political aspects of music. Its narrative was closer to the Birmingham School's notion of the subculture as collective, stylistically uniform, cultural-political response to the current social tensions, though in contrast to the CCCS not necessarily limited to the working class.<sup>307</sup>

Indeed the role that both *Polet* and *Radio Študent* played in the evolution of punk, contradicts the Birmingham school's understanding of punk as a primarily working class phenomenon. Conversely, both youth media borrowed certain aspects of the British punk, "the politics of marginalization" while being informed by the local context, producing shocking effects. But while *Polet's* discourse on sex, drugs and rock'n'roll attempted to bypass the official norms, *Radio Študent's* was more direct, not hiding its open social-political implications, sometimes at odds with the local punks. Drawing form the political agenda from the past and faced with rougher

---

<sup>306</sup> Lawrence Grossberg, "Another Boring Day in Practice: Rock and Roll and the Empowerment of Everyday Life" in Ken Gelder and Sarah Thornton, eds., *The Subcultures Reader* (London: Routledge, 1997), 477-493.

<sup>307</sup> More in: Dave Laing, *One Chord Wonders: Power and Meaning in Punk Rock* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1985); Chambers, *Urban Rhythms*.

context, scene and firmer repressive actions *Radio Študent* thus turned domestic punk into an openly politicized movement.

Not surprisingly, the subsequent destinies of the two scenes varied substantially. Zagreb's New Wave in good measure merged into the mainstream, brimming over its edges into the artistic avant-garde. Openly politicized Ljubljana punk, on the other hand, could be linked to the concept of civil society and the ecological, feminist and antiwar initiatives that would arise in Slovenia in the mid 1980s.<sup>308</sup> The youth press again called the shots. Ljubljana's *Mladina*, by then transformed into a news-magazine, became an organ of the new social movements, launching the final battle for the alternative media.<sup>309</sup>

---

<sup>308</sup> See: Vurnik, *Med Marxom in punkom*.

<sup>309</sup> Božo Repe, "Vloga slovenskega punka pri širjenju svobode v samoupravnem socializmu sedamdesetih let" (The Role of Slovenian Punk in the Spreading of Freedom during the Seventies Self-mangement Socialism), in Lovšin et al., eds., *Punk je bil prej*, 54-65.

## 7. CHAPTER: THE IMAGE OF THE YOUTH PRESS

The previous two research chapters dealt with the two core interests of the new youth press, the student politicization and the punk-rock subculture, stressing their importance for its transformation in the alternative media. Both analyzed the youth press through its messages and authors. What was intentionally left out was its visual and formal side which showed equally striking avant-garde and inventive features.

This last chapter observes then the youth press as a frame within which creative formative experiments, graphic and artistic visions emerged, thus providing another argument for the main hypothesis about the variety of challenges posed by this unique media. The structure is again defined by the material itself. The youth press left profound traces in three specific visual fields, each having a section of its own. In the first one, I exhibit the new developments in press design which distinguished the youth journals from the mainstream media. The remaining two explore their major contributions in two underrated art forms, comics and newspaper photography respectively.

The chapter treats all relevant cases, with no regional distinctions and covering the whole time period from the end of the 1960s to the 1980. The reason for this is the random and sporadic nature of these creative outbursts which equally supplemented and diverged from the main journals' interests. Some features turned into a wide fashion engulfing many publications, while others remained isolated, but left a huge impact nonetheless.

As will be seen, a certain body of work has been created about some of the issues discussed in this chapter, dating even before the breakup of Yugoslavia.<sup>1</sup> The scholarship here suffered the least by reinterpretations in line with the newly constructed national narratives. In contrast, the problem was somewhat different and referred to the questionable academic legitimacy of these research topics. Graphic design, comics, and photojournalism were all traditionally considered less valuable art forms and received but a fragmentary scholarly interest, the contention that just lately began to change.<sup>2</sup> No wonder then that the role of the youth press as a common denominator of many outstanding visual artistic contributions remained ignored and was only incidentally mentioned, without deeper insights.

## 7.1. GRAPHIC DESIGN

At the time when the youth press began to revitalize by the end of the 1960s, the press design in communist Yugoslavia was still in its formative stages, not yet fully recognized as a profession.<sup>3</sup> Yet, the surrounding milieu was quite favorable for the development of new design practices. The early emergence, recognition and influence of Yugoslav modernistic artistic groups such as *EXAT 51* played an important role in this regard.<sup>4</sup> *EXAT*'s specific understanding of art insisted on its inherent social

---

<sup>1</sup> Considering the many fields covered by the chapter, the relevant literature is listed in each section individually.

<sup>2</sup> With the partial exception of comics where literature mushroomed from the early 1980s on, the rich heritage only now begins to be slowly revealed and revaluated, as can be inferred from the cited publication dates.

<sup>3</sup> There exists no clear narrative about the Yugoslav graphic design, let alone the one in the press. Those few existing works on certain authors, observed them solely through the features of their artistic expression. Only recently research moved outside these narrow frames touching upon wider surrounding social, ideological and cultural context. Not surprisingly, press design remained on the margins of such deficient literature. See for example: Feđa Vukić, ed., *Od oblikovanja do dizajna* (From Forming to Design) (Zagreb: Meandar, 2003); Jasna Galjer, *Dizajn pedesetih u Hrvatskoj – Od utopije do stvarnosti* (Design in Croatia during the 1950s – From Utopia to Reality) (Zagreb: Horetzky, 2004); Branka Čurčić, ed., *Ideology of Design/Ideologija dizajna* (New York-Novi Sad: Autonomedia-Centar za nove medije, 2009).

<sup>4</sup> See excellent recent insight in: Dejan Kršić, “Grafički dizajn i vizualne komunikacije” in Ljiljana Kolečnik, ed., *Socijalizam i modernost. Umjetnost, kultura, politika: 1950.-1974.* (Socialism and

relevance.<sup>5</sup> In that way, it worked to erase the differences between high and applied arts and, by extension, legitimized (graphic) design.<sup>6</sup> The potential, however, was not fully realized, leaving traces only in certain fields, such as thriving poster design, where artists could rely on the rich inter-war tradition and consequently quickly revitalized their activities.<sup>7</sup>

For the press design in particular more influential proved the growing importance of market elements within the planned economy, always beneficial for the growth of demand for design. Indeed, it was the market turn in the press enterprises that was crucial for the affirmation of the discipline within the media. With the differentiation of the Yugoslav mediascape during the 1960s, the new special interest magazines, fighting for market share, were forced to pay greater attention to their visual outlook, from layout and typefaces to the whole text-image ratio.<sup>8</sup> Within the existent professional vacuum, the job was first given to graphic technicians. Depending on the proliferation of new requirements, they were gradually replaced by more skillful architects and illustrators. Slowly, the Western concept of art-director came into being, even if it was not named as such.

---

Modernity: Art, Culture, Politics: 1950-1974) (Zagreb: Muzej suvremene umjetnosti, Institut za povijest umjetnosti, 2012), 216-235.

<sup>5</sup> More on *Exat '51* in Jerko Denegri, *Umjetnost konstruktivnog pristupa. EXAT '51 i Nove tendencije* (The Art of Constructivist Approach. *Exat '51 and New Tendencies*), (Zagreb: Horetzky, 2004).

<sup>6</sup> The group even developed a distinct discourse on design. See: Dejan Kršić, *Ideologija dizajna i ideologije oko dizajna* (na primjeru grafičkog dizajna u Hrvatskoj 1950-2005), 6-7. Available on the Internet: <http://www.kuda.org/dejan-krsic-ideologija-dizajna-i-ideologije-oko-dizajna-work-progress>.

<sup>7</sup> This also refers to the artists discussed in this section, from Slobodan Mašić, Mihajlo Arsovski to Kostja Gatnik who all left traces in the affiliated activities and established their reputation as poster artists. See recent monographs on Gatnik and Arsovski cited below.

<sup>8</sup> Renowned painter Milan Vulpe designed the first Zagreb female magazine *Svijet*. See: Kršić, *Ideologija dizajna i ideologije oko dizajna*, 10.

### 7.1.1. The visual response to the 1960s student politics

Here, just as in so many other fields, the youth press for a long while lagged behind the general media trends.<sup>9</sup> Yet, coinciding with the birth of the politically relevant youth journals, their rigid graphics began to flourish. A range of intertwined, yet diverse solutions pointed to the rise of new awareness about the importance of the visual side of the journals. New aspirations strived to present the content in a different way, preferably in harmony with the message. In this early phase, the process was fully random. One could hardly speak of some common aesthetics as the inclination for experiments merged with import of contemporary Western graphic styles.<sup>10</sup>

As a whole, journals received less uniform and livelier layout that opposed the traditional octagonal orientation of the text. The articles were placed on the margins of the page and broken with numerous subtitles and inserted images. The width and length of the columns start to vary, using atypical, enlarged, deformed lettering and reverse numbering.<sup>11</sup>

Such experiments echoed the global break with universal typography.<sup>12</sup> At the same time, they were determined by the outdated reprographic technologies at hand. The basic two-colored hot type printing of the majority of the journals left few other options to make a splash.<sup>13</sup> Consequently, many tried to make the difference with the

---

<sup>9</sup> Apart from the lack of incentives, the very conditions were missing. With scarce financial resources, the youth journals could hardly make a difference in the graphic realm.

<sup>10</sup> Partly, this was a contemporary reflection of the pop-art's openness towards different influences, with no prevailing dominant style. More in: Aynsley, *A Century of Graphic Design. Graphic Design Pioneers of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century* (London: Octopus Publishing Group, 2001), 148-49.

<sup>11</sup> The change undermined hitherto privileged status of the text and can be traced across the whole spectrum of the youth press, from central organ to cultural and intellectual journals.

<sup>12</sup> Steven Heller, *Design Literacy. Understanding Graphic Design* (New York: Allworth Press, 2004), 168-69.

<sup>13</sup> Virtually all central organs, with the exception of *Tribuna* from the autumn 1970, were published on low quality paper in rigid hot-type.

minimal means. In such a deprived context, even the unorthodox format of the journal conveyed the editorial wish to engage with new policies.<sup>14</sup>

Sporadically, political messages were presented in a direct manner. Graphic means, or rather the lack of them, were employed in the struggle against censorship. Both *Student* and *Omladinski tjednik* used a blank cover to respond to the first attacks on their writings.<sup>15</sup> Elsewhere, the methods were more complex and demanded careful interpretation. Old techniques of montage were creatively updated with new patterns, borrowed from the US underground press, whose specific graphics began to be emulated. The collage in particular suited the new trends as it could be used to produce critical statements that subverted original intentions.<sup>16</sup>

A nice example was already mentioned in the fifth chapter, namely, *Omladinski tjednik*'s creative appropriation of Christopher Logue's poster poem *Know the Enemy*, adopted from the London's magazine *Black Dwarf*.<sup>17</sup> Somewhat later the same journal criticized Nixon's visit to Yugoslavia in an equally abrasive underground fashion. In the last outburst of its New Left phase, one of the staff cut out a poster announcing a US travelling circus and juxtaposed it with violent scenes of the Vietnam War.<sup>18</sup> The resulting composite image, entitled *American Circus: The Greatest Show in the World*, presented an impressive political comment that provoked the reprimand of the local Party authorities.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> For example, the exceptionally large format of *Omladinski tjednik* was supposed to suggest the journal's great political ambitions. See: Vujić, interview; "O veličini tjednika" (On the Size of the Weekly), *Omladinski tjednik* 143 (17 March 1971): 12.

<sup>15</sup> While the latter added a tiny related note, the former attached nothing more than a black dot. At the end of 1969, cover illustrations of convicts facing the gallows anticipated an upcoming editorial removal in *Student*. See: *Omladinski tisak* 83/84 (25 March 1970), 1; *Student* 29/30 (24 Dec. 1968), 1; *Student* 25 (9 Dec. 1969), 1.

<sup>16</sup> Aynsley, *A Century of Graphic Design*, 162-63; 198.

<sup>17</sup> *Omladinski tjednik* 27 (9 Oct. 1968): 1; See: Appendices, Fig. 1.

<sup>18</sup> See: Internet: <http://babl.blog.hr/2008/03/1624547065/slavne-stranice-omladinske-stampe.2.html>.

<sup>19</sup> *Omladinski tjednik* 99 (23. Sept. 1970): 3; See: Appendices, Fig. 2

These efforts notwithstanding, the press design was not always in balance with the content. Not all politically relevant youth journals were visually inspiring, nor was their outlook necessarily at its best when they were the most radical. Two reasons stood behind the disparity. With due exceptions, a new visual approach did not directly reflect the burgeoning political radicalization.<sup>20</sup> In contrast, it could be regarded much more as a successful part of its cultural reflection.

The best illustration of this is *Pop-Express*, the youth journal with the most striking graphics of the period, but one that dealt with pop-rock music, rather than politics. On the other hand, the creative breakthrough typically occurred only if the two prerequisites were first secured: when a talented designer was matched with adequate printing facilities.<sup>21</sup> Such a complex set of demands caused the achievements to be sporadic, mutually inconsistent and to appear in various places.

### **7.1.2. The rendition of foreign trends: from pop-art to psychedelic flower power**

Many of those who had the opportunity to work in better technical conditions left deeper traces that opened up horizons beyond the youth press. Four graphic designers, or rather art-directors, should be mentioned, all responsible for the novel outlook of their publications, without which just about any review of the Yugoslav graphic design would be incomplete. Benefiting from the relaxed working ambience, they tested out their fresh, innovative ideas while introducing contemporary Western aesthetic trends, from pop-art to flower power design. In the consequent renditions

---

<sup>20</sup> This relation was not obvious even in the Western politically radical journals which frequently paid less attention to colorful design. Rufus Seger's layout of *Anarchy journal* for instance leaned much more on typographic experiments and montages. More in: Daniel Poyner, ed., *Autonomy: The Cover Designs of Anarchy, 1961–1970* (London: Hyphen Press, 2012).

<sup>21</sup> The fact also explains a common unity between the individual publication and the designer who typically related to a single journal.



these consecutive styles were then reworked and jumbled together, resulting in unique original artistic combinations.

*Vidici*'s graphic editor Florian Hajdu radically experimented with the journal's format, doing the equivalent of what the likes of Jonathan Goodshield of the London underground journal *Oz* had done.<sup>22</sup> From the late 1970 to early 1971, seven consecutive issues of *Vidici* were designed in a completely different format and layout, as if each was a completely new publication.<sup>23</sup> The issue dedicated to Soviet dissidents was wrapped in a large Bolshevik revolutionary poster. The one criticizing the Croatian Spring was inserted into a postal envelope with a Yugoslav flag on its back.<sup>24</sup>

While *Vidici*'s experiments coincided with the journal's political climax, elsewhere, this was not the case. *Tribuna* visually excelled in the year that preceded its political outburst. The fact was due equally to the new rainbow printing technique and the fresh person in charge, Kostja Gatnik, an art student from Ljubljana with particular love for pop-art.<sup>25</sup> Appointed in the autumn of 1970 as the journal's graphic editor, Gatnik's design translated the spirit of the US underground counter-culture more trustworthy than *Tribuna*'s political prose.<sup>26</sup>

In order to produce bright colors, Gatnik removed black from the negative, creating vibrant images and illustrations that contrasted the prevalent grayness of the

---

<sup>22</sup> Hajdu had already played with typography and patchworks while editing *Student* in 1968. Together with Ilić he moved to *Vidici* in the discussed editorial shift at the end of 1969. In his formative experiments he was assisted by Lazar Stojanović. See: Florian Hajdu, interview by author, 15 Nov. 2010, Düsseldorf. *Skype* recording; Stojanović, interview.

<sup>23</sup> See for example: *Vidici* 145 (Nov. 1970); *Vidici* 144 (Oct. 1970); *Vidici* 148/149 (Feb./March 1971).

<sup>24</sup> *Vidici* 142/143 (June/Sept. 1970); *Vidici* 146 (Dec. 1970); See: Appendices, Fig. 3.

<sup>25</sup> More on Gatnik's work in recent monograph: Kostja Gatnik et al., *Kaj sem videl 1968-2008* (What I Have Seen 1968-2008) (Ljubljana: Narodna Galerija 2008).

<sup>26</sup> Gatnik, who was offered the position in the café, meeting place of *Tribuna*'s staff, was enchanted by the colourful London underground journal *Oz*. Kostja Gatnik, interview by author, 19 Nov. 2010, Ljubljana. *E-mail*.

rest of the media.<sup>27</sup> His self-edited sections *Zoom* or *Freaking out*, loaded with references to rock culture, heavily drew from American and British underground graphics and its colorful psychedelic imagery.<sup>28</sup> Comparison is not accidental. Just as the San Francisco masters of the genre, from Victor Moscoso to Rick Griffin, Gatnik too designed rock-posters and record covers.<sup>29</sup> Following these psychedelic pioneers, his illusionistic visual language contrasted the uniform modernism, underlined by the same implication. Only those “inside”, maybe even under the influence, could grasp the presented visual code.<sup>30</sup>

Along similar lines, both Belgrade’s *Susret* and Zagreb’s *Polet* were visually superior to politically more relevant *Student* or *Studentski list*. *Susret*’s editor, Slobodan Mašić, adeptly utilized the cooper plate printing to create the journal’s recognizable outlook with which the editors widely praised.<sup>31</sup> Prone to experiments, he continuously re-designed the journal’s logo.<sup>32</sup> Mašić’s distinguishing feature, however, was positioning texts on retouched photographs, devoid of any details. Often done in the unity with content, the practice dictated careful decoding.<sup>33</sup> Though not alien to political citations, *Susret*’s references heavily leaned on pop-culture with its rich, imported iconography, from music to film and fashion.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Gatnik often treated cover and back-cover as one whole. See: *Tribuna* 1 (15 Oct. 1970) 1, 8; *Tribuna* 6 (19 Nov. 1970) 1, 8. See: Appendices, Fig. 4a-b.

<sup>28</sup> See among others: *Tribuna* 2 (22 Oct. 1970): 4-5, 8; *Tribuna* 15 (1971): 8; *Tribuna* 17 (1971): 8. See: Appendices, Fig. 5.

<sup>29</sup> Moscoso’s posters were recognizable by their illegible typefaces, vibrant colours and ready-made images, all put in balance. Heller, *Design Literacy. Understanding Graphic Design*, 251-52.

<sup>30</sup> More on psychedelic graphics in: Catherine McDermott, *Design. The Key Concepts* (London: Routledge, 2007), 188.

<sup>31</sup> While Mašić’s exceptional design is yet to be revalorized, back in the days *Susret*’s editorial announced the journal’s 1968/69 series specifically mentioning its revolutionary design: *Susret* 86 (2 Oct. 1968): 2.

<sup>32</sup> See: *Susret* 93 (10 Jan. 1969): 1; *Susret* 94 (19 Feb. 1969): 2; *Susret* 95 (5 March 1969): 1.

<sup>33</sup> The reprint of Robespierre’s monologue from Büchner’s play *Danton’s Death* was placed on the retouched portrait of Stevo Žigon, an actor who recited it before the enthused students in June 1968. See: “Društvo mora da služi duhovom životu čoveka” (Society Must Serve the Spiritual Life of Humans), *Susret* 99 (1 May 1969): 16.

<sup>34</sup> *Susret* was filled with blown-up pop-artsy images of stylish youths. See: *Susret* 93 (10 Jan. 1969): 6; *Susret* 94 (19 Feb. 1969): 14; 24.

The same is true of the two Zagreb journals, *Polet* and *Pop-Express*, placed under the authority of Mihajlo Arsovski, arguably the best designer of the period, who, along with his close collaborator Zoran Pavlović, set the major visual tone of the Zagreb youth press.<sup>35</sup> Inspired by the Polish designer Roman Ciešlewicz, an art-director of the French fashion magazine *Elle* available in Zagreb, Arsovski erased the borders between academic and popular design.<sup>36</sup> Like Ciešlewicz he combined expressionist and constructivist experiments with the contemporary pop-cultural phenomena that appealed to the youth.<sup>37</sup>

Arsovski utilized figurative typography to the level of art, treating the letter almost as a decorative element.<sup>38</sup> In this manner, resembling another classic designer Herb Lubalin, he de-constructed the conventional regulations of communication.<sup>39</sup> Working before the emergence of *letraset*, Arsovski, used to this purpose old discarded wooden printing letters, or personally copied fonts from foreign catalogues and invented a range of typefaces that he pasted on the printing plates.<sup>40</sup> With unusual lettering of various forms and shapes, Arsovski broke headings, lines and columns, creating composite images that required an effort if one was to understand them.<sup>41</sup>

This type of pulsating typographic play became the visual trademark of most of the Zagreb youth press. In *Pop-Express*, Arsovski combined it with intensive, luminous colors and collages, made up from foreign music magazines.<sup>42</sup> The first nine

---

<sup>35</sup> At the time, Arsovski was already a relatively affirmed designer who began his probation in the youth press, namely in *Studentski list* in 1964. Ignored for a long while, Arsovski's work lately began to draw considerable scholarly attention. See: Jasna Galjer, *Arsovski* (Zagreb: Horetzky, 2010).

<sup>36</sup> Arsovski was also attracted to the chic German magazine *Twen*. See: Mihajlo Arsovski, interview by author, 16 Nov. 2010, Zagreb. *Skype* recording.

<sup>37</sup> Aynsley, *A Century of Graphic Design*, 166-67; See also *Polet's* pop-art covers: *Polet* 22 (October 1968); *Polet* 23 (November 1968); See: Appendices, Fig. 6.

<sup>38</sup> Zvonko Maković, "Arsovo slovo", *Novine Galerije SC* 37 (June 1972).

<sup>39</sup> Heller, *Design Literacy. Understanding Graphic Design*, 251-52.

<sup>40</sup> Arsovski, interview.

<sup>41</sup> See for example: *Polet* 22 (October 1968): 44; *Polet* 23 (November 1968): 1, 48.

<sup>42</sup> Among the many examples, see covers and posters: *Pop-Express* 1 (10 Feb. 1969): 1; *Pop-Express* 4 (24 March 1969): 1; *Pop-Express* 5 (7 April 1969): 1; *Pop-Express* 7 (5 May 1969): 12-13; *Pop-Express* 9 (2 June 1969) 12-13; See: Appendices, Fig. 7, Fig. 8.

color issues, printed on even offset, introduced hippy flower-power graphics to the Yugoslav media with much less concession than the journal's content.<sup>43</sup>

Perhaps the best illustration of the emergent prosperous design milieu is the formation of first graphic studios around the youth press. In 1968 Slobodan Mašić formed *Studio Structure* which became the first Yugoslav private design studio.<sup>44</sup> Around the same time, under the auspices of the cultural branch of the Zagreb youth union, Arsovski and Pavlović established *P&D* (Pop Design) studio named after its most famous artifact, *Pop-Express*.<sup>45</sup>

### 7.1.3. The revival: Goran Trbuljak

Among the core aims of the *P&D* was to serve as a graphic studio for the entire Zagreb youth press.<sup>46</sup> The upcoming political crisis in the early 1970s temporarily halted the project. But the idea recurred by the middle of the decade. Within the wider endeavor to revive their publishing, the Croatian and Serbian youth unions established their own design studios with the chief task to process all graphic needs of these respective organizations, including their press.<sup>47</sup>

The newly formed Zagreb's *Studio for Graphic Design* (*SGD*) or Belgrade *ICS* raised the visual standards of the youth press during the 1970s. Specialized cultural and intellectual youth journals like *Pitanja* and *Vidici* greatly profited, as they both transformed from a dull theoretical periodicals into stylish cultural publications which

---

<sup>43</sup> The founder Veljko Despot recalls in retrospect the impact the journal had beyond the Yugoslav borders: "I remember all that well the reactions that *Pop-Express* produced as I showed it in London to musical journalists, record producers and rock stars of the time." Despot, interview.

<sup>44</sup> Shortly before, Mašić founded the first semi-independent Yugoslav publishing house where he designed a short-lived avant-garde journal. See: *Rok: časopis za književnost i estetičko ispitivanje stvarnosti* 1 (1968).

<sup>45</sup> "Od 'Poleta' do 'Poleta'" (From 'Polet' to 'Polet'), *Polet* 67/68/69 (22 May 1978): 36.

<sup>46</sup> Zoran Pavlović, interview by author, 28 Oct. 2010, Samobor. *Digital recording*.

<sup>47</sup> "Studio grafičkog dizajna" (Studio for Graphic Design), *Polet* 70 (28 Aug. 1978): 22.

helped them to re-gain some reputation.<sup>48</sup> Yet, as paradoxical as it might sound, the key step forward came from outside of the existing structures. Like most of the achievements of the period, it occurred within the Zagreb's youth weekly *Polet* whose graphic editor did not work in the *SGD*.

Goran Trbuljak was a young, conceptual artist acknowledged for questioning the essence and status of art. In a range of projects he tried to demystify art practices in ironic and humorous manner, often by turning ordinary people into artists.<sup>49</sup> Trbuljak's parallel career of an art-director commenced in the early 1970s and remained intrinsically linked to the youth press.<sup>50</sup> His first professional job was to format monthly catalogue of the *Student Centre Gallery* where he himself exhibited.<sup>51</sup> Issued in the form of a newspaper and printed in hot type, *Novine Galerije SC* left little space for creative expression, yet taught Trbuljak the basic graphic techniques.<sup>52</sup> There he also acquainted with a group of film enthusiasts who in 1975 launched a specialized cultural youth journal *Film*, focused on marginal cinematic phenomena.<sup>53</sup>

Appointed as the *Film's* graphic editor Trbuljak, now working in slightly better conditions, showed an inclination for improvisation. The journal's long essays and

<sup>48</sup> After being re-launched in 1975, *Pitanja* slowly revitalized and entered its golden period, paying great attention to its visual appearance and new art trends. Some time later the same occurred in *Vidici*, under the graphic editorship of Nikola Kostadinović. See among others: *Pitanja* 1 (Jan. 1977); *Vidici* 5/6 (1978).

<sup>49</sup> Starting from 1969, these included displaying an empty gallery, exchanging his own name with another artist or inviting random passers-by to enter a gallery only to attribute one of them as the author of his work. He also organized a referendum where citizens, uninformed about his work, were asked to decide if he was a true artist or not. See: Branka Stipančić, *G. Trbuljak* (Zagreb: Muzej suvremene umjetnosti, 1996).

<sup>50</sup> While Trbuljak's art has attracted some academic interest, his press work still waits to be properly assessed.

<sup>51</sup> "Ne želim prikazati ništa novo i originalno" (I Don't Want to Show Anything New or Original), Gallery of Student Center, 1971, *Novine Galerije SC* 30 (1971). More on the formative years of Gallery in: Želimir Košćević, ed., *Galerija Studentskog centra Zagreb: 1961-1973* (Student Centre Gallery 1961-1973) (Zagreb: Studentski centar Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 1975).

<sup>52</sup> Launched in 1968 on, *Novine Galerije SC* were formatted by a range of young contemporary artists. See: *Novine Galerije SC* 1 (1968); Maroje Mrdušić and Dea Vidović, eds., *Dizajn i nezavisna kultura* (Design and Independent Culture) (Zagreb: Prirerna grupa, 2010), 45.

<sup>53</sup> At first published under the auspices of Zagreb University, *Film* was eventually adopted by the cultural section of the Zagreb youth union. Throughout its existence, from 1975 till 1978 the journal followed less known and non-mainstream aspects of cinema, from experimental film to dissident film makers. Turković, interview.

interviews, unusually printed on the typewriter, were set apart by big black and white photographs, stripped of half-tones.<sup>54</sup> Trbuljak personally cut them out from foreign film books or, alternatively, shot movie stills directly from the screen of the local artsy cinema.<sup>55</sup> This unique blend of non-edited interviews and large images, pointed out to the model upon which Trbuljak would rely in the future: Andy Warhol's magazine *Interview* that fascinated him as he came across it during one of his artistic residencies.<sup>56</sup>

Incidentally, *Film*'s chief editor Nenad Polimac was also *Polet*'s film critic and introduced Trbuljak to the assistant editor Kuljiš who, impressed by his fresh vision, entrusted Trbuljak with the design of the *Polet*'s ground-breaking offset series in autumn 1978.<sup>57</sup> Trbuljak instantly became a vital cog in the new editorial concept that tackled the form as much as the content.

#### 7.1.4. *Polet*

Trbuljak's appointment was highly subversive. In the existing system where youth union had its own graphic studio that processed its needs, it was highly irregular that an external person would design its central organ.<sup>58</sup> Trbuljak thus drafted the initial new layout semi-legally in the café across *Polet*'s premises, where the staff enjoyed their daily coffee breaks.<sup>59</sup>

Eventually Kuljiš, the mastermind of the project, secured the institutional backing and defended the unorthodox concept before editor Pavić and his superiors. Enjoying

---

<sup>54</sup> See among others: *Film 2/3* (Autumn/Winter 1975): 1-120.

<sup>55</sup> Goran Trbuljak, interview by author, 23 Nov. 2010, Zagreb. *Skype* recording.

<sup>56</sup> Andy Warhol began to publish his *Interview* as a monthly tabloid in 1969. More on the journal and its transformations in: David Bourdon, *Warhol* (New York: Abradale Press, 1989), 301-02.

<sup>57</sup> Kuljiš, interview.

<sup>58</sup> Trbuljak, interview.

<sup>59</sup> Kuljiš, interview.

his absolute trust, Trbuljak readily exploited the given freedom to disrupt a few major conventions.

His leading concept was relatively straightforward and was modeled on foreign magazines, such as *The New Musical Express*, that portrayed the new rock lifestyle and its heroes. The recipe implied that to the average *Polet*'s reader the image was just as important as the text.<sup>60</sup> Hence, Trbuljak reversed the standard ratio between the two. In a complete break from the tradition, it was the latter that came to dominate the journal.

Such drastic change would not be feasible without the necessary technical conditions, assured by the shift to the offset litho printing that enabled good reproductions of black and white images.<sup>61</sup> While beneficial for the quality, it also meant that, unlike his previous haphazard duties, Trbuljak now faced a complex machinery that was largely unknown to him and required full precision.<sup>62</sup>

Errors and improvisations were almost inevitable. For instance, to open up more space for images, Trbuljak unified the lettering, leaving all the text in the smallest, scarcely legible typeface *nonpareil*.<sup>63</sup> Against all rules, he moved the journal's logo across the cover, with obvious sexual allusions.<sup>64</sup> At the end, however, such small transgressions, much to the dislike of the official *SGD* designers, contributed to the authenticity of *Polet*'s layout which became one of its most recognizable assets.

In contrast to the previous period, the design was now finally in full balance with the content. It turned into an indispensable and complementary part of the message, its equal if not more essential constituent. In short, the journal portrayed precisely what it

---

<sup>60</sup> Trbuljak, interview

<sup>61</sup> See: *Polet* 72 (3 Oct. 1978).

<sup>62</sup> Trbuljak, interview.

<sup>63</sup> *Polet* 72 (3 Oct. 1978), 1-12.

<sup>64</sup> Whereas the logo is traditionally fixed because of the journal's identity, Trbuljak placed it randomly on the images, covering male and female sexual organs. See: *Polet* 120 (6 Feb. 1980): 1; *Polet* 121 (12 Feb. 1980): 1. See: Appendices, Fig. 9.

wrote about. Visually as well as textually, *Polet* took the burgeoning Zagreb youth subculture seriously, giving it an adequate reflection.

The chief medium in that regard became photography, discussed in more detail in the final section of the chapter. Here it suffices to note that a group of talented photographers gathered around *Polet*, benefiting from the new guiding principle that purported for each article to be illustrated with an original photograph.<sup>65</sup> Among those who recognized the stirring ambience was Trbuljak's friend Tomislav Gotovac, a pioneer of Yugoslav experimental film and performance art.<sup>66</sup> As such, made to the measure of *Polet*'s interest in marginal individuals, he became a permanent resident of Trbuljak's office, located in the bathroom of *Polet*'s premises. In turn, the journal promoted Gotovac as a life-model, staunchly recording his eccentric actions.<sup>67</sup>

The liaison was not incidental. One can easily see parallels between Trbuljak's work in *Polet* and his conceptual projects based on the demystification of art.<sup>68</sup> Like the *Interview*'s art director Richard Bernstein whose lipstick-drawn logo he paraphrased, Trbuljak acted as a catalyst for numerous creative processes.<sup>69</sup> In collaboration with photographers he devised certain covers which fully corresponded with his art projects.<sup>70</sup> Likewise, many of the journal's guerrilla actions leaned on his ideas that merged art with advertisement.<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> Trbuljak, interview.

<sup>66</sup> More on Gotovac in: Aleksandar Battista Ilić et al., ed, *Tomislav Gotovac* (Zagreb: Hrvatski filmski savez, 2003)

<sup>67</sup> "Filmovi iz Tomove tintare" (Films out of Tom's Dome), *Polet* 72 (3 Oct. 1978): 23; "Pimpekart" (Dickart), *Polet* 103 (23 May 1979): 20; *Polet* 120 (6 Feb. 1980): 3.

<sup>68</sup> Trbuljak himself attests that some of *Polet*'s projects thrilled him like any other of his art works. Trbuljak, interview.

<sup>69</sup> More on Richard Bernstein's role in *Interview* in: Bourdon, *Warhol*, 326; Heller, *Design Literacy. Understanding Graphic Design*, 127-28.

<sup>70</sup> These for example included the controversial *Discobol* and *The Eyes of Yugoslavia* covers discussed in the fifth chapter: *Polet* 146 (24 Dec. 1980): 1; *Polet* 128 (2 April 1980): 1.

<sup>71</sup> See the covers featuring a girl holding a blank *Polet* sheet or one of the staff with the journal's logo printed on his forehead. *Polet* 97 (11 April 1979): 1; *Polet* 100 (2 May 1979): 1; Appendices, Fig. 10.



The chosen visual language was expressive of the Zagreb's punk-rock scene and its youth lifestyles. Conversely, it also matched the journal's fluid treatment of the New Wave. On one side, it borrowed DIY punk elements such as photo-collages or pirated images that produced parodic destabilizations.<sup>72</sup> Yet, it also differed from the orthodox British idiom embodied by the fanzine poetics.<sup>73</sup> Unlike Ljubljana's *Problemi* which presented the original punk production from below, *Polet* conveyed its stylized version, harmonized with the finer New Wave sentiments and partly manufactured from above. The final effect was again counter to Hebdige's claim about the dangers of such sub-cultural colonization which supposedly neutralizes its radical edge.

In the Yugoslav communist context where there was shortage of commodities, even this controlled, re-packed punk aesthetics easily deconstructed the conventional meanings, subverting the original attentions through acts of detourment.<sup>74</sup> Consequently, it too was subjected to the formal criticism of the youth officials.<sup>75</sup> Yet, what seemed offensive to the superiors, appealed to the youth readers who were able to understand the insider's references. By merging contemporary youth expression with the avant-garde sensibility, *Polet* posed as a trendsetter who indicated the ongoing generational change and determined what deserves the media attention. In this way, it anticipated style magazines of the 1980s, such as the British *Face* or *ID*, with their emphasis on style and experiments in design.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> See respectively photo-collage of Zagreb's youth and cover that juxtaposed two images of the same girl, one taken in her childhood in a pioneer uniform and the other showing her as a trendy teenage girl: "Curice izišle na ulice" (Girls Out on the Streets), *Polet* 95 (28 March 1979): 12-13; *Polet* 111/112 (28 Nov. 1979): 1.

<sup>73</sup> Jamie Reid is generally accredited for creating the DIY punk style, characterized by random approach to layout, and deliberate stealing of ideas and images. Aynsley, *A Century of Graphic Design*, 198-99.

<sup>74</sup> This refers to the usage of existing aesthetic elements to carry messages that their creators did not intend. See : Atton, *Alternative Media*, 43.

<sup>75</sup> Trbuljak confirms that his graphic design arose informal Party criticism. Trbuljak, interview.

<sup>76</sup> Aynsley, *A Century of Graphic Design*, 206-208.

*Polet's* new approach to graphics remained a vital part of its journalistic legacy. With considerable delay and differing success, youth journals across the country emulated its layout and focus on photography. In the 1980s almost each central organ, from *Studentski list* to *Omladinske novine*, in some way visually resembled *Polet*. Mainstream media was affected as well, adopting many of the features, while offering work to their architects.

## 7.2. COMICS

In order to correctly assess the complex comic role of the youth press, the exceptionally rich Yugoslav comic tradition needs to be shortly addressed.<sup>77</sup> Namely, as early as the mid 1930s comics took roots in both Belgrade and Zagreb. There a group of Russian revolutionary émigrés and the renowned painter Andrija Maurović respectively, set the roots of the new pop-cultural form, creating works of exceptional quality.<sup>78</sup>

The arrival of communist rule abruptly stopped this process.<sup>79</sup> Just as in the rest of the Eastern Europe, comics were denounced for their Western origins and labeled as

---

<sup>77</sup> Considerable literature on Yugoslav comics emerged since the 1980s, reflecting the wider process of revalorization discussed at the end of the section. Apart from historical overviews, potential students could lean on reprints of early authors and various exhibition catalogues. From the substantial list see: Slavko Draginčić and Zdravko Zupan, *Istorija jugoslovenskog stripa 1* (History of Yugoslav Comics 1) (Novi Sad: Forum Marketprint, 1986); Veljko Krulčić, ed., *Hrvatski poslijeratni strip* (Postwar Croatian Comics) (Pula: Istarska naklada, 1984); Iztok Sitar, *Zgodovina slovenskega stripa 1927-2007* (History of Slovenian Comics) (Ljubljana: UMco, 2007); Veljko Krulčić, *Tri generacije, katalog Salon jugoslovenskog stripa*, Vinkovci, 1984.

<sup>78</sup> Ever since Maurović published his first comic in 1935, both Zagreb and Belgrade comic circles, irrespectively of each other, established the new art of “newspaper movies,” later referred to as the first generation of Yugoslav comics. About the interwar pioneers see: Veljko Krulčić, *Zagrebački strip: 1935-1941* (Zagreb Comics: 1935-1941) (Zagreb: Galerija Nova, 1985); Draginčić and Zupan, *Istorija jugoslovenskog stripa 1*, 21-125.

<sup>79</sup> The genre failed to survive despite Maurović himself joining partisans and working for the communist government. On Maurović see: Veljko Krulčić, ed., *Mauroviću s ljubavlju. Spomenar* (To Maurović with Love: Scrapbook) (Zagreb: Vedis, 2009).

capitalist opium for the youth.<sup>80</sup> Coincidentally, not for long. Within the wider cultural liberalization that ensued after the break-up with Soviets, comics were rehabilitated and slowly re-emerged in the Yugoslav press.<sup>81</sup> In the early 1960s, world standards were again attained thanks to a group of talented illustrators assembled around the Zagreb mainstream youth weekly *Plavi vjesnik*.<sup>82</sup> This new generation of comic authors, like their inter-war predecessors, faithfully followed traditional rules of the genre, leaving behind an array of adventurous and humorous comics drawn in realistic and caricature mode.<sup>83</sup>

Ironically, the growing Western cultural influence had a disastrous effect on the further evolution of Yugoslav comics. With open borders and strong market incentives, it simply became more profitable for press enterprises to print foreign than support domestic authors. Consequently, with a few exceptions, Yugoslav comics vanished as cheap imported comics, frequently of low quality, flooded Yugoslav newspapers and emergent specialized comic magazines.<sup>84</sup>

The youth press became a site of resistance against such a state, traceable on two different levels. Whereas the rest of the press increasingly closed their doors to local comic authors, the youth press transpired into a relevant ghetto of domestic comic

---

<sup>80</sup> More on comics in the immediate post-war years in: Darko Macan, *Hrvatski strip 1945.-54.* (Croatian Comics 1945-54) (Zagreb: Mentor, 2007).

<sup>81</sup> Veljko Krulčić, *I Salon jugoslavenskog stripa* (I Yugoslav Comic Salon) (Vinkovci: Radničko Sveučilište 'Nada Sremac', 1984), 5-6.

<sup>82</sup> Lidija Butković, *Plavi vjesnik (1954.-1973.)*, Internet: <http://www.stripforum.hr/leksikon/magazin/plavi-vjesnik/#3>.

<sup>83</sup> Launched in 1954, *Plavi Vjesnik* was not dedicated strictly to comics, yet these had a seminal part in its popularity which rocketed in the early 1960s. Feeding on the celebrated Zagreb School of Animation, the editor Nenad Bixy gathered a group of illustrators who, along with a couple of pre-war authors, forged the so called second generation of Yugoslav comics. Despite some individual efforts, no equivalent Belgrade group emerged at the time, not least since *Plavi vjesnik*'s counterpart *Politikin Zabavnik* preferred foreign comics. See: Slavko Draginčić, "Strip u Hrvatskoj – Od ilustriranih priča do treće generacije" (Croatian Comics: From Illustrated Stories to the Third Generation), in Krulčić, ed., *Hrvatski poslijeratni strip*, 11-14.

<sup>84</sup> Specialized comic magazines were regularly published from the early 1960s on and continued to prosper ever since, commonly leaning on imported works. Krulčić, *I Salon jugoslavenskog stripa*, 7-9.

production.<sup>85</sup> With one distinction: comics issued there differed from those found in the mainstream press. At first hectic, and later as a conscious editorial policy, the youth press, from the late 1960s on, began promoting a different type of comics, as a local reflection and interpretation of related current global trends.

### 7.2.1. From anti-comics to comix

At the time, the main inspiration stemmed from the unique genre that emerged in the US in the mid 1960s as a mixture of conventional comic language, spunky graphics and scabrous storylines. Underground comix, where x pointed to the deviation from the norms, seemed to be in perfect accord with the new interest of the youth press.<sup>86</sup> Comix were politically radical, sexually explicit and undermined a range of social and aesthetic values, reacting against the self-censored comic industry.<sup>87</sup> Not surprisingly, their first Yugoslav translations, unavailable anywhere else, initially appeared in the youth press and would continue to serve as the enduring inspiration.<sup>88</sup>

The first similar domestic attempts from the end of the 1960s reflected the new rebellious mindset of the Yugoslav youth press. Zagreb's *Omladinski tjednik*

---

<sup>85</sup> Out of all the discussed issues from this thesis, the literature probably best documents the youth press's impact on comics, acknowledging its importance, even if dealing only with a few of the issues included in this review. See: Veljko Krulčić, *Put u obećanu zemlju: 12 godina stripa u 'Poletu'* (Road to the Promise Land: 12 Years of Comics in 'Polet') (Zagreb: RS SOH Zagreba, 1990); Slobodan Ivkov, *60 godina domaćeg stripa u Srbiji* (Six Decades of Comics in Serbia) (Subotica: Likovni susret, 1995), 109-122.

<sup>86</sup> Among the abundant, if frequently anecdotal literature on the underground comix see: Mark James Estren, *A History of Underground Comics* (Berkeley: Ronin, 1993); Patrick Rosenkranz, *Rebel Visions: The Underground Comix Revolution 1963-1975* (Seattle: Fantagraphics Books, 2008); James Danky and Denis Kitchen, eds., *Underground Classics: The Transformation of Comics into Comix*, (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2009).

<sup>87</sup> More on the comix's subversive employment of sexuality in: Beth Bailey, "Sex as a Weapon. Underground Comix and the Paradox of Liberation" in Braunstein, Doyle, eds., *Imagine Nation. The American Counterculture of the 1960s and '70s* (New York, London: Routledge, 2002), 305-323.

<sup>88</sup> Already in 1969 *Pop-Express* introduced its readers to the likes of Robert Crumb, Jerry Marcus and Foolbert Sturgeon. See: "The Phonus Balonus Blues", *Pop-Express* 10 (18 Oct. 1969): 14; "Trudy", *Pop-Express* 11 (25 Oct.1969): 14; "Avanture Strawbricka" (Strawbrick's Adventures), *Pop-Express* 15 (22 Nov.1969): 14.

inaugurated a corresponding term that implied a critical stance towards the rules of the genre. The two of its “anti-comic” series, each in its own way, exposed the bad features of commercial comics.<sup>89</sup> The first used guerilla semiotics to dub the script of the little known comic.<sup>90</sup> The other was crudely illustrated and devoid of any narrative at all.<sup>91</sup> The journal also published works of countercultural pioneer Pero Kvesić whose very publication was subversive since Kvesić drew them as a joke in a scrapbook, without much ambition.<sup>92</sup> With the most primitive of comic means, he expressed there provocative and humorous messages, from the internal editorial quips to the New Left ideas.<sup>93</sup> Even when not reaching professional standards such attempts paved the way for the affirmation of different type of comics, that a decade later Kvesić himself would promote from the editorial position.<sup>94</sup>

The sole illustrator of this period who managed to combine the new sensibility with actual drawing skills was *Tribuna*'s graphic editor Kostja Gatnik. His comics and illustrations, created under the pseudonym Magna Purga, played a big role in *Tribuna*'s revolutionary underground design.<sup>95</sup> Open to most diverse genres and forms, the existing comics seemed too straight to Gatnik.<sup>96</sup> Instead, he was impressed

---

<sup>89</sup> The term was quickly adopted by the renowned animator Nedeljko Dragić who in the early 1970 published his own anti-comic in the Zagreb daily. More in: Nedeljko Dragić, *Tupko* (Bjelovar: Prosveta, 1985).

<sup>90</sup> For the beginning of a ten part series see: “Antistrip: Branka protiv Dr. Zvonka” (Anticomics: Branka versus Dr. Zvonko), *Omladinski tjednik* 23 (12 Sept. 1968): 11.

<sup>91</sup> The journal's graphic editor Ratko Petrić drew fifteen episodes. See: “Strip stoljeća: Naslov stripa donosimo u idućem broju” (Comic of the Century: The Title the Next Issue), *Omladinski tjednik* 34/35 (4 Dec. 1968): 15.

<sup>92</sup> Kvesić admitted that he did not regard his works as “real” comics worth of publishing: “Prethodnici bez nasljednika” (Predecessors without Successors), *Pitanja* 10 (1979): 7.

<sup>93</sup> See among others: “Trla baba lan da joj prođe dan” (Fooling Around), *Omladinski tjednik* 76 (7 Jan. 1970); “Pustolovine malih spermica” (Adventures of a Little Sperm), *Omladinski tjednik* 124 (24 March 1971): 12.

<sup>94</sup> For two years, *Studentski list* issued a similar gag series. See: “Keser”, *Studentski list* 18 (27 Oct. 1970): 24.

<sup>95</sup> Gatnik differs from the aforesaid authors, for he neither originally nor chiefly drew comics in the youth press. While still a student he published in Ljubljana's satirical and entertainment mainstream magazines *Zvitorepec* or *Pavliha*. Prior to *Tribuna*, Gatnik also published comics in *Pop-Express: Pop-Express* 23 (17 Jan. 1970): 16.

<sup>96</sup> Aside from comix, George Herriman's Krazy Kat counts strong among Gatnik's influences. Gatnik, interview.

by the rare fragments of Robert Crumb and other underground illustrators that he had seen in the London journal *Oz*. Gatnik's comics remain among the best traces of the youth press's infatuation with the US counterculture. With similar graphics and shocking plots, he truthfully conveyed the absurd and violent worldview of comix.<sup>97</sup>

Using various techniques, he introduced a range of its conventions, from the ironic onomatopoeic sound effects to parodies of the superhero genre. Emulating Gilbert Shelton's notorious classic *The Freak Brothers* Gatnik illustrated stories by random authors.<sup>98</sup> His illustrations were filled with an equal dose of sarcasm, black humor and sexual allusions that derided good taste and broke the taboos.<sup>99</sup>

In the summer of 1971, Gatnik left *Tribuna* to complete his military service. Soon thereafter he ceased drawing comics for good.<sup>100</sup> The upcoming crisis of the youth press halted other similar efforts, bringing about a temporary creative breakdown.<sup>101</sup> By then, however, solid grounds of unorthodox comics were already established. In the second half of the decade they would transpire into a widespread policy shared by the entire Yugoslav youth press.

### 7.2.2. The New Square

In the late 1970s Yugoslav comics were drowned in deep crises as those few remaining authors gradually turned to more lucrative professions like animation or graphic design.<sup>102</sup> Against this background, *Polet's* decision to publish four pages of

<sup>97</sup> "En star štos" (An Old Trick), *Tribuna* 4 (19 Nov. 1970): 8 ; "In rodil se bo..." (And He Was Born...), *Tribuna* 11 (24 Dec. 1970): 8. See: Appendices, Fig. 11.

<sup>98</sup> Magna Purga, *Danes in nikdar več* (Today and Never Again) (Ljubljana: Študentska založba, 1977), 3-4.

<sup>99</sup> See: *Tribuna* 1 (15 Oct. 1970): 6; *Tribuna* 15 (1971): 8.

<sup>100</sup> Gatnik, interview.

<sup>101</sup> Even if quality deteriorated, comics remained one of the rare strongholds of the youth press during the crisis.

<sup>102</sup> Draginčić, "Strip u Hrvatskoj – Od ilustriranih priča do treće generacije", 14.

original comics per each issue easily made an impact. Indeed, it was with comics rather than punk-rock that the journal made its first mark.

The policy had as much to do with the preferences of its founding editor Pero Kvesić, as with the outdated hot-type printing facilities, apt strictly for illustrations.<sup>103</sup> The comic niche that opened up as a result was occupied by the group of young Zagreb comic enthusiasts that came to be known as *The New Square* collective. Its core comprised of three fresh art high-school graduates, which were joined by a few slightly more experienced illustrators.<sup>104</sup> Together, within the next year and a half, they turned *Polet* into the epicenter of the true comic revolution that subverted the traditional comic language, in a different way than their forerunners had done.

The collective was officially formed a year later, with the chief intention to draw public attention to their work.<sup>105</sup> While originally devised as a joke, the name, *The New Square*, was warmly accepted since it implied group's common interest in the new type of comics.<sup>106</sup> Indeed, for most members drawing comics made sense only if it breached boundaries. This was especially true of the group's leader, the nineteen year old Mirko Ilić, who was placed in charge of *Polet's* comics after having published not more than a few works.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> Kvesić, interview.

<sup>104</sup> *The New Square* consisted of school friends Mirko Ilić, Igor Kordej and Krešimir Zimonjić, who, while apprenticing in the Zagreb Studio of Animated Film, met two slightly more experienced illustrators Radovan Devlić and Ninoslav Kunc. Finally, they stumbled across Joško Marušić in the editorial offices of the Zagreb youth journals. Marušić was the sole author who had some prior professional recognition and was regarded as a talented animator and caricaturist. See: Bogdan Tirnanić, "Majstorova senka" (The Master's Shadow), *Pitanja*, vol.10 (1979): 11.

<sup>105</sup> During the three years of its activity the group published over hundred comics in *Polet* alone. The first comic collectively signed appeared in September 1977: "Dobitnik" (Winner), *Polet* 32/33 (23 Sept. 1977): 16.

<sup>106</sup> The original name *Novi kvadrat* literally translates as new square, but in view of its comic implications more appropriate would be new panel: "Nije krug nego kvadrat" (Not Circle but Square), *Polet* 65 (8 Aug. 1978): 23.

<sup>107</sup> Ilić published his first comics in *Studentski list* and *Pitanja*, immediately showing traits of his later poetics. See: "Slikovnica za diktatore" (Dictator's Picture Book), *Studentski list* 10 (25 Feb. 1976): 24; "Slikovnica o velikim i malim" (Picture Book on Big and Small), *Studentski list* 11 (19 March 1978): 24, "Prostor za strip" (Room for Comics), *Pitanja* 8 (1976): 50; 101.

Along with his friends, Ilić was impressed by everything that circumvented the established conventions, from the US underground classics to the emerging French and Italian authors, represented by the likes of Jean Giraud, Guido Crepax, or Hugo Pratt.<sup>108</sup> Like them, they explored new styles and topics that challenged the narrative-realistic standards.<sup>109</sup>

Ilić went a step further and investigated the very nature of comics, beginning with its core element: the frame.<sup>110</sup> Above all, he fiddled with its size, shape and division across the panel. Much like Crepax, he would spread figures over several frames, tracing them at different moments, playing with the perception of time.<sup>111</sup> While reinterpreting the accepted comic conventions, Ilić assigned them with new meanings, rather than just negate them. The line dividing the two frames thus became a prison bar and a part of the storyline.<sup>112</sup> In place of typical sound effects, like trash or snap, he inscribed music notes.<sup>113</sup> His characters and stories even reached beyond the standard two-dimensional comic spectrum.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>108</sup> Alternative comics were not easily available and were acquired through various channels. As a seventeen year old, Ilić hitch-hiked across Europe using the opportunity to buy comic magazines such as *Linus* or *Métal Hurlant*, and meet some authors. Mirko Ilić, interview by author, 16 Nov. 2010, New York. Skype recording.

<sup>109</sup> A good insight into novel French comic trends of the 1970s see in: Ann Miller, *Reading Bande Dessinée. Critical Approaches to French-language Comic Strip* (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2007), 25-32; Matthew Screech, “Jean Giraud/Moebius: *Nouveau Réalisme* and Science Fiction” in Braunstein, Doyle, eds., *Imagine Nation. The American Counterculture of the 1960s and ‘70s* (New York, London: Routledge, 2002), 97-111.

<sup>110</sup> More on frames as the essential element in comics in: Scott McCloud, *Understanding Comics: The Invisible Art* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1994), 38-99.

<sup>111</sup> See: “Vodoravno i okomito” (Horizontal and Vertical), *Polet* 66 (15 May 1978): 16; “Hereditarna netrpeljivost” (Hereditary Intolerance), *Polet* 22 (8 April 1977): 10; “Iz povijesti ljudske gluposti” (From the History of Human Stupidity), *Polet* 24 (22 April 1977): 16; “(Sudar)” (Crash), *Polet* 53 (3 April 1978): 16.

<sup>112</sup> In one of Ilić’s comics, a series of gory scenes is followed with a few empty frames to which he added human hands. In this way, he reinterpreted the basic rule turning it into a prison setting. See: “Strogo zabranjeno - 1, 2 naredujem ja” (Strictly Forbidden – One, Two, I Command), *Polet* 42/43 (25 Nov. 1977): 12-13. See: Appendices, Fig. 12.

<sup>113</sup> See a bizarre comic parody of a nursery rhyme: “Debil blues” (Moron Blues), *Polet* 16 (25 Feb. 1977): 11-12. See: Appendices, Fig. 13.

<sup>114</sup> Ilić’s two-page comic *On the Same Side* is printed on a single sheet and makes sense only if it is read as a whole and held against the light, so that the pages relate. A group of warriors, not knowingly, interact with those on the reverse page, which are in fact they themselves, and their shots, swords and voices apparently penetrate right through the paper. See: “Na istoj strani” (On the Same Side), *Pitanja* 6/7 (1979): 33-34. See: Appendices, Fig. 14a-b.



For Ilić and his colleagues the idea always took precedence over a fully-fledged narrative. Less bothered about the storyline, they treated comics like posters, focusing on monumental graphics instead.<sup>115</sup> The very context facilitated such a style. Considering the journal's format and circulation, it made little sense to draw a narrative series.<sup>116</sup> Instead, given a single page, each author treated it as an independent whole which in turn condensed their language. In a nutshell, the chances for experiments mushroomed.<sup>117</sup>

Ilić's high-school friends followed a similar style, typified with flashy drawings and splashy, intellectual punch-lines. His close collaborator Igor Kordej often illustrated Ilić's ideas, with his monumental compositions and dramatic editing, reminiscent of the authors of the influential French comic magazine *Métal Hurlant*, Richard Corben in particular.<sup>118</sup> Krešimir Zimonjić, on the other hand, created a fantastic fairytale imagery drowned in melancholic atmosphere, which tackled universal philosophic themes.<sup>119</sup>

Despite these similarities, the group, however, did not impose aesthetic inhibitions on its authors. The more orthodox approach of the two senior members attest to the stylistic and thematic variety present within *The New Square*. Ninoslav Kunc was renowned for his primitively drawn, single strip gag comic *Shadow* which explored comic conventions in a hero form, making it accessible to those not attuned to speculation.<sup>120</sup> While equally bizarre, his other series owed more to the comix

---

<sup>115</sup> Their comics easily served as exhibition posters: See: Mirko Ilić, "Shakti"; For another good example of poster poetics see: "Promjena kotača" (Changing the Wheel), *Polet* 36 (14 Oct. 1977): 16.

<sup>116</sup> During the period, *Polet* published one unorthodox sequel, see: "Deja vu", *Polet* 50/51/52 (6 Feb. 1978): 20.

<sup>117</sup> "Prethodnici bez nasljednika" (Predecessors without Successors), *Pitanja* 10 (1979): 8.

<sup>118</sup> See for example: "198?", *Polet* 34 (30 Sept. 1977): 18; "Gdje je tu poanta?" (What Is the Point?), *Polet* 62 (17 April 1978): 10; "Posljednji pobunjenik" (The Last Rebel), *Polet* 66 (15 May 1978): 18.

<sup>119</sup> "Početak ili... početak ili..." (Beginning, or... Beginning, or), *Polet* 62 (17 April 1978): 25.

<sup>120</sup> *Shadow* was a black figure, reduced to a few basic lines, whose adventures often bordered with comic theory. See: "Sjena" (Shadow), *Polet* 12 (14 Jan. 1977): 12; "Sjena" (Shadow), *Polet* 41 (18 Nov. 1977): 10; "Sjena" (Shadow), *Polet* 62 (17 April 1978): 26. See: Appendices, Fig. 15.

tradition, with its graphics and irrational closures both evoking and satirizing Robert Crumb's grotesque, psychedelic universe.<sup>121</sup>

Radovan Devlić, on the other hand, unlike all other members, exceptionally endowed his works with a rounded narrative, characterized by a fine literary quality and a touch of humor. His witty caricature series *The Rascals* dealt with the everyday life of the youth, thus adding to an array of new issues the group introduced to local comics, from science fiction to sexuality.<sup>122</sup> Among those, one was conspicuously missing though. Apart from Joško Marušić, who used comics to comment on daily affairs, *The New Square* dealt with politics only incidentally.<sup>123</sup> In contrast to their formers, theirs was primarily to revolutionize the art form, not the society.

### 7.2.3. The legacy and epigones

In September 1978, *The New Square* suddenly disappeared from *Polet* in the same abrupt manner as it originally emerged, and owing to the same combination of editorial preferences and technological conditions. Following the switch to the offset litho printing, Trbuljak radically changed the journal's design and, backed by the editors, replaced illustrations with photographs.<sup>124</sup> As a result, Ilić and his colleagues were, literally overnight, evicted from *Polet*.<sup>125</sup> By then, however, *The New Square*

<sup>121</sup> See: "Takav je život" (That's Life), *Polet* 8 (17 Dec. 1976): 23; "Gospodin Pjer" (Mister Pierre), *Polet* 56 (6 March 1978): 14.

<sup>122</sup> See: "Huljice" (Rascals), *Polet* 9 (24 Dec. 1976): 12; "Tiho, tiho, povjerljivo" (Hush, hush, Confidential), *Polet* 46 (23 Dec. 1977): 14; "Neki to vole vruće" (Some Like It Hot), *Polet* 62 (17 April 1978): 26.

<sup>123</sup> It is worth noting that for Marušić alone, comics were a side-interest. See his comics treated as social commentaries: "Država umire" (State Dissolves), *Polet* 40 (11 Nov. 1977): 6; "Mirko i Slavko" (Mirko and Slavko), *Polet* 44 (9 Dec. 1977): 8; "Samokritika" (Self-Critique), *Polet* 60 (3 March 1978): 6.

<sup>124</sup> Trbuljak, interview.

<sup>125</sup> A personal feud between Ilić and Kuljiš contributed to the decision. In fact, *Polet* continued publishing foreign comics, most notably paramount Jean-Marc Reiser from *Hara-Kiri* magazine. See: Denis Kuljiš, *Ad hominem* (Zagreb: Metro, 2006.): 63-68.

already gained recognition across and beyond the country.<sup>126</sup> Charismatic and outgoing, Ilić established connections throughout the youth press, enabling the collective to publish in other Zagreb, Belgrade and Ljubljana youth journals.<sup>127</sup> *Vidici's* graphic editor Nikola Kostadinović even became the associated member of the group and would promote their comics in the journals he supervised.<sup>128</sup>

In 1979, the Croatian youth union awarded *The New Square* with a prestigious cultural prize. The Zagreb youth cultural journal *Pitanja* snatched the opportunity to produce a special issue on the group which became its first monograph.<sup>129</sup> Ilić would soon quit comics for good to engage with poster and record cover design.<sup>130</sup> However, others carried on with the same conviction. Kunc thus became a head of the comic section in revitalized *Studentski list* where he published “open comics” with only a part of the story being revealed.<sup>131</sup> Moreover, their sweeping success encouraged other young illustrators who already played with similar ideas, while inspiring new ones to pursue a similar experimental route.

By the end of the decade a multitude of young comic buffs across Yugoslavia followed their example. The ongoing comic renaissance now surpassed both *Polet* and *The New Square*. Even the very form of collective became a model to emulate,

<sup>126</sup> Ilić published a few comics in European comic magazines, including Italian *Alter Alter (Linus)*, or French *Métal Hurlant* which named his *On the Same Side* to be the most bizarre comic of the year. See: “Debil blues”, *Alter Alter* 3/51 (1978): 107-108; “Du Même Côté” (On the Same Side), *Métal Hurlant* 57 (Nov. 1980): 81-82.

<sup>127</sup> The group published comics in each and every Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana journal and continued doing so after being expelled from *Polet*. See: “Strogo angažirani strip” (Strictly Engaged Comic), *Student* 16 (25 Oct. 1978): 19; “Ne zezaj znanje” (Don’t Mess With the Knowledge), *Omladinske novine* 191 (13 Oct. 1979): 20.

<sup>128</sup> Some of Ilić’s finest comics, such as *Shakti*, were in fact first published in *Vidici*. For Kostadinović’s own comics see among others: “Gvozdeni šlager - istina priča o izmišljenim događajima” (Iron Hit – True Story about the Invented Events), *Vidici* 4 (1977): 10-11.

<sup>129</sup> The issue contained around hundred comics, coupled with a few excellent introductory texts by Kvesić and others. See: “Novi kvadrat” (New Square), *Pitanja* 10 (Dec. 1979).

<sup>130</sup> Switching to illustration, Ilić began working for the mainstream press. In 1986 he left for New York where he established a world-known reputation as a graphic designer and worked for a while as the art-director of the *Time* magazine. See an excellent recent review of Ilić’s career: Dejan Kršić, ed., *Mirko Ilić: Strip, ilustracija, dizajn, multimedija 1975-2007* (Mirko Ilić: *Comics, Illustrations, Design, Multimedia 1975-2007*) (Zagreb: AGM & Profil International, 2008).

<sup>131</sup> “Jedna lajna” (One Line), *Studentski list* 12 (23. Nov.1979): 12; 24.

deemed capable of forging a momentum that easily outshined all individual efforts. Within the next couple of years, new comic groups were formed, finding their medium in the youth press where their members took over editorial roles.

In 1978 a group of stylistically diverse Belgrade comic authors, interested in everything from realistic to avant-garde comics, gathered to form *The Belgrade Circle* 2.<sup>132</sup> *The Ink Group*, on the other hand, sustained a more hermeneutic style, comparable to *The New Square*. Its founding member, Rade Marković, used his editorial position in *Student* to promote his peers and the whole new generation of authors, a practice followed by other youth journals.<sup>133</sup>

#### 7.2.4. The matching discourse

The burgeoning discourse on comics complemented and re-strengthened the described creative crescendo. Throughout the period, the Yugoslav youth press critically revalorized comics in several intertwined ways. The journals promoted new streams that opposed the mainstream conventions, wishing to point to their great artistic and subversive potential. Just as they translated first underground comix, they introduced new European comic authors, from Willem to Corben and Moebius, who eventually inspired the aforesaid comic upsurge.<sup>134</sup>

A new discourse on comics developed along the way that aimed to alter the common perception about this tolerated yet scorned art form. The youth press was not

---

<sup>132</sup> The name was given in reference to the existent pre-war comic tradition in Belgrade. See: “Beogradski krug 2” (Belgrade Circle 2), *Omladinske novine* 121 (11 March 1978): 29.

<sup>133</sup> Marković in 1977 re-introduced *Student*'s comic section, putting stress on the new experimental trends, a policy that was quickly espoused by *Omladinske novine*. See among others: “Rade Marković: Ex librist”, *Student* 20 (2 Nov. 1977): 8; “Rade Marković: Filmofil” (Film Buff), *Student* 2 (21 Feb. 1979): 14.

<sup>134</sup> “Les Avatures de Tom Blanc”, *Studentski list* 6/722 (30 Oct. 1973): 31; “Crepax”, *Student* 4 (17 Feb. 1976): 11; “Harzak” (Arzach), *Student* 29 (16 Dec. 1975): 12; “Richard Corben”, *Tribuna* 9 (27 March 1977): 14-15.

alone in the endeavor, yet often took the lead.<sup>135</sup> Already in the early 1970s, they discussed semiotics and sociology of comics.<sup>136</sup> Most of them supported special comic sections where they presented key authors.<sup>137</sup> By the end of the decade virtually each youth journal dedicated a special issue to comics. *Pitanja* remained preoccupied with the underground legacy of Robert Crumb and Gilbert Shelton.<sup>138</sup> Others hailed the “anti-bourgeois trends” exemplified by the likes of Giraud or Phillipe Druillet and exposed the reactionary ideology that underlined mainstream comics.<sup>139</sup>

Not all such series were dedicated to alternative comics, yet all shared a serious approach to the genre. Incidentally, the main say in this project had two advocates of another controversial form of pop-culture, punk-rock.<sup>140</sup> Both Darko Glavan and Igor Vidmar fervently promoted comics, each with his own specific preferences. The former held them equal in value to just about any other cultural expression.<sup>141</sup> The latter, true to his political agenda, praised socially-engaged comics that opposed the

---

<sup>135</sup> Next to a short-lived journal for “theory of comics,” published in the mid 1970s, a renowned academic periodical *Kultura* produced a special comic issue with eminent art historians contributing. See: *Pegaz, revija za istoriju i teoriju stripa i drugih medija koji se izražavaju grafičkim putem* 1 (July-Dec. 1974); “*Strip – deveta umetnost?*” (Comics – Ninth Art?), *Kultura* 28, (1975).

<sup>136</sup> “Zapisi o novom stripu” (Notes on the New Comics), *Omladinski tjednik* 170 (30 Jan. 1973): 12-13; “Povampirene igračke – izgubljena trka sa stripom” (Toys Out of Control – Lost Chase for Comics), *Omladinski tjednik* 187 (17 Nov. 1973): 13.

<sup>137</sup> The trend spread even to less relevant journals. For the start of *Omladinske novine*’s lasting column see: O stripu uz poštovanje i ljubav (On Comics with Love and Respect) *Omladinske novine* 38 (28 Sept. 1974): 6.

<sup>138</sup> *Pitanja*’s last 1976 issue included a big poster featuring Crumb’s and Shelton’s comics. Three years later the journal regularly published their works, often with a related text. See respectively: “Dale Steinberger”; “Freakovi u krađi” (Freak Brothers Stealing), *Pitanja* 10/11/12 (1976), suppl.; “Mačak Debelog Fredija” (Fat Freddy’s Cat); “Mali Johnny brzojebac” (Little Johnny Fuckerfaster), *Pitanja* 6-7 (1979): 1; 107.

<sup>139</sup> See critical texts in Belgrade’s *Student* and *Vidici*: “Novi strip” (New Comics), *Student* 29 (16 Dec. 1975): 8-9; “Pokušaj čitanja ideološke komponente u prvim stripovima naučne fantastike” (Attempt at Reading the Ideological Element in the First SF Comics), *Vidici* 1/2 (May-June 1977): 17; “Američki podzemni strip” (American Underground Comix), *Vidici* 5/6 (1978): 15, 18.

<sup>140</sup> Indeed, many saw an inherent link connecting comics to punk. Mirko Ilić perceived his work as a visual extension of the New Wave. Coincidentally, as Vidmar introduced him to *Pankrti*, they played at his first Zagreb exhibition, presenting punk to the local audiences. See: Ilić, interview.

<sup>141</sup> During 1977/78 Glavan wrote a series of texts on individual comic artists, from George Herriman to Al Capp: “Krazy Kat: U pohvalu uporne ludosti” (Krazy Kat: In Praise of Stubborn Madness), *Pitanja* 8 (1977): 21-24; “Al Capp – strip kao društvena satira” (Al Capp – Comic as a Social Satire), *Pitanja* 5/6 (1978): 68-72.

escapist kitsch and offered a new form of Marxist critique.<sup>142</sup> Vidmar headed ŠKUC's *Section for Critical Evaluation of Comics*, a shortly lived body that was responsible for *Tribuna*'s comic issue composed solely of scholarly texts.<sup>143</sup>

Along with its many doppelgangers, *The New Square* ideally fitted in these preferences for artistically relevant comics. The created discourse could now simply shift to the local terrain. Vidmar acclaimed Gatnik and *The New Square* as the original Yugoslav take on the underground and avant-garde tradition.<sup>144</sup> Young Zagreb and Belgrade artists dominated *Vidici*'s comic issue, the first out of three the journal would eventually produce.<sup>145</sup>

The phenomenon was ultimately codified by Ljubomir Kljajić who assembled *Student*'s thematic issue, placing the new authors under a single, joint perspective. Kljajić convincingly argued that they constituted the third Yugoslav comic generation, the label that resonated with the previous two historical waves but also implied certain shared qualities.<sup>146</sup> First, they typically exhibited strong artistic and intellectual aspirations.<sup>147</sup> Second, they were all published almost exclusively in the youth press.

The two features were intrinsically linked with each other. Confined to the youth press, the majority of the new comic illustrators developed an enigmatic, almost elitist

---

<sup>142</sup> Vidmar's criticism of US mainstream comics that spread cultural propaganda transpired into a regular weekly spot in *Mladina* where he analyzed basic elements and history of the genre. See: "Kako brati racmana Jako?" (How to Read Donald Duck?), *Mladina* 27 (22 July 1976): 22-23; "Smisel antistripa" (Meaning of Anti-comics), *Mladina* 21 (31 March 1977): 44.

<sup>143</sup> Vidmar co-edited the issue that dissected various aspects of comic industry, while introducing new unorthodox artists like Corben and Crepax: "Stripbuna" (Comicbuna), *Tribuna* 9 (27 March 1977).

<sup>144</sup> Vidmar literally reinvented Gatnik, eventually assembling his comics into a full comic album, one of the first in Yugoslavia. Likewise, he became an ardent advocate of *The New Square*, presenting in his column each individual author. See respectively: "Kdo je Magna Purga" (Who is Magna Purga), *Mladina* 22 (31 March 1977): 44; Purga, *Danes in nikdar več*; "Mirko Ilić", *Mladina* 15 (13 April 1978): 41.

<sup>145</sup> All three major comic collectives were presented. See: "Strip" (Comics), *Vidici* 2 (1979).

<sup>146</sup> "Treća generacija?" (Third Generation), *Student* 15 (20 May 1978): 8; See also: "Quo vadis treća generacija?" (Quo Vadis Third Generation), *Vidici* 2 (1979): 5-6.

<sup>147</sup> The term was quickly embraced in the literature. See: Zoran Đukanović, "Treća generacija i posle" (Third Generation and Beyond), *Istra* 6/7 (1986): 98-103.

language with frequent philosophic connotations.<sup>148</sup> And while this unorthodox style helped to legitimize their artistic pretensions, it also distanced them from the common comic readers, against their original intentions. Whereas Ilić and his friends merely wished to change the mainstream comics, they ended up in galleries instead.<sup>149</sup> Over the years, *The New Square* alone organized some ten collective and individual exhibitions, provoking wide critical acclaim.<sup>150</sup>

Despite their limited impact in the specialized magazines, the legacy of the experimental collectives was no less. They worked hand in hand with the youth press to change the perception of comics.<sup>151</sup> No more seen as a worthless entertainment, they came to be treated as a respectable art form with potential social effects.

### 7.3. PHOTOGRAPHY

Photography for a long while conspicuously missed out from the described graphic boom of the youth press. The newborn visual approach from the late 1960s failed to affect it for several reasons. First, photojournalism in general, both within and outside the youth press, was in poor state to say the least. Though a constituent part of the Yugoslav visual arts from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, quality photography was absent from the printed media and never achieved mass-circulation.<sup>152</sup> Amidst its

<sup>148</sup> Veselko Tenžera, “Novi kvadrat” (*New Square*), *Pitanja* 10 (1979): 13.

<sup>149</sup> See: “Nije krug nego kvadrat” (Not Circle but Square), *Polet* 65 (8 Aug. 1978): 23.

<sup>150</sup> See for example: *Katalog izložbe stripova objavljenih u 'Poletu' i 'Studentu'* (Catalogue of the Exhibition of Comics Published in ‘Polet’ and ‘Student’) (Beograd: SKC, 1978); Slavenka Drakulić-Ilić, *Novi kvadrat* (*New Square*) (Rijeka: Izdavački centar Rijeka, 1978);

<sup>151</sup> Apart from Devlić, only Kordej remained active as a comic author on the long run. For a while the sole employed comic illustrator in Yugoslavia, he adjusted his style during the 1980s as he began working for foreign comic agencies, following patterns he initially loathed, yet differed from the usual poetics, provoking controversial reactions among the readers. See: “Interview with Igor Kordej”, *E-flit – internet comic magazine*, [www.nuclearagenomadz.org/e-flit/tekst/svibanj03/kordej/kordej.htm](http://www.nuclearagenomadz.org/e-flit/tekst/svibanj03/kordej/kordej.htm) (May, 2003).

<sup>152</sup> The literature followed a similar road. Just as the photographs sought to exhibit solely in the galleries, most valuable texts can be found in the catalogues of these exhibitions, typically focusing on a few established artists: See for example: Tošo Dabac, *Zagreb tridesetih godina* (*Zagreb in the 1930s*)

appalling status in the daily press, each photographer with any ambitions desperately tried to distance from the so called “ordinary photography,” searching for different motives and ways for its display.<sup>153</sup> Consequently, when not taken over, Yugoslav press photography was of low quality, and by default subjugated to the text.<sup>154</sup>

The youth press faced a couple of other obstacles to remove from this gloomy context. The prevailing hot type print of the majority of the journals did not allow for quality photographic reproductions. Referred to as the “killer of photography,” it confined all creativity, causing the rebellious political youth journals to lean on illustrations instead. Those few with access to adequate printing facilities were, in turn, infected by the old-fashioned aesthetics of the local photo-clubs, with their abstract lifeless motifs with which they legitimized their artistic credentials. If at all, the youth was portrayed as naive and vulnerable, lost in their inner world of sentimental problems.<sup>155</sup> During the whole political period there were only a few exceptions, most notably, *Susret*’s special June issue with its powerful images of the Belgrade student unrest.<sup>156</sup>

### 7.3.1. *Polet*’s School of Photography

It was not before the autumn of 1978, that this rigid uniform treatment of photography began to disappear. Zagreb’s *Polet* was again to blame, finding the winning combination of appropriate technical conditions, inciting milieu and inspired

---

(Zagreb: Arhiv Tošo Dabac, 1994); *Hrvatska fotografija od 1950 do danas: katalog izložbe* (Croatian Photography from 1950 to Today: Exhibition Catalogue) (Zagreb: Muzej suvremene umjetnosti, 1997).

<sup>153</sup> Even within domestic artistic photography, motifs and ideas were more important than actual technical skills. Davor Matičević, “Fotografija u Hrvatskoj od tisuću devetsto pedesete godine do danas” (Photography in Croatia from 1950 till the Present) in *Hrvatska fotografija od 1950 do danas*, 14.

<sup>154</sup> Rene Bakalović, “Medijska fotografija” (Media Photography) in *Hrvatska fotografija od 1950 do danas*, 153-54.

<sup>155</sup> See: Slavko Timotijević, “Novotalasna fotografija u rok-ključu” (New Wave Photography in the Rock Key) in *Drugom stranom*, 53-55.

<sup>156</sup> See: *Susret*, spec. vol. (11 June 1968).



individuals. Simultaneously with the journal's shift to the offset lithography, the freshly appointed art-director Goran Trbuljak changed the standard approach to photographs. Instead of subjecting them to the text, he spread them across the entire pages.

The move was an essential part of the new editorial concept which proposed that the journal portrayed what it wrote about. Accordingly, Trbuljak stipulated that each article should be illustrated with an authentic, custom-made image.<sup>157</sup> There were few other options since the youth journals were stripped off the mainstream publishing infrastructure and, as such, denied access to photo material from the press agencies. Where the mainstream press could take over, *Polet* was forced to produce its own.

An initial drawback turned into an advantage when a diverse team of photographers gathered around Trbuljak, drawn by the new creative enclave. The first cohort came from the ranks of more experienced photographers, such as Siniša Knaflec or Danilo Dučak or Dražen Kalenić, who already contributed to the Zagreb youth press from the early 1970s. Though lacking professional training and better reproductive technology, they used the negligence of the youth unions that hardly checked how the films were spent to begin experimenting and develop a different visual language.<sup>158</sup> Influenced by the annual issues of *Life* magazine, foreign fashion editorials and record covers they learned about awkward camera angles, reduced and deformed frames and use of special lenses.<sup>159</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup> Trbuljak, interview.

<sup>158</sup> These photographers began to work in the marginal Zagreb youth journals following their political collapse, many by chance. For example, one of the pioneers Željko Stanojević came to the editorial premises of *Omladinski tjednik*, after seeing Michelangelo Antonioni's classic film *Blow-up* and declared that he would like to be a photographer to which one of the editors simply replied: "Well, go on and buy yourself a camera." See: Kvesić, interview.

<sup>159</sup> Excellent review of these early days can be seen in the special issue of youth journal *Pitanja* devoted precisely to *Polet*'s photography: "Nova novinska fotografija" (New Press Photography), *Pitanja* 10-12 (1980): 2-8.

As the demand for quality images boosted, they were joined by a younger guard of photographers with academic background. Mio Vesović, Ivan Posavec, Fedor Vučemilović or Andrija Zelmanović were camera students who readily snatched the given opportunity.<sup>160</sup> Within the ambience even amateur photo-buffs among *Polet's* staff, such as Goran Pavelić, began shooting and in a process created unique photo-reports.<sup>161</sup> During the next three years, they all formed what became known as the *Polet's School of Photography*, a label that served as a common denominator for the journal's black-and-white photographs which made a drastic break with the traditional (youth) press photography in both subject and style.

From the onset, *Polet's* photographers engaged in an ironic play with the formal visualization of socialist youth. Thus far confined to the private sphere, vibrant images of real young people in an urban settings and everyday situations suddenly popped up in the public eye. Rather than anxiously gazing at the distance, they aggressively looked back at the reader.<sup>162</sup> Shot from the insider's perspective, they conveyed new youth scenery, at odds with the social-realist codes.

The practice symbolically recreated the project of Trbuljak's fellow colleague and once close collaborator, conceptual artist Braco Dimitrijević. Back in 1971, he exhibited blown up images of random people on the Zagreb main city square, spurring commotion among the public, not used to see unfamiliar portraits unless they belonged to some high-ranking Party politicians.<sup>163</sup> *Polet* now turned Dimitrijević's shock into a weekly routine as life-size anonymous teenage faces, adjoined the

---

<sup>160</sup> See: Marina Viculin, ed., *Ivan Posavec: Fotografije '71-'02: Galerija Klovićevi dvori*, 7. 11. - 8. 12. 2002. (Ivan Posavec: Photography '71-'02: Gallery Klovićevi dvori, 7. 11. - 8. 12. 2002) (Zagreb: Galerija Klovićevi dvori, 2002); Marina Viculin, ed., *Mio Vesović, Fotografije '76-'03.: Galerija Klovićevi dvori*, 26.2.-6.4. 2003. (Mio Vesović: Photography '76-'03: Gallery Klovićevi dvori, 26.2.-6.4. 2003) (Zagreb: Galerija Klovićevi dvori, 2003.)

<sup>161</sup> Pavelić, interview; "Curice izašle na ulice" (Girls Out on the Streets), *Polet* 95 (28 March 1979): 12-13

<sup>162</sup> *Polet* 104 (10 Oct. 1979): 1; *Polet* 146 (24 Dec. 1980): 1; Also: Appendices, Fig. 17.

<sup>163</sup> Želimir Košćević, *Ispitivanje međuprostora* (Questioning the Interspace) (Zagreb: CKD SSO, 1978), 109; Želimir Košćević, *U fokusu* (In Focus) (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2006), 119-26.

covers, amounting to the same effect: they were not different from those of the officials.<sup>164</sup>

Trbuljak's background was almost palpable. The inclusion of the black border framed most images and became the journal's signature.<sup>165</sup> It served as a testament of the original, complete negative, a proof that no intervention on the image was made in respect to the artistic integrity of the author.<sup>166</sup> Indeed, while all photos were commissioned specially for the occasion, the room for interpretation was left to the imagination of the photographers who enjoyed freedom to offer their own personal visions. The nude portrait of a goalkeeper played on the related pun; the safety pin with the star embodied the journal's subversive employment of punk.<sup>167</sup> Moreover, when missing an appropriate image, photographers collaborated with Trbuljak to design fitting covers and centerfolds that could be regarded as artistic interventions in their own right.<sup>168</sup>

### 7.3.2. Rock photography

*Polet's* images both reflected and forged the spirit of the time, urban mythology and the atmosphere of Zagreb youth lifestyle and new meeting places.<sup>169</sup> One subject, however, featured so prominently that it developed into a new subgenre which, despite favorable conditions, was yet to be affirmed in the Yugoslav mediascape: rock photography. With its rich and rebellious iconography, the thriving Zagreb rock-

<sup>164</sup> See: *Polet* 78 (15 Nov. 1978): 1; *Polet* 92 (7 March 1979): 1.

<sup>165</sup> More on the documentary practice made known by celebrated French photographer Henri Cartier Bresson in: Liz Wells, ed., *Photography: A Critical Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2000), 98-99.

<sup>166</sup> In turn, the border allowed Trbuljak more freedom with the placement of photography as he conveniently used it to limit the upper margin of the photographs on the journal's black and white rotation. See: Trbuljak, interview.

<sup>167</sup> *Polet* 72 (3 Oct. 1978): 3; See: Appendices, Fig. 16.

<sup>168</sup> Aside from those already mentioned a nice example is Fedor Vučemilović's cover photo that showed an ironic Zagreb graffiti that protested *Polet*: *Polet* 140 (5 Nov. 1980): 1.

<sup>169</sup> See: "Duhanski put" (Tobacco Road), *Polet* 72 (3 Oct. 1978): 22; "Žurka, tulum, tulumiška" (Clubbing, Party, Bash), *Polet* 80-81 (13 Dec. 1978): 26.

"Kamo izaći u Zagrebu" (Where to go out in Zagreb), *Polet*, vol.80/81, (18.10.1978), p.27.

culture presented an ideal motif to undermine the official representations of youth. In turn, *Polet's* photographers were well equipped to encapsulate its exciting spirit. Enjoying privileged access to the Zagreb New Wave scene to which some of them belonged and having inside knowledge of its fashion and worldview, they conveyed the whole ambience of punk-rock.<sup>170</sup>

Following established principles, their images communicated in a clear and condensed way, capturing lively scenes filled with information, all of the features that were traditionally absent from the press photography.<sup>171</sup> Staged promotional photographs of unknown rock bands stylized their image, matching the visual elements with the music.<sup>172</sup> Conversely, utilizing their insider's status, photographers recorded the ongoing events, shooting from the perspective of the participants. Bands were displayed at concerts, in close contact with the audience, or during rehearsals and behind the stage.<sup>173</sup> Simple equipment and wide lenses suited the need for quick reaction.<sup>174</sup> And since subjects were aware of their presence, they could use flash, and thus allow images with bad lightning, taken at night and indoors.

Through *Polet's* images the New Wave emerged as a new type of democratic youth socialist ritual, where both rock heroes and youth audiences were active participants.<sup>175</sup> The latter were seen in the clubs, at the parties or on the city streets, having fun in the early hours of the morning.<sup>176</sup>

---

<sup>170</sup> Almost all *Polet* photographers were active in this regard, yet Dražen Kalenić focused almost exclusively on the rock scene becoming first true Yugoslav rock photographer. More on Kalenić in: Darko Glavan, and Slavko Timotijević, eds., *Dražen Kalenić* (Zagreb: Spektar, 1983).

<sup>171</sup> "Hod po trećoj liniji" (Walking the Third Line), *Polet* 121 (12 Feb. 1980): 12-13.

<sup>172</sup> See: "Novi Film" (The New Film), *Polet* 99 (24 April 1979): 20-21; *Polet* 110 (21 Nov. 1979): 1.

<sup>173</sup> See among others: *Polet* 73 (10 Oct. 1978): 1, 20-21; *Polet* 82/83 (27 Dec. 1978): 1; "Mi nismo destruktivci" (We Are Not Destructive): *Polet* 88 (7 Feb. 1979): 11; *Polet* 117 (16 Jan. 1980): 1. See: Appendices, Fig. 18.

<sup>174</sup> *Polet* photographers often used *Leica* camera. See: "Pečat vremena" (Sing of the Times), *Vijenac* 265 (29 April 2004): 14.

<sup>175</sup> Moreover, the youth were invited to record it themselves. *Polet* initiated a contest for a winning photo for its cover. "Poletov natječaj za fotografiju" (*Polet's* Photo Contest), *Polet* 74 (18. Oct. 1978): 2.

<sup>176</sup> *Polet* 144 (10 Dec. 1980): 1 ; *Polet* 115-116 (26 Dec. 1979): 2, 4. See: Appendices, Fig. 19.

The new approach could be seen even in the old residual tasks from the past, now interpreted in a new manner. *Polet* depicted the working class with a hint of irony and humor, be it a slightly eroticized young miner or a cleaning lady resting in front of the hotel pool.<sup>177</sup> Interviewed public figures, from politicians to celebrities, were observed in their natural ambience, shot from strange angles and placed on the side or even cut out of the frame.<sup>178</sup> Their face gestures were stressed, making them look as ordinary people.<sup>179</sup>

### 7.3.3. Influence

*Polet's* photography profoundly influenced the Yugoslav media scene, affirming the new type of press photography that disparaged the previous tradition. Abolishing the established distinctions, it became equal to the artistic photography in both value and status.

The rest of the media scene slowly caught on. Initially, a few of *Polet's* photographers moved to the neighboring Zagreb's *Studentski list*, where they realized similar projects. Among others, Mio Vesović recorded Tomislav Gotovac's artistic performance where the latter walked nude in the city centre kissing its pavements.<sup>180</sup> His photo-series "Zagreb, I Love You" broke with the typical documentary approach to such actions, blurring the line between photography and performance art.<sup>181</sup>

Yet unlike *The New Square*, *Polet's School of Photography* remained an isolated phenomenon. Even if many of the youth journals by the end of the covered period showed similar inclinations, no comparable group of photographers emerged within

<sup>177</sup> See for example: *Polet* 113 (12 Dec. 1979): 1.

<sup>178</sup> *Polet* 94 (21 March 19): 7.

<sup>179</sup> "Nova novinska fotografija," 2-8.

<sup>180</sup> Vesović was among the more distinguished *Polet's* photographers, responsible among others for the controversial nude goalkeeper photo-feature. For his *Studentski list's* series see: "Zagreb, volim te" (Zagreb, I Love You) *Studentski list* 792 (20 Nov. 1981): 11.

<sup>181</sup> Želimir Košćević, *U fokusu*, 127-34.

the Yugoslav youth press. Not least since the youth journals in the rest of the country had a minor role in the formative period of the respective local punk-rock scenes which provided *Polet*'s photographers with one of their chief subjects.

In Ljubljana, where the punk medium became primarily *Radio Študent*, *Tribuna* rejected photography as a whole, while *Mladina* remained influenced by its main photographer Tone Stojko whose classic artistic sensibility was not in tune with the new youth lifestyle.<sup>182</sup> In Belgrade, the youth press was in crisis up until the very end of the period, and only *Džuboks* could make the stand.<sup>183</sup> Yet, attached to the major publishing network, it preferred photos from the foreign press agencies. Indeed, first journal's photographs failed to present the real atmosphere of the early 1970s Yugoslav rock.<sup>184</sup>

It was only in 1980, when *Džuboks* turned to new punk-rock bands that its treatment of photography changed. *Polet*'s influence clearly showed as *Džuboks* readily imported its rock images.<sup>185</sup> In turn, the journal invited local photographers who shot in the same style.<sup>186</sup> Before long, *Polet*'s influence spread beyond rock culture as the mainstream media began to imitate its overall approach. Moonlighting

---

<sup>182</sup> *Mladina* promoted photography even before *Polet* and regularly featured an original photo on its cover, mostly taken by Stojko who was the sole journal's photographer and serviced most of the needs. His artistic style, however, was more similar to those of the local photo clubs, though occasionally he too turned to more urban motives, most prominently after *Polet*'s breakthrough. See his typical covers: *Mladina* 47 (1 Dec. 1977): 1; *Mladina* 9 (2 March 1978): 1.

<sup>183</sup> *Omladinske novine* adopted *Polet*'s orientation to photography only by the end of the covered period. See: "Bez foto laboratorije" (Without Photo-Laboratory), *Omladinske novine* 266 (2 Nov. 1980): 19.

<sup>184</sup> *Džuboks*'s editors for instance initially removed from the rare local rock images the essential background of sport halls or cellar rehearsals, stripping them of their context. Timotijević, "Novotalasna fotografija u rok-ključu," 53-55.

<sup>185</sup> After frequently publishing his photos in *Duboks*, *Polets*'s chief rock expert Dražen Kalenić became in 1981 the journal's official photographer. See: "Najdinamičniji rock centar" (The Most Dynamic Rock Centre), *Džuboks* 84 (14 March 1980): 22-24; *Džuboks* 101 (7 Nov. 1980): 14-15; *Džuboks* 105 (2 Jan. 1981): 2.

<sup>186</sup> Apart from Dragan Papić, the mastermind behind the *Dečaci* project, Goranka Matić emerged as the quintessential Belgrade rock photographer and would later publish in the youth press as well. Yet, unlike in Zagreb, these were mainly individual rather than collective efforts. See respectively: "Od Idola – do Idola" (From *Idoli* to *Idoli*), *Džuboks* 97 (12 Sept. 1980): 22-23; "Muzika aranžmani i tekst: Šarlo Akrobata" (Music, Arrangements and Lyrics: Šarlo Akrobata), *Džuboks* 123 (11 Sept. 1981): 16-20.

for *Džuboks* was thus merely the beginning of a much broader move of *Polet*'s photographers into the mainstream media. In the years to come, most of them would become principal photographers in the mainstream press, active to this day.<sup>187</sup>

#### 7.4. CONCLUSION: THE YOUTH PRESS AS AN ART FORM

Beyond the level of content, the alternative challenge of the Yugoslav youth press included a new approach to form. Opened up for new and original ideas and sensibilities, it exhibited strong aesthetic element and firm commitment to creative visual expression. The previous sections revealed the huge impact that the youth journals had on the evolution and affirmation of three different, traditionally undermined art forms, from graphic press design, to alternative comics and newspaper photography.

On one hand, the youth press introduced young illustrators, designers and photographs to media production, allowing them to realize their artistic projects on their pages. By the same token, they also encouraged their own staff to behave and perceive themselves as artists, and in doing so turned into art forms themselves.<sup>188</sup>

Some art-focused sections served as venues for testing a multitude of styles and art forms, at times for its own sake, unconnected and detached from the main trends. Elsewhere, the new outlook reflected the emerging subcultural or political initiatives, forging the artistic feel of a time.

In both cases, the result was the same. The youth press distinguished itself as the alternative media prone to visual exploration that expanded and enriched the

---

<sup>187</sup> Virtually all of the mentioned *Polet*'s photographers, from Mio Vesović, Ivan Posavec to Fedor Vučemilović made great careers in the mainstream press, while also frequently hosting gallery exhibitions. More in: Feđa Vukić et al., *Dokumenti vremena: Tri desetljeća novinske fotografije u Hrvatskoj* (Documents of the Time: Three Decades of Press Photography in Croatia) (Zagreb: Europapress holding, 2009).

<sup>188</sup> Waltz, *Alternative and Activist Media* Waltz, 68-70.

boundaries of standard expression and in the process affected the rest of the mediascape. Impressed by the graphic quality of the youth journals, the mainstream media imitated its radical and hip features, eventually canonizing them into a norm.<sup>189</sup> Consequently, it hired many of its authors who went on to accomplish respective professional and artistic careers.

---

<sup>189</sup> Ibid, 5.



## CONCLUSION

It is challenging to summarize a work of this complexity in which I have tried to offer several new interpretations across disciplines. What holds them together is the major aim of presenting the Yugoslav youth press as an exceptional medium that emerged from its communist roots into an unlikely promoter of radical political, cultural and media initiatives. Almost by default, the thesis exposed the specific context that facilitated such an unorthodox trajectory and the chief agent standing behind it – the late socialist Yugoslav youth. This research aimed to open up new scholarly horizons in two fields, namely, with regards to communist media and socialist Yugoslavia in particular.

### **Redefining the institutional space for the youth: From communist propaganda to alternative media**

In my study of this particular communist media, I employed Western analytical tools, engaging in a theoretical confrontation with different media traditions. By doing so, I showed how the field can benefit from such a dialogue where concepts from competing ideological contexts are entwined and their limits and value determined. Namely, if attempted on a right terrain it can uncover mutual ground between the traditional East-West divide, populated by unique media, such as the Yugoslav youth press, that cut across established borders.

The origins of the concept of youth media and a great deal of its features are deeply ingrained in the Soviet thinking about youth and about the press, both having an important place within the wider notion of propaganda. When combined together, the youth press was defined as a tool of the state youth organization by which it

should indoctrinate, organize and educate its young subjects, deemed in desperate need of firm communist guidance. Along with other Soviet inventions, the Yugoslav communists happily took over this media tool, yet in the consequent rendition both of its components experienced a comprehensive reinterpretation that created a favorable context for the ensuing evolution.

With its great semantic potential, the self-management doctrine proved crucial in this sense, providing the bridge between the old and the new. While it legitimized the detachment from the Soviet solutions, self-management doctrine never relinquished its Marxist-Leninist aura of correct ideological worldview. The new tasks and the right to make mistakes thus simply merged with the initial propagandistic reach and ambitions.

Moreover, the Yugoslav youth press could exploit the wide breach left by the new Yugoslav youth and media theories whose coordinates were much more blurry than the original Soviet ones. The youth was elevated into an active agent, yet the boundaries of its freedom were far from determined. The Yugoslav press greatly diversified, but remained torn between the need to attain the market needs and fulfill its social mission.

Operating within such a schizophrenic mediascape, the resulting hybrid medium proved extremely elusive. Fusing original elements, inherited marginal status and the new self-management mission, it defied standard paradigms from the Soviet propaganda model to its *samizdat* opposite. The concept capable of containing its complex diversity was found on the margin of the Western media theory, in the flexible model of alternative media, recently revived to account for a range of non-mainstream media whose influence vastly surpass their circulation.

As the research chapters showed, the Yugoslav youth press easily found resonance in the existing overviews of the alternative media. Complying with its narrowest stipulations, Yugoslav youth publications combined communal responsibility, interest in critical ideas with commitment to creative expression and insecure existence.<sup>1</sup>

Throughout the covered period the youth press introduced large segments of Yugoslav youth to media, both as its subjects and creators. Allowing those usually underrepresented to express their interests and identities, it hosted diverse empowering discourses of resistance. Despite their institutional position, the youth journals privileged the involved over the informed readers, and preferred spontaneous forms over institutions. Their staff combined writing with action, feeding the debate from their own perspective.

Squeezed to the margins of the media scene, the youth press challenged the mainstream media hegemony beyond the explicit political realm. Obligated to constantly solicit new writers, it turned into a true training ground with great educational and transformative potential. Confined by scarce finances, its staff was encouraged to experiment and find new strategies that opposed established media practices, developing a reputation for being open to cutting edge ideas. With time, the youth press introduced a range of media innovations in content, form and methods of production, setting up along the way new professional norms, roles, forms of social capital and knowledge production.

The process was neither ubiquitous nor linear and evolved in two distinct stages. From the late 1960s the Yugoslav youth press became both a mediator and an organizer of the radical student politicization. The youth journals not only provided media space once the students found themselves on the streets, but were heavily

---

<sup>1</sup> Chris Atton “Alternative Journalism: Ideology and Practice”, in Allan, Stuart, ed., *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism* (London: Routledge, 2009), 169-178.

involved in all of the preparations and their aftermath. Openly pointing to the shortcomings of the Yugoslav regime, they democratized political participation, ready to enter into conflicts with the various institutions of the regime.

Following a period of crisis caused by the backlash in the early 1970s, the youth press revived in the latter part of the decade, albeit with different focus and targeted audience. In the new politically repressive climate, the youth journals became a key promoter of local punk-rock subculture. A new type of struggle between teenage punk-rockers and their wary professors replaced the old one between the progressive leftists and Party bureaucrats. Whereas beforehand ideology spread directly, here the staff acted as cultural interpreters rather than political leaders.

In both cases, however, youth journals were those who led the way and set the major tone, engaging in a fierce semantic struggle over representation whereby new concepts were awarded with new signifiers. As they posed key agendas and provided vital initial impulses, their narratives decisively affected both processes to the extent that they became mutually intertwined. Moreover, the journalists were personally involved in the topics they discussed. Whether student-activists or teenage punk promoters they became major actors on the local political and sub-cultural scene, profoundly shaping their outlook and directing its future course.

The authorities noticed this iconoclastic progress as it occurred. Already during the first political period a distinct internal discourse on the youth press and its specific tasks was born. Between 1968 and 1972 around twenty related debates evolved, typically prompted by some transgression made by the youth journals. Depending on the intentions these were initiated either by the Party, the youth union and the

mainstream media who were all throwing allegations, or by the youth journalists who defended themselves, respectively.<sup>2</sup>

In this dialogue it was the youth journalists who came up with fresh ideas. By learning through experience, they formulated their specific mission in a way that corresponds to the provisions suggested by the theorists of alternative media. If, as they argued, alternative media should behave as a corrective of mainstream media and the authorities, actively promote new ideas and affirm authentic youth voices, stay inclined to experiments and exhibit great educational value, then the Yugoslav youth press fits this definition.

To a large extent, the authorities agreed, even if they were usually on the offensive. Their reaction brilliantly restated the chief discrepancy embedded in the new self-management paradigm of the youth. After first being applauded for addressing important problems, the youth journals were reproached for the particular manner in which they did so.<sup>3</sup>

Despite the upcoming political crisis, many of the articulated features were thus, consequently, accepted as the essential qualities of the new self-management youth press. Indeed, once the journals recovered in the 1970s, the internal dialogue resumed along similar lines. The youth press was still expected to introduce new ideas and

---

<sup>2</sup> See among others: “Omladinska & studentska štampa” (Youth & Student Press), *Polet* 24 (Dec. 1968): 10-13; “Mladi pred vratima Sedme sile” (Youth Ahead of the Seventh Power), *Omladinski tjednik* 29 (23 Oct. 1968): 9; “Štampa, taj krepki krepani feniks” (The Press that brisk Phoenix), *Omladinski tjednik* 67 (5 Nov. 1969): 1; “Mlada štampa” (Young Press), *Omladinski tjednik* 67 (5 Nov. 1969): 3.

<sup>3</sup> The pattern was followed ever since the Belgrade youth journals first came under fire for their June engagement. See: “Stav Univerzitetskog odbora” (The Stance of the University Committee); *Student* 22 (5 Nov. 1968): 3; “Zaključci Gradskog komiteta Saveza omladine povodom revije *Susret*” (The Youth Union City Committee’s Conclusions on the *Susret* journal), *Susret* 90 (27 Nov. 1968): 4. “Zaključci Skupštine Saveza studenata Beograda” (Conclusions of the Belgrade Student Union Assembly), *Student* 7 (18 March 1969): 2.

actors, only the focus was now on (rock)culture and teenage self-representation, rather than politics.<sup>4</sup>

### **New perspective of the student movement and punk-rock subculture**

The Yugoslav youth press is undoubtedly the main hero of the thesis. Yet, its outstanding role of an active media agent makes it impossible to speak about its alternative experience without dealing in detail with the two phenomena on which it had a seminal impact. Here too, the thesis points to a new approach to the scholarship on communist Yugoslavia. More concretely, I shed new light upon the Yugoslav student politicization and the punk-rock subculture of the late 1960s and the late 1970s respectively, as seen through the eyes of their major protagonist: the youth journals. Chapters 5 and 6 provided a more comprehensive, comparative and theoretically informed interpretation of both phenomena traced through their three major centers, Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana.

First, both were recognized as the formative experiences of the late socialist Yugoslav youth that mirrored the deeper changes in society and the official attitude towards youth. The first came as a direct consequence of the late 1960s reformist attempt to politically activate the youth which for the first time seized its assigned role of a political partner of the Party. In Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana students aggressively posed as the conscious vanguard of the Yugoslav socialist society. Defending what they perceived were its original goals they added a new aggressive tone to the customary self-management phrases, taking them seriously and affording them with new meanings.

---

<sup>4</sup> The new focus was matched by the less formal discourse. See: “Dečki se boje biti mladi” (Guys Are Afraid to Be Young), *Polet* 1 (27 Oct. 1978): 21.

That their project ultimately failed bluntly unveiled the naivety of the new official paradigm that mistakenly believed the youth would self-willingly choose the single predetermined road, something that Soviets did not take for granted. The Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana student movements exposed the intrinsic fragility and deep incongruities of the Yugoslav communism, defined by a range of mutually contrasting elements.

The ensuing collapse was immense and terminated all genuine youth political engagement for years to come. The existing youth infrastructure, however, remained open and was reused in the subsequent decade for a different type of activity. In the new scenery where youth politics was literally proscribed, rebellious punk-rock subculture became a surrogate channel for the expression of youth creativity and defiance. The challenge was seemingly less confrontational than the one before, yet just as intense since local punk-rock added a new subversive dimension to what till then was, to a large extent, a non-problematic domestic rock culture.

This crucial turn from politics to subculture, as shown in Chapter 6, signaled a clear failure of the regime to incorporate any genuine political activity of the youth, marking the loss of its belief in the reformative potential of the system. As such it was a clear symptom of the crisis of Yugoslav socialism. Instead of trying to better it from within, the youth came to utilize self-management to promote different agenda, which even while revoking the same ideological tenants had little to do with them. From the official point, the shift indicated the change in the preferred, or rather tolerated way of being young. Over a single decade, the latter transformed from being radically politically (predominantly leftist) active to being ideologically disillusioned yet equally subversive punk-rocker. The related subaltern youth public sphere narrowed accordingly.

Furthermore, the thesis emphasized a balanced manner in dealing with the Yugoslav decentralizing federal framework, frequently acknowledged for its huge impact, yet rarely followed in detail. Away from the ruling dichotomy between centralist and fragmentary perspectives, I tried to remain sensitive to both the common and specific features of the processes in the three major Yugoslav republican/national centers, which, as narratives confirmed, evolved in a diverse manner.

Different trajectories were most visible during the political turmoil. Motives, ideologies and chronologies of each student movement varied from one city to another, even as they stayed on the same left side of the political spectrum. Once the national issue entered into equation, the collision only enhanced, disclosing once again inherent contradictions of the Yugoslav communism.

But punk-rock as well, though widely regarded as an urban pan-Yugoslav phenomenon exhibited strong local contours. With all their similarities, Ljubljana punk and Zagreb New Wave were not the same, just as this was not the case with the previous student movements. In fact political and sub-cultural processes were intrinsically linked to each other, as the circumstances in which the first was suppressed affected the manner in which the latter was formed.

Finally, the political and sub-cultural eruption emerged through a creative interaction of local and foreign elements. In both cases, if not in the same measure, Western political and cultural ideas and forms were readily adopted and reworked by the Yugoslav youth. Despite having major domestic motives and overtones, the student political upheaval of the late 1960s echoed the concurrent global student rebellion and the related New Left tactics and ideology. With punk the prime impulse came from abroad, only to be reshaped in the new environment. Feeding off the established Yugoslav rock culture, the youth borrowed the aesthetics and iconography



of the British punk to articulate its own agenda. Even where the translation was literal, the different context assigned the original idiom different meanings.

In this way, Yugoslav student movements and punk-rock were placed in a broader context, beyond the narrow state or Cold-War borders. Both were observed not only as authentic Yugoslav experiences, but to an extent as a local reflection of the international political and cultural youth evolution. However, as stressed before, they were never carbon copies. Borrowed elements were always colored with local concerns, resulting in unique combinations that asked for new interpretations.

### **State sponsored alternative media and its subaltern youth public sphere**

The youth press itself was subjected to the same process of adoption of foreign media impulses. Over the years, it resembled, if not always intentionally, the two contemporary Western alternative media that until recently embodied the concept: the underground press and the punk-fanzines. Akin to the same New Left sentiments or rebellious punk-rock mindset, the mutual interaction was often direct as these Western journals were acquired in various ways.<sup>5</sup> Conversely, operating in the similar conditions and confronted with the same marginal status their solutions proved alike.

During the 1960s and early 1970s, much of the Western political counter-culture was directly imported from the US and British underground journals such as *Rat* or *It*.<sup>6</sup> Aside from the content, the genre itself was lavishly presented, allowing the youth

---

<sup>5</sup> While *Tribuna* was prescribed to *Village Voice*, more often journalists acquired underground journals through friendly contacts established during their excursions abroad. Kvesić, interview, Štrajn, interview, Stojanović, interview.

<sup>6</sup> See Klarin's interview with *Rat*'s editor: "Otpadnici post-oskudnog društva" (Outcasts of the Post-Meagre Society), *Omladinski tjednik* 67 (5 Nov. 1969): 10.

journalists to recognize in it their own qualities, from links with the radical student politics to insecure existence caused by the latent pressure from the authorities.<sup>7</sup>

Yet, unlike its counterpart, the youth press of the period kept its political focus, displaying only hints of authentic youth culture. The deficit was annulled in the following decade with the journals' sub-cultural turn, immediately matched by the new role model. *Polet's* close community of readers and self-representation of marginal voices heavily drew from DIY fanzine style, while presentation-wise leaned more on the emerging life-style magazines.

In the process, the two unlikely, ideologically contrasting contexts were joined, with one important distinction. What in the West appeared on the margins, in communist Yugoslavia squeezed in the heart of the system, retaining its subversive potential. The fact reiterates, in a radical form, the contention on which recent debates on the alternative media insist: their frequent affiliation with the formal state structures and the mainstream media which does not necessarily diminish their counter-hegemonic edge.

Indeed, the alternative experience of the Yugoslav youth press forces one to go beyond the binary categories of opposition and conformity that are simply too narrow to integrate its contingency. Sponsored and supervised by the youth organization, the youth journals by definition depended on the state and were forced to operate in a tiny relative space between cooperation and contention with the institutional power. Leaning on the new self-management directives, they tried to emancipate from their tutors in a long process of negotiation. By the same token, they remained permanently

---

<sup>7</sup> See: ““Underground press”, *Polet* 17 (March 1968): 23; “Podzemna štampa radikalne mlade amerike” (Underground Press of Radical Young America), *Omladinski tjednik* 54-55 (30 Apr. 1969): 12; “Časopisi za eksperimente i istraživanja” (Magazine for Experiments and Research), *Student*, spec. issue (16 Dec 1971): 26.

vulnerable, at a constant threat of being suppressed by them and having their independence lost.

The type of challenges they managed to produce thus reveal both the scope and limits of the forged subaltern youth public sphere in the process, which stayed relational to the surrounding governing context.<sup>8</sup> Within the wider democratizing reforms from the 1960s, a space opened up for a direct political struggle whereby the youth questioned the key ideological tenants of the Yugoslav state. Disenchanted and precluded from the project, a decade later the journalists moved away from the official discourse finding in a subcultural realm a vacant, less elitist and more secure spot to articulate their visions and grievances. Away from the slippery political terrain, its impact proved deeper.

Likewise, throughout the period, a rich exchange existed between the youth press and the mainstream media whose commercial interests and professional standards the youth journalists emulated at times. More often though, the ideas went the other way around. Impressed with the originality of the youth press, mainstream media regularly appropriated its popular features and staff. Yet the dangerous side-effects of such recuperation that troubled early Western critical media scholars were less evident in the officially monolithic communist context. There each dissonant voice has by default more weight and could not be so easily absorbed and rendered harmless. In fact the opposite is much more likely. By borrowing from the youth press, the Yugoslav mainstream media was further changed and diversified.

Overall, the thesis has placed the Yugoslav youth press as an actor and shaper not only of youth ideas and culture, but also as an instigator and articulator of major

---

<sup>8</sup> Corresponding to Nancy Fraser's argument, the youth press formed part of a "subaltern" public sphere which interacted with the mainstream to create emancipatory potential: See: Nancy Fraser, "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy," in Craig Calhoun, ed., *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 1992), 109-142.

debates and critiques of Yugoslav society in its important period of reform and development. Its unorthodox historic role illustrates the changes that affected late socialist Yugoslavia, at the time when the country's early ideological innovations had time to develop and transform, showing their extraordinary hybrid features. The presented experience of the youth press thus not only enriches the Western model of alternative media with a specific medium which operated from the centre of the communist regime, but points to the idiosyncratic and paradoxical Yugoslav context that institutionally cultivated, if not willingly, the production of alternatives.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### PRIMARY SOURCES:

#### Youth and other relevant periodicals

##### Central press organs of the youth and student organizations:

*Indeks* (Novi Sad)  
*Iskra* (Split)  
*Katedra* (Maribor)  
*Mladina* (Ljubljana)  
*Mladost* (Belgrade)  
*Naši dani* (Sarajevo)  
*Nezavisne omladinske novine* (Belgrade)  
*Omladinske novine* (Belgrade)  
*Omladinski tjednik* (Zagreb)  
*Polet* (Zagreb)  
*Student* (Belgrade)  
*Studentski list* (Zagreb)  
*Susret* (Belgrade)  
*Tlo* (Zagreb)  
*Tribuna* (Ljubljana)  
*Val* (Rijeka)

##### Cultural and academic youth and student journals:

*Časopis za kritiko znanosti* (Ljubljana)  
*Film* (Zagreb)  
*Gordogan* (Zagreb)  
*Ideje* (Belgrade)  
*Književna reč* (Belgrade)  
*Lica* (Sarajevo)  
*Quorum* (Zagreb)  
*Paradoks* (Zagreb)  
*Pitanja* (Zagreb)  
*Polet* (Zagreb)  
*Polja* (Novi Sad)  
*Pop-Express* (Zagreb)  
*Potkulture* (Beograd)  
*Problemi* (Ljubljana)  
*Prolog* (Zagreb)  
*Vidici* (Belgrade)

##### University, academic and art/cultural journals:

*Gledišta* (Belgrade)  
*Hrvatsko sveučilište* (Zagreb)  
*Naše teme* (Zagreb)  
*Novine Galerije SC* (Zagreb)  
*Perspektive* (Ljubljana)  
*Praxis* (Zagreb)

*Pegaz* (Beograd)  
*Razlog* (Zagreb)

Academic and professional press periodicals:

*Novinarstvo* (Belgrade)  
*Naša Štampa* (Belgrade)

Mainstream youth magazines:

*Čik* (Belgrade)  
*Džuboks* (Belgrade)  
*Kekec* (Belgrade)  
*Plavi vjesnik* (Zagreb)  
*Politikin zabavnik* (Belgrade)  
*Ritam* (Novi Sad)  
*Stop* (Ljubljana)  
*Tina* (Zagreb)  
*Zdravo* (Belgrade)  
*Zov* (Zagreb)  
*Yu strip* (Gornji Milanovac)  
*Spunk strip magazin* (Novi Sad)

**Interviews:**

Arsovski, Mihajlo. Interview by author, 15 November 2010, Zagreb. *Skype* recording  
 Barbarič, Peter. Interview by author, 26 November 2010, Ljubljana. E-mail.  
 Bešker, Inoslav. Interview by author, 27 November 2010, Zagreb. *Skype* recording.  
 Despot, Veljko. Interview by author, 14 December 2010, Rovinj. E-mail.  
 Dolar, Mladen. Interview by author, 23 April 2011, Ljubljana. Digital recording.  
 Fras, Vlatko. Interview by author, 5 November 2010, Zagreb. Digital recording.  
 Gatnik, Kostja. Interview by author, 19 November 2010, Ljubljana. E-mail.  
 Hajdu, Florian. Interview by author, 16 November 2010, Düsseldorf. *Skype* recording  
 Hodžić, Alija. Interview by author, 5 June 2006, Zagreb. Tape recording.  
 Ilić, Aleksandar. Interview by author, 3 August 2011. Belgrade. E-mail.  
 Ilić, Mirko. Interview by author, 16 November 2010, New York. *Skype* recording.  
 Klarin, Mirko. Interview by author, 16 April 2011, The Hague. *Skype* recording.  
 Kuljiš, Denis. Interview by author, 11 November 2010, Zagreb. Digital recording.  
 Kvesić, Pero. Interview by author, 15 November 2010, Zagreb. Digital recording.  
 Pavelić, Goran. Interview by author, 9 November 2010, Zagreb. Digital recording.  
 Pavlović, Zoran. Interview by author, 28 October 2010, Samobor. Digital recording.  
 Puhovski, Žarko. Interview by author, 13 May 2011, Zagreb. Digital recording.  
 Semenčić, Sven. Interview by author, 10 November 2010, Zagreb. Digital recording.  
 Stojanović, Lazar. Interview by author, 22 April 2011, Belgrade. *Skype* recording.  
 Strpić, Dag. Interview by author, 12 November 2010, Zagreb. Digital recording.  
 Štrajn, Darko. Interview by author, 8 April 2011, Ljubljana. *Skype* recording.  
 Trbuljak, Goran. Interview by author, 23 November 2010, Zagreb. Digital recording.  
 Turković, Hrvoje. Interview by author, 2 May 2011, Zagreb. Digital recording.  
 Vidmar, Igor. Interview by author, 11 December 2010, Ljubljana. E-mail.  
 Vujić, Antun. Interview by author, 27 Oct 2011, Zagreb. Digital recording.

**Documents: (press resolutions, statues of youth and student unions, party memmos, collection of sources):**

- “VIII Kongres SSOH. Dokumenti“ (VIII Congress SSOH), *Pitanja* 52-53-54 (1974).  
Badovinac, Tomislav, ed., *Sedmi kongres Saveza omladine Jugoslavije* (Seventh Congress of LYY). Beograd: CK SOJ, 1963.
- “Cirkular biroa CK SKOJ-a o *Mladom Boljševiku*, 1927” (CK SKOY Biro’s Circular on *The Young Bolshevik*). *Novinarstvo* 3/4 (1969): 84.
- Deveti kongres Saveza socijalističke omladine Jugoslavije (Dokumenti)* (Ninth Congress of the Socialist League of Youth of Yugoslavia (Documents)). Beograd: Mladost, 1974.
- Deveti kongres Zveze socialistične mladine Slovenije* (Ninth Congress of the Socialist League of Youth of Slovenia). Ljubljana: RK Zveze socialistične mladine Slovenije, 1975.
- Dokumenti istorije omladinskog pokreta Jugoslavije - Sv. 1: Prvi i drugi kongres USAOJ-a.*  
Beograd: Istorijsko odeljenje centralnog komiteta narodne omladine Jugoslavije, 1953.
- Hadžić, Ibrahim and Vladimir Maksimović, eds. *Omladinske organizacije u socijalističkom samoupravnom društvu: Od treće konferencije do IX kongresa* (Youth Organizations in Socialist Self-management Society: From the Third Conference till the Ninth Congress). Beograd: Mladost, 1975
- Hrvatsko proljeće: Presuda partije – Izveštaj o stanju u Savezu komunista Hrvatske u odnosu na prodor nacionalizma u njegove redove* (The Croatian Spring: Party’s Verdict – Report on the Situation in the League of Communists of Croatia about the Rise of Nationalism in Its Ranks). Zagreb: Dom i svijet, 2003.
- Izveštaj o radu Saveza omladine Hrvatske i Centralnog komiteta Saveza omladine Hrvatske između šestog i sedmog kongresa* (Report on the Activities of the League of Youth of Croatia and the Central Committee of the League of Youth of Croatia between the Sixth and Seventh Congress). Zagreb: 1963.
- Izveštaj o radu Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske između IX i X kongresa* (Report on the Work of the Socialist League of Youth of Croatia between the Ninth and Tenth Congress). Zagreb: Republička konferencija Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1982.
- Jedanaesti kongres SSOJ* (Eleventh Congress of the SSOJ). Beograd: Mladost, 1983.
- “Odluka Predsedništva Saveza omladine Jugoslavije o *Mladosti* – listu Saveza omladine Jugoslavije” (Decision of the Presidency of the Yugoslav Youth Union on *Mladost* – the Journal of the Yugoslav Youth Union). *Naša Štampa* 158 (May 1968): 13.
- Omladina i društvo: izvodi iz tekstova koji su bili predmet obrade u okviru projekta “Nauka i naučna publicistika o omladini.”* Beograd: Centar za društvena istraživanja pri Predsjedništvu SKJ: izdavački centar Komunist, 1972.
- Osmi kongres Saveza omladine Jugoslavije* (Eighth Congress of the LYY). Beograd: Mladost, 1968.
- Osmi Kongres Zveze mladine Slovenije* (Eighth Congress of the League of Youth of Slovenia). Ljubljana, 1968.
- Predlog statuta i akciono-političkog programa Saveza socijalističke omladine Srbije* (Draft of the Statute and Action-political Program of the Socialist League of Youth of Serbia). Beograd: Republička konferencija SSO Srbije, Konferencija Saveza studenata Srbije, 1974.
- “Resolucija 10. kongresa” (Resolution of the Tenth Congress). In Dušan Skupek, ed. *Deseti kongres Zveze socialistične mladine Slovenije* (The Tenth Congress of the Socialist League of Youth of Slovenia). Ljubljana: Republiška konferenca ZSMS, 1978.
- “Rezolucija o štampi prve zemaljske konferencije SKOJ-a, 4. VIII 1922.” (Resolution on the Press of the SKOY’s First National Conference, 4 Aug. 1922). *Novinarstvo* 3/4 (1969): 72-73.
- “Rezolucija o štampi [prvog kongresa Saveza radničke omladine Jugoslavije, 10. II. 1924.]“ (*Resolution on Press* [of the First Congress of the Union of the Working Youth of Yugoslavia, 10.02.1924]. *Novinarstvo* 3/4 (1969): 74-75.

- Rezolucija o zadacima NOJ u društvenom samoupravljanju, VI. kongres NOJ* (Resolution on the Tasks of NOJ in the Social Self-management, Sixth Congress of NOJ). Beograd: Politička dokumentacija, 1958.
- Sedmi Kongres Saveza omladine Hrvatske: Dokumenti* (Seventh Congress of the League of Youth of Croatia: Documents). Zagreb: Konferencija Saveza omladine Hrvatske, 1968.
- Sječa Hrvatske u Karađorđevu 1971: autorizirani zapisnik*. (The Fall of Croatia in Karađorđevo in 1971: Authorized Transcript). Zagreb: Meditor, 1994.
- Skupek, Dušan, ed. *Deseti kongres Zveze socialistične mladine Slovenije* (The Tenth Congress of the Socialist League of Youth of Slovenia). Ljubljana: Republiška konferenca ZSMS, 1978.
- Start magazin: analiza poruka i sadržaja od broja 1 do 160 (za internu upotrebu)*. (Start Magazine: Analysis of the Messages and Contents from Volume 1 to 160 (for Internal Use). Zagreb, 1975.
- Statut i akciono politički program Saveza socijalističke omladine Srbije* (Statute and Action-political Program of the LSY of Serbia). Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1978. *Statut Saveza socijalističke omladine Jugoslavije* (Statute of the Socialist League of Youth of Yugoslavia). Zagreb: CDD, 1975.
- Statut Saveza studenata Jugoslavije* (Statute of the Student Union of Yugoslavia). Beograd: ICS, Predsjedništvo Konferencije Saveza studenata Jugoslavije, 1972.
- “Zakon o oporezivanju knjiga, novina i drugih publikacija u prometu” (Law on the Taxation of Books, Newspapers and Other Publications in Circulation). *Službeni glasnik* 33 (1972).
- Zbornik: Dokumenti Jun-Lipanj 1968*. (Collection of Documents: Jun 1968). Zagreb: Praxis, 1971.

## SECONDARY LITERATURE:

### **Books:**

- Adelman, Deborah. *The “Children of Perestroika”: Moscow Teenagers Talk about their Lives and the Future*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1992.
- Adrić, Iris, Vladimir Arsenijević and Đorđe Matić, eds. *Leksikon YU mitologije* (Lexicon of Yu Mythology). Zagreb/Beograd: Postscriptum/Rende, 2004.
- Alaniz, José. *Komiks. Comic Art in Russia*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2010.
- Albahari, David, ed. *Drugom stranom: Almanah novog talasa u SFRJ* (On the Other Side: The Almanac of the New Wave in SFRY). Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1983.
- Albright, Madeleine Korbel. *Poland, the Role of the Press in Political Change*. New York: Praeger, 1983.
- Aleksić, Jordan, ed. *Mlada generacija osamdesetih godina: položaj, svet i ponašanja* (Young Generation in the Eighties: Status, World and Attitudes). Beograd: Centar za društvena istraživanja CK SKJ, 1986.
- Ali, Tariq and Susan Watkins. *1968: Marching in the Streets*. New York: Free Press, 1998.
- Allan, Stuart, ed. *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism*. London: Routledge, 2009.
- Allcock, John B. *Explaining Yugoslavia*. London: C. Hurst, 2000.
- Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy*. London: New Left Books, 1971.
- Andreovski, Živko. *Informisanje u SSO* (Informing within the SSO). Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1985.
- Andrić, Dragoslav. *Dvosmerni rečnik srpskog žargona* (Two-directional Dictionar of Serbian Slang). Beograd: Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod, 1976.
- Andelković, Vladimir, ed. *Pankeri* (Punks). Beograd: Pan Publik, 1988.



- Arsić, Mirko and Dragan R. Marković. '68: *studentski bunt i društvo* ('68: Student Revolt and Society). Beograd: Istraživačko izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1988.
- Atton, Chris. *Alternative Media*. London: Sage Publications, 2006.
- Aulich, James and Marta Sylvestrová. *Political Posters in Central and Eastern Europe, 1945-95: Signs of the Times*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.
- Aumente, Jerome, et al. *Eastern European Journalism: Before, During and After Communism*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 1999.
- Avramović, Miodrag, ed. *Srebrni jubilej SNJ, 1945-1970* (SNY's Silver Jubilee, 1945-1970). Beograd: Savez novinara Jugoslavije, 1971.
- Aynsley, Jeremy. *A Century of Graphic Design: Graphic Design Pioneers of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*. London: Octopus Publishing Group, 2001.
- Bačević, Ljiljana et al. *Mladi u sistemu masovnog komuniciranja* (Youth in the System of Mass Communication). Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1979.
- Bagić, Krešimir, ed. *Goli grad: antologija hrvatske kratke priče* (The Naked City: Croatian Short Story Anthology). Zagreb: Naklada MD, 2003.
- Bagić, Krešimir, ed. *Proza Quorumovog naraštaja* (The Prose of the Quorum Generation). Zagreb: Naklada MD, 1996.
- Bahtijarević, Štefica et al. *Seoska omladina danas: rezultati istraživanja u SR Hrvatskoj* (Rural Youth Today: Results of the Research in SR Croatia). Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1977.
- Balažic, Milan. *Slovenska demokratična revolucija 1986-1988: Civilna družba, nacionalni program in ljubljanski proces* (Slovenian Democratic Revolution 1986-1988: Civil Society, National Program and the Ljubljana Process). Ljubljana: Liberalna akademija, 2004.
- Baletić, Milovan ed. *Ljudi iz 1971: Prekinuta šutnja* (People from 1971: Broken silence). Zagreb: Vjesnik, 1990.
- Banac, Ivo. *With Stalin against Tito: Cominformist Splits in Yugoslav Communism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- Barbarič, Peter. *Okopi slave: Štiri desetletja rocka & popa* (The Trenches of Glory: Four Decades of Rock & Pop). Ljubljana: Vitrum, 1996.
- Barber-Kersovan, Alenka. *Vom "Punk-Frühling" zum "Slowenischen Frühling": Der Beitrag des slowenischen Punk zur Demontage des sozialistischen Wertesystems*. Hamburg: Krämer, 2005.
- Barić, Vinko. *Hrvatski punk i novi val 1976-1987* (Croatian Punk and New Wave 1976-1987). Solin: 2011.
- Barker, Martin. *Comics: Ideology, Power and the Critics*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.
- Barnard, Malcolm. *Graphic Design as Communication*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Bašin, Igor. *Novi rock: Rockovski festival v Križankah: 1981-2000* (New Rock: Rock Festival at Križanke: 1981-2000). Maribor: Subkulturni azil, 2006.
- Baškovič, Ciril, Pavel Gantar, Marjan Pungartnik, and Pavel Zgaga. *Študentsko gibanje 1968-72* (Student Movement 1968-72). Ljubljana: Krt, 1982.
- Bavčar, Igor, ed., *Punk pod Slovenci* (Punk under Slovenians/in Slovenia). Ljubljana: Republiška konferenca ZSMS, Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS, 1985.
- Beham, Mira. *Ratni doboši: Mediji, rat, politika* (War Drums: Media, War, Politics) (Beograd: Miona, 1997).
- Bekić, Milan, ed. *Zbornik sjećanja: Vjesnik: 1940. - 1990.* (Collection of Memories: Vjesnik: 1940.-1990.). Zagreb: Vjesnik, 1990.
- Benderly, Jill and Evan Kraft, eds. *Independent Slovenia. Origins, Movements, Prospects*. London: Macmillan, 1994.
- Bennett, Andy. *Cultures of Popular Music*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 2001.
- Bennett, Andy. *Popular Music and Youth Culture: Music, Identity and Place*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000.
- Bennett, Andy and Keith Kahn-Harris, eds. *After Subculture: Critical Studies in Contemporary Youth Culture*. London/Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

- Bennett, Tony et al., eds. *Rock and Popular Music: Politics, Policies, Institutions*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Bierut, Michael, William Drenttel, and Steven Heller. *Looking Closer 5: Critical Writings on Graphic Design*. New York: Allworth Press, 2006.
- Bilandžić, Dušan. *Historija SFRJ: Glavni procesi* (History of SFRY: Main Processes). Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1978.
- Bilandžić, Dušan. *Moderna Hrvatska* (Modern Croatia). Zagreb: Golden Marketing, 2000.
- Birgus, Vladimír and Jan Mičoch. *Česká fotografie 20. století* (Czech Photography of the 20th Century). Prague: KANT, 2005.
- Bjelica, Mihailo. *200 godina jugoslovenske štampe* (200 Years of Yugoslav Press). Beograd: JIN, 1968.
- Bjelica, Mihailo. *Mediji i politička moć: Istraživanje političke štampe i novinarstva u Srbiji (1945-1997)* (Media and Political Power: Research on the Political Press and Journalism in Serbia, 1945-1997). Beograd: Institut za političke studije, 1997.
- Bjelica, Mihailo. *Velike bitke za slobodu štampe* (Great Struggles for the Freedom of the Press). Beograd: Narodna knjiga, 1985.
- Bjelica, Mihailo, and Zdravko Lekovic. *Communication Policies in Yugoslavia*. Paris: Unesco, 1976.
- Black, Bob and Gregor Tomc, eds. *Pozdravi iz Babilona: Ameriška subkulturna teoretska scena* (Greetings from Babylon: American Subcultural Scene). Ljubljana: Krt, Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS, 1987.
- Boehlke, Michael and Henryk Gericke, eds. *ostPUNK! – Too Much Future: Punk in der DDR 1979-89*. Berlin: Künstlerhaus Bethanien, 2005.
- Boggs, Carl. *Gramsci's Marxism*. London: Pluto Press, 1976.
- Bokovoy, Melissa K., Irvine, Jill A. and Lilly Carol. *State-society relations in Yugoslavia, 1945-1992*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.
- Bondžić, Dragomir. *Beogradski univerzitet 1944-1952* (Belgrade University 1944-1952). Beograd: Institut za savremenu istoriju, 2004.
- Bongco, Mila. *Reading Comics: Language, Culture, and the Concept of the Superhero in Comic Books*. New York: Garland Publishing, 2000.
- Bonnell, Victoria E. *Iconography of Power: Soviet Political Posters Under Lenin and Stalin*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997.
- Boren, Mark Edelman. *Student Resistance: A History of the Unruly Subject*. New York/London: Routledge, 2001.
- Bošković, Blagoje, and David Dašić, eds. *Samoupravljanje u Jugoslaviji* (Self-management in Yugoslavia). Beograd: Privredni pregled, 1977.
- Boucher, David and Browning, Gary, eds. *The Political Art of Bob Dylan*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Bourdon, David. *Warhol*. New York: Abradale Press, 1989.
- Božinović, Neda et al., eds. *Beogradski univerzitet u predratnom periodu, narodno-oslobodilačkom ratu i revoluciji. Knj. 1&2* (Belgrade University in the Pre-war Period, Liberation War and Revolution. Vol. 1&2). Beograd: Centar za marskizam Univerziteta u Beogradu, 1986; 1989.
- Brake, Mike. *Comparative Youth Culture: The Sociology of Youth Cultures and Youth Subcultures in America, Britain and Canada*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1985.
- Brake, Mike. *Sociologija mladinske kulture in mladinskih subkultur* (Sociology of Youth Cultures and Youth Subcultures). Ljubljana: Republiška konferenca ZSMS, Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS, 1984.
- Braunstein, Peter and Michael William Doyle, eds. *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and '70s*. New York/London: Routledge, 2002.
- Brennen, Bonnie and Hanno Hardt, eds. *Picturing the Past. Media, History, and Photography*. Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
- Bročić, Manojlo et al. *Aktivnosti mladih i slobodno vrijeme: unapređivanje organizacije i programiranja aktivnosti djece i omladine u slobodnom vremenu* (Youth Activities and

- Leisure: Improving the Organization and the Programming of the Children and Youth Leisure Activities). Zagreb: Centar za vanškolski odgoj SR Hrvatske, 1971.
- Brovkin, Vladimir. *Russia after Lenin: Politics, Culture and Society, 1921-1929*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Brunnbauer, Ulf, ed. *(Re)Writing History: Historiography in Southeast Europe after Socialism*. Münster u.a.: Lit-Verlag, 2004.
- Bugarski, Ranko. *Žargon: lingvistička studija* (Slang: Linguistic Study). Beograd: Krug, 2003.
- Burg, Steven L. *Conflict and Cohesion in Socialist Yugoslavia. Political Decision Making Since 1966*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Buzek, Antony. *How the Communist Press Works*. London: Pall Mall Press, 1964.
- Buzov, Željko et al. *Navijačko pleme: prvo YU istraživanje* (Fan Tribe). Zagreb: RZ RK SSOH, 1989.
- Calhoun, Craig, ed. *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 1992.
- Califano, Joseph A. *The Student Revolution: A Global Confrontation*. New York: Norton, 1970.
- Carrier, David. *The Aesthetics of Comics*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000.
- Cateforis, Theo, ed. *The Rock History Reader*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Caute, David. *The Year of the Barricades: A Journey Through 1968*. New York: Harper & Row, 1988.
- Chambers, Iain. *Popular Culture: The Metropolitan Experience*. London/New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Chambers, Iain. *Urban Rhythms: Pop Music and Popular Culture*. London: Macmillan, 1985.
- Chaney, David. *Lifestyles*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Clarke, Graham. *The Photograph*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Clews, John C. *Communist Propaganda Techniques*. New York: Praeger, 1964.
- Cohen, Stanley. *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*. Oxford: Martin Robertson & Company Ltd, 1980.
- Cohen, Philip. *Serbia's Secret War: Propaganda and the Deceit of History*. Collage Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1996.
- Consuegra, David. *American Type Design and Designers*. New York: Allworth Press, 2004.
- Couldry, Nick. *Place of Media Power*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Couldry, Nick, and James Curran, eds. *Contesting Media Power: Alternative Media in a Networked World*. Lanham, Md./Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003.
- Coyer, Kate, Tony Dowmunt, and Alan Fountain. *The Alternative Media Handbook*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Croteau, David, William Hoynes, and Charlotte Ryan, eds. *Rhyming Hope and History: Activists, Academics, and Social Movement Scholarship*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Crowley, David and Susan E. Reid, eds. *Socialist Spaces. Sites of Everyday Life in the Eastern Bloc*. Oxford: Berg, 2002.
- Curran, James, and Myung-Jin Park, eds. *De-Westernizing Media Studies*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Curran, James, David Morley, and Valerie Walkerdine, eds. *Cultural Studies and Communications*. London: Arnold, 1996.
- Curry, Jane Leftwich. *Poland's Journalists: Professionalism and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Curry, Jane Leftwich, ed. *Dissent in Eastern Europe*. New York: Praeger, 1983.
- Cushman, Thomas. *Notes from Underground: Rock Music Counterculture in Russia*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995.
- Cuvalo, Ante. *The Croatian national movement 1966-1972*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.

- Cvetković, Slavoljub. *Napredni omladinski pokret u Jugoslaviji: 1919-1928* (Progressive Youth Movement in Yugoslavia: 1919-1928). Beograd: Institut društvenih nauka, Odeljenje za istorijske nauke, 1966.
- Cvitan-Černelić, Mirna, Djurdja Bartlett, and Ante Tonči Vladislavić, eds. *Moda: povijest, sociologija i teorija mode* (Fashion: History, Sociology and Theory of Fashion). Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2002.
- Cvjetičanin, Veljko et al., eds. *Društvo revolucija omladina: Mladi između sadašnjosti i budućnosti* (Society Revolution Youth: Youth between the Present and the Future). Zagreb: Centar za kulturnu djelatnost, 1969.
- Czerwionka, Markus, ed. *Lexikon der Comics (Loseblattsammlung)*. Meitingen: Corian, 1994/1995/1996.
- Čaldarović, Ognjen et al. *Problemi stanovanja mladih: rezultati istraživanja u SRH* (Problems of Youth Housing: Results of the Research in SR Croatia). Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1978.
- Čulig, Benjamin, Nenad Fanuko and Velibor Jerbić. *Vrijednosti i vrijednosne orijentacije mladih: rezultati istraživanja provedenog u SR Hrvatskoj 1981. godine* (Values and Value Orientations: Results of the Research in SR Croatia in 1981). Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1982.
- Čurčić, Branka, ed. *Ideology of Design/ Ideologija dizajna*. New York-Novi Sad: Autonomedia-Centar za nove medije, 2009.
- Dabac, Tošo. *Zagreb tridesetih godina* (Zagreb in the 1930s). Zagreb: Arhiv Tošo Dabac, 1994.
- Dahlgren, Peter, and Colin Sparks, eds. *Journalism and Popular Culture*. London: Sage, 1992.
- Damjanović, Milica. *Napredni pokret studenata Beogradskog univerziteta. Knj. 1. Od 1919. do 1929. godine; knj. 2. Od 1929. do 1941. godine* (Progressive Student Movement at the Belgrade University. Vol. 1. From 1919 till 1929; vol. 2. From 1929 till 1941). Beograd: Nolit, 1966; 1974.
- Daniels, Robert V. *The Year of Heroic Guerrilla: World Revolution and Contrarevolution in 1968*. Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Danky, James and Denis Kitchen, eds. *Underground Classics: The Transformation of Comics into Comix*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 2009.
- D'Arcus, Bruce. *Boundaries of Dissent. Protest and State Power in the Media Age*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Dabčević-Kučar, Savka. *'71 Hrvatski snovi i stvarnost ('71 Croatian Dreams and Reality)*, vol. 1; vol. 2. Zagreb: Interpublic, 1997.
- Davenport, Christian, Hank Johnston, and Carol Mueller, eds. *Repression and Mobilization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Davidović, Dušan, ed. *Mladi i nacionalizam* (Youth and Nationalism). Beograd: Mladost, Centar za istraživačku, dokumentacionu i izdavačku delatnost predsedništva Konferencije Saveza socijalističke omladine Jugoslavije, 1984.
- Dean, John and Jean-Paul Gabilliet, eds. *European Readings of American Popular Culture*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996.
- De Jong, Wilma, Martin Shaw, and Neil Stammers, eds. *Global Activism, Global Media*. London: Pluto Press, 2005.
- della Porta, Donatella and Herbert Reiter, eds. *Policing Protest: The Control of Mass Demonstrations in Western Democracies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- Denitch, Bogdan Denis. *The Legitimation of a Revolution: The Yugoslav case*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.
- Detlef, Junker, ed. *1968: The World Transformed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Dewitz, Bodo von and Robert Lebeck, eds. *Kiosk: Eine Geschichte der Fotoreportage, 1839-1973* (Kiosk: A History of Photojournalism, 1839-1973). Göttingen: Steidl, 2001.

- Dimić, Ljubodrag. *Agitprop kultura: Agitpropovska faza kulturne politike u Srbiji, 1945-1952* (Agitprop Culture: Agitprop Period in the Cultural Policy in Serbia, 1945-1952). Beograd: Rad, 1988.
- Duda, Igor. *Pronađeno blagostanje: Svakodnevni život i potrošačka kultura u Hrvatskoj 1970-ih i 1980-ih* (Found Prosperity: Everyday Life and Consumerist Culture in Croatia in the 1970 and the 1980s)
- Dukić, Slavoljub. *Slom srpskih liberala: tehnologija političkih obračuna Josipa Broza* (The Breakdown of the Serbian Liberals: The Technology of Josip Broz's Political Confrontations). Belgrade: Filip Višnjić, 1990.
- Djurić, Dubravka and Miško Šuvaković, eds. *Impossible Histories: Historical Avant-gardes, Neo-avant-gardes and Post-avant-gardes in Yugoslavia, 1918-1991*. Cambridge, Mass./London: The MIT Press, 2003.
- Docker, John. *Postmodernism and Popular Culture: A Cultural History*. Cambridge: University Press, 1995.
- Downing, John D.H. *Internationalizing Media Theory: Transition, Power, Culture: Reflections on Mass Media in Russia, Poland and Hungary 1980-95*. London: Sage Publications, 1996.
- Downing, John D.H. *Radical Media: The Political Experience of Alternative Communication*. Boston, MA: South End Press, 1984.
- Downing, John D.H., Tamara Villarreal Ford, Genève Gil, and Laura Stein. *Radical Media: Rebellious Communication and Social Movements*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 2001.
- Dragić, Nedeljko. *Tupko*. Bjelovar: Prosvjeta, 1985.
- Draginčić, Slavko and Zupan, Zdravko. *Istorija jugoslovenskog stripa 1* (History of Yugoslav Comics 1). Novi Sad: Forum Marketprint, 1986.
- Duda, Dean. *Kulturalni studiji: ishodišta i problemi* (Cultural Studies: Origins and Problems). Zagreb: AGM, 2002.
- Duncombe, Stephen. *Notes from Underground: Zines and the Politics of Alternative Culture*. London: Verso, 1997.
- Dutschke, Rudi. *Moj dugi marš* (My Long March). Zagreb: Globus, 1983.
- Džuverović, Borislav. *Generacija budućnosti: Mladi između mogućnosti i stvarnosti* (Generation of the Future: Youth between the Possibilities and the Reality). Beograd: Ideje, 1974.
- Džuverović, Borislav. *Omladina u jugoslavenskom društvu: Socio-demografski profil mlade generacije* (Youth in the Yugoslav Society: Socio-demographic Profile of the Young Generation). Beograd: Mladost, 1974.
- Đekić, Velid. *91.decibel: Vodič rock'n'rol Rijekom* (91 Decibel: A Guide to the Rock'n'Roll Rijeka). Zagreb: Meandarmedia, 2009.
- Đukanović, Zoran. *Tomas Man ili Filip K. Dik – eseji o stripu* (Thomas Mann or Philip K. Dick – Essays on Comics). Beograd: Vidici (special issue), UK SSO Beograda, 1988.
- Eastopen, Antony and Kate McGowan, eds. *A Critical and Cultural Theory Reader*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press, 2004.
- Eisner, Will. *Comics & Sequential Art*. Tamarac, Fl: Poorhouse Press, 1985.
- Engerman, David C. *Know Your Enemy: The Rise and Fall of America's Soviet Experts*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Enzensberger, Hans Magnus. *Raids and Reconstructions: Essays on Politics, Crime and Culture*. London: Pluto Press, 1976.
- Erjavec, Aleš, ed. *Postmodernism and Postsocialist Condition: Politicised Art under Late Socialism*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2003.
- Esler, Anthony, ed. *The Youth Revolution: The Conflict of Generations in Modern History*. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1974.
- Espoir et al. *Communist Cartoons: Cartoons from "The Communist", 1921-22*. London: J. Klugmann Pictorials, 1982.
- Estren, Mark James. *A History of Underground Comics*. Berkeley, CA: Ronin Publishing, 1993.

- Estrin, Saul. *Self-management: Economic Theory and Yugoslav Practice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Evans, Harold. *Pictures on a Page: Photojournalism, Graphics and Picture Editing*. London: Pimlico, 1997.
- Eyerman, Ron and Andrew Jamison. *Music and Social Movements: Mobilizing Traditions in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Fahlenbrach, Kathrin. *Protestinszenierungen. Visuelle Kommunikation und kollektive Identitäten in Protestbewegungen* (Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, 2002)
- Fanuko, Nenad, Vlasta Ilišin, Dinka Marinović, Vladimir Obradović, Maria Oliveira-Roca, Furio Radin, Ivan Rimac, Helena Štimac, and Srđan Vrcan. *Fragments of the Youth*. Zagreb: RZ RK Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1988.
- Fehér, Ferenc, and Andrew Arato, eds. *Crises and Reform in Eastern Europe*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 1991.
- Feldbrugge, F. J. M. *Samizdat and Political Dissent in the Soviet Union*. Leyden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1975.
- Feuer, Lewis S. *The Conflict of Generations: The Character and Significance of Student Movements*. New York: Basic Books, 1969.
- Filipović, Filip. *Izabrani spisi* (Selected Writings). Beograd: Kultura, 1962.
- Fischer, Hartwig, ed. *Covering the real. Kunst und Pressebild von Warhol bis Tillmans* (Covering the real. Arts and Press Picture, from Warhol to Tillmans). Basel: Kunstmuseum Basel/Cologne: DuMont, 2005.
- Fisher, Ralph Talcott, Jr. *Pattern for Soviet Youth: A Study of the Congresses of the Komsomol, 1918-1954*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- Fornäs, Johan and Göran Bolin. *Youth Culture in Late Modernity*. London: Sage Publications, 1995.
- Forsdick, Charles, Laurence Grove, and Libbie McQuillan, eds. *The Francophone Bande Dessinée*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi, 2005.
- Frit, Sajmon. *Sociologija roka* (Sociology of Rock). Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1987.
- Frith, Simon and Goodwin Andrew, eds. *On Record: Rock, Pop, and the Written Word*. London: London: Routledge, 1990.
- Frith, Simon. *Performing Rites: Evaluating Popular Music*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Frith, Simon. *Sound Effects: Youth, Leisure, and the Politics of Rock*. London: Constable, 1983.
- Frith, Simon. *Zvočni učinki: Mladina, brezdelje in politika rock'n'rolla* (Sound Effects: Youth, Leisure, and the Politics of Rock). Ljubljana: Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS, Republiška konferenca ZSMS, 1986.
- Fulgosi, Ante, and Furio Radin. *Stilovi života zagrebačkih srednjoškolaca*. (Lifestyles of Zagreb High-school Youth). Zagreb: CDD SSOH, 1982.
- Gabilliet, Jean-Paul. *Of Comics and Man: A Cultural History of American Comic Book*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2010.
- Galjer, Jasna. *Dizajn pedesetih u Hrvatskoj – Od utopije do stvarnosti* (Design in Croatia during the 1950s – From Utopia to Reality). Zagreb: Horetzky, 2004.
- Galjer, Jasna, *Arsovski*. Zagreb: Horetzky, 2010.
- Gamson, William A. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Belmont: Wadsworth, 1990.
- Garner, Roberta and John Tenuto. *Social Movement Theory and Research: An Annotated Bibliographical Guide*. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press, 1997.
- Garofalo, Reebee, ed. *Rockin' the Boat: Mass Music and Mass Movements*. Boston, MA: South End Press, 1992.
- Garriock, P.R. *Masters of Comic Book Art*. New York: Images Graphiques, 1978.
- Gatnik, Kostja. *Danes in nikdar več* (Today and Never Again). Ljubljana: Študentska založba, 1977.
- Gelder, Ken. *Subcultures: Cultural Histories and Social Practice*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Gelder, Ken and Sarah Thornton, eds. *The Subcultures Reader*. London: Routledge, 1997.

- Gibbs, Joseph. *Gorbachev's Glasnost: The Soviet Media in the First Phase of Perestroika*. College Station, Texas: A&M University Press, 1999.
- Gifford, Denis. *The International Book of Comics*. London: Hamlyn, 1990.
- Gitlin, Todd. *The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making & Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Giugni, Marco, Doug McAdam and Charles Tilly, eds. *How Social Movements Matter*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Glander, Timothy Richard. *Origins of Mass Communication Research During the American Cold War: Educational Effects and Contemporary Implications*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000.
- Glasgow University Media Group. *Bad News*. London: Routledge&Kegan Paul, 1976.
- Glasgow University Media Group. *More Bad News*. London: Routledge&Kegan Paul, 1980.
- Glavan, Darko. *Punk: potpuno uvredljivo negiranje klasike (Punk: Utterly Insulting Negation of Classics)*. Gornji Milanovac: Dečje novine, 1980.
- Glavan, Darko and Hrvoje Horvat. *Prljavo kazalište: Sve je lako kad si mlad: Autorizirana biografija (Dirty Theatre: Everything Is Easy When You Are Young)*. Zagreb: Minerva/Europapress Holding, 2001.
- Glavan, Darko and Dražen Vrdoljak. *Ništa mudro: Bijelo dugme: autorizirana biografija (Nothing Very Wise: Bijelo Dugme: An Authorized Biography)*. Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti SSOH, 1981.
- Glavan, Darko and Timotijević, Slavko, eds. *Dražen Kalenić*. Zagreb: Spektar, 1983.
- Glavan, Darko et al. *Pop glazba i kultura mladih: sondažno istraživanje publike rock-koncertata (Pop Music and Youth Culture: A Survey of the Rock-Concerts Audience)*. Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti SSOH, 1978.
- Glessing, Robert. *The Underground Press in America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970.
- Goban-Klas, Tomasz. *The Orchestration of the Media: The Politics of Mass Communications in Communist Poland and the Aftermath*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1994.
- Gordy, Eric D. *The Culture of Power in Serbia: Nationalism and the Destruction of Alternatives*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999.
- Gorsuch, Anne E. *Youth in Revolutionary Russia: Enthusiasts, Bohemians, Delinquents*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.
- Goulding, Daniel J.. *Liberated Cinema: The Yugoslav Experience, 1945-2001*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.
- Graber, Doris, Denis McQuail, and Pippa Norris, eds. *The Politics of News: The News of Politics*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 1998.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.
- Grandits, Hannes and Taylor, Karin, eds. *Yugoslavia's Sunny Side: A History of Tourism in Socialism (1950s-1980s)* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2010)
- Grbelja, Josip. *Cenzura u hrvatskom novinstvu: 1945-1990 (Censorship in Croatian Journalism: 1945-1990)*. Zagreb: Naklada Jurčić, 1998.
- Grdešić, Ivan, Jasna Grgić Bigović, Vlasta Ilišin, and Mirjana Kasapović. *Omladina u delegatskom sistemu: Rezultati istraživanja provedenog u SR Hrvatskoj 1980. godine (Youth in the Delegate System: The Results of the Research Conducted in SR Croatia in 1980)*. Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti SSOH, 1982.
- Grgić Bigović, Jasna, Boris Hudina, and Mladen Knežević. *Maloljetni delikventi i radne akcije: omladinske radne akcije kao element socijalizacije maloljetnih delikvenata: rezultati istraživanja u SR Hrvatskoj (Juvenile Delinquents and Work Brigades: Youth Work Actions as an Element of Socialization of Juvenile Delinquents)*. Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1978.
- Groensteen, Thierry. *The System of Comics*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2007.
- Gross, Peter. *Entangled Evolutions: Media and Democratization in Eastern Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

- Gross, Peter. *Mass Media in Revolution and National Development: The Romanian Laboratory*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1996.
- Grossberg, Lawrence and Della Pollock, eds. *Cultural Studies: Theorizing Politics, Politicizing Theory*. London/New York: *Cultural Studies* 18, no. 2/3 (Routledge special issue), 2004.
- Grunenberg, Cristoph and Jonathan Harris, eds. *Summer of Love: Psychedelic Art, Social Crises and Counterculture in the 1960s*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005.
- Guedes Bailey, Olga, Bart Cammaerts, and Nico Carpentier. *Understanding Alternative Media*. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2008.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Toward a Rational Society: Student Protest, Science and Politics*. London: Polity Press, 1989.
- Hadžić, Ibrahim, and Vladimir Maksimović, eds. *Omladinske organizacije u socijalističkom samoupravnom društvu: Od treće konferencije do IX kongresa* (Youth Organizations in Socialist Self-management Society: From the Third Conference till the Ninth Congress). Beograd: Mladost, 1975.
- Hall, Stuart, and Tony Jefferson, eds. *Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-war Britain*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Hamersky, Heidrun ed. *Gegenansichten. Fotografien zur politischer und kulturellen Opposition in Osteuropa 1956-1989*. Berlin: Christoph Links Verlag, 2005.
- Harrison, Sylvia. *Pop Art and the Origins of Post-Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Harth, Helene and Titus Heydenreich, eds. *Fumetti – Comics in Italien*. München: Piper Verlag (*Zibaldone* vol. 17 special issue), 1994.
- Harvey, Robert C. *The Art of the Funnies: An Aesthetic History*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1994.
- Hatfield, Charles. *Alternative Comics: An Emerging Literature*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2005.
- Hebdige, Dick. *Hiding in the Light: On Images and Things*. London/New York: Routledge/Comedia, 1988.
- Hebdige, Dick. *Subculture, The Meaning of Style*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Hebdiž, Dik. *Potkultura: Značenje stila* (Subculture, The Meaning of Style). Beograd: Rad, 1980.
- Heer, Jeet and Kent Worcester, eds. *Arguing Comics. Literary Masters on a Popular Medium*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2004.
- Heer, Jeet and Kent Worcester, eds. *A Comics Studies Reader*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2009.
- Heged, Mirjana. *Šank nije katedra* (The Bar is Not a Cathedral). Beograd: IIC SSOS, 1987.
- Heller, Steven. *Design Literacy. Understanding Graphic Design*. New York: Allworth Press, 2004.
- Hemingway, Andrew, ed. *Marxism and the History of Art. From William Morris to the New Left*. London: Pluto Press, 2006.
- Henry, Tricia. *Break all Rules! Punk Rock and the Making of a Style*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1989.
- Hewison, Robert. *Too Much: Art and Society in the Sixties 1960-75*. London: Methuen, 1988.
- Highmore, Ben. *The Everyday Life Reader*. London/New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Hollander, Gayle Durham. *Soviet Political Indoctrination: Developments in Mass Media and Propaganda since Stalin*. New York: Praeger, 1972.
- Hopkins, Mark W. *Mass Media in the Soviet Union*. New York: Pegasus, 1970.
- Hopkins, Mark W. *Russia's Underground Press: The Chronicle of Current Events*. New York: Praeger, 1983.
- Horn, Maurice. *The World Encyclopedia of Comics*. New York: Chelsea House, 1983.
- Horvat, Hrvoje. *Johnny B. Štulić: Fantom slobode* (Johnny B. Štulić: Phantom of Freedom). Zagreb: Profil, 2005.
- Hrvatska fotografija od 1950 do danas: katalog izložbe* (Croatian Photography from 1950 to Today: Exhibition catalog). Zagreb: Muzej suvremene umjetnosti, 1997.



- Huxley, David. *Nasty Tales: Sex, Drugs, Rock'n'Roll and Violence in the British Undergr.* Manchester: *Critical Vision*, 2002.
- Ignjatović, Srba. *Poetizam Stripa* (Poetics of Comics). Osijek: Izdavački centar *Revija*, 1979.
- Ihitić, Kasim. *Eseji o kulturi mladih* (Essays on Youth Culture). Sarajevo: RK Književne omladine BiH, 1988.
- Ilich, Iztok, ed. *Pričevanja študentske pomladi* (Testimonies of the Student Spring). Ljubljana: Partizanska knjiga, 1986.
- Ilić, Aleksandar Battista, et al., ed. *Tomislav Gotovac*. Zagreb: Hrvatski filmski savez, 2003.
- Ilišin, Vlasta, Furio Radin, Helena Štimac, and Srđan Vrcan. *Ogledi o omladini osamdesetih* (Essays on the Eighties Youth). Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 1990.
- Inkeles, Alex. *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia: A Study in Mass Persuasion*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951.
- Irwin, John. *Scenes*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977.
- Ivkov, Slobodan. *60 godina domaćeg stripa u Srbiji* (Six Decades of Comics in Serbia). Subotica: Likovni susret, 1995.
- Jakovina, Tvrtko, ed. *Hrvatsko proljeće 40 godina poslije* (The Croatian Spring 40 Years After). Zagreb: Centar za demokraciju i pravo Miko Tripalo, 2012.
- Jakovina, Tvrtko. *Socijalizam na američkoj pšenici* (Socialism on American Wheat). Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2002.
- Jakubowicz, Karol. *Rude Awakening: Social and Media Change in Central and Eastern Europe*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 2006.
- Janjatović, Petar, ed. *Ilustrovana YU Rock enciklopedija 1960-2000* (Illustrated YU Rock Encyclopedia, 1960-2000). Novi Sad: Prometej, 2001.
- Janjatović, Petar, ed. *Pesme bratstva, detinjstva i potomstva: Antologija ex yu rok poezije. 1967-2007* (Poems of the Brotherhood, Childhood, and Posterity: The Anthology of Ex-Yu Rock Poetry. 1967-2007). Novi Sad: Vega media, 2008.
- Janjetović, Zoran. *Od "internacionalne" do komercijale: Popularna kultura u Jugoslaviji: 1945-1991* (From the "International" to Commercial: Popular Culture in Yugoslavia: 1945-1991.)
- Janowitz, Anne, and Nancy Peters, eds. *Unamerican Activities*. San Francisco: City Light Books, 1981.
- Denegri, Jerko. *Prilozi za drugu liniju: Kronika jednog kritičarskog izlaganja* (Contributions to *Other Line: Chronicle of a critical Evaluation*). Zagreb: Horetzky, 2003.
- Denegri, Ješa. *Razlozi za drugu liniju – za novu umetnost sedamdesetih* (Reasons for the Other Line – For the New Art of the Seventies). Novi Sad: Biblioteka matice srpske, 2007.
- Denegri, Ješa. *Studentski kulturni centar kao umetnička scena* (Student Cultural Center as Art Scene). Beograd: SKC, 2003.
- Denegri, Jerko. *Umjetnost konstruktivnog pristupa. EXAT '51 i Nove tendencije* (The Art of Constructivist Approach. *Exat '51 and New Tendencies*). Zagreb: Horetzky, 2004.
- Drakulić-Ilić, Slavenka. *Novi kvadrat* (New Square). Rijeka: Izdavački centar Rijeka, 1978.
- Jenkins, J. Craig and Bert Klandermans, eds. *The Politics of Social Protest. Comparative Perspectives on States and Social Movements*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.
- Jerbić, Velibor. *Analiza načina života i korištenja slobodnog vremena djece i omladine u Zagrebu u 1968. godini* (Analysis of the Way of Life and the Usage of Free Time of Children and Youth in Zagreb in 1968). Zagreb: Centar za vanškolski odgoj Saveza društava Naša djeca SR Hrvatske, 1970.
- Jilek, Miroslav. *Omladinske radne akcije: problemi i perspektive* (Youth Work Actions: Problems and Perspectives). Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1982.
- Johnston, Hank and Bernd Klandermans, eds. *Social Movements and Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.
- Johnston, Hank, Enrique Larana and Joseph R. Gusfield, eds. *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994.

- Johnston, Hank and John A. Noakes, eds. *Frames of Protest: Social Movements and the Framing Perspective*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005.
- Joksimović, Snežana et al. *Mladi i neformalne grupe: U traganju za alternativom* (Youth and Informal Groups: In Search of Alternative). Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, Centar za idejni rad SSO Beograda, 1988.
- Jones, Amelia, ed. *A Companion to Contemporary Art since 1945*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Kačavenda, Petar. *Omladina u revoluciji: Ujedinjeni Savez antifašističke omladine Jugoslavije 1942-1945* (Youth in Revolution: United League of Antifascist Youth of Yugoslavia 1942-1945). Beograd: Institut za savremenu istoriju, 1985.
- Kačavenda, Petar, ed. *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret Jugoslavije 1919-1979* (Youth Revolutionary Movement in Yugoslavia 1919-1979). Beograd: Ekspres Pres, 1979.
- Kangrga, Milan. *Šverceri vlastitog života* (Smugglers of Their Own Lives). Zagreb: Feral Tribune, 2002.
- Kanzleiter, Boris and Krunoslav Stojakovic, eds. *1968 in Jugoslawien. Studentenproteste und kulturelle Avantgarde zwischen 1960 und 1975*. Bonn: Dietz Verlag, 2008.
- Kanzleiter, Boris. *Die "Rote Universität": Studentenbewegung und Linksopposition in Belgrad 1964-1975* (Hamburg: VSA Verlag, 2011).
- Kaplan, Frank L. *Winter into Spring: The Czechoslovak Press and the Reform Movement, 1963-1968*. Boulder, Colo.: East European Quarterly, 1977.
- Kardelj, Edvard. *Beleške o našoj društvenoj kritici* (Notes on Our Social Critique). Beograd: Kultura, 1966.
- Kardelj, Edvard. *Self-management and the Political System*. Beograd: Socialist Thought and Practice, 1980.
- Kassof, Allen. *The Soviet Youth Program: Regimentation and Rebellion*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Kenez, Peter. *The Birth of the Propaganda State: Soviet Methods of Mass Mobilization, 1917-1929*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Kern, Nikola, ed. *Štampa, radio, televizija i film u Jugoslaviji* (Press, Radio, Television and Film in Yugoslavia). Beograd: Jugoslavenski institut za novinarstvo, 1964.
- Kisić, Milica. *Pionirska i omladinska štampa u SR Srbiji 1945-1985: bibliografija* (Pioneer and Youth Press in SR Serbia in 1945-1985: Bibliography). Gornji Milanovac: Dečje novine, 1988.
- Klandermans, Bert and Suzanne Staggenborg, eds. *Methods of Social Movement Research*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
- Klasić, Hrvoje. *Jugoslavija i svijet 1968* (Yugoslavia and the World: 1968). Zagreb: Naklada Ljevak, 2012.
- Klein, Carmen. *Između zidova i preko njih* (Between the Walls and Over). Zagreb: CDD, 1985.
- Klimke, Martin and Joachim Scharloth, eds. *1968 in Europe: A History of Protest and Activism, 1956-77*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Knigge, Andreas C. *Comic Lexikon* (Comics Lexicon). Berlin: Ullstein, 1988.
- Kolešnik, Ljiljana, ed. *Socijalizam i modernost: Umjetnost, kultura, politika: 1950.-1974.* (Socialism and Modernity: Art, Culture, Politics: 1950-1974). Zagreb: Muzej suvremene umjetnosti, Institut za povijest umjetnosti, 2012.
- Kobré, Kenneth. *Photojournalism: The Professionals' Approach*. London: Focal Press, 1991.
- Kołakowski, Leszek. *Main currents of Marxism: Vol. 3, The Breakdown*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Kostelnik, Branko. *Moj život je novi val: Razgovori s prvoborcima i dragovoljcima novog vala* (My Life is New Wave: Interviews with the New Wave Pioneers and Volunteers). Zaprrešić: Fraktura, 2004.
- Košević, Želimir, ed., *Galerija Studentskog centra Zagreb: 1961-1973* (Student Centre Gallery 1961-1973). Zagreb: Studentski centar Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 1975.
- Košević, Želimir, *Ispitivanje međuprostora* (Questioning the Interspace). Zagreb: CKD SSO, 1978.

- Koščević, Želimir, *U fokusu* (In Focus). Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2006.
- Kolanović, Maša. *Udarnik! Buntovnik? Potrošač... Popularna kultura i hrvatski roman od socijalizma do tranzicije* (Strike Worker! Rebel? Consumer... Popular Culture and Croatian Novel from Socialism to Transition). Zagreb: Naklada Ljevak, 2011.
- Kremenšek, Slavko. *Slovensko študentovsko gibanje 1919-1941* (Slovenian Student Movement 1919-1941). Ljubljana: Inštitut za zgodovino delavskega gibanja, Mladinska knjiga, 1972.
- Kršić, Dejan, ed. *Mirko Ilić: Strip, ilustracija, dizajn, multimedija 1975-2007* (Mirko Ilić: Comics, Illustrations, Design, Multimedia 1975-2007). Zagreb: AGM & Profil International, 2008.
- Krulčić, Veljko, ed., *Hrvatski poslijeratni strip* (Postwar Croatian Comics). Pula: Istarska naklada, 1984.
- Krulčić, Veljko, ed. *Mauroviću s ljubavlju. Spomenar* (To Maurović with Love: Scrapbook). Zagreb: Vedis, 2009.
- Krulčić, Veljko, ed. *Put u obećanu zemlju - 12 godina stripa u "Poletu"* (The Road to Promised Land - 12 Years of Comics in *Polet*). Zagreb: RS SOH Zagreb, 1990.
- Krulčić, Veljko. *Tri generacije, katalog Salon jugoslavenskog stripa*. Vinkovci, 1984.
- Krulčić, Veljko. *Zagrebački strip: 1935-1941* (Zagreb Comics: 1935-1941). Zagreb: Galerija Nova, 1985.
- Krulčić, Veljko. *I Salon jugoslavenskog stripa* (I Yugoslav Comic Salon). Vinkovci: Radničko Sveučilište 'Nada Sremac', 1984.
- Kuehn, Karl Gernot *Caught: The Art of Photography in the German Democratic Republic*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Kulić, Mišo. *Rok-kultura u izazovu* (Rock Culture Facing Challenge). Sarajevo: Gradska konferencija Književne omladine BiH, 1980.
- Kuljiš, Denis. *Ad hominem*. Zagreb: Metro, 2006.
- Kurspahić, Kemal. *Zločin u 19:30: Balkanski mediji u ratu i miru* (Prime Time Crime: Balkan Media in War and Peace). Sarajevo: Media centar, 2003.
- Kvesić, Pero. *Mladi K.: nova verzija Uvoda u Peru K* (Young K.: New Version of the Introduction to Pero K). Zagreb: Znanje, 1983.
- Kvesić, Pero. *Što mi rade & što im radim* (What Are They Doing to Me & What Am I Doing to Them). Zagreb: Nezavisna izdanja, 1984.
- la Grange, Ashley. *Basic Critical Theory for Photographers*. Oxford: Elsevier/Focal Press, 2005.
- Laing, Dave. *One Chord Wonders: Power and Meaning in Punk Rock*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1985.
- Lalić, Dražen, Anči Leburić, and Nenad Bulat. *Grafiti i supkultura* (Graffiti and Subculture). Zagreb: Alinea, 1991.
- Lalić, Dražen. *Torcida: Pogled iznutra* (Torcida: View from the Inside). Zagreb: AGM, 1993.
- Lampe, John R. *Yugoslavia as History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Lamza, Vesna, ed. *Mladi i novine. Rezultati istraživanja provedenog povodom izdavanja ogleđnog primjerka omladinskog magazina "Ševa"* (Youth and the Press: Results of the Research on the Exemplary Issue of the Youth Magazine *Ševa*). Zagreb: NIŠP Vjesnik, 1977.
- Langlois, Andrea, and Frédéric Dubois, eds. *Autonomous Media: Activating Resistance & Dissent*. Montréal: Cumulus Press, 2005.
- Laughey, Dan. *Key Themes in Media Theory*. Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press, 2007.
- Leamer, Laurence. *The Paper Revolutionaries: The Rise of the Underground Press*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972.
- Leburić, Anči and Inga Tomić-Koludrović. *Nova političnost mladih* (New Politicization of Youth). Zagreb: Alinea, 2002.
- Leković, Zdravko. *Omladina i Savez komunista* (Youth and the League of Communists). Beograd: Privredni pregled, 1972.

- Leković, Zdravko. *Štampa i revolucija* (Press and the Revolution). Beograd: Radnička štampa, 1982.
- Lenin, Vladimir Ilych. *On Youth*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1967.
- Lenin, Vladimir Ilych. *What is to Be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement*. New York: International Publishers, 1969.
- Lent, John A. *Comic Art of Europe through 2000: An International Bibliography. Vol. 1&2*. Westport: Praeger, 2003.
- Lent, John A., ed. *Pulp Demons: International Dimensions of the Postwar Anti-Comics Campaign*. Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1999.
- Lester, Paul Martin. *Photojournalism: An Ethical Approach*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1991.
- Lester, Paul Martin. *Visual Communication: Images with Messages*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth, 2006.
- Levi, Pavle. *Disintegration in Frames: Aesthetics and Ideology in the Yugoslav and Post-Yugoslav Cinema*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007.
- Levi Strauss, David. *Between the Eyes: Essays on Photography and Politics*. New York: Aperture Foundation, 2003.
- Lewes, James. *Protest and Survive: Underground GI Newspapers during the Vietnam War*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2003.
- Lewis, Lisa A., ed. *The Adoring Audience: Fan Culture and Popular Media*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Lewis, Roger. *Outlaws of America: The Underground Press and its Contents: Notes on a Cultural Revolution*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin and Philip G. Altbach, eds. *Students in Revolt*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.
- Lolić, Marko. *Mladost revolucije: SKOJ-SSOJ 1919-1979 (The Youth of Revolution: LCYY-LSYY 1919-1979)*. Zagreb: CKD SSO, 1979.
- Lopes, Paul. *Demanding Respect: The Evolution of the American Comic Book*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2009.
- Lovšin, Peter, Peter Mlakar, and Igor Vidmar, eds. *Punk je bil prej: 25 let punka pod Slovenci (Punk Was Before: 25 Years of Punk in Slovenia)*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba and ROPOT, 2002.
- Lukšić, Irena, ed. *Šezdesete (Sixties)*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko filološko društvo, 2007.
- Lull, James. *Media, Communication, Culture: A Global Approach*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- Luthar, Breda and Marusa Pusnik, eds. *Remembering Utopia: The Culture of Everyday Life in Socialist Yugoslavia*. Washington, DC: New Academia Pub., 2010.
- Macan, Darko. *Hrvatski strip 1945.-54. (Croatian Comics 1945-54)*. Zagreb: Mentor, 2007.
- Mackay, Hugh, ed. *Consumption and Everyday Life*. London/Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications and Open University, 1997.
- Magnussen, Anne and Hans-Christian Christiansen, eds. *Comics and Culture*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 2000.
- Majstorović, Zlatko, ed. *Za reformu Hrvatskog sveučilišta (For the Reform of the Croatian University)*. Zagreb: Savez studenata Hrvatske, 1971.
- Mally, Lynn. *Culture of the Future: The Proletkult Movement in Revolutionary Russia*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Mandić, Igor, ed. *60. obljetnica Vjesnika: 1940.-2000. (Vjesnik's 60th Anniversary: 1940-2000)*. Zagreb: Vjesnik, 2000.
- Marcus, Greil. *In the Fascist Bathroom: Punk in Pop Music 1977-1992*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Marcus, Greil. *Lipstick Traces: A Secret History of the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Marcuse, Herbert. *The New Left and the 1960s*. London; New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Markoff, John. *Waves of Democracy: Social Movements and Political Change*. Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Pine Forge Press, 1996.

- Marković, Dragan and Križavac, Savo. *Zašto su smenjivani: Političke krize u Jugoslaviji, knjiga prva* (Why Were they Deposed: Political Crises in Yugoslavia, Volume One). Beograd: Narodna knjiga, 1985.
- Marković, Ljiljana, ed. *Leksikon novinarstva* (The Journalistic Lexicon). Beograd: Savremena administracija, 1979.
- Marović, Miodrag. "*Politika*" i *politika. Knj.1, Otpor; knj.2, Sunovrat* (Politics and Politics. Vol. 1. Resistance; vol. 2. Collaps). Beograd: Interprint, 2003.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Collected Works. Vol. 1*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1975.
- Mastnak, Tomaž. *Vzhodno od raja: civilna družba pod komunizmom in po njem* (East from Heaven: Civil Society under Communism and After). Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije, 1992.
- Mastnak, Tomaž, ed. *Socialistična civilna družba: Zbornik* (Socialist Civil Society: Edited Volume). Ljubljana: Republiška konferenca ZSMS, Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS, 1986.
- Maurović, Andrija. *Albumi. 1-3* (Albums. 3 vols.). Gornji Milanovac: Dečje novine, 1981; 1983; 1986.
- McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald, eds. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- McAdam, Doug and David A. Snow, eds. *Social Movements: Readings on Their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamics*. Los Angeles: Roxbury Pub., 1997.
- McCloud, Scott. *Understanding Comics: The Invisible Art*. New York: HarperPerennial, 1994.
- McDermott, Catherine. *Design: The Key Concepts*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- McDougall, Alan. *Youth Politics in East Germany: The Free German Youth Movement 1946-1968*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.
- McMillian, John and Paul Buhle. *The New Left Revisited*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2003.
- McNair, Brian. *Glasnost, Perestroika and the Soviet Media*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- McRobbie, Angela. *Postmodernism and Popular Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Meerson-Aksenov, Michael, and Boris Shragin, eds. *The Political, Social, and Religious Thought of Russian "Samizdat": An Anthology*. Belmont, Mass.: Nordland Publishing Company, 1977.
- Meršol, Mitja. *Študentje na barikadah* (Students at the Barricades). Ljubljana: Cankarjeva Založba, 1968.
- Mezei, Stevan et al. *Samoupravni socijalizam* (Self-management Socialism). Beograd: Savremena administracija, 1976.
- Mezer, David S., Nancy Whittier, and Belinda Robnett, eds. *Social Movements. Identity, Culture, and the State*. Oxford: University Press, 2002.
- Mickiewicz, Ellen. *Media and the Russian public*. New York: Praeger, 1981.
- Mihailović, Srećko. *Pregled najznačajnijih rezultata istraživanja o društveno-ekonomskom položaju, svesti i aktivizmu omladine* (Overview of the Relevant Findings of the Research on the Youth's Socio-political Status, Consciousness and Activism of the Youth). Beograd: Istraživačko izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1987.
- Mihailović, Srećko et al. *Deca krize: Omladina Jugoslavije krajem osamdesetih* (The Children of Crises: Yugoslav Youth at the End of the Eighties). Beograd: Institut društvenih nauka, 1990.
- Mihovilović, Miro A. *Konflikti generacija: Roditelji-djeca: Rezultati istraživanja u Zagrebu* (Generational Conflicts: Parents-Children: Results of the Zagreb Research). Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti Saveza socijalističke omladine, 1978.
- Mihovilović, Miro A. *Struktura i funkcija omladinskih klubova u Zagrebu: slobodno vrijeme omladine* (Structure and Function of the Youth Clubs in Zagreb: Youth's Leisure). Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 1970.

- Mijatović, Bogomir. *NS Rockopedija. Novosadska rok enciklopedija 1963-2003* (NS Rockopedia: Novi Sad Rock Encyclopedia 1963-2003). Sremska Kamenica: Switch, 2005.
- Miladinović, Ivan. *1968: Poslednji veliki san* (1968: The Last Big Dream). Beograd: Filip Višnjić, 2008.
- Miladinović, Ivan. *1968. Tajna i opomena* (1968. Mystery and Warning). Beograd: Damjanić, 2003.
- Miliša, Zlatko, Andrija Rako, and Vladimir Takšić. *Vrijednosne orijentacije studenata prema radu: socio-ekonomski status i vrijednosne orijentacije prema radu studenata Sveučilišta u Splitu* (The Students' Value Orientation toward Work: Socio-Economic Status and the Value Orientation toward the Work of Students at the University of Split). Zagreb: Radna zajednica republičke konferencije Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1988.
- Miller, Ann. *Reading Bande Dessinée. Critical Approaches to French-language Comic Strips*. Bristol: Intellect Books, 2007.
- Mirković, Igor. *Sretno dijete* (Happy Child). Zagreb: Fraktura, 2004.
- Misirlić, Amir. *Soundtrack vremena – Komparativna historija popularne muzike. Prvi tom – 1955-1973*. (Soundtrack of Time – Comparative History of Pop-Music. First Volume – 1955-1973). Zagreb: BTC Šahinpašić, 2008.
- Mitrović, Momčilo and Dobrica Vulović. *Beogradski univerzitet i '68. Zbornik dokumenata o studentskim demonstracijama* (Belgrade University and '68. Collection of Documents on Student Demonstrations). Beograd: Centar za marksizam univerziteta, 1989.
- Mlakar, Peter. *Uvod u Boga* (Introduction to God). Zagreb: Arkzin, 2000.
- Moljković, Ilija. *Dokumenti: "Slučaj" Student* (Documents: The Student "case"). Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 1998.
- Moore-Gilbert, Bart and John Seed, eds. *Cultural Revolution? The Challenge of the Arts in 1960s*. London/New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Morley, David and Kuan-Hsing Chen, eds. *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. London/New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Morris, John G. *Get the Picture Right: A Personal History of Photojournalism*. New York: Random House, 1998.
- Mrdušić, Maroje and Vidović, Dea, eds. *Dizajn i nezavisna kultura* (Design and Independent Culture). Zagreb: Prinera grupa, 2010.
- Muggleton, David. *Inside Subculture: The Postmodern Meaning of Style*. Oxford: Berg, 2000.
- Mukerji, Chandra and Michael Schudson, eds. *Rethinking Popular Culture: Contemporary Perspectives in Cultural Studies*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1991.
- Murray, John. *The Russian Press from Brezhnev to Yeltsin: Behind the Paper Curtain*. Aldershot, UK: E. Elgar, 1994.
- Nastran Ule, Mirjana, ed. *Mladina v devedesetih: Analiza stanja v Sloveniji* (Youth in the Nineties: Analysis of the Situation in Slovenia). Ljubljana: Znanstveno in publicistično središče, 1996.
- Nikolić, Miloš, ed. *Omladina i društvo* (Youth and Society). Beograd: Izdavački centar Komunist, 1972.
- Nikšić, Stevan. *Oslobođenje štampe* (The Liberation of the Press). Beograd: Mladost, 1982.
- Nothnagle, Alan L. *Building the East German Myth: Historical Mythology and Youth Propaganda in the German Democratic Republic, 1945-1989*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.
- Novak, Božidar. *Hrvatsko novinarstvo u 20. stoljeću* (Croatian Press in the 20th Century). Zagreb: Golden marketing, 2005.
- Novosel, Pavle. *Mladi i slobodno vrijeme: studija o uvjetima i ponašanjima zagrebačke srednjoškolske omladine u slobodnom vremenu* (Youth and Leisure: Study of the Conditions and Behavior of the Zagreb High-School Youth during Leisure). Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 1970.
- Novosel, Pavle. *Struktura i funkcija omladinskih organizacija u Hrvatskoj* (Structure and Function of the Youth Organizations in Croatia). Zagreb: CDD, 1971.

- Nuhić, Muhamed. *Sistem informisanja u SFRJ* (The Information System in SFRY). Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1981.
- Osgerby, Bill. *Youth Media*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- O'Sullivan, Tim, John Hartley, Danny Saunders, Martin Montgomery, and John Fiske. *Key Concepts in Communication and Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Paletz, David L., Karol Jakubowicz, and Pavao Novosel, eds. *Glasnost and After: Media and Change in Central and Eastern Europe*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 1995.
- Pantić, Dragomir. *Nacionalna svest mladih u SR Srbiji bez SAP: preliminarni istraživački izveštaj* (National Consciousness of the Youth in SR Serbia, without SAP). Beograd: Istraživačko izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1987.
- Pavelić, Goran Pipo. *Zagreb, osamdesete...* (Zagreb, the Eighties...). Zagreb: V.D.T., 2004.
- Pavković, Vasa. *Naš slatki strip* (Our Sweet Comics). Beograd: Narodna knjiga/Alfa, 2003.
- Pavlović, Vukašin. *Poredak i alternativa: izazov novih pokreta* (The Order and the Alternative: The Challenge of New Movements). Nikšić: Univerzitetska riječ, 1987.
- Pavlović, Živojin. *Ispljuvak pun krvi* (Spit Full of Blood). Beograd: Grafički atelje Dereta, 1990.
- Peck, Abe. *Uncovering the Sixties: The Life and Times of the Underground Press*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985.
- Perasović, Benjamin. *Urbana plemena* (Urban Tribes). Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 2001.
- Perić, Ivan. *Ideje "masovnog pokreta" u Hrvatskoj* (Ideas of "the Mass Movement" in Croatia). Zagreb: Narodno sveučilište grada Zagreba, Centar za aktualni politički studij, 1974.
- Perović, Latinka. *Zatvaranje kruga: ishod političkog rascjepa u SKJ 1971/1972* (Closing of the Circle: The Outcome of the Political Split in the LCY 1971/1972). Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1991.
- Peršen, Mirko, ed. *Vjesnikov leksikon, 1940-1990* (Vjesnik Lexicon, 1940-1990). Zagreb: Vjesnik, 1990.
- Petrinović, Kruno, ed. *Branimir Štulić: Kad Miki kaže da se boji. Prilozi za biografiju Johnnyja B. Štulića* (Branimir Štulić: When Miki Says He Is Afraid. Contributions to the Biography of Johnny B. Štulić). Zagreb: Umjetnička organizacija *Uradi nešto*, 2006.
- Pickering, Kenneth. *Key Concepts in Drama and Performance*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Pilkington, Hilary. *Russia's Youth and its Culture: A Nation's Constructors and Constructed*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Plenča, Dušan, ed. *Omladinski pokret Jugoslavije 1919-1969* (Yugoslav Youth Movement 1919-1969). Beograd: Mladost, 1969.
- Podrebarac, Vladimir, and Stanko Posavec. *Idejno-političke tendencije u omladinskoj i studentskoj štampi* (Ideological-political Tendencies in the Youth and Student Press). Zagreb: Istraživački i izdavački centar Naše teme, 1969.
- Ponoš, Tihomir. *Na rubu revolucije - studenti '71* (On the Edge of the Revolution – Students '71). Zagreb: Profil international, 2007.
- Popov, Nebojša. *Sukobi: Društveni sukobi – izazovi sociologiji* (Conflicts: Social Conflicts – A Challenge to Sociology). Beograd: Centar FDT, 1990.
- Popov, Nebojša, ed. *Sloboda i nasilje* (Freedom and Violence). Beograd: *Res publica*, 2003.
- Popović, Petar. *Rokopisi* (Rockwritings). Beograd: Zepter Book World, 2008.
- Posavec, Stanko, ed. *Omladina i socijalizam – ostvarenja i mogućnosti* (Youth and Socialism – Achievements and Potentials). Zagreb: Centar za društvene djelatnosti omladine, 1971.
- Poyner, Daniel, ed. *Autonomy: The Cover Designs of Anarchy, 1961–1970*. London: Hypen Press, 2012.
- Previšić, Jozo, and Vladimir Serdar. *Studentska omladina danas: Rezultati istraživanja u SR Hrvatskoj* (Student Youth Today: Results of the Research in SR Croatia). Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti SSOH, 1978.
- Prica, Ines. *Omladinska potkultura u Beogradu: simbolička praksa* (Youth Subculture in Belgrade: Symbolic Practice). Beograd: Etnografski institut SANU, 1991.

- Pšeničny, Vili, ed. *Mladina Slovenije '82. Rezultati raziskovanj v SR Sloveniji* (Slovenia Youth '82. The Results of the Research in SR Slovenia). Ljubljana: Republiška Konferenca ZSMS, 1982.
- Pšeničny, Vili, ed. *Mladinski dnevnik (Mladina's Diary)*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1978.
- Puhar, Alenka. *Peticije, pisma in tihotapski časi* (Petitions, Letters and Undercover Times). Maribor: Založba Obzorja, 1985.
- Pustz, Matthew. *Comic Book Culture: Fanboys and True Believers*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1999.
- Raboy, Marc. *Movements and Messages: Media and Radical Politics in Quebec*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 1984.
- Radaković, Siniša, ed. *Mala enciklopedija hrvatske pop i rock glazbe* (Small Encyclopedia of Croatian Pop and Rock Music). Rijeka: Nema problema produkcija, 1994.
- Radić, Radmila, ed. *1968 - četrdeset godina posle; 1968 – Fourth Years Later*. Beograd: Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije, 2008.
- Rajčević, Vojo. *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret u Hrvatskoj. Knj.1, 1919-1928; knj. 2, 1929-1949* (Revolutionary Youth Movement in Croatia. Vol. 1. 1919-1928; vol. 2. 1929-1949). Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1979; 1980.
- Rajčević, Vojo. *Studentski pokret na zagrebačkom sveučilištu između dva rata: 1918-1941* (Student Movement at the Zagreb University in the Interwar Period: 1918-1941). Zagreb: Mladost, 1959.
- Rajčević, Vojo et al. *Sveučilište i revolucija* (University and Revolution). Zagreb: Sveučilišni komitet SKH, 1970.
- Ramet, Sabrina P. *Balkan Babel: The Disintegration of Yugoslavia From the Death of Tito to the War for Kosovo*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1999.
- Ramet, Sabrina P. *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia, 1962-1991*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992.
- Ramet, Sabrina P., ed. *Rocking the State: Rock Music and Politics in Eastern Europe and Russia*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1994.
- Ramet, Sabrina P. *The Three Yugoslavias: State-Building and Legitimation, 1918-2005*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.
- Ramet, Sabrina P. and Crnković, Gordana P., eds. *Kazaaam! Splat! Poof!: The American Impact on European Popular Culture since 1945*. Landham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003.
- Ribar, Ivo Lola. *Omladina i revolucija* (Youth and Revolution). Beograd: Mladost, 1976.
- Riordan, Jim, ed. *Soviet Youth Culture*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.
- Roberts, John. *The Art of Interruption: Realism, Photography, and the Everyday*. Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 1998.
- Robinson, Gertrude. *Tito's Maverick Media: The Politics of Mass Communications in Yugoslavia*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977.
- Rodriguez, Clemencia. *Fissures in the Mediascape: An International Study of Citizen's Media*. Creskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 2001.
- Roemer, John E. *A Future for Socialism*. London: Verso, 1994
- Rosenkranz, Patrick. *Rebel Visions: the Underground Comix Revolution, 1963-1975*. Seattle: Fantagraphics Books, 2008.
- Roszak, Theodore. *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition*. London: Faber and Faber, 1973.
- Rucht, Dieter, Ruud Koopmans, and Friedhelm Neidhardt, eds. *Acts of Dissent: New Developments in the Study of Protest*. Berlin: Edition Sigma, 1998.
- Rucht, Dieter, ed. *Research on Social Movements: The State of the Art in Western Europe and the USA*. Frankfurt am Main/ Boulder, Colo.: Campus Verlag/Westview Press, 1991.
- Rucht Dieter et al., eds. *Cyberprotest: New media, Citizens and Social Movements*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Rudisill, Richard, Peter E. Palmquist, and Martha A. Sandweiss. *Photographers: A Sourcebook for Historical Research*. Nevada City, Calif.: Carl Mautz Publishing, 2000.



- Rupel, Dimitrij. *Od vojnog do civilnog društva* (From Military to Civil Society). Zagreb: Globus, 1990.
- Rusemagić, Ervin. *Čudesni svijet stripa* (Remarkable World of Comics). Sarajevo: Strip art Features, 1975.
- Rusinow, Dennison. *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*. London: C. Hurst, 1977.
- Ryback, Timothy W. *Rock Around the Bloc: A History of Rock Music in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Sabin, Roger. *Adult Comics: An Introduction*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Sabin, Roger, ed. *Punk rock: So what?; The Cultural Legacy of Punk*. London/New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Sabljak, Tomislav. *Rječnik hrvatskog žargona* (Dictionary of Croatian Slang). Zagreb: V.B.Z., 2001.
- Satterwhite, James H. *Varieties of Marxist Humanist: Philosophical Revision in Postwar Eastern Europe*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1992.
- Savage, Jon. *Engleski snovi: Sex Pistols i punk rock* (England's Dreaming: Sex Pistols and Punk Rock). Zagreb: VBZ, 2007.
- Schäfer, Hermann, ed. *Foto-Anschlag: Vier Generationen ostdeutschen Fotografen*. Leipzig: Stiftung Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Zeitgeschichtliches Forum Leipzig, E.A. Seemann, 2001.
- Schepers, Wolfgang, ed. '68. *Design und Alltagskultur zwischen Konsum und Konflikt*. Köln/Cologne: DuMont, 1998.
- Schreiber, Armin. *Kunst-Comics. Corben, Druillet, Moebius* (Art-Comics. Corben, Druillet, Moebius). Hamburg: Dreihen, 1989.
- Scott, Clive. *The Spoken Image: Photography & Image*. London: Reaktion Books, 1999.
- Sher, Gerson. *Marxist Criticism and Dissent in Socialist Yugoslavia*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977.
- Shuker, Roy. *Understanding Popular Music*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Sekelj, Laslo. *Yugoslavia: The Process of Disintegration*. Highland Lakes, New Jersey: Atlantic Research and Publications, 1993.
- Siebert, Fred S., Theodore Peterson, and Wilbur Schramm. *Four Theories of the Press: The Authoritarian, Libertarian, Social Responsibility, and Soviet Communist Concepts of What the Press Should Be and Do*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956.
- Simmie, James, and Joze Dekleva, eds. *Yugoslavia in Turmoil: After Self-management?*. London/New York: Pinter Publishers, 1991.
- Simpson, Christopher. *Science of Coercion: Communication Research and Psychological Warfare, 1945-1960*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Sitar, Iztok. *Zgodovina slovenskega stripa 1927-2007* (History of Slovenian Comics). Ljubljana: UMco, 2007.
- Skilling, H. Gordon. *Charter 77 and Human Rights in Czechoslovakia*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1981.
- Skilling, H. Gordon. *Samizdat and an Independent Society in Central and Eastern Europe*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan, 1989.
- Skinn, Dezz. *Comix: The Underground Revolution*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 2004.
- Snow, David A., Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi, eds. *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2007.
- Sonneson, Göran. *Semiotics of Photography: On Tracing the Index*. Lund: Department of Art History, 1989.
- Sontag, Susan. *On Photography*. London: Penguin, 2008.
- Sparks, Colin. *Communism, Capitalism and the Mass Media*. London: Sage Publications, 1998.
- Spassov, Orlin, ed. *Quality press in Southeast Europe*. Sofia: Southeast European Media Centre, 2004.
- Spehnyjak, Katarina. *Javnost i propaganda: Narodna fronta u politici i kulturi Hrvatske, 1945-1952* (Public and Propaganda: People's Front in Politics and Culture in Croatia, 1945-1952). Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest/Dom i svijet, 2002.

- Spender, Stephen. *The year of the young rebels*. New York: Vintage Books, 1969.
- Spigel, Lynn and Michael Curtin. *The Revolution wasn't Televised: Sixties Television and Social Conflict*. New York/London: Routledge, 1997.
- Stanković, Đorđe. *Studenti i Univerzitet: 1914-1954. Ogledi iz društvene istorije* (Students and the University: 1914-1954. Essays in Social History). Beograd: Centar za savremenu istoriju jugoistočne Evrope, 2000.
- Stimson, Blake and Gregory Scholette, eds. *Collectivism after Modernism: The Art of Social Imagination after 1945*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
- Stites, Richard. *Russian Popular Culture: Entertainment and Society since 1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Stojanovic Svetozar. *The Fall of Yugoslavia: Why Communism Failed*. Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 1997.
- Stoković, Živorad. *Štampa naroda i narodnosti u SFRJ 1945-1973: Građa za istoriju štampe* (The Press of SFRY Nations 1945-1973: Sources for the History of the Press). Beograd: Jugoslavenski institut za novinarstvo, 1975.
- Storey, John, ed. *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture: A Reader*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2006.
- Stipančić, Branka. *G. Trbuljak*. Zagreb: Muzej suvremene umjetnosti, 1996.
- Strinati, Dominic. *An Introduction to Theories of Popular Culture*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Strpić, Dag. *Kako smo rušili dogmatizam* (How We Destroyed Dogmatism). Zagreb: Kulturni radnik, 1988.
- Suri, Jeremi, ed. *The Global Revolutions of 1968: A Norton Casebook in History*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2006.
- Susovski, Marijan, ed., *Inovacije u hrvatskoj umjetnosti sedamdesetih godina, katalog izložbe* (Inovations in Croatian Art in the 1970s: Exhibition Catalogue) (Zagreb: Galerija suvremene umjetnosti, 1984).
- Škarica, Siniša. *Kad je rock bio mlad. Priča s istočne strane (1956-1970)* (When Rock Was Young: Story from the East Side (1956-1970)). Zagreb: VBZ, 2005.
- Škrabalo, Ivo. *101 godina filma u Hrvatskoj: 1896.-1997.: Pregled povijesti hrvatske kinematografije* (101 Years of Film in Croatia: 1896-1997: Historical Overview of Croatian Cinematography). Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus, 1998.
- Štrajn, Darko et al. *40-letnica študentskih gibanj na Slovenskem* (40th Anniversary of Student Movements in Slovenia). Ljubljana: Zavod Republike Slovenije za šolstvo, 2008.
- Šunjka, Dejan and Dragan Pavlov, eds. *Pank u Jugoslaviji: 1980-1990* (Punk in Yugoslavia: 1980-1990). Beograd: Dedalus, 1990.
- Šušar, Stipe. *Omladina između ideala i stvarnosti* (Youth between the Ideals and the Reality). Osijek: Konferencija SKH Zajednice općina, Centar za idejno teorijski rad, 1984.
- Tadić, Đuro. *Rasprava o djelovanju Saveza socijalističke omladine* (Discussion about the Activities of the Socialist League of Youth). Zagreb: CDD, 1981.
- Teodori, Massimo. *Historijat novih ljevica u Europi: 1956-1978* (History of the New Left in Europe: 1956-1978). Zagreb: Globus, 1979.
- Thompson, Mark. *Forging War: The Media in Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina*. Washington: Article 19, 1995.
- Tilly, Charles. *Social Movements, 1768-2004*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2004.
- Tirado, Isabel A. *Young guard!: The Communist Youth League, Petrograd, 1917-1920*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1988.
- Tismaneanu, Vladimir. *The Crisis of Marxist Ideology in Eastern Europe: The Poverty of Utopia*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Tito, Josip Broz. *Govori i članci* (Speeches and Articles). Zagreb: Naprijed, 1959.
- Tito, Josip Broz. *O omladini* (On Youth). Beograd: Mladost, 1974.
- Tökés, Rudolf L., ed. *Dissent in the USSR: Politics, Ideology, and People*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975.
- Tökés, Rudolf L., ed. *Opposition in Eastern Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.
- Tomanović, Velimir. *Omladina i socijalizam* (Youth and Socialism). Beograd: Mladost, 1977.

- Tomc, Gregor. *Druga Slovenija: zgodovina mladinskih gibanj na Slovenskem v 20. stoletju* (The Other Slovenia: History of Youth Movements in Slovenia in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century). Ljubljana: Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS, Knjižnica revolucionarne teorije, 1989.
- Tomc, Gregor, Peter Stanković, and Mitja Velikonja, eds. *Urbana plemena: Subkulture v Sloveniji v devetdesetih* (Urban Tribes: Subcultures in Slovenia in the 90s). Ljubljana: ŠOU, Študentska založba, 1999.
- Tomić, Đorđe and Petar Atanacković, eds. *Društvo u pokretu. Novi društveni pokreti u Jugoslaviji od 1968. do danas* (Society in Movement: New Social Movements in Yugoslavia from 1968 till Present). Novi Sad: Cenzura, 2009.
- Tomić, Svetozar. *Strip, poreklo i značaj* (Comics, Origin and Meaning). Novi Sad: Forum/Marketprint, 1985.
- Tomić-Koludrović, Inga and Leburić, Anči. *Skeptična generacija: Životni stilovi mladih u Hrvatskoj* (Skeptical Generation: Youth Lifestyles in Croatia). Zagreb: AGM, 2001.
- Tomić-Koludrović, Inga and Leburić, Anči. *Sociologija životnog stila: Prema novoj metodološkoj strategiji* (Sociology of Lifestyle: Towards the New Methodological Strategy). Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk/Hrvatsko sociološko društvo, 2002.
- Tripalo, Miko. *Hrvatsko Proljeće* (Croatian Spring). Zagreb: Globus, 1990.
- Troitsky, Artemy. *Back in the USSR: The True Story of Rock in Russia*. Boston: Faber and Faber, 1988.
- Turner, Graeme. *British Cultural Studies: An Introduction*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Tuš grupa. *Ludi jezik* (Crazy Language). Beograd: Pegaz/Književna omladina Srbije, 1980.
- Ule, Mirjana. *Mladina in ideologija* (Youth and Ideology). Ljubljana: Delavska enotnost, 1988.
- Valdivia, Angharad N., ed. *A Companion to Media Studies*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.
- Varnum, Robin and Gibbons, Christina T., eds. *The Language of Comics: Word and Image*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2001.
- Vasić, Miroljub. *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret u Jugoslaviji: 1929-1941. godine* (Revolutionary Youth Movement in Yugoslavia. 1929-1941). Beograd: Narodna knjiga, 1977.
- Vasić, Miroljub, ed. *Četvrti kongres SKOJ-a i zajednički kongres SKOJ-a i NOJ-a: 1948* (Fourth Congress of LCYY and Joint Congress of LCYY and PYY: 1948). Beograd: Izdavački centar Komunist, 1985.
- Vasić, Miroljub et al., eds. *Ideje i pokreti na Beogradskom univerzitetu od osnivanja do danas. Knj. 1 & 2* (Ideas and Movements at the Belgrade University from the Foundation till the Present. Vol.1&2). Beograd: Centar za marksizam Univerziteta u Beogradu, 1989.
- Vatovec, Fran. *Razvoj jugoslovanskoga novinarstva. Del 1: Razvoj slovenskega novinarstva* (Development of Yugoslav Journalism. Vol. 1: Development of Slovenian Journalism). Ljubljana: Visoka šola za politične vede, 1967.
- Vesović, Milan. *Ilegalna štampa KPJ, 1929-1941* (Illegal Press of CPY, 1929-1941). Beograd: Institut za savremenu istoriju, 1989.
- Vesović, Milan. *Revolucionarna štampa u Kraljevini Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca: 1918-1929* (Revolutionary Press in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes: 1918-1929). Beograd: Institut za savremenu istoriju, 1979.
- Vesović, Milan. *Studentska štampa između dva svetska rata*. Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu/Savremena administracija, 1988.
- Viculin, Marina, ed. *Ivan Posavec: Fotografije '71-'02: Galerija Klovićevi dvori, 7. 11. - 8. 12. 2002.* (Ivan Posavec: Photography '71-'02: Gallery Klovićevi dvori, 7. 11. - 8. 12. 2002.) Zagreb: Galerija Klovićevi dvori, 2002.
- Viculin, Marina, ed. *Mio Vesović, Fotografije '76-'03.: Galerija Klovićevi dvori, 26.2.-6.4. 2003.* (Photography '76-'03: Gallery Klovićevi dvori, 26.2.-6.4. 2003.). Zagreb: Galerija Klovićevi dvori, 2003.
- Vidovič-Miklavčić, Anka et al., eds. *Napredno mladinsko gibanje na Slovenskom. Del 1&2* (Progressive Youth Movement in Slovenia. Vol. 1&2). Ljubljana: Republiška konferenca ZSMS, 1982; 1985.

- Visković, Ivo. *Omladinski i studentski pokret u svijetu* (Youth and Student Movement in the World). Beograd: Radnički univerzitet "Đuro Salaj", 1974.
- Vrdoljak, Dražen. *Moje brazde: Bilješke o hrvatskoj zabavnoj, pop i jazz glazbi* (My Rigs: Notes on Croatian Popular, Pop and Jazz Music). Zagreb: VBZ, 2008.
- Volk, Petar. *Dvadeseti vek srpskog filma* (Twentieth Century of Serbian Cinema). Beograd: Institut za film, 2001.
- Volk, Petar. *Istorija jugoslovenskog filma* (History of Yugoslav cinema). Beograd: Institut za film, 1986.
- Volk, Petar. *Pozorišni život u Srbiji: 1944-1986* (Theatre Life in Serbia: 1944-1986). Beograd: Institut za pozorište, film, radio i televiziju Fakulteta dramskih umetnosti, 1990.
- Vučetić, Radina. *Koka-kola socijalizam: Amerikanizacija jugoslovenske popularne kulture šezdesetih godina XX veka* (Americanization of Yugoslav Popular Culture during the 1960s).
- Vukić, Feđa, et al. *Dokumenti vremena: Tri desetljeća novinske fotografije u Hrvatskoj* (Documents of the Time: Three Decades of Press Photography in Croatia). Zagreb: Europapress holding, 2009.
- Vukić, Feđa. *Modernizam u praksi* (Modernity in Practice). Zagreb: Meandar, 2008.
- Vukić, Feđa. *Stoljeće hrvatskog dizajna* (Century of Croatian Design). Zagreb: Meandar, 1996.
- Vukić, Feđa, ed. *Od oblikovanja do dizajna* (From Forming to Design). Zagreb: Meandar, 2003.
- Vukojević, Branko. *Kako je bio rokenrol: Izabrani tekstovi, 1975-1991*. (How Rock and Roll Happened: Selected Texts, 1975-1991). Beograd: Društvo ljubitelja popularne kulture, 2005.
- Vukotić, Manojlo, ed. *Brzo, kratko, jasno: 50 godina "Večernjih novosti"* (Fast, Short and Clear: 50 years of *Večernje novosti*). Beograd: Novosti, 2003.
- Vulović, Dobrica and Stojiljković, Zoran. *Mladi Univerziteta u političkoj akciji* (The University Youth in Political Action). Beograd: Centar za marksizam Univerziteta u Beogradu, 1983.
- Vurnik, Blaž. *Med Marxom in punkom: Vloga Zveze socialistične mladine Slovenije pri demokratizaciji Slovenije (1980-1990)* (Between Marx and Punk: The Role of the League of Socialist Youth of Slovenia in the Democratization of Slovenia (1980-1990)). Ljubljana: Modrijan, 2005.
- Wachsberger, Ken, ed. *Voices from the Underground: Insider Histories of the Vietnam War Underground Press. Vol 1&2*. Tempe, AZ: Mica's Press, 1993.
- Walker, John A. *Art in the Age of Mass Media*. Oxford: Westview Press, 1994.
- Wallace, Claire, and Sijka Kovatcheva, eds. *Youth in Society: The Construction and Deconstruction of Youth in East and West Europe*. London: Macmillan Press, 1998.
- Waller, Michael. *Democratic Centralism: An Historical Commentary*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981.
- Waltz, Mitzi. *Alternative and Activist Media*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.
- Warner Marien, Mary. *Photography: A Cultural History*. London: Laurence King Publishing, 2006.
- Warren, Lynne, ed. *Encyclopedia of Twentieth-Century Photography, Vol. 1-3*, New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Wayne, Mike, ed. *Understanding Film. Marxist Perspectives*. London: Pluto Press, 2005.
- Weiner, Robert G. *Graphic Novels and Comics in Libraries and Archives: Essays on Readers, Research, History and Cataloging*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co., 2010.
- Wells, Liz, ed. *Photography: A Critical Introduction*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Williams, Robert. *Hysteria in Remission*. Seattle: Fantagraphics Books, 2002.
- Wright, Charles R. *Mass Communication: A Sociological Perspective*. New York: Random House, 1975.
- Žarić, Slobodan. *Revolucionarni omladinski pokret u Hrvatskoj, 1941-1948* (Revolutionary Youth Movement in Croatia, 1941-1948). Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti Saveza socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1980.

**Journal (and internet) articles:**

- Ajdković, Dean. "Analiza sadržaja *Poleta*" (Analysis of Contents of *Polet*). *Pitanja* 5 (Nov. 1980): 1-24.
- Barbarič, Peter. "Zgodovina Radia Študent in nekaj osnovnih izpiskov iz zgodovine Radia" (History of the Radio Študent and Some Basic Excerpts from the History of the Radio) in *Evropski pilotski model praktičnega usposabljanja za integralnega radijca* (European Pilot Model for Practical Training of an All-round Boadcaster), *Radio Študent*, 9-11.
- Bardić, Zinka, and Silvija Šeparović. "Radio 101: The Radio that Never Stops." *Erasmus* 17 (1996): 32-33.
- Bjelica, Mihailo. "Cenzura bez cenzura: programi opozicione štampe u posleratnoj Jugoslaviji" (Censorship without the Censors). *Novinarstvo* 3/4 (1990): 81-85.
- Bjelica, Mihailo. "Karakteristične faze u razvitku jugoslavenskog novinarstva 1945-1985" (Typical Features in the Evolution of the Yugoslav Press 1945-1985). *Novinarstvo* 3/4 (1986): 123.
- Bohn, Chris. "Elektricni Orgazam. Elektricni Orgazam. (Jugoton – Yugoslav import)." *New Musical Express* 28 (8 Aug: 1981).
- Bohn, Chris. "Non-aligned Punk." *Melody Maker* (22 March 1980).
- Butković, Lidija. *Plavi vjesnik (1954.-1973.)*, Internet: <http://www.stripforum.hr/leksikon/magazin/plavi-vjesnik/#3>.
- Denegri, Ješa. "OHO, četiri desetljeća poslije" (OHO, Four Decades After). *Fantom Slobode* 3 (2010): 79-87.
- Drakulić, Slobodan. "Omladinske subkulture i njihovo proučavanje" (Youth Subcultures and their Research). *Revija za sociologiju: sociologijski tromjesečnik* 3/4: 241-247.
- Dukić, Ivan. "*Studio* i *Plavi vjesnik*: pogled na istraživanja prodora i utjecaja zapadne popularne kulture u Hrvatsku (1963.-1965.)" (*Studio* and *Plavi vjesnik*: A Look upon the Research on the Influence of the Western Popular Culture in Croatia (1963-1965)). *Radovi* 29 (1996): 331-48.
- Đukanović, Zoran. "Treća generacija i posle" (Third Generation and Beyond). *Istra* 6/7 (1986): 98-103.
- Džuverović, Borisav. "Osobnosti studentske štampe" (The Specificities of the Student Press). *Gledišta* 3 (1969): 410-15.
- Džuverović, Borisav. "Tretman mladih u jugoslavenskoj štampi" (The Coverage of the Youth in the Yugoslav Press). *Novinarstvo* 1/2 (1971): 45-64.
- Đurašković, Stevo. "Ideologija Organizacije jugoslavenskih nacionalista: (Orjuna)" (The Ideology of the Organization of Yugoslav Nationalists: (Orjuna)) *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 1 (2011): 225-247.
- "Ekspanzija i socijalna rasprostranjenost zabavne štampe u našoj suvremenosti" (Expansion and Social Distribution of Entertainment Press in Our Time). *Naše teme*, 4-6 (1975): 1543-45.
- Franičević, Zoran. "Polet je kriv za sve!" (Polet is to Blame for Everything!). *Vox* 3 (June 2000): 72- 86.
- Hanke, Helmut. "Media Culture in the GDR: Characteristics, Processes and Problems." *Media, Culture and Society* 12 (1990): 185.
- Huber, Zdravko. "Četiri decenije omladinske štampe u Srbiji" (Four Decades of the Youth Press in Serbia). *Novinarstvo* 3/4 (1984): 102-107.
- Ilc, Andrej. "Sedemdeseta - srednji vek popularne glasbe" (Seventies – Middle Ages of Pop-Music). *Časopis za kritiko znanosti* 154/155 (1993): 177-189.
- "Interview with Igor Kordej", *E-flit – internet comic magazine*, [www.nuclearagenomadz.org/e-flit/tekst/svibanj03/kordej/kordej.htm](http://www.nuclearagenomadz.org/e-flit/tekst/svibanj03/kordej/kordej.htm) (May, 2003).
- Jandrić, Berislav. "Prilog proučavanju studentskih demonstracija na Filozofskom fakultetu u Zagrebu 1968." (Contribution to the Research of the Student Demonstrations at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb in 1968). *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 1 (2002): 7-40.

- Kalabić, Radovan. "Omladinska štampa danas" (Youth Press Today). *Novinarstvo* 1 (1991): 70-74.
- Karaula, Željko. "Croatian National Youth – (HANA O): Contribution to the Study of the Activity and Work of Croatian Youth Organizations in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes." *Slovo* 20, 1 (2008): 1-15.
- Knezović, Marin. "Štrajk hrvatskih sveučilištaraca u jesen 1971. u onodobnom tisku" (Croatian Student Strike in the Autumn of 1971 in the Contemporary Press) in *Radovi* 28 (1995).
- "Koliko je *Student* studentski list" (To What Extent is *Student* a Student Journal). *Naša Štampa* 170 (Nov. 1969): 19.
- Kostelnik, Branko. "Savska 25" (Savska Street 25). *15 dana: Ilustrirani časopis za umjetnost i kulturu*, 5-6 (2008): 42-50.
- Dejan Kršić, *Ideologija dizajna i ideologije oko dizajna* (na primjeru grafičkog dizajna u Hrvatskoj 1950-2005). Internet: <http://www.kuda.org/dejan-krsic-ideologija-dizajna-i-ideologije-ok-dizajna-work-progress>.
- Novi val, *15 dana: Ilustrirani časopis za umjetnost i kulturu*, 5-6 (2008).
- Kreft, Lev. "Gesamtkunstwerk in Neue Slowenische Kunst" *Filozofski vestnik* 2 (1989): 55-68.
- Marčinko, Tomislav. "Razvoj omladinske štampe u Srbiji" (The Development of the Youth Press in Serbia). *Novinarstvo* 3/4 (1984): 108-111.
- Mickiewicz, Ellen. "The Modernisation of Party Propaganda in the USSR." *Slavic Review* 30, 2 (1971): 259.
- Milosavljević, Miloslav. "Primjer proučavanja strukture lista pomoću analize sadržaja" (The Example of the Study on the Structure of the Journal Using Content Analysis). *Novinarstvo*, 3/4 (1972): 86-96.
- "Mladi Udarnik i Rdeći signali" (Young Strike Worker and Red Signals). *Novinarstvo* 1/2 (1970): 92-96.
- Perasović, Benjamin. "Sociologija subkultura i hrvatski kontekst" (Sociology of Subcultures and Croatian Context). *Društvena istraživanja: časopis za opća društvena pitanja* 2-3 (2002): 485-498.
- Popov, Nebojša. "Prilozi proučavanju studentskih pokreta u Jugoslaviji" (Contributions to the Research of the Student Movement in Yugoslavia) in *Sociološki pregled*, Beograd, vol.1/2, 1984.
- Popov, Nebojša. "Studentski pokret u Jugoslaviji 1963-1974" (Student Movement in Yugoslavia 1963-1974) in *Sociološki pregled*. Beograd, vol. 1/2 and 3/4, 1984.
- Preporod hrvatskih sveučilištaraca: Anatomija slučaja Čičak* (Croatian Students Renaissance: The Anatomy of the Čičak Case). *Kritika*, special issue (1971)
- Prica, Ines. "Novi val kao anticipacija krize" (New Wave as the Anticipation of Crises). *Etnološka tribina: godišnjak Hrvatskog etnološkog društva* 20 (1990): 23-31.
- Prica, Ines. "Značenje i funkcija stila u odevanju beogradske omladine" in *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU* 34 (1985): 71-78.
- "Privatizacija jedne tribine" (Privatization of One Forum). *Naša Štampa* 166 (May 1969): 15.
- Repe, Božo. "'Liberalizem' v Sloveniji" ("Liberalism" in Slovenia). *Borec: revija za zgodovino, literaturo in antropologijo*. Ljubljana: RO ZZB NOV Slovenije, 1992.
- Resis, Albert. "Lenin on Freedom of the Press." *The Russian Review* 36, 3 (1977).
- "Savjetovanje o položaju i društvenoj ulozi omladinske štampe" (Counseling on the Position and Social Role of the Youth Press). *Novinarstvo* 1/2 (1972): 161-62.
- Stojković, Branimir. "Slika masovne kulture u listu 'Student'" (Image of Mass Culture in the *Student* Magazine). *Potkulture* 1 (1985): 135-148.
- "Strip – deveta umetnost?" (Comics – Ninth Art?), *Kultura* 28, (1975).
- Supek, Ivan. "Hrvatsko sveučilište 1968-1972" (Croatian University 1968-1972). *Hrvatska revija* 3 ( 1998): 520-543.
- Štamcar, Miha. "Četrto stoletja pozneje - intervju s Peterom Lovšinom" (Quarter of a Century Later - Interview with Peter Lovšin). *Mladina* 41 (14. Oct. 2002): 60-61.
- "Tlo dobija novog urednika" (Tlo Gets a New Editor). *Naša Štampa* 179 (Oct 1970): 15.

- Tsipursky, Gleb. "Citizenship, Deviance, and Identity. Soviet Youth Newspapers as Agents of Social Control in the Thaw-era Leisure Campaign." *Cahiers du Monde russe* 49, 4 (2008): 629-50.
- Valenčič, Erik. "Študent naj bo!" (Let it be Student!). *Mladina* 18 (2009)
- Veljak, Lino. "Studentski pokret izmedju mistifikacija i nesporazuma" (Student Movement between Mystification and Misunderstanding) in *Naše teme* 10 (1984).
- Vidmar, Igor. "Deset let Novega rocka: NR včeraj in nikdar več?" (Ten Years of New Rock: NR Yesterday and Never Again ). *Mladina* 31 (12 Sept. 1990): 41.
- Vučetić, Radina. "Rokenrol na Zapadu Istoka – slučaj *Džuboks*" (Rock and Roll on the West of the East – The *Džuboks* Case). *Godišnjak za društvenu istoriju* 1-3 (2006): 71-88.
- "Zabranjen deveti broj *Tribune*" (Banning of the Ninth Issue of *Tribuna*). *Naša Štampa* 191 (Dec. 1971): 9.
- Zubok, Iu. A. and V.I. Chuprov. "The Founding and Development of the Sociology of Youth in This Country." *Russian Education and Society* 51, no. 9 (2009): 22-39.