

COMMUNICATION POLICIES IN YUGOSLAVIA (A STUDY CARRIED OUT BY THE YUGOSLAV INSTITUTE OF JOURNALISM). By *Zdravko Leković* and *Mihalo Bjelica*. Paris: Unesco, 1976. 66 pp. \$3.95, paper. Distributed by Unipub, Box 433, Murray Hill Station, New York, N.Y. 10016.

Communication Policies in Yugoslavia, written by members of the Yugoslav Institute of Journalism, is part of a UNESCO series, the main purpose of which is to provide an analysis of communication policies in different countries. The study itself is a factual report of various aspects of Yugoslav communication policies, and its six chapters, appendix, and brief bibliography aim to present a picture of contemporary public, institutional, and professional policies in Yugoslavia. That aspects of mass communication, especially the mass media, play an important role in Yugoslavia is obvious, and its only constraint is that an average of 15 percent of Yugoslavia's population is still illiterate, with the rate increasing to 30 percent in some of the country's southern regions. The Yugoslav system of public communication is decisively influenced by its self-management decision-making system of "socialist democracy," but to comprehend fully its objectives, it is important to understand Yugoslavia's diverse culture and its novel social and political institutions.

The study itself discusses first the premise of the country's communication policy, the historical background of mass communication in Yugoslavia, public policy in the field of communication, social participation in the progress of the mass media, the position of the mass media, journalists' organizations, and research work. Many important features of the country's communication policies remain unmentioned in this study, even considering the space limitations. This reviewer, for example, would have appreciated a presentation of the background of the people who work in the various media—their social characteristics, their career patterns which obviously influence their professional behavior—as well as a discussion of the problem of establishing policies and specifically the relationship between the party and the media. Of considerable importance in a country of such ethnic diversity is the impact this leaves on the interpretation of key national and international issues. The whole nationality issue with its centrifugal impact and the relationship of the party and the government to the various ethnic groups obviously has an effect on communication policies. Nothing is said about the journalists' position and relationship to this explosive issue.

Research on communication policies and the communicator is of relatively recent origin in the United States. It is even more difficult in a country like Yugoslavia which has serious constraints in terms of available data and opinion research. This small publication of *Communication Policies in Yugoslavia* therefore must be considered only a first step on a topic which has serious policy implications for the entire field of political and social studies which will contribute to a better understanding of the Yugoslav scene.

GEORGE W. HOFFMAN
University of Texas, Austin

TITO'S MAVERICK MEDIA: THE POLITICS OF MASS COMMUNICATIONS IN YUGOSLAVIA. By *Gertrude Joch Robinson*. Urbana, Chicago, and London: University of Illinois Press, 1977. 263 pp. \$12.95.

Gertrude Joch Robinson's appraisal of the press and broadcasting in postwar Yugoslavia conjures up a drawing on the title page of Belgrade's satirical *Jež* (*The Hedgehog*) of August 21, 1970—a diminutive hedgehog slipping down the sharp edge of an enormous razor blade, with a tub of iodine presumably waiting at the bottom of this

torturous descent. Professor Robinson would probably tend to discount such a foreboding image. Pleasantly aware that Yugoslavia's journalistic hedgehogs are occasionally allowed to grow a spine or two, she has set out to examine how a Communist press establishment lost some of the earmarks of a conveyor belt. On the whole, Robinson's results are admirable. She has enriched Western scholarship with the first rounded study of news communication in contemporary Yugoslavia. Readers of her thoughtful series of essays will learn much about the slow dismantling of the centralized press and broadcasting operations and about the cultivation of professionalism among news managers and reporters. They will become acquainted with the structure of TANJUG—Yugoslavia's federal news agency—the extent of its activities, and how TANJUG differs from TASS and all the other "eastern" establishments. Fine essays are devoted to evaluation of the country's press corps, to assessment of the criteria by which news stories are selected for publication, and to the overall "picture of the world" presented to the public at large.

Had she confined her remarks to these subjects, Robinson would have written a perfectly adequate book that one might want to consult for many years to come and which students in many disciplines could read with great profit. Unfortunately, however, Robinson felt obliged to set her narrative within the framework of Yugoslavia's postwar political history, and here she has found herself in a quagmire. Ideally, of course, an investigator of Yugoslavia's mass communications should establish how the systemic changes affected the press and broadcasting. But unless this effort is undertaken in a comprehensive way, it is better to do without.

Robinson's writings on Yugoslavia's politics are nothing but a restatement of largely inadequate Western (or Western-language) secondary sources. One would search in vain on these pages for even the best-known syntheses published in Belgrade or Zagreb, not to mention the key documents and published statements from the periods that Robinson discusses with totally misplaced alacrity (such as the crises of 1971–72). Despite her good intentions, her essays, "Journalists in Conflict" and "Ethnicity and Political Communication," are no better than most of her sources, and these are—in some cases—quite insufficient.

Quotations from Ema Derossi-Bjelajac (not *Erna* Darossi-Bjelajac!) will not prove that "ethnicity facilitates the co-optation of the media, since these are organized along communal lines." (What was it that facilitated the "co-optation of the media" after 1971–72?) Nor will frequent references to various social science "models" help to explain singular and unrepeatable phenomena. Nevertheless, in her discussion of the implications of "ethnic" strife, Robinson does drive one more nail into the coffin of the "modernization" theory, although her correct conclusions could have been supported better. In fact, many of Robinson's findings (notably her conclusions about Titoist media philosophy) would surely have been different had she taken her study into the 1970s.

The book is marred by the usual social science jargon, a faulty map, and numerous errors which betray sloppy editing and questionable linguistic skills. (Some of the more engaging ones include: *Hrvatski tjednik* entered as "*Hrvatski Četnik*," Mongolia's capital given as "Alan Bator," U Thant renamed as "Tantov," and Ivory Coast appearing as "Ubala Slonovace" [misspelled], probably because that sounds very Attie or Kulango.) There are a number of factual errors: *CIK* (*ČIK*) is described as a "news magazine," *Naše teme* as an organ of humanist philosophers, and a mysterious "Milo Popović" is said to have been purged with Nikezić in 1972.

IVO BANAC
Yale University