

Milena Dragičević Šešić  
University of Arts in Belgrade

## CULTURE AND DEMOCRACY: CULTURAL POLICIES AT WORK IS CULTURAL POLICY THEORY POSSIBLE AT THE SEMI-PERIPHERY

**Abstract:** *This article is based on the thesis that the Yugoslav (Belgrade and Zagreb) schools of cultural policy in the sixties and the seventies were in line with the world's leading theories and practices of cultural policy, and that the semi-peripheral status of Yugoslav science, along with the insufficiently committed academic culture of remembrance, and as a result of new trends of academic capitalism, have completely sidelined them from academic currents. The paper analyzes the methods of operation of the world's top academic journals in the development of the culture of remembrance through a case study: a review of the books in the field of cultural policy referred to in the *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, when requesting texts from 40 professors of cultural policy around the world (*The International Journal of Cultural Policy* Vol. 16, n. 1). Choosing Anglo-American scholars and theoreticians from Northern Europe, this academic journal has additionally "centralized" true knowledge and produced new peripheries and semi-peripheries of knowledge production. The paper also points to possible strategies and tactics of resistance in the subversion of the semi-periphery with the example of the author's text about a book by Michel de Certeau titled *Culture in the Plural*, written upon invitation for the given issue of the journal.*

**Key words:** *Yugoslav School of Cultural Policy, Stevan Majstorović, Michel de Certeau, International Journal of Cultural Policy, academic culture of remembrance, academic semi-periphery*

### *Introduction*

In December 2008, I received an email from the editor of the most respected world journal for cultural policy, asking me, as one of the fifty professors of cultural policy around the world, to answer the question which book has changed my view of culture and cultural policy, and to write a book review for a special thematic issue of the *International Journal of Cultural Policy* (Taylor & Francis Group, Routledge).<sup>\*</sup> I immediately replied, happy to accept the opportunity to introduce the so-called Belgrade School of Cultural Policy, which had never been covered by any of the texts written in either Serbia or the former Yugoslavia.

At just about the same time, I spoke with my colleague Sanjin Dragojević, with whom I had written several books related to cultural policy and management,<sup>†</sup> about writing another book concerning

---

<sup>\*</sup> This text was written for the special number of the journal *Kultura: Culture & Democracy*, n. 160/2018., as a result of the research project OI178012 "Identity and remembrance: Transcultural texts from drama arts and the media", supported by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

<sup>†</sup> Dragičević Šešić, M. and Dragojević, S. (2004) *Intercultural mediation in the Balkans*, Sarajevo: Oko; Dragičević Šešić, M. and Dragojević, S. (2005) *Art Management in Turbulent Times: Adaptable quality management*, Amsterdam: Boekmansstichting.

the Yugoslav, Belgrade and Zagreb schools of cultural policy, since not much is known about them today, and since many researchers and theoreticians simply sank into oblivion. As the topics of remembrance and identity have been of interest at the Faculty of Dramatic Arts for some time, and as my research has already included the fields of cultural management (institutional memories) and cultural policy (encouraging "academic culture of remembrance" in research projects, cultural and political dimensions that have changed the area of culture), the topic of the "schools" of cultural policies and cultural practices in Serbia and Yugoslavia naturally imposed themselves.

Also, the fact was that, despite some of the texts, quotes and information that we had submitted, Yugoslav science in this field failed to be included in the Western body of knowledge. For example, the fact that the organization of cultural activities (cultural management) as an academic discipline was first developed in Yugoslavia in 1961 – well ahead of the City University in London, which started in 1967 – could not be found in the texts of Western authors, who still name the City University as first, even though a number of articles had been published in English mentioning the Belgrade school's past and current teaching of the history of art management.<sup>‡</sup>

Viewed from this distance, the writings and publications in the field of cultural policy issued during the sixties and the seventies in Belgrade and Zagreb have included texts that still raise very current debates and questions. Since the purpose of this article, on the one hand, is to be a tribute to the team of somewhat forgotten theorists, and on the other hand, to emphasize the permanent semi-peripheral status that the cultures on the margins of Europe have in the Western world (including their academic centres), this text will be organised in three segments: a brief overview of the theory and theorists from Zagreb and Belgrade focusing on the opus of Stevan Majstorović; the second part, which is the essence of this paper, will show the functioning of the world of science, the way of acceptance and rejection of information and knowledge produced at the semi-periphery; and the third part - the text itself, my review of the book of the relevant French author Michel de Certeau, that I have chosen when not allowed by the editors to choose Majstorović. The review thus contains the `subversive content` (although I do not know if that was really subversive). This content is linked to the small presentation of the context (of the Yugoslav cultural policies and practices – a context for which the "academic centre" has failed to show interest) in which I was reading de Certeau's books and in which they could resonate better, with a strong voice (the justification of this small subversion).

### Belgrade and Zagreb schools of cultural policy

During the 1960s, a large number of public figures and intellectuals, both Serbian and Croatian, and to a lesser extent some from other republics, began to deal with issues relating to the most general questions of culture and cultural policy, from cultural rights to the decentralization of culture, which was regarded as a necessary vector of the democratisation of society and culture. In Belgrade, these people gathered around the journals *Vidici*, *NIN*, and the daily newspaper *Politika*. This is where a

---

<sup>‡</sup> Dragičević Šešić, M. (2009) "Educational Programs in Strategic Cultural Management within the Regional Context", *Cultural Policy and Management (kpy) Yearbook*, Boekmanstudies and Istanbul Bilgi University Press, p. 99-108; Dragičević Šešić, M. (2011) "The Teaching of Organization, Management and Production in Arts, Culture and Media in Serbia - 50 years", and: "Fifty years of the Department of Management and Production in Theatre, Radio and Culture", *Yearly Proceedings of the Faculty of Dramatic Arts* no. 19, p. 19-35.

new generation of philosophers, political scientists, sociologists, scholars of literature and art were published: Stevan Majstorović, Zagorka Golubović, Trivo Inđić, Miloš Nemanjić, Ratko Božović, Branka Prnjat, Sveta Lukić, Radoslav Đokić, Miladin Životić, Sonja Licht, Branimir Stojković, Ružica Rosandić, Bora Džuverović. There were also activists gathered around the cultural-educational communities of Belgrade, Serbia and Yugoslavia (*Kulturni život*, as a journal of the Association of Cultural-Educational Communities of Yugoslavia) – Miloš Jevtić, Milutin Dedić, as well as those connected with the projects and cultural policy programmes of the Marxist centres like Prvoslav Ralić, Milan Ranković, Đoko Stojičić and many others. All of them explored and debated, whether being of scientific or ideological provenance, the important topics of cultural policy and practice. Their debates published in journals related to art, culture and social issues (the usual subtitle of many academic journals) covered a wide range of topics, from the freedom of artistic expression, the development of audiences and tastes linked to the new populist cultural patterns, to the specific cultural policy issues related to the methods of financing culture, art markets, the organisation of cultural life and decentralisation.

In Zagreb, at the same time, a number of intellectuals of different disciplines operated in at least three different circles: 1) within the Praxis group (Lešaja and Medak; Lešaja <http://www.praxis-arhiva.net/>), some of whom were Milan Kangrga, Rudi Supek, Vjekoslav Mikecin, Gajo Petrović; 2) around the journals *Kulturni radnik* and *Naše teme*, and especially connected to the Institute for Development and International Relations (IRMO), like Biserka Cvjetičanin, Nada Švob Đokić, Matko Meštrović; and 3) experts gathered around the projects of the Croatian Institute of Culture – Božidar Gagro, Zdenka Gjanković, Ivan Rogić, Andrija Mutnjaković, Jasenka Kodrnja, Miroslav Tuđman, Ivan Jakopović, Zlatko Sudović and many others. They covered many different topics, from the network of community centres and cultural centres and festivals of culture, to the relationship between culture and tourism.

The greatest momentum in establishing cultural policy as a science was created by Stevan Majstorović, who managed to initiate the founding of the Institute for Studies in Cultural Development in 1967. As soon as in 1968, they launched the journal *Kultura* (whose first editors were Stevan Majstorović, Slobodan Canić, Dragutin Gostuški, Trivo Inđić, Vujadin Jokić, Danica Mojsin, Mirjana Nikolić,<sup>§</sup> Nebojša Popov, Bogdan Tirnanić, Milan Vojnović and Tihomir Vučković) to stimulate national authors to research and write but also to translate the most important world theorists – Leo Lowenthal, Pierre Bourdieu, Frederic Jameson, Ernst Bloch, Herbert Marcuse, Raymonde Moulin, Noam Chomsky, Edward Sapir, Robert Escarpit, Pierre Belleville, Lucien Goldmann, Bronislaw Malinowski, Michel Foucault, Ruth Benedict, Paul Ricker, Charles Snow and many others.

---

<sup>§</sup> For the author of these lines, one person, Mirjana Nikolić, was crucial for the decision to bind my research to the Institute and to publish my research works in this journal, because, as the secretary of the editorial board she received my texts without any recommendations and invited me, after first reading the text, for further collaboration, never hesitating to send me detailed remarks on my writing (peer reviewing was not the standard procedure in most journals). In the next issue of *Kultura*, (no. 40), in 1978, they published not one but two of my texts. Later, I prepared several thematic issues, and from 1996 to 2001 I became the chief editor of *Kultura*. I write about this to indicate the openness and willingness of the editors of *Kultura* and of Institute for Cultural Development to engage young, emerging researchers who came from outside the established academic disciplines, such as my area of work then: the organization of cultural activities developed at the Faculty of Dramatic Arts in that time.

These processes of researching and theorising that have taken place in different circles both in Belgrade and Zagreb – the circles that gave them more or less freedom – have culminated in the Congress of Cultural Action in Kragujevac in 1971, which was dissolved for political reasons. The fact that the congress was organized with such a large number of participants to debate cultural policy makes it almost unique in the world, although it must be said that, upon the arrival of Andre Malraux to the position of the head of the Ministry of Culture of France (1960), the public debate on cultural policy also became an important part of the practice in the French public, (as part of making five-year plans) as well as the counter-public: in Avignon and Villeurbanne, in 1968 (Jutant et al. 2019). However, in other countries of Europe, cultural policy was much less of a topic, while it was altogether absent from the academic framework.

Therefore, it is very important to note that the theoreticians of culture in Yugoslavia, encouraged by the public debates organized by the journal *Kultura*, turned to cultural policy research and introduced such research into the teaching process, stimulating graduate PhD students to deal with those issues. The first doctorates in the field of cultural policy were defended at the Faculty of Political Sciences by Branko Prnjat (1974) and Stevan Majstorović (1976)\*\*. At the same time, a series of masters' theses were prepared at the Faculty of Dramatic Arts with Professor Dr Borislav Jović, an expert in the labour law of artists.††

Meanwhile, in the rest of the world, cultural policy as a scientific discipline in the sixties became a topic through research that often belonged to the domain of legal science (like the work of Jacques Lang, who obtained his PhD on the relationship of the state and the theatre), economic sciences (like the famous research on the economics of the theatre by Baumol and Bowen), as well as the literary science from which cultural studies were created (Raymond Williams, Richard Hogarth etc.). However, cultural policy as academic discipline was not constituted until the nineties (University of Warwick, 1994), when the first specialized journal was launched – *European Journal of Cultural Policy* (after 1997 it was called *International Journal of Cultural Policy*), or more precisely until 1998, when the first world conference of researchers in the field of cultural policy was organized (*ICCPR - International Conference of Cultural Policy Research*). These details are important to compare with the fact that there was the journal *Kultura* in Belgrade in 1968, as 'the journal of the theory and the sociology of culture and cultural policy', and with the fact that later (1988) in Zagreb, the First Yugoslav conference of professors of cultural policy was organized (Prnjat, 2011: 170). It is obvious that Yugoslavia was ahead of the curve in this area, but that it remained globally unrecognized.

The knowledge produced in Yugoslavia at that time, in spite of or because of the government efforts to translate only the "selected" texts into major world languages and publish them in the "official" journal that was not really influential (the academic community just ignored this journal, and it was a form of subversion of official ideological efforts). Thus, this journal, *Aktuelna pitanja socijalizma* (*Actual Questions of Socialism*),‡‡ failed to be incorporated into world trends (but it was neglected by Yugoslav academics also). The only translated book – *Cultural Policy of Yugoslavia* – was published in French and English, as a part of the first globally significant project to map cultural

---

\*\* Mentors were Radoslav Ratković and Ratko Božović; Đukić, V. (2011) Editor's word: Development of cultural policies, *Kultura* No. 130, Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development, p. 20

†† Ibid, p. 21-23.

‡‡ Texts taken from this journal into the world's data banks are mainly related to political issues and personalities, such as the texts of Josip Broz Tito (Inventory of the Hoover Institution Library Pamphlet Collection), <https://oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/c8qz2f9v/> (accessed 21 July 2018)

policies, implemented by UNESCO in preparation for the World Conference on Cultural Policies in Mexico in 1982. Neither Stevan Majstorović nor most of the researchers who closely dealt with the field of cultural policy had been published in international journals before, since the main form of international cooperation was through state projects of bilateral exchange and multilateral cooperation (UNESCO).

Thus, in spite of the fact that the Institute for Studies in Cultural Development had intensive cooperation with relevant institutions in France, Hungary, Bulgaria, Poland and so on, their research efforts were not recognized in the world in the long run. Both institutes in Belgrade and Zagreb were also engaged in a multilateral cooperation through UNESCO and the Council of Europe, by participating in the first world cultural policy comparative projects. Thus, in 1980 Stevan Majstorović wrote a book about Yugoslav cultural policy for a major international project of UNESCO, which presented national cultural policies of the countries around the world, and included the Institute in other international projects. In the period 1978-1980, the Institute participated in the projects *Culture and working life*,<sup>§§</sup> *Cultural pluralism and cultural identity: the experiences of Canada, Finland and Yugoslavia* (Rosandić et al. 1985), as well as a nine-year project *Europe of Regions* from the Council of Europe, which resulted in a book (Bassand, 1990) and a final conference in Lyon in 1991 (in that period Yugoslavia had the status of an observer country). At the same time, the Institute organized training for statisticians and archivists from developing countries (countries of the non-aligned movement), when the world's greatest experts in this field came to the Institute, like Raymond Williams, who then travelled throughout Yugoslavia with Stevan Majstorović.

As early as in 1975, Stevan Majstorović prepared a concept of an international project *Cultural development in countries with more nations and/or ethnic groups*, the output of which was his book "In Search of Identity" (1979), long before "identity politics" appeared in British cultural studies. Another project, *Culture and working life*, involved researchers from Sweden, Yugoslavia, France, Belgium, Hungary and Norway. It was a project on identity, which involved the joint work of researchers from Canada, Finland and Yugoslavia (including both Belgrade and Zagreb institutes). All this shows that, at that time, scientific work was conducted without the domination of a "centre of power", and that both Yugoslav research institutions, as well as those from other small countries, played an important role in these projects.

In 1989, IRMO launched an international project *Documentation of cultural policies*. The war that broke out in 1991 prevented the realization of this project, and it was practically taken over in 1998 by the Council of Europe which, together with the European Centre for Comparative Cultural Research - ERICarts, created a Compendium – a documentary base of national cultural policies. However, IRMO had succeeded in establishing *Culturelink* as a journal that would regularly manage the exchange of information on research, publications, and conferences in the relevant domains of culture and cultural development for all members of UNESCO.

---

<sup>§§</sup> Participants in this project, on behalf of the Institute for Studies in Cultural Development, were Stevan Majstorović, Veselin Ilić and Branimir Stojković. This study is considered to be the world's first comparative scientific research in the field of cultural policy (Wiesand, A., 2002) – Comparative Cultural Policy Research in Europe: A Change of Paradigm, *Canadian Journal of Communication*, Vol. 27 (2-3) – and this fact indicates the high esteem in which the Yugoslav (in this case Belgrade) school of cultural policy was held at that time in the world.

All this shows how much Yugoslavia was at the forefront of research in cultural policies, and what reputation it had even as a mere observer member of the Council of Europe, as it was equally involved in all the projects and even led some of them. Unfortunately, the collapse of the country, and for Serbia in particular, the fact that cultural and scientific cooperation was placed under embargo meant not only the termination of these relationships but also an interruption in research work within the country. So, at the time when the European networks of culture were strengthening, especially the C.I.R.C.L.E.<sup>\*\*\*</sup> network (Strasbourg, 1980), cultural institutions from Serbia could not officially participate in them (IETM and ENCATC were rare exceptions that accepted individual members from Yugoslavia, while TEH, ELIA, European Festival Association, etc. started incorporating members from Serbia only after the political changes in 2000).

Organisations and researchers from Serbia had practically completely missed the most important decade for the development of cultural policies in Europe (1990-2000), a decade that followed the fall of the Berlin Wall and the Maastricht Treaty. Serbia did not evaluate its cultural policy until later in 2003 when it became a member of the Council of Europe (when this process was practically over for other countries, and when the political importance of the Council of Europe started diminishing, losing also its economic strength to continue supporting and organizing research, conferences, etc.). The world stage (scene) in the field of cultural policy then opened to a new set of stakeholders, like the Canadian and Australian governments, or IFACCA (International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies). The `academization` of a cultural policy requires all contemporary researchers to publish in academic journals, thus the whole body of literature written and published during the sixties and the seventies in the form of books or articles in non-academic journals<sup>†††</sup> was practically left to be forgotten.<sup>‡‡‡</sup>

*An invitation to write about the cultural policy book  
that influenced my teaching and research*

As I have already mentioned, *The European/International Journal of Cultural Policy* (created in 1994) invited me to write a review about the book that influenced my thoughts and my teaching related to cultural policy. I readily accepted the invitation, and I immediately proposed to the editors to write about the capital work of Stevan Majstorović – his book titled *Kultura i demokratija* (*Culture and Democracy*). This book was based on his doctorate and his previously published papers on the topics of the right to culture (Majstorović, 1969, 1972a), cultural plurality (1972b, 1972v), international cultural cooperation (1974) and the decentralization and accessibility of culture (1975). Unfortunately, ten minutes after sending the mail, I received a reply from the editor-in-chief of the journal, Oliver Bennett, who was my long-time friend and the founder of ENCATC (1990-1992), with whom I collaborated on the first ENCATC executive board and on the editorial

---

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Wiesand, A. (2002) Comparative Cultural Policy Research in Europe: A Paradigm of Change, *Canadian Journal of Communication*, Vol. 27 (2-3), r. 374.

<sup>†††</sup> A common subtitle in such newspapers read - for culture, art and social issues (paying equal attention to artistic phenomena, criticism and scientific analysis).

<sup>‡‡‡</sup> The aforementioned international research involving the Institute resulted in publications in which the author's names were given inside the book, not on the covers. This is why finding such works in the COBISS system is difficult, or the authors are practically unrecognized (e.g. the book *Kultura i radni život* states only the translator's name and not a single author, while the book by Ružica Rosandić and other co-authors is altogether missing). At the same time, due to many "interruptions" in the work of the Institute and the complete shutdown of the Croatian Institute of Culture in the early nineties, such institutional memory was simply lost.

board of the *European Journal of Cultural Policy* (1994-1997). He stated that my proposal was absolutely out of the question since the only acceptable books should be those published in the English language. I was still thinking about what to do and how to respond, when a new letter arrived, only now it was sent to all fifty addresses, asking authors to consider reviewing only books that existed in the English language.

So, there was no need to send the letter that I had already began to compose, about how this limitation was a missed opportunity to enrich the "Anglo-Saxon pool of knowledge" and to be inspired by ideas and concepts that come from other parts of the world, both the periphery and semi-periphery. Then I carefully looked at the names in the mailing list and I realized that the invitation was primarily sent to the representatives of Western, Anglo-Saxon knowledge dominated by the British and Europeans who work at British academies (Bianchini, Belfiore), Australians, Canadians and Americans (Throsby, Miller, Mulcahy), then Scandinavians (Mangset, Duelund, Dorte Skot-Hansen), the Flemish and the Dutch (Smiers, van Maanen, Vestheim), while the other invitees from other regions were only doctoral candidates from Warwick, originating in Taiwan (Li-Jung Wang) and Japan (Kawashima). Realizing that I was the only researcher from the so-called semi-periphery, the only researcher from the Slavic world and the countries of the so-called new democracies, and that no researcher was even invited from France (despite the fact that the French theory of culture and cultural policy has marked the development of cultural policy as a practical discipline), all this motivated me to reconsider my own responsibility – it was no longer about just another "important" book. What seemed to me the only possible solution was to search for my answers among the French books and among French authors who were important for the processes of my development as a researcher, and to opt for one of them to ensure that French thought on culture and cultural politics was represented (Dragičević Šešić, 1987).<sup>§§§</sup>

I contemplated the books written by my professor during my graduate studies in Paris, Joffre Dumazedier (*Towards the Civilization of Leisure*), Jacques Lang (*State and Theatre*) and Michel de Certeau (*The Practice of Everyday Life, Culture in the Plural*), because I assumed that one of the other professors would certainly opt for the then very influential Pierre Bourdieu (and four of the invited scholars of cultural policy in fact did opt for his books). In the end, I chose *Culture in the Plural* by Michel de Certeau (while his second book, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, was chosen by Jeremy Ahern, a professor at Warwick, from the Department of French Language and Culture).

Writing about this "translated book" (although I read it in the French original), despite the clearly expressed will of the editor, I also wrote about the "untranslated" and unknown cultural and academic context of Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav theory of cultural policy, in which I comprehended the book and whose pluralistic context carried great significance to me. Every book is always read in a different way and experienced differently in different circles, so I took the liberty to explain not only its content, but also the time and the theoretical Yugoslav cultural and political context ascribed to it. So, although in a very concise way, I still managed to present the contribution of Yugoslav researchers to the development of cultural policies and practices, always in dialogue with the rest of the world, primarily the French-speaking world but also that outside of the centre, from the other borders of the semi-periphery (Poland) and even the complete periphery (e.g. works by Biserka Cvjetičanin and Nada Švob Đokić referring to African countries and their developmental processes in culture and cultural policy).

---

<sup>§§§</sup> Dragičević Šešić, M. (ed.) (1987), Francuska misao o kulturi (*French Thought on Culture*), thematic issue, *Gradina* no. 9/10. Institutional System of French Cultural Policy, Master's thesis, Faculty of Dramatic Arts, 1981.

Therefore, I think it is important that the academic public also becomes familiar with the methods and manners in which this knowledge is "centred", through reviews of literature and academic culture of remembrance, and that in accordance with our responsibility as researchers we do everything we can to integrate the knowledge that is created at the semi-peripheries into the global corpus of knowledge, using different strategies and tactics, just like Michel de Certeau suggested in his writings.

#### REVIEW ESSAY

Michel de Certeau, *La Culture au pluriel*\*\*\*\*

Michel de Certeau, *Culture in the Plural*

Union d'Éditions Générale, Paris, 1974 / Editions du Seuil, Paris, 1993, 228p; English edition: *Culture in the plural*, translator Tim Conley (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1997) 160 p.

#### REVIEW ESSAY

Michel de Certeau, *Culture in the Plural*

Milena Dragičević Šešić††††

---

\*\*\*\* This part of the text was published in Dragičević Šešić, M. (2010), 'Michel de Certeau, Culture in the Plural (La Culture au Pluriel)', *The International Journal of Cultural Policy* Vol. 16, n.1 pp. 23-25.

†††† Email: msesic@gmail.com



La Culture au pluriel, by Michel de Certeau, Paris, Union Générale d'Éditions, 1974 (Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1993), 228 pp., ISBN 978-2-02-020274-9 (première publication ISBN 2-267-00211-6)

English edition: Culture in the Plural, translated by Tom Conley, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1997, 160 pp., paperback, ISBN-13: 9780816627677, ISBN-10: 0816627673

La Culture au singulière est devenue une mysification politique. Elle est mortifère.  
(p. 122)

I enrolled in the Department for the Organization of Cultural Activities (founded in 1961; later Cultural Management) at the Faculty of Dramatic Arts in Belgrade in 1972 as an undergraduate student, eager to become a producer and cultural activist. Since 1968, the cultural debate in society had become heated; the Institute for Cultural Research, as well as the journal *Culture*, were founded in Belgrade, while a similar institute and a journal called *Cultural Worker* were founded in Zagreb. At the same time publishing companies started to open up and several book collections of cultural policy research were published, including *Culture and Democracy*, *Cultural Rights* and *In Search of Identity* (all by Stevan Majstorovic), *Cultural Needs* (M. Nemanjic), *Decentralisation of Culture*, *Cultural Policy* (B. Prnjat), *Economy and Law of Artistic Production* and *Labour Law for Artists* (B. Jovic), etc. More important was that international contemporary theory was translated and widely distributed, giving an opportunity for academics to create a corresponding curriculum in cultural management based on five theoretical pillars: (a) *French cultural theory*: Foucault, Levi-Strauss, Morin, Moles, Bourdieu; (b) *Polish philosophy and sociology of culture*: Bauman, Zulkiewski, Kloskowska, Morawski; (c) *British cultural studies*: Williams, Hoggart, Hall, Hebdidge; (d) *Frankfurt School*: Adorno, Horkheimer, Benjamin, Marcuse; and (e) *Anglo-American cultural anthropology*: Malinowski, Benedict, Mead.

In spite of the huge publishing 'production' in the field of cultural studies (in today's view, *translation practice* was the dominant cultural form of the 1970s in Serbia through publishing, international exhibitions, international art festivals, etc.), the work of de Certeau was not translated and his ideas and concepts had not been known. The book *Culture in the Plural*, focusing on micro-resistance and subversiveness of cultural practices by marginal or sub-cultural groups entered accidentally and introduced new concepts in cultural policy teaching.

Michel de Certeau, a historian by education and vocation living in the midst of cultural turmoil, has constituted his own methodological approach which intersected history with anthropology and philosophy: sociology of culture, and political science with linguistics and psycho-analytical theory. Deliberately eclectic (p. 70), his references included everything from Marcuse, Husserl, and Freud, through Foucault, Bourdieu, Baudrillard, and Moles, also Zulkiewski and Roszak.

His famous texts around 1968 had contributed to his notoriety, so he quickly entered the world of contemporary public policies and practices – giving him the ability to see the process of policy-making first-hand (Commissariat au Plan) and to discuss critical issues of social, cultural and educational reforms.

At the same time, as a historian, he investigated the real cultural policies of the eighteenth and nineteenth century through the famous report of abbé Grégoire (*Sur la nécessité et les moyens d'anéantir les patois et d'universaliser l'usage de la langue française*), or through popular culture (creation, through common themes and issues, of a united cultural history, and using dissemination throughout the French territory – creation of community with *mentalité française*, p. 53). As he

directly underlined, we have to use two paths: 'la voie d'une sociologie de la culture, de sa production, de sa diffusion, de sa circulation (...) et l'autre voie avec des outils aussi divers que l'analyse linguistique, la formalization du recit (Prop) et la methode textuelle, l'analyse des representations conceptuelles...' (p. 69).

His aim was to show how the cultural system functions, what its laws are, its silences, its landscape, etc. Specifically, he wanted to contribute to that *geography of forgotten issues* (p. 63) in cultural studies research, opening new themes and introducing new interdisciplinary approaches. Those topics included neglected spaces in popular culture (children, sexuality, and violence), power without authority (*bureaucratic tyranny*), new marginalism - 'chaque culture prolifère sur ses marges' (p. 213; later developed in his book *Invention au quotidien*); universities facing mass culture as 'cultural producers', producers of knowledge through the *bricolage plus collage* work of its students and researchers (as de Certeau had emphasized that the university had been distanced from 'strategic spots of social organization', where research is endangered by its division, etc.), and finally minorities – where he introduced a crucial issue: that the demands for recognition are at the same time cultural and political. The new cultural request demands new political realities. So *negritude* appeared as a demand only when a new political subject appeared (p. 133). Making an effort to define the crucial notions (subcultures vs. counterculture, cultural action, cultural activity, cultural policy, cultural development), he described his ideological position and his uneasiness regarding the bureaucratic state apparatus and bureaucratized public institutions such as universities.

The final chapter 'Spaces and Practices' argues for multiple locations of cultural production and communication, and its final subchapter 'Cultural Operations' (activities) is extremely significant for contemporary cultural policy theory. It emphasizes the importance of cultural practices whose expression creates patterns for each group of social organization, its process of self-recognition, and reclaiming its own history – the process of subjectivization.

The work of Michel de Certeau resonates powerfully in 2009, a year of creativity and innovation, which celebrates cultural diversity and heterogeneity: *Culture in the Plural* and *The Practice of Everyday Life* prioritize bottom-up cultural policy and the forgotten efforts of interdisciplinary attempts of comprehension of the complex cultural phenomena in the global world of consumerism, where subversion and new trends might appear only from entrepreneurial creative endeavours from peripheral groups. In this respect, de Certeau is taking into account processes of reception as active utilization of artistic or cultural products in the form of a dialogue which gives a real meaning to them, showing that although cultural policy is created from above (through the selection of works whose production and/or dissemination will be supported), its impact and results are achieved only by way of dynamic interaction with citizens, who, using their 'cunning', might completely distort the intended meaning.

This theory helps us to understand the fact that the cultural impact of any product is deeply linked to its different usages, and de Certeau is implying that a specific 'cultural tactic' is possible to envisage, a tactic which will take into account all the new territories of cultural practices, from youth houses to theater troupes, from universities to self-organized associations. That was the key cultural policy lesson. Real change is happening from the bottom-up when resistance to canons and dominant cultural values would provide us with creative solutions and self-organized communities of artists and citizens.

## Conclusion

At the time when I chose the book for reviewing, I still did not understand that French cultural policy and its theory of culture had already started moving away from the centre, slowly beginning to occupy places closer to the semi-periphery. For many of us – the theoreticians of cultural policy in Yugoslavia and Serbia – French authors have always been key authors (e.g. the book *Cultural Development* by Augustin Girard that was published by the Croatian Institute of Culture has been a textbook for students and practitioners for many years). Today, as I write this article, I am becoming deeply aware of the impact of globalization carried out by the Anglo-American academic system (this includes, of course, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, all the way to the so-called developed Global South represented by Hong Kong, Singapore, Seoul, Taiwan, South Africa, etc.) in which THERE IS NO PLACE for knowledge built on the outskirts, nor at the semi-periphery, or even in those parts of the "centre" where the English language is not in use. Academic capitalism (Dragičević Šešić, 2018) has instituted new values in the university environments around the world, the values of competitiveness, quantification, fighting for market visibility and development of curricula according to the needs "of the labour market", regardless of its underdevelopment. In this process, what suffers the most are social sciences and humanities, whose aim is to promote critical thinking and cultural diversity, particularly those created outside the world centres of power.<sup>15</sup>

I therefore believe that it is our duty as academics to make our scientific and research traditions visible, to translate as much as we can into small and minority languages, and (precisely in line with the basic thesis of the book by Michel de Certeau) to ensure that the original cultural production of the periphery reaches the centre of the process of conceptualization and reconceptualization of cultural policy. *In from the Margins* (CoE 1995), is the title of a famous book of the Council of Europe that is now forgotten, but which used to place in the spotlight the processes and activities of minority social groups and independent initiatives. Similarly, UNESCO today supports the reconceptualization of cultural policy (*Re-shaping Cultural Policies*, 2018), taking the positive examples and examples of good practice from different world peripheries and semi-peripheries, from Togo, Niger, Ivory Coast, the Caribbean islands to Colombia, Chile and Mexico. But, the question is: to what extent this book is read and quoted?

At the same time, the scientific community in the field of cultural policy must be more present at world conferences and in academic journals of higher impact. Only in this way will the unquestionable value the scientific achievements of Stevan Majstorović and the whole Pleiades of researchers in the field of cultural policy, cultural development and cultural management, aided by the consciously-guided academic culture of remembrance, be able to enter the global corpus of knowledge and participate in scientific and cultural development dialogue. Today, even more now than at the time of the non-aligned movement, it is of growing importance that the voice of the periphery and semi-periphery is heard, as it is muffled by the spectacular creative industries of the centre, which increasingly includes the production of academic knowledge as well.

---

<sup>15</sup> Dragičević Šešić, M. and Jestrović, S. The University as a Public and Autonomous Sphere: Between Enlightenment Ideas and Market Demands, in: *International Performance Research Pedagogies*, Bale, S. et al. (2017), London: Palgrave, pp. 69-82.

## Bibliography of Stevan Majstorović (relevant to cultural policy):

- Majstorović, S. (1968) *Kulturne potrebe i struktura kadrova* (Cultural needs and structure of personnel), *Kultura* no. 1, Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development, p. 47-69.
- Majstorović, S. (1969) *Zavod za proučavanje kulturnog razvitka* (The Institute for Studies in Cultural Development), *Kultura* no. 5-6, Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development, p. 262-276.
- Majstorović, S. (1969) *Pravo na kulturu* (The right to culture), *Kultura* no. 5-6, Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development, p. 76-86.
- Majstorović, S., K. Pavlović, Nikolić, M., I. Leandrov, Marjanović S., M. Mišović, Jevtić M., M. Ivanišević (1970) *Program razvoja kulture u SR Srbiji* (The development of culture in SR Serbia): 1971-1980, Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development.
- Majstorović, S. (1971) *La politique culturelle en Yougoslavie*, Paris, UNESCO.
- Majstorović, S. (1972) *Pravo na kulturu* (The right to culture), Belgrade: Cultural and Educational Community, Valjevo: Milan Rakić.
- Majstorović, S. (1972b) *Narodnosti i međunarodna kulturna saradnja* (Ethnicity and international cultural cooperation), *Kultura* no. 17, Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development, p. 80-97.
- Majstorović, S. (1972v) *Kulturne i jezičke različitosti* (Cultural and linguistic diversity), *Kultura* no. 19, Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development, p. 122-145.
- Majstorović, S. (1974) *UNESKO i uloga malih naroda u kulturnoj saradnji* (UNESCO and the role of small nations in cultural cooperation), *Kultura* no. 26, Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development, p. 43-66.
- Majstorović, S. (1975) *Kulturni atlas SR Srbije* (Cultural atlas of SR Serbia), *Kultura* no. 29, Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development, p. 20-27.
- Majstorović, S. (1975b) *Mogući okviri, predmet studije za projekat "Kulturni razvoj zemalja sa više nacija i/ili etničkih grupa"* (Possible frameworks, case studies for the project "Cultural development of the countries with more nations and/or ethnic groups", Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development.
- Majstorović, S. (1976) *Rejmond Vilijems* (Raymond Williams), *Kultura* no. 32, Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development, p. 58-68.
- Majstorović, S. (1976b) *Kulturni unitarizam ili kulturna unifikacija* (Cultural unitarism or unification of culture) *Kultura* no. 33/34, Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development, p. 8-29.
- Majstorović, S. (1976v) *Kultura kao put ka slobodi* (Culture as a way to freedom), *Kultura* no. 35, Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development, p. 8-21.
- Majstorović, S. (1977) *Kultura i demokratija* (Culture and Democracy), Belgrade: Prosveta (second edition 1978)
- Majstorović, S. (1979) *U traganju za identitom* (In search of identity), Belgrade: Slovo ljubve, Prosveta.
- Majstorović, S. (1980) *La politique culturelle en Yougoslavie: autogestion et la culture*, Paris, UNESCO.
- Majstorović, S. (1980) *The Cultural Policy of Yugoslavia*, Paris, UNESCO.

### References:

- Bakočević, A. (1971) *Putevi kulturne politike* (Paths of Cultural Policy), Belgrade, Cultural and Educational Community.

- Bassand, M. (1990) *La culture et les regions d'Europe*, Lausanne: Presses polytechniques et universitaires romandes.
- Berisavljević, G. (1972) *Kulturna akcija* (Cultural Action), Belgrade: Cultural and Educational Community.
- Bowen, W. (1968) *Performing Arts - The Economic Dilemma*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Council of Europe (1997), *In From the Margins: A Contribution to the Debate on Culture and Development in Europe*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Cyjetičanin, B. and Švob Đokić, N. (1977) *Problemi suvremenih afričkih kultura u svijetlu FESTAC-a*, (Problems of contemporary African culture in the light of FESTAC), *Kultura* no. 38, Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development, p. 182-189.
- De Certeau, M. (1974) *La Culture au Pluriel*, Paris: Union generale d'editions.
- De Certeau, M. (1990) *L'Invention du quotidien*, Paris, Gallimard.
- Đukić, V. (2011) Introductory word of the editor: the development of cultural policies, *Kultura* no. 130, Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development, p. 9-32.
- Dragičević Šešić, M. (2018) Ethical challenges in a time of academic capitalism: knowledge versus transverse skills, International Conference: University Culture and Philology, Belgrade Faculty of Philology, May 30 - June 1, 2018, respectively.
- Dragičević Šešić, Milena (2012) Ethical dilemmas in cultural policies: conceptualising new managerial practices and new democracies, Anthology of essays of the Faculty of Dramatic Arts, p. 69-94.
- Dragičević Šešić, M. Teaching of organization, management and production of art, culture and the media in Serbia - 50 years, in: 50 Years of the Department of Management and Production of Theatre, Radio and Culture, ed. Dragičević Šešić, M. Savin Ljubić, G. (2011) Anthology of essays of the Faculty of Dramatic Arts, no. 19, p. 19-35
- Dragičević Šešić, M. (ed.) (1987), French thought on culture, thematic issue, *Gradina* no. 9/10.
- Dragičević Šešić, M. and Jestrović, S. The University as a Public and Autonomous Sphere: Between Enlightenment Ideas and Market Demands, in: *International Performance Research pedagogies*, Bale, S. et al. (2017), London: Palgrave, pp. 69-82.
- Dumazedier, J. (1962) *Vers une civilization du Loisir?* Paris: Seuil.
- Girard, A. (1977) *Kulturni razvoj* (Cultural Development) Zagreb: Croatian Cultural Institute.
- Gončin, M. (ed.) (1971) *Congress of the cultural action in SR Serbia*, Belgrade: Republic Secretariat for information.
- Group of authors (1980) *Culture and the working life: Experiences from six European countries*, Paris / Uppsala: UNESCO / LiberFörlag; *Kultura i radni život*, Belgrade: Institute for Studies in Cultural Development. Belgrade, translated by Boško Čolak Antić.
- Jović, B. (1963) *Radno pravo umetnika* (Labor Law for Artists), Belgrade: Art Academy.
- Jović, B. (1968) *Ekonomika i pravo umetničkih delatnosti* (Economics and the law in artistic activities) Belgrade: Art Academy.
- Lang, J. (1968) *L'etat et le theater*, Paris: *Librarie General de droit et de jurisprudence*.
- Lešaja A. and Medak T., *Praxis digital archive*; <http://www.praxis-arhiva.net/>
- Lešaja, A. 2014. *Praxis orientation, the journal Praxis and the Korčula Summer School* (materials), Belgrade: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung.
- Nemanjić, M. (1974) *Kulturne potrebe* (Cultural needs), Beograd: Vuk Karadžić.
- Prnjat, B. (1977) *Kulturna politika* (Cultural Policy), Belgrade: Radnička štampa.
- Prnjat, B. (2011) *Kulturna politika u nastavi menadžmenta i produkcije umetnosti – tragom sećanja* (Cultural policy in teaching of art management and production – on the trail of a memory), Anthology of essays of the Faculty of Dramatic Arts br. 19, p. 169-171.
- Rosandić, R. and others (1985) *Cultural pluralism and cultural Identity, the experience of Canada, Finland and Yugoslavia*, Paris: UNESCO,  
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0006/000651/065187eo.pdf>

UNESCO (2018) Re-shaping cultural policies, Paris: UNESCO.

Wiesand, A. (2002) Comparative Cultural Policy Research in Europe: A Paradigm of Change, *Canadian Journal of Communication*, Vol. 27 (2-3).

Annex: Correspondence with the editor of the International Journal of Cultural Policy

Subject: Cultural Policy Review of Books  
Date: & # 9; Mon, 15 Dec 2008 10:20 -0000  
From: & # 9; Bennett, Oliver  
To: ...

Dear Colleagues,

Editors of the International Journal of Cultural Policy want to publish a special issue of the journal that will be devoted to reviewing books in the field of cultural policy. Appreciating your work in this area, we invite you to participate in this project and choose a book that has influenced your thinking and that you would like to recommend to new students of cultural policy. The text should contain from 500-1000 words.

I hope you will decide to participate in this important project

with best wishes

Oliver

Professor Oliver Bennett  
Editor of  
International Journal of Cultural Policy

Subject: Cultural Policy Review of Books  
Date: & # 9; Mon, 15 Dec 2008 17:25:10 -0000  
From: Milena Dragicevic Sesic  
To: Bennett, Oliver

Dear Oliver,

thank you for this interesting and for me a very important call. For some time I am thinking to write a text on Belgrade and Zagreb School of cultural policy with my colleague Sanjin Dragojević, taking in consideration their research, theoretical concepts and empirical research. For this occasion I would propose to write a text about the book of Stevan Majstorovic: Culture and Democracy, considering this book extremely important for the development of the theory and practice of cultural policy in seventies of XX century in Yugoslavia. Stevan Majstorovic did a lot of writing, he founded the Institute for Studies in Cultural Development, thus helping to develop research in this field and the book in question was his doctoral thesis, defended at the Faculty of Political Science as one of the first cultural policy doctoral thesis in the world. His books cover a wide field of cultural policy, the right to culture, identity politics through a democratization of culture, i.e. cultural democracy.

I'm sure that his work deserves to be presented to the world public

Best regards,

Milena

Subject: Cultural Policy Review of Books  
Date: & # 9; Mon, 15 Dec 2008 17:45:20 -0000  
From: & # 9; Bennett, Oliver  
To: Milena Dragicevic Sestic

Dear Milena,

your proposal unfortunately I can not accept, because we will only accept articles about books that exist (that have been written or translated) in English.  
There's no point to represent books that can not be read.

I hope it will not be a problem choose another author and the book

with the best wishes of

Oliver

---

Subject: Cultural Policy Review of Books  
Date: 15 Dec 2008 19:38:38 -0000  
From: Bennett, Oliver <O.Bennett@warwick.ac.uk>  
To: ...

#### TO ALL CONTRIBUTORS TO THE CULTURAL POLICY REVIEW OF BOOKS

Thank you for agreeing to contribute to the Cultural Policy Review of Books. I am pleased to say that there has been a very positive response to the idea. A list of all those contributing is attached.

As explained in my previous email, you are asked to write 500-1000 words on one book (available in English), which has influenced your thinking and which you would want new students of cultural policy to read. The deadline for the submission of your review is April 10th 2009. The collection of reviews will be published as a special supplement of the *International Journal of Cultural Policy*.

In order to submit your review, please visit <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/gcul>. You will then need to log in, visit your 'Author Centre' and follow the instructions for submitting a new manuscript. If you have not written or reviewed for the Journal before, you will first of all need to create an account. This is a simple process that takes only a few minutes.

Once you start to submit your manuscript, you will be asked a few questions. For 'Manuscript Type', please select 'Book Review' from the drop-down menu. In the 'title' box, give only the details of the book you are reviewing in the format of the following example:

Eric Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century 1914-1991* (Michael Joseph, London, 1994), 727 pp., ISBN 0 7181 3307 2

In the 'abstract' box, please enter the words 'abstract not required'. If you leave this box blank, the system won't accept your manuscript.

Please note that your manuscript will not be sent out to external reviewers. You can therefore ignore the questions concerning preferred or non-preferred reviewers.



Thanks again for contributing to this. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any queries.

With best wishes,

Oliver

Professor Oliver Bennett  
Editor  
International Journal of Cultural Policy  
Email: o.bennett@warwick.ac.uk

---

From: Lamkin, David [mailto:David.Lamkin@tandf.co.uk]  
Sent: Tue 1/8/2010 14:21  
To: Milena Dragicevic Sesic  
Cc: Bennett, Oliver  
Subject: The final version of the text for verification (ID GCUL #

06 January 2010

Proofs of your article(s) listed below are now available for review through the Central Article Tracking System (CATS) website:

Journal: GCUL: International Journal of Cultural Policy  
Manuscript ID: 397334  
Manuscript Title: Michel de Certeau, La Culture au pluriel, (Union Générale d'Éditions, Paris, 1974/ Editions du Seuil, Paris 1993), 228pp. ISBN 978-2-02-020274-9  
English edition: Culture in the Plural, translator Tim Conley (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1997) 160pp. ISBN: 9780816627677 ;  
By: Dragicevic Sesic

Please approve these proofs, or return any corrections by 11 Jan 2010. Failure to do so may result in delay of your publication, reallocation to a later issue, or review and approval of your article by the journal's Editor-in-Chief.

Thank you,  
David Lamkin  
Production Editor  
Journals Production Department, 2nd Floor  
Routledge/Taylor & Francis

---

From: Lamkin, David [mailto:David.Lamkin@tandf.co.uk]  
Sent: Tue 1/26/2010 15:57  
To: Milena Dragicevic Sesic  
Cc: Bennett, Oliver  
Subject: RE: Your article proofs for review (ID# GCUL 397334)

Dear Milena

Thank you for sending your corrections. Please could you also send me a completed and signed licence to publish form, since your review cannot be published until one is received. I have attached a blank copy here for you in case this makes it easier for you.

With best regards

David

---

Subject: RE: Cultural Policy Review of Books  
Date: Fri, 8 Jul 2011 15:02:32 +0100  
From: Bennett, Oliver <O.Bennett@warwick.ac.uk>  
To: ...  
Dear all,

Dear All,

I am pleased to tell you that *The Cultural Policy Review of Books*, to which you contributed and which was published last year as a special issue of the *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, will now also be published by Routledge as a book. The expected publication date is December this year.

With best wishes,

Oliver

Professor Oliver Bennett

Са српског превела Татјана Медић  
Лектура на енглеском Грег де Куирж

Translated from Serbian by Tatjana Medic  
Proofreading in English by Greg de Kuir