

Slavica Radišić

The Hague, The Netherlands

# GRAFFITI MANAGEMENT AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN BELGRADE: A CASE STUDY OF PROJECT *RAPRESENT*

DOI 10.5937/kultura2485137R

УДК 316.723:003.6.079(497.11)

316.644(497.11)

Оригиналан научни рад

Датум пријема: 31. 01. 2024.

Датум прихватања: 19. 06. 2024.

**Abstract:** *Graffiti, once solely perceived as vandalism, has undergone a shift in interpretation, now acknowledged as a potential art form. This evolution has prompted many western cities to reconsider their approach to graffiti management, incorporating educational initiatives alongside traditional removal and enforcement measures. While Belgrade has just begun to develop its graffiti management policies, they primarily revolve around removal and enforcement, lacking preventive measures like education and community engagement. The text showcases the “Rapresent” project (2010-2015) by the IDE Group, as an example of a possible educational initiative in this domain. The project aimed to transform the city’s underpasses into legal graffiti zones and provide educational platforms for young graffiti writers. Despite bureaucratic obstacles, the project demonstrated graffiti’s potential to enhance neglected public spaces and engage youth positively. It emphasised the importance of clearer city regulations and procedures to actively engage with young artists and promote responsible graffiti practices.*

**Key words:** *Graffiti management, Belgrade, regulations, enforcement, removal, education programs, Rapresent*

## *Introduction*

**G**raffiti is a multifaceted phenomenon that elicits varied interpretations depending on the context of study. This text aims to explore graffiti through the lenses of existing graffiti management policies in Belgrade, acknowledging the diverse perspectives within this field and what are the ways for the city to manage this problem. In this text I present and suggest some alternative ways for dealing with it. The main focus is on the Rapresent project, an educational initiative by the IDE Group aimed at designating legal spaces for young graffiti artists to practise their skills, as well as to develop a more responsible attitude towards the urban environment.

Traditionally, graffiti has been viewed as unauthorised markings, etchings, or paintings that deface public or private property.<sup>1</sup> Numerous city ordinances and anti-graffiti programs, notably those adopting a zero-tolerance stance prevalent for a long time in the USA, Australia, Scandinavia, and the UK, classified all forms of graffiti as blight and view graffiti artists as vandals deserving of punishment. However, over the past 50 years, understanding of graffiti has evolved significantly. Some scholars, as well as local municipalities since the beginning of the 2000s, have started to recognise graffiti as a form of artistic expression.<sup>2</sup> This prompts the question: what makes graffiti an artistic expression? The answer is complex, as the boundary between the art and vandalism is sometimes difficult to pinpoint. Marisa Gomez highlights the complexity of graffiti, noting that there are various types driven by different motivations.<sup>3</sup> Understanding these motivations is essential for distinguishing between art and vandalism and for effectively managing graffiti. She proposes a nuanced classification of graffiti into two main categories: “graffiti art” and “graffiti vandalism”.<sup>4</sup> According to her, graffiti art encompasses works exhibiting characteristics akin to “high art” or “folk art,” often created with the intention of producing artwork. On the other hand, graffiti vandalism refers to simple scrawling driven by motives such as territorial marking, seeking notoriety, or defying societal norms.<sup>5</sup> While some graffiti may possess qualities of both art and vandalism, Gomez argues that the distinction remains valuable.

To address these complexities of graffiti, many cities today prioritise making distinctions between various types of graffiti in their graffiti management programs.<sup>6</sup> By recognising differences in characteristics and motivations, cities are developing targeted strategies tailored to address specific challenges posed by different types of graffiti. This may involve implementing legal graffiti programs and mural art programs, to provide a

1 Weisel, D. L. (2004, revised 2013) *Graffiti: Problem-oriented guides for police*, series no. 9, *Office of Community Oriented Policing Services*, Washington, p. 5.

2 Halsey, M. and Young, A. (2002) *The Meanings of Graffiti and Municipal Administration*, *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* Vol. 35, No. 2, Australia: Sage, pp. 165-186.

3 Gómez, M.A. (1993) *The Writing on Our Walls: Finding Solutions Through Distinguishing Graffiti Art from Graffiti Vandalism*, *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform*, Vol.26, Issue 3, Michigan: University of Michigan, pp. 634-635.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 634.

5 *Ibid.*

6 For example this distinction is made in following texts: Calne Town Council, *Policy and Procedure Street Art, Graffiti and Anti-Social Behaviour*, Calne 2014, 24. 04. 2024, <https://moderengov.microshadeapplications.co.uk/calnetc/documents/s10074StreetArtGraffitiandAntiSocialBehaviourPolicydocxv1.docx.pdf>; *Graffiti Management Policy 2021*, City of Melbourne. 24.04.2024, <https://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/SiteCollectionDocuments/graffiti-management-policy.pdf>; Morgan, A. and Louis, E. (2009) *Key issues in graffiti. Research in practice summary paper*, no. 6. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology; *Tackling Graffiti, A report from Overview & Scrutiny* (2008) Birmingham City Council, 24.04.2024, [https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/592/tackling\\_graffiti\\_scrutiny\\_review\\_february\\_2008](https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/592/tackling_graffiti_scrutiny_review_february_2008).

space for the expression of graffiti writers while discouraging graffiti vandalism. Effectively managing graffiti requires a nuanced understanding of its various forms and motivations. By embracing this complexity and developing tailored approaches, cities can better address the challenges posed by graffiti while also recognising and supporting its potential as a legitimate form of artistic expression.<sup>7</sup>

### *Overview of the Graffiti Management Policies<sup>8</sup>*

Initially, city graffiti management policies typically focus on identifying and removing graffiti. However, relying solely on removal as a long-term strategy for combating graffiti may not be sufficient. In response to this challenge, cities have developed several other strategies: enforcement strategies utilising legal means, and prevention strategies, which encompass physical protection and proactive measures including education and community engagement.

Removal as a graffiti management program is a widespread approach. Even in cities lacking specific anti-graffiti regulations, removal procedures are often integrated into regular maintenance protocols. Responsibility for removing graffiti from public property usually falls on city administrations, while private property owners are typically responsible for their own premises. Some cities offer specialised graffiti removal services, either for a fee or free of charge, depending on local finances.

Enforcement strategies often involve prosecuting graffiti writing under criminal laws related to property destruction or trespassing. Police have the authority to make arrests for these offences, but they have to catch vandals in the act. Generally, offenders face penalties such as fines or community service, often involving the cleaning of graffiti.<sup>9</sup> Additionally, property owners can make a civil claim against the writer for the cost of the damage caused. Cities which base their graffiti policy on strong enforcement have even specialised police divisions that focus solely on addressing graffiti problems. They conduct patrols, document tags, and aim to apprehend offenders in the act, with vandals facing maximum penalties upon capture.<sup>10</sup>

In the domain of prevention various measures are available: including physical protection, public space design changes, PR campaigns and education programs. Physical protection usually includes employing the anti-graffiti coating, implementation of CCTV systems and bolstering security personnel. Efforts are made to integrate preventive measures into urban and architectural design, such as using graffiti-resistant materials, textured walls, darker colours, landscape solutions as well as mandatory use of anti-graffiti

7 Halsey, M. and Young, A. op.cit., pp. 165-186.

8 This section primarily draws upon the experiences of cities in North America, Australia, and Europe, starting from the early 1980s. It specifically examines the period from 2000 onwards up to the present day. For this purpose, texts by A. Young for Australian cities, M.A. Gomez and H. Shobe & T. Conklin for US cities, as well as various governmental policy documents and city graffiti management plans, were utilised.

9 Halsey, M and Young, A. op.cit., pp. 165-186; Gómez, M.A. op.cit., pp. 633-707.

10 Cities with zero policy, see in: Gómez, M.A. op.cit., pp. 633-707.

coatings. As part of PR strategies anti-graffiti campaigns are intensified through diverse channels, educating the public about the harm and cost associated with graffiti and encouraging reporting. Community-led clean-up initiatives, including 'clean-up days', involve volunteer participation in graffiti removal.

Education and outreach programs primarily target young people involved in graffiti activities. Cities collaborate with youth organisations to offer programs diverting youths from graffiti toward alternative activities.<sup>11</sup> For instance, municipalities with a zero-tolerance policy engage schools to educate students about the negative consequences and costs of graffiti. They also encourage youth participation in graffiti clean-up projects. Additionally, welfare projects aim to provide constructive outlets for young people's free time as they see young graffiti writers as troubled, underprivileged, or unemployed individuals acting out of boredom. Consequently, investments are made in programs such as job placement, employment training, and various youth activities like sports, art, and science aimed at providing constructive outlets for their free time.<sup>12</sup>

On the other hand, some cities are adopting strategies that acknowledge and embrace graffiti culture, such as commissioning murals on walls prone to graffiti. This not only covers up graffiti but also enhances urban aesthetics and reduces graffiti vandalism as graffiti writers tend to respect and appreciate artwork.<sup>13</sup> Education projects such as graffiti workshops and the mural paintings aim to steer young graffiti writers away from vandalism (tagging) and toward cultivating their artistic skills. Typically led by seasoned graffiti artists, these workshops serve as platforms for mentorship and skill development. Cities support instalment of legal graffiti walls and zones, recognising the significance of graffiti culture for youth. Legalised graffiti provides opportunities for skill development and fosters a sense of belonging among young people, contributing to a more responsible attitude towards their communities. One of the most renowned programs of this nature is Mural Arts in Philadelphia,<sup>14</sup> established in 1984 as part of the Philadelphia Anti-Graffiti Network. This initiative engages young graffiti offenders in art workshops to acquire skills and subsequently involves them in creating murals throughout the city. Over the past 40 years, this program has produced between 50 and 100 murals annually in the City of Philadelphia.<sup>15</sup>

### *Graffiti Management Policy in Belgrade*

Before discussing the strategies employed by the city of Belgrade to combat graffiti, it is important to outline the types of graffiti commonly found on Belgrade walls and the

11 Halsey, M. and Young, A. op.cit., pp. 165-186.

12 Ibid.

13 Ibid. and Gómez, M.A. op.cit., pp. 633-707.

14 More about Mural Arts Philadelphia on their webpage: <https://www.muralarts.org/40years/>

15 It is interesting to note that two cities that represent the cradle of contemporary graffiti culture New York and Philadelphia have adopted two totally different strategies for tackling the graffiti problems. New York adopted a zero policy approach based on total eradication and criminalisation of graffiti while Philadelphia based its strategy on development of the Mural Arts program.

motivations driving them. Graffiti appearing on the Belgrade walls can be divided into five groups:<sup>16</sup>

1. Slogans and simple pictograms (often created using stencils), convey a diverse range of messages. These messages can range from personal expressions like love notes to political statements, activist messages, or even hate speech. While some citizens may find them interesting or thought-provoking, they are generally considered vandalism.
2. Tagger graffiti - typically include simple or stylised calligraphic lettering, often forming a unique pseudonymous signature. Additionally, there are more elaborate versions known as throw-ups, characterised by fat bubble-style letters.<sup>17</sup> The primary motivation for taggers is to disseminate their tags across as many locations as possible, as their recognition and reputation hinge on widespread visibility. Although some of them may have artistic aspirations, these types of graffiti are generally classified as vandalism.
3. Pieces (masterpieces) also known as graffiti murals, feature large, intricate lettering often accompanied by characters or imagery.<sup>18</sup> Crafting these pieces demands considerable time and skill, with the primary motivation being artistic expression.
4. Street art is visual expression originated from graffiti culture, characterised by stylised drawings, diverse symbols, often showcasing refined techniques and compositions. This form of art encompasses a range of methods, including drawings, murals, stencils, paste-ups, objects, etc. The main motivation here is artistic expression.
5. Football supporters' graffiti constitute another significant type of graffiti. These serve primarily to mark territory, promote specific groups claiming ownership, and communicate messages to rival factions. They come in various forms, ranging from simple slogans and visual symbols to elaborate murals that reflect the values and attitudes of the groups involved.<sup>19</sup> Even in the case of large murals their primary intention remains more territorial than artistic.<sup>20</sup> They are usually considered vandalism.

---

<sup>16</sup> Some groups could be further divided based on their content, but for the purpose of this text, that is not so relevant.

<sup>17</sup> Tags and throw-ups are integral parts of graffiti culture. They are typically the first step for people getting involved in the graffiti culture, and they often develop their skills through tagging.

<sup>18</sup> Pieces are also part of the graffiti culture, which has a different approach to the concept and practice of graffiti.

<sup>19</sup> This includes portraits of deceased members as well as various nationalistic and patriotic murals.

<sup>20</sup> Often, these murals are not created by the group themselves but are commissioned from graffiti artists (from the third group).

Artistic motivations clearly underpin the creations of the third and the fourth group, while the primary aim across all other groups tends to be more the communication of various messages. Sociologically, all these groups hold significance as a means of representing public discourse. However, for the majority of citizens, the first, second, and fifth group are perceived as vandalism. Conversely, citizens typically view the works of the third and the fourth group in a more positive light.<sup>21</sup>

### *Regulation and enforcement*

There is no single universal document that clearly defines all aspects of the graffiti management policy in Belgrade. The fact that until recently (2011) the only city ordinance addressing this issue was the “Decision on the General Regulation of the City” (Odluka o opštem uređenju grada) from 1987 reveals a great deal about the city’s lack of attention to this problem during the last thirty years. In this decision, it is stated that “*writing advertisements and other inscriptions is prohibited*”<sup>22</sup> and that for this is a prescribed penalty from 250 to 25, 000 dinars (around 2 to 213 euros today). It also defines the responsibility of the owners to keep wall surfaces clean, or they could be fined up to 500,000 dinars (around 4260 euro). This regulation was replaced in 2011 by the new “Decision on Communal Order” (Odluka o komunalnom redu) in which we can find some general aspect of city policy toward graffiti today - who is responsible for maintenance of wall surfaces as well as existing reinforcement and supervision strategies. Even though the term “graffiti” is still not explicitly mentioned in this regulation the concept is addressed through descriptions. Article 9 states that “*it is prohibited to damage, write on, draw on, stick posters to, soil, or otherwise disrupt the appearance of the exterior parts of the building*”.<sup>23</sup> At the same time the article 5 mandates that “*exterior parts of buildings must be maintained, prohibiting damage, soiling, writing, or any other actions that disrupt the city’s appearance*”.<sup>24</sup>

Responsibility for maintenance of walls differs: the city oversees public spaces, while building owners and users<sup>25</sup> are responsible for their buildings, and in case of multifamily buildings, all owners share responsibility together.<sup>26</sup> The Secretariat for Communal

21 Пурић, Д. (2014) Однос Београђана према различитим врстама графита, *Култура* бр. 142, Београд: Завод за проучавање културног развоја, стр. 302-323.

22 Odluka o opštem uređenju grada, *Službeni list grada Beograda*, br. 32/87, 29/2007, član 47.

23 Odluka o komunalnom redu, *Sl. list grada Beograda*, br. 10/2011, 60/2012, 51/2014, 92/2014, 2/2015, 11/2015, 61/2015, 75/2016, 19/2017, 50/2018, 92/2018, 118/2018, 26/2019, 52/2019, 60/2019, 17/2020, 89/2020, 106/2020, 138/2020, 152/2020, 40/2021, 94/2021, 101/2021, 111/2021, 120/2021 i 19/2022, član 9.

24 Ibid., član 5.

25 Buildings that are given for use to public institutions and organisations.

26 Odluka o komunalnom redu, *Sl. list grada Beograda*, br. 10/2011, 60/2012, 51/2014, 92/2014, 2/2015, 11/2015, 61/2015, 75/2016, 19/2017, 50/2018, 92/2018, 118/2018, 26/2019, 52/2019, 60/2019, 17/2020, 89/2020, 106/2020, 138/2020, 152/2020, 40/2021, 94/2021, 101/2021, 111/2021, 120/2021 i 19/2022, član 6.

Affairs (Sekretarijat za komunalne poslove), and City and Municipal Communal inspections (Gradska i Opštinska komunalna inspekcija) are responsible for monitoring and reporting graffiti,<sup>27</sup> ensuring that buildings meet aesthetic standards. Fines of 5,000 (around 42 euros) to 25,000 dinars (213 euro) may be imposed on non-compliant owners.<sup>28</sup> The municipal police (Komunalna policija) enforce these regulations, penalising individuals caught defacing facades with graffiti with a fine between 5,000 (42 euros) and 20,000 dinars (170 euro). They can also be sentenced to community service ranging from 40 to 160 hours. Community service involves individuals cleaning up graffiti.<sup>29</sup> Parents of offenders under 14 are fined, while offenders aged 14 to 18 may face corrective measures per misdemeanour law.<sup>30</sup>

### *Removal strategies*

During the 1990s and the first decades of the 21st century, there was no official strategy for the removal of graffiti, which likely contributed to its flourishing in Belgrade. Economic challenges and widespread poverty during the 90s limited the city's ability to organise more than basic maintenance of public spaces. Additionally, as citizens became owners of their apartments during this period, they also became responsible for the maintenance of multifamily buildings. However, their responsibilities were not clearly defined in city regulations but even if they were, the pervasive poverty hindered their ability to address graffiti and other building maintenance issues effectively.

This began to change in the early 2000s when the city initiated some renovation programs in the central part of the city, such as the *Renovation of facades of buildings under the state protection* project (Obnavljanje fasada zgrada pod zaštitom države) in 2002.<sup>31</sup> During this time, municipal company Belgrade Road (Beograd put) started a graffiti removal program focused mainly on public transit areas such as underpasses which were cleaned annually or sometimes even twice a year. The Secretariat for Communal and Housing Affairs (Sekretarijat za komunalne i stambene poslove) also began annual (spring) graffiti removal actions in central parts of the city, primarily in municipalities

27 Citizens can also contact the City and Municipal Inspections to report graffiti.

28 Odluka o komunalnom redu, *Sl. list grada Beograda*, br. 10/2011, 60/2012, 51/2014, 92/2014, 2/2015, 11/2015, 61/2015, 75/2016, 19/2017, 50/2018, 92/2018, 118/2018, 26/2019, 52/2019, 60/2019, 17/2020, 89/2020, 106/2020, 138/2020, 152/2020, 40/2021, 94/2021, 101/2021, 111/2021, 120/2021 i 19/2022, član 64b. In practice, fines of 5 000 dinars are usually issued.

29 <https://www.paragraf.rs/dnevne-vesti/230215/230215-vest11.html>.

30 Odluka o komunalnom redu, *Sl. list grada Beograda*, br. 10/2011, 60/2012, 51/2014, 92/2014, 2/2015, 11/2015, 61/2015, 75/2016, 19/2017, 50/2018, 92/2018, 118/2018, 26/2019, 52/2019, 60/2019, 17/2020, 89/2020, 106/2020, 138/2020, 152/2020, 40/2021, 94/2021, 101/2021, 111/2021, 120/2021 i 19/2022, član 64g.

31 Later, projects "Popravimo zajedno" and "Lepša Srbija" were launched. Subsequently, facades on Kosančićev Venac were renovated (2016-18), and the facade restoration continued on Brankova Street. More information about these projects can be found on the page <https://www.beograd.rs/>.

Stari Grad and Vračar, and later expanded these actions to other areas. City Sanitation Services (Gradska čistoća) and Belgrade Road (Beograd put) were typically responsible for these tasks, although specialised companies were also engaged due to a lack of suitable equipment.<sup>32</sup>

Some municipalities also organised cleaning actions in collaboration with city communal enterprises, as well as volunteer cleaning campaigns in collaboration with citizens. Essentially, all these actions were seasonal, lasting for a limited period, and therefore inadequate to effectively tackle the problem. It wasn't until 2019 that a city ordinance for graffiti removal was adopted, which precisely defined responsibilities, tasks, and procedures. Today, the public utility company City Sanitation Services (Gradska čistoća) is responsible for year-round graffiti removal.<sup>33</sup> The ordinance defines graffiti "as any image, drawing, or textual message visible from public areas on a structure".<sup>34</sup> Building owners are held responsible for maintaining cleanliness, with the city authorised to remove graffiti at their expense if they fail to do so.<sup>35</sup>

#### *Preventive measures*

In addition to removal strategies, the city also implements prevention measures, mostly physical protection by applying special anti-graffiti coatings to surfaces after removal. According to a city manager interview from 2019, all new buildings are expected to have anti-graffiti coatings on the surface up to 2 metres<sup>36</sup> and CCTV cameras are installed in some cases.

City's reliance solely on physical protection as a preventive measure reflects a lack of understanding of the complexity of the graffiti problem. This is evident in the city ordinances, which equate all graffiti with vandalism, disregarding the nuances observed on the streets. In reality, many graffiti murals, though illegal, are considered as art by the local community<sup>37</sup> and are even tolerated by the city.

32 "The Secretariat for Communal and Housing Affairs will initiate a public procurement procedure for cleaning graffiti, removing posters, and protecting the facades of buildings and other public structures in the broader city centre from graffiti and posters during 2008 and 2009. The estimated value of the works is 25 million dinars" Anonym., Čišćenje grafita i skidanje plakata sa javnih objekata, *DanasOnline*, 24.03.2008, 24.04.2024, <https://www.danas.rs/vesti/beograd/ciscenje-grafita-i-skidanje-plakata-sa-javnih-objekata/>

33 Removal is primarily conducted from spring to autumn due to weather conditions, as it is important for the temperature to be above 15 degrees Celsius.

34 This is the first time that this term is used in official city regulations. Odluka o čišćenju grafita, *Sl. list grada Beograda*, br. 60/2019, član 3.

35 In practice, the removal of graffiti from multi-family buildings is financed through the city budget.

36 Anonim., Vesić: Čišćenje grafita od velike važnosti za uređenje grada, *Danas Online*, 25.07.2019, 24.04.2024, <https://www.danas.rs/vesti/beograd/vesic-ciscenje-grafita-od-velike-vaznosti-za-uredjenje-grada/>.

37 Пурић, Д. (2014) Однос Београђана према различитим врстама графита, *Култура* бр.142, Београд: Завод за проучавање културног развитка, стр. 302-323.



Furthermore, during the last twenty years there were numerous legal murals and mural programs initiated by individuals, NGOs, public institutions and companies, and yet there are no defined regulations in this domain as well as no official city support for such initiatives. The absence of clear procedures for painting murals, especially on city-managed areas, highlights the difficulty of the situation. While the Decision on Communal Order allows for mural decoration on building facades and gable ends under specific conditions,<sup>38</sup> these conditions have yet to be defined.

The process is somewhat easier for privately-owned buildings or public institutions, such as schools, where obtaining permission from the owner (or user) or signatures from the majority of apartment owners, along with the opinion of the City Institute or the Republic Institute for the Protection of Monuments<sup>39</sup> suffices. However, the lack of established guidelines for mural painting on the city level hampers progress in addressing the issue effectively. In spring 2015, city officials announced plans to launch a city mural program and to establish procedures in this domain. In the fall of 2015, they even formed a Commission under the Secretariat for Culture (Sekretarijat za kulturu) tasked with overseeing art in public spaces projects. Regrettably, these efforts stagnated, and as of today, conditions for mural painting in Belgrade remain undefined.<sup>40</sup>

A significant issue in Belgrade is the absence of educational programs such as graffiti workshops, tailored for young taggers who may have artistic intentions, aimed at teaching them skills to create larger pieces. These workshops could potentially discourage prolific or random tagging by confining it to designated areas around the more elaborate pieces. Additionally, the establishment of legal walls or approved areas where writers can practise their skills could provide further outlets for expression and help channel their artistic energy in a positive direction. In the following section, I present one of the projects initiated by the group of artists represented by IDE Group, which could serve as an example of how educational initiatives can be conceived as part of the city's graffiti management policy.

### *Project Rapresent*

The latter part of the first decade of the 2000s, when the city initiated its first regular graffiti removal efforts, was also a period of significant growth for graffiti culture in Belgrade. Although the beginnings of the graffiti culture in Belgrade are often associated

38 In the Decision on Communal Order article 11 is stated “the facade and side wall of the building can be decorated with a mural, under the conditions and in the manner determined by the city’s special regulations”. Odluka o komunalnom redu, *Sl. list grada Beograda*, br. 10/2011, 60/2012, 51/2014, 92/2014, 2/2015, 11/2015, 61/2015, 75/2016, 19/2017, 50/2018, 92/2018, 118/2018, 26/2019, 52/2019, 60/2019, 17/2020, 89/2020, 106/2020, 138/2020, 152/2020, 40/2021, 94/2021, 101/2021, 111/2021, 120/2021 i 19/2022, član 11.

39 Zavod za zaštitu spomenika kulture grada Beograda or Republički zavod za zaštitu spomenika kulture

40 Весић: Мурали и графити у будуће на прецизно одређеним локацијама, 19.03. 2015, 24.04.2024, <https://www.beograd.rs/index.php?kat=beoinfo&lang=cir&sub=1657267%3F>

with the late 1990s, it wasn't until the mid-2000s that it began to flourish more widely. Initially, by the end of the 90s, only a small number of people were involved in the culture, and graffiti could be seen primarily in areas like New Belgrade (especially Block 45) and on transit infrastructure.<sup>41</sup> It took a few more years for it to expand to the city centre. From the mid-2000s onward, graffiti started to rapidly spread throughout the entire city and to an increasing number of towns in Serbia.

Their expansion was largely facilitated by the fact that more and more young people gained access to websites, blogs, and forums dedicated to graffiti, thanks to the internet. Additionally, many of them became involved in graffiti through the widespread influence of hip-hop culture,<sup>42</sup> which was dominant in Serbia at that time. Graffiti became an integral part of many cultural festivals, such as the Hip Hop Festival and the Mikser Festival. The first specialised graffiti shops were opened and in 2010 a group of graffiti writers started organising the Belgrade edition of the international Meeting of Styles festival. At the same time, smaller graffiti jams were regularly organised, many of them in school yards, providing young people with the opportunity to see experienced writers in action.

Meanwhile, many brands aimed to attract younger consumers by using elements of graffiti aesthetic and by employing graffiti writers for their promotional activities. Even the City of Belgrade, at one point, used graffiti as part of its campaigns for a new city identity, including the Meeting of Styles festival as part of its "Beogradizacija" (Belgradisation) campaign. The same approach was adopted by NGOs, using graffiti aesthetics whenever they wanted to address youth issues.

In 2008, young graffiti writer Bojan Radanov, known by the tag Rapresent (RST), initiated and organised a graffiti jam in an underpass near Student City (Studentski grad) with the help of his friends. The underpass, situated on the outskirts of the city but still highly used by pedestrians, was covered with numerous tags and scribbles, making it an ideal location for such an event. During this time, Bojan was affiliated with the Academic Film Centre (Akademski filmski centar), which was part of the Cultural Centre Student City (Dom kulture Studentski grad) located near the underpass. Utilising his connections at the Cultural Centre, Bojan secured support for the jam, which was also included as an accompanying activity of the Balkanima Festival.<sup>43</sup> Bojan's dedication to this project was remarkable, especially considering his challenging past. Before his involvement with the Balkanima Festival and the Academic Film Centre, Bojan faced homelessness on the streets of Belgrade. Graffiti and hip-hop were some of the few positive aspects of his life during those difficult times. Born in Croatia, Bojan experienced tragedy early on, losing his father during the war when he was only three years old. He,

41 More about this period in: Radošević, Lj. (2008) "Nevidna"energija beograjskih ulic, Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo, Issue 231-232, pp. 291-306.

42 While graffiti is often portrayed as an integral part of hip-hop culture, it's important to note that in the early days of graffiti culture in Serbia, writers were listening to various music genres, and hip-hop was just one among them.

43 In the organisation of this event, Bojan collaborated with Mara Prohaska Marković, who was then the PR of the Cultural Centre Student City.

along with his mother and sister, sought refuge in Serbia, but unfortunately, his mother passed away when he was just eleven. Subsequently, Bojan found himself living in the Community Home (Dom za napuštenu decu) and later in the Juvenile Detention Centre “Vasa Stajić” (Zavod za vaspitanje dece i omladine, Beograd). At the age of eighteen, he lost his accommodation rights at the Home, which led to him becoming homeless. In 2007, his compelling story caught the attention of documentary filmmaker Ivana Todorović, who created a short film depicting Bojan’s life on the streets and his love of graffiti.<sup>44</sup> Through the process of making this film, Bojan became involved with the Academic Film Centre at the Cultural Centre Student City.

Following the success of the initial underpass project, Bojan hoped to organise similar initiatives in other underpasses throughout Belgrade. Unfortunately, he tragically passed away in 2009 before seeing his plans realised.<sup>45</sup> In honour of Bojan’s memory and his unrealised dreams, a group of Bojan friends decided to continue his work by carrying on the underpass graffiti mural painting project. The founding team of the project in 2009 consisted of Mara Prohaska Marković,<sup>46</sup> Nebojša Petrović,<sup>47</sup> and Slavica Radišić<sup>48</sup>. Due to organisational reasons and the necessity to apply for funding, it was decided that the IDE Group would officially organise the project. The IDE group was a Citizens’ Association established in 2009, gathering artists interested in mural painting and community arts.<sup>49</sup> They named the project “Rapresent” as a tribute to Bojan’s creative influence and enduring impact.<sup>50</sup>

Recognising the pivotal role graffiti culture played in Bojan’s life, helping him navigate through challenging times, IDE Group envisioned a project that transcended traditional mural initiatives. Instead of just making the mural, they decided to craft an educational platform tailored for young graffiti writers, much like Bojan once was, who dedicated their free time to mastering the art of graffiti on the streets. Their goal was to provide those young people with the chance to collaborate with seasoned graffiti writers and street artists, refine their aerosol techniques, connect with peers facing similar interests, and cultivate teamwork skills. The aim was also to teach them how to act more responsibly towards public spaces and to channel their energy and time into creating graffiti murals that enriched rather than diminished the neighbourhoods.

44 Ivana Todorović, Rapresent, short documentary film, 2008, 24.04.2024, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tZeiclsjOhI&list=PLMRoOv65OioLb7KyHvT-54w6Jc0jTF5Gn&index=6&t=958s>

45 He was twenty-one years old.

46 Participated in the first edition of the project in 2010.

47 A member of the Balkanima team and one of the founders of the IDE Group.

48 Member of IDE Group.

49 More about IDE Group projects see: <http://grupaide.blogspot.com/>

50 Bojan chose this tag because of his deep love for rap music, as he explains in the documentary. Additionally, “Rapresent” closely resembles the word “represent”, a term with significant weight in hip hop culture and graffiti. It reflects the duty of hip hop artists and graffiti writers to represent their crew, neighbourhood, and the city.

In addition to this educational goal, IDE Group had a second objective aimed at obtaining permits for New Belgrade underpasses to become legal graffiti zones. Transit infrastructure such as bridges, highway and bridge pillars, protective walls, and underpasses are common sites for graffiti murals in Belgrade. Some of these locations serve as genuine graffiti galleries and are occasionally tolerated by the city, and citizens agree that graffiti murals in these areas enhance urban landscapes.<sup>51</sup> The underpasses in New Belgrade that IDE Group aimed to designate as legal graffiti zones typically suffer from neglect and could indeed benefit from the addition of graffiti murals. These poorly lit and littered spaces are characterised by walls covered with tags, various political and football fans related slogans, layers of torn posters, and advertisements. Consequently, citizens often feel unsafe using these passages, considering them problematic spots in their neighbourhoods. IDE Group believed that involving young graffiti artists in decorating these areas with graffiti murals would not only make them easier to maintain, as graffiti writers tend to avoid defacing murals, but would also instil a sense of pride and ownership among the young graffiti writers participating in the mural painting process. By organising periodic painting sessions every few years, the project would ensure the involvement of each successive generation of young writers in the mural painting and maintenance of the underpasses. Essentially, the project aimed to establish a symbiotic relationship between the city and young graffiti writers, providing them with dedicated platforms for creative expression while simultaneously reducing the city's maintenance costs for these underpasses.



Figure 1: “Student City” Underpass, 2011 (photo Olivera Indić)

51 Пурић, Д. (2014) Однос Београђана према различитим врстама графита, *Култура* бр.142, Београд: Завод за проучавање културног развитка, стр. 302-323.

The Rapresent project had 6 editions and took place every year from late September to early October from 2010 to 2015, except for 2012 when it was organised at the end of July. During the project's tenure three underpasses were painted: the underpass near the Student City two times - 2010, 2011, the underpass in Block 44 in 2012 and the underpass Ušće 2013. Unfortunately, during the project, there were numerous issues in obtaining permits for mural painting. Since there was no precise procedure in such situations, much depended on the goodwill of individuals within the city administration. Due to permit problems, in the last two years of the project, painting was organised outside of the underpasses: one year on the back wall of the Simpo building in Lion neighbourhood (2014) and the last year of the project (2015) in the courtyard of the Vasa Stajić Juvenile Detention Centre.



Figure 2: "Vasa Stajić" Juvenile Detention Centre, 2015 (photo Nebojša Petrović)

Every year, the project began by issuing a public call for participants. The call was primarily distributed through social media platforms and groups where graffiti writers exchange information, as well as through specialised websites intended for young people. The conditions for participation in the project were that participants be between the ages of 14 and 20 and that they submit photographs of their work on the wall, along with two to three sketches.

During the first three years, up to 20 writers per year participated in the workshops, but due to reduced painting areas, the number had to decrease to 10 to 15 participants later on. Participants were predominantly male, with only two female participants in the

first year. The average age of participants was 16-17, but towards the end of the project, younger writers, some even younger than 14, have started to apply. Nearly half of the participants took part in painting twice.

The project was primarily intended for participants from Belgrade, but throughout the years, there were applications from various parts of Serbia. Therefore, the organisers decided to give them a chance as well, resulting in participants from Novi Sad, Smederevo, Pančevo, Inđija, Novi Pazar, Užice, and other cities in Serbia. A lot of participants were attending various secondary art schools, such as School for design, Tehnoart or Architectural school. Many of them opted to pursue further education in the field of arts or architecture, and eventually chose artistic professions for their careers.

Workshops typically began with a documentary about Bojan, after which participants delved into learning more about graffiti art, including its origins, history, various technical aspects as well as how to be more responsible towards public space and help beautify it while avoiding contributing to its degradation. In the subsequent sessions, participants would select an overall subject and colour pattern for their mural, define the spatial arrangement of who would paint where, and begin working on their sketches. The workshops were led by senior and well-established graffiti writers and street artists.

During most editions of the project, special attention was given to informing young people about other important social issues, such as the problem of homeless children and children working on the streets. To address this, documentary about Bojan was often used, along with the animated film “Čudovište”, made by Nebojša Petrović, Natalija Dabić (IDE Group) and Aleksandra Jelić (Aps Art) in collaboration with children from The Shelter for Children in Belgrade (Prihvatište za decu Beograda). Additionally,



Figure 3: Artwork done by children from Drop-In Shelter New Belgrade, Underpass “Ušće”, 2013 (photo Miloš Vujičić)

during the mural painting events in 2012 (Block 44) and 2013 (Ušće), a portion of the wall was allocated for workshops with children living on the streets, allowing them to, by working back-to-back with young graffiti writers, create their own artworks. These workshops were jointly organised by IDE Group and Drop-In Shelter in New Belgrade (Svratište za decu Novi Beograd) managed by the Centre for Youth Integration (Centar za integraciju mladih).

Since one of the project's goals was the promotion of graffiti culture and the establishment of legal graffiti zones, IDE Group insisted that graffiti writers be an integral part of the project team. They were primarily responsible for conducting workshops, organising mural painting sessions, and often participating in project PR. Throughout the project's duration, several graffiti artists were closely involved in its organisation: Aleksandar Slivnjak Lortek (throughout all 6 editions of the project), Marko Veljić Soter (2010, 2011),<sup>52</sup> Dragan Planinčić Super Timor (2011,2012) and Aleksandra Petković TKV (2010).

Throughout all six years, the project was primarily funded by the Ministry of Culture, initially under the Visual Arts Program for the first four years and later through the Children and Youth Program for the last two years. During the period when the project was funded through the Visual Arts Program, the allocated amount managed to cover the basic project expenses as well as very small fees for organisers. However, in the first year, the amount was rather symbolic (50,000 dinars or 427 euros), which was insufficient even to purchase basic painting materials. Consequently, the IDE Group had to finance some materials themselves, unfortunately of very poor quality, which also affected the quality of the murals in the first year. When the project was transferred to the jurisdiction of the Children and Youth Program, the funding received from the Ministry was significantly reduced and could only cover basic materials. In addition to funding from the Ministry of Culture, the project received support from the City of Belgrade. One year, the support came through the Secretariat for Culture (Sekretarijat za kulturu), and another year through the Secretariat for Youth and Sport (Sekretarijat za sport i omladinu).

Since one of the main goals of the project was to obtain permission for graffiti murals and advocate for legal graffiti zones in underpasses, collaboration with local municipalities, as well as various city institutions and services that could contribute to the organisation and quality of the project, was an important aspect. Throughout the four years of the project in New Belgrade, organisers strived to establish close cooperation with the municipality of New Belgrade. The assistance from the municipality of New Belgrade was primarily logistical in nature, as financial support was not possible since the municipality funded other projects of the IDE Group. This logistical assistance included finding spaces for workshops,<sup>53</sup> providing technical support for workshops and mural painting, and offering recommendations from the municipality for obtaining permits from other city institutions. Unfortunately, the municipality's support for the project

52 A member of the IDE Group and the founder of Meeting of Styles Belgrade Festival.

53 In 2012, workshops were held in the premises (Block 45) and with the assistance of the New Belgrade Cultural Network (Novobeogradska kulturna mreža).

was not systematic and mostly relied on the goodwill of individuals interested in this type of project, primarily Miloš Petrović, then Deputy President of the Municipality.<sup>54</sup> However, Petrović's influence did not extend to other city institutions. For example, although the municipality promised to improve the lighting in the underpass in Block 44 they were unable to do so due to unclear responsibility for maintaining that underpass. All municipality support ceased when Miloš Petrović stepped down from his position (2012/2013).

In 2014, during the mural project on the Simpo building, organisers attempted to establish cooperation with the Municipality of Zvezdara to provide assistance in finding space and the technical support for the workshops. Sadly, communication with the municipality was almost non-existent, and support was obtained thanks to a former participant of the workshops who was then part of the youth organisation of the political party in power in the Zvezdara municipality.<sup>55</sup>

In addition to those two municipalities, the Cultural Centre Student City and Community Theatre Aps Art played significant roles in assisting with the organisation of the project. The Cultural Centre Student City (Kulturni centar Studentski grad) provided substantial help during the first two years with technical and PR support for workshops, which were also included in the official program of the Visual Art Department. The same support was provided by Aps Art during the last edition of the project.

On the city level, the project received significant support from the Office of the City Architect, especially concerning the issue of the lack of procedures for obtaining permits for murals in public spaces under the direct city's control. Obtaining permits was the biggest problem during the organisation of the project. It should be noted that during the initial painting in 2008, obtaining permits was a simple process. Organisers obtained permission from Belgrade Road (Beograd put), which was then responsible for maintaining the underpass. However, in 2010, things changed. Belgrade Road was still responsible for maintenance works in the underpass (regular painting, electrical works) but they could no longer issue permits. They directed organisers to the Secretariat for Transport and the Directorate for Roads (Sekretarijat za saobraćaj i Direkcija za puteve), which was responsible for issuing maintenance orders for the underpasses. When organisers approached them, the Directorate automatically rejected them and directed them to a higher authority, the City Administration and the City Manager, who later referred them to the City Architect.

This process took a long time and significantly jeopardised the organisation of the project (in the meantime, the project received a donation from the Telekom Founda-

54 Petrović also enabled the painting of graffiti mural at the Graphic School in New Belgrade organised by TKV and Lortek, one of the first of its kind in the municipality, and initiated the project of allocating space for cultural non-governmental organisations (Aps Art, Context Collective, Carina Scene) in the building of the Local Community "Student City" (Mesna zajednica Studentski grad).

55 The workshops were organised within the cultural centre "Vuk Stefanović Karadžić". During the mural painting, assistance was received from the Local Community "Lipov lad".



tion, which was lost due to permit issues). Fortunately, the then-city architect, Dejan Vasović, was very interested in the whole project and graffiti and murals' role in the city beautification process in general. During a meeting with him, organisers learned that the main problem that needed to be solved to obtain permission for mural painting was the issue of maintenance. Since underpasses were places where various types of inscriptions and slogans appeared, and some of them were offensive and politically charged, the City Directorate for Roads was tasked with regularly removing them (at that time, Belgrade walls were full of various hate graffiti against the Pride Parade, there were also many nationalist graffiti and those against the then-mayor Dragan Đilas). They had a problem with what to do if such graffiti appeared on our graffiti murals. How to remove them without removing or damaging the murals? For this reason, they were not willing to take responsibility for issuing permissions for murals because they didn't know how to maintain them.

At the suggestion of the City Architect, it was agreed that the IDE Group would assume responsibility for the maintenance of the murals. This meant that they committed to regularly inspecting the murals, and in case any hate graffiti or political graffiti appeared on them, they would remove them themselves and repair the murals if necessary. In addition to that, one of the Directorate's requirements was to issue them a temporary permit for two years, after which IDE Group could seek an extension of the permit (depending on the wall's condition), permit for re-painting, or in the worst case, they would have to restore the walls to their previous state - to paint them white. Furthermore, there was also an issue of which competent city authority could approve the mural sketch since there was no city-level procedure in such situations. For example, City Companies and Institutions did not recognise the term Art in Public Space, and if you wanted to install some temporary artwork in public space, you had to comply with the same conditions as when installing a kiosk or some mobile sales object. No one could provide an opinion on whether, from an artistic point of view, the object met the conditions. In the absence of appropriate procedures, the City Architect agreed to personally review the sketches and approve them (during this process, care was taken to ensure that the sketch did not contain any offensive themes or words, and the artistic aspect was not so important).

So, after nearly 6 months, IDE Group managed to find a way to obtain a permit for graffiti murals, and this procedure was followed during the first three years of the project. However, since this was only a provisional procedure based primarily on the goodwill of the City Architect, with the change of government and the new City Architect, the same problems reappeared. The new City Architect, Milutin Folić, was not willing to take on the obligation of approving the sketch and issuing a permit for murals; instead, his team tried to devise new official procedures in such situations. At that time, the new City Manager, Goran Vesić, often appeared in the media, announcing a tough fight against graffiti but at the same time announcing a city mural program. Unfortunately, nothing came out of the mural program itself, only the Secretariat for Culture was tasked with organising a Commission whose assignment was to assess the artistic quality of

proposals for art projects in public space and to approve whether a work meets the aesthetic and artistic qualities to be installed. By organising this Commission, this important problem - approving the sketch - was finally resolved. There still existed the issue of which specific authority could issue permits for mural painting on the city's property (no City Secretariat or Company can independently issue permits; you always have to obtain a permit from the central City Administration), and how to define the maintenance of such projects. Unfortunately, despite all efforts and constant letter writing and phone calls to the relevant city institutions, this whole process took a long time, and that is the main reason why for the last two editions of the project, we had to find alternative locations where obtaining permits was not an issue. Only what we managed to achieve was obtaining an extension in 2016 from the Commission for the existing murals in underpasses.

Throughout the project, special attention was given to working closely with the media because it was the best way to help people understand graffiti art better. The main aim was to show how graffiti can make our neighbourhoods more beautiful and how everyone can get involved in improving their community. Considering the scale of the project, media coverage of every edition was very good. The project was covered by most of the local newspapers and web portals in sections that focus on Belgrade and topics related to the city. All major TV stations had made at least one short report about the project during its duration. Unfortunately, the project didn't have much visibility from media in charge of culture, except for the web platform Designed.

It was intriguing to discover through conversations with journalists that graffiti culture and street art remained largely unknown to the broader public. Our graffiti artists, both as part of the PR of the project and on their own, worked hard during various media appearances to showcase the culture, its origins, and how other European cities tackle this topic. Nearly every year during the project, graffiti writer Lortek was discussing these themes with journalists of the *Politika* newspaper.<sup>56</sup> Ultimately, the project received mainly positive feedback from citizens, as seen through social media comments and conversations on the site during the mural painting. Radio Beograd 202 also aired a detailed report on the project during its third edition, which included interviews with passers-by discussing their thoughts on the project.<sup>57</sup>

56 Anonim, Grafit je umetnost, ne samo škrabanje po zidu, *Politika*, 15.02.2015, 24.04.2024, <https://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/319130/Grafit-je-umetnost-ne-samo-skrabanje-po-zidu>

Brakočević, M., Umetnost je i „šaranje” po zidu, *Politika*, 03.01.2010, 24.04.2024, <https://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/118204/Umetnost-je-i-saranje-po-zidu>

Brakočević, M., Grafiti i murali – skrajnuta umetnost ulice, *Politika*, 28.12.2016, 24.04.2024, <https://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/371022/Grafiti-i-murali-skrajnuta-umetnost-ulice>

M.S.M. Grafiti u Zavodu za vaspitanje – znak sećanja na nekadašnjeg stanara, *Politika*, 25.11.2015, 24.04.2024, <https://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/344172/Grafiti-u-Zavodu-za-vaspitanje-znak-secanja-na-nekadasnjeg-stanara>

57 Author of the report was journalist Hana Gadomski.

### Conclusion

Given the circumstances surrounding the project and the issues encountered during its execution, the primary challenge was the absence of clear city strategies for addressing graffiti issues and facilitating art in public spaces. This was particularly evident in the lack of defined procedures in this domain. While there were indications at various times that the city understood and was ready to allocate walls for graffiti and street artists to express themselves, and there were expressed intentions to finally regulate this realm, ultimately, no significant progress was made despite public statements from city officials. Although a Commission for Public Art was established, in reality, it never really commenced to fully work, as there are still no regulations in this domain.

In addition, the city did not make any attempts to engage with young people involved in graffiti art to redirect their energies from vandalism to legal graffiti. There are still no legal graffiti places in Belgrade and this subject is even rarely mentioned in public discourse today.<sup>58</sup> This is highlighted by the city decision to grant concession rights for 25 years<sup>59</sup> to a private company tasked with reconstructing and regularly maintaining (including graffiti removal) the underpasses in Belgrade including those three in New Belgrade that IDE Group wanted to convert into spaces for legal graffiti. The initial passages that underwent reconstruction under this new project in 2021, were those in Block 44 and Ušće, which were part of the Represent project, and recently, works were completed in the passage near Student City.<sup>60</sup> All murals created during the Rapresent project were painted over during the reconstruction, except for one small part with Bojan's portrait and a dedication to Bojan and all children of the street. This part still stands in the underpass near Student City. The reason and the person behind the decision to preserve this part of the mural are unknown, but it was a thoughtful gesture. Besides this small segment, the only remaining mural from the Rapresent project is that painted in the courtyard of the Vasa Stajić Centre as the mural on the Simpo building was also painted over during the renovation of the building in 2018/2019.

---

58 It is difficult to find any mention of city officials understanding graffiti culture while the City Manager clearly acknowledges an understanding of football supporters culture: "We wish to gain broad public support, and discussions are planned with supporter groups to come to agreements with them as well. Our intention is for them to commit to preserving the city and its protected areas. We have no objections to painting football supporter messages, symbols, or ideas around larger stadiums. The interest of all of us is to have this city organised, despite the need to find space for everyone to express their views."

Vesić: Murali i grafiti ubuduće na precizno određenim lokacijama, 19. 03. 2015, 24. 04. 2024, <https://www.beograd.rs/index.php?kat=beoinfo&lang=cir&sub=1657267%3F>

59 Vuković A., Podzemne prolaze preuzimaju koncesionari na 25 godina, *Politika*, 19. 09. 2019, 24. 04. 2024; <https://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/438173/Podzemne-prolaze-preuzimaju-koncesionari-na-25-godina>

60 Vuković A., Podzemni prolazi – od rugla do sjaja, *Politika*, 16. 04. 2021, 24. 04. 2024., <https://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/477186/Podzemni-prolazi-od-rugla-do-sjaja>



Figure 4: Remaining part of graffiti mural in the underpass “Student City”  
(photo Olivera Inđić)

#### REFERENCES:

- Galić, A. (2022) Posao uklanjanja grafitu: skupa “ulična umetnost”, 03. 08. 2022, 24. 04. 2024, <https://bif.rs/2022/08/posao-uklanjanja-grafita-skupa-ulicna-umetnost>.
- Anonim. (2008) Čišćenje grafitu i skidanje plakata sa javnih objekata, 24. 03. 2008, 24. 04. 2024, <https://www.danas.rs/vesti/beograd/ciscenje-grafita-i-skidanje-plakata-sa-javnih-objekata/>.
- Anonim. (2015) Grafit je umetnost, ne samo škrabanje po zidu, 15. 02. 2015, 24. 04. 2024, <https://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/319130/Grafit-je-umetnost-ne-samo-skrabanje-po-zidu>.
- Anonim. (2015) Весић: Мурали и графити убудуће на прецизно одређеним локацијама, 19.03. 2015, 24. 04. 2024, <https://www.beograd.rs/index.php?kat=beoinfo&lang=cir&sub=1657267%3F>.
- Anonim. (2019) Čišćenje grafitu od velike važnosti za uređenje grada, 25. 07. 2019, 24. 04. 2024, <https://www.danas.rs/vesti/beograd/vesic-ciscenje-grafita-od-velike-vaznosti-za-uredjenje-grada/>
- Brakočević, M. (2010) Umetnost je i „šaranje” po zidu, 03. 01. 2010, 24. 04. 2024, <https://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/118204/Umetnost-je-i-saranje-po-zidu>.
- Birmingham City Council (2008) Tackling Graffiti, A report from Overview & Scrutiny, 24. 04. 2024, [https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/592/tackling\\_graffiti\\_scrutiny\\_review\\_february](https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/592/tackling_graffiti_scrutiny_review_february).

- Brakočević, M. (2016) Grafiti i murali – skrajnuta umetnost ulice, *Politika*, 28. 12. 2016, 24. 04. 2024, <https://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/371022/Grafiti-i-murali-skrajnuta-umetnost-ulice>.
- Calne Town Council (2014) *Policy and Procedure Street Art, Graffiti and Anti-Social Behaviour*, Calne, 24. 04. 2024, <https://modern.gov.microshadeapplications.co.uk/calnetc/documents/s10074StreetArtGraffitiandAntiSocialBehaviourPolicydocxv1.docx.pdf>
- City of Melbourne (2021) Graffiti Management Policy 2021, 24. 04. 2024, <https://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/SiteCollectionDocuments/graffiti-management-policy.pdf>.
- Gómez, M. A. (1993) The Writing on Our Walls: Finding Solutions Through Distinguishing Graffiti Art from Graffiti Vandalism, *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform*, Vol.26, Issue 3, Michigan: University of Michigan, pp. 633-707.
- Halsey, M. and Young, A. (2002) The Meanings of Graffiti and Municipal Administration, *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* Vol. 35, No. 2, Australia: Sage, pp. 165-186.
- Izmena odluke o komunalnom redu u Beogradu, 22. 02. 2015, 24. 04. 2024, <https://www.paragraf.rs/dnevne-vesti/230215/230215-vest11.html>.
- Morgan, A. and Louis, E. (2009) Key issues in graffiti, *Research in practice summary paper*, no. 6, Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology, <https://www.aic.gov.au/publications/rip/rip6>.
- M.S.M. (2015) Grafiti u Zavodu za vaspitanje – znak sećanja na nekadašnjeg stanara, 25.11.2015, 24. 04. 2024; <https://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/344172/Grafiti-u-Zavodu-za-vaspitanje-znak-secanja-na-nekadasnjeg-stanara>.
- Mural Arts Philadelphia, 24. 04. 2024; <https://www.muralarts.org/40years/>.
- Odluka o opštem uređenju grada, *Sl. list grada Beograda*, br. 32/87, 29/2007, 24. 04. 2024, [http://demo.paragraf.rs/demo/combined/Old/t/t2007\\_10/t10\\_0026.htm](http://demo.paragraf.rs/demo/combined/Old/t/t2007_10/t10_0026.htm)
- Odluka o komunalnom redu, *Sl. list grada Beograda*, br. 10/2011, 60/2012, 51/2014, 92/2014, 2/2015, 11/2015, 61/2015, 75/2016, 19/2017, 50/2018, 92/2018, 118/2018, 26/2019, 52/2019, 60/2019, 17/2020, 89/2020, 106/2020, 138/2020, 152/2020, 40/2021, 94/2021, 101/2021, 111/2021, 120/2021 i 19/2022, 24. 04. 2024, [https://www.paragraf.rs/propisi/odluka\\_o\\_komunalnom\\_redu-beograd.html](https://www.paragraf.rs/propisi/odluka_o_komunalnom_redu-beograd.html).
- Odluka o čišćenju grafita, *Sl. list grada Beograda*, br. 60/2019, 24. 04. 2024, [http://demo.paragraf.rs/demo/combined/Old/t/t2019\\_08/t08\\_0042.htm](http://demo.paragraf.rs/demo/combined/Old/t/t2019_08/t08_0042.htm).
- Пурић, Д. (2014) Однос Београђана према различитим врстама графита, *Култура* бр.142, Београд: Завод за проучавање културног развоја, pp. 302-323.
- Shobe, H. and Conklin, T. (2018) Geographies of Graffiti Abatement: Zero Tolerance in Portland, San Francisco, and Seattle, *The Professional Geographer* Vol.70, Issue 4, London: Taylor & Francis, Inc., pp. 1-9.
- Tavares, S. S. (2014) *California Graffiti Removal Programs: Benchmarking San Jose's Graffiti Abatement Program against Best Practices in the Cities of Long Beach, San Diego, and Santa Ana*, Master's Projects, San Jose State University.
- Vuković A. (2019) Podzemne prolaze preuzimaju koncesionari na 25 godina, 19.09.2019, 24. 04. 2024, <https://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/438173/Podzemne-prolaze-preuzimaju-koncesionari-na-25-godina>.

- Vuković, A. (2021) Podzemni prolazi – od rugla do sjaja, 16. 04. 2021, 24. 04. 2024, <https://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/477186/Podzemni-prolazi-od-rugla-do-sjaja>.
- Weisel, D. L. (2004, revised 2013) Graffiti: Problem-oriented guides for police, series no. 9, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, Washington.
- Young, A. (2010) Negotiated consent or zero tolerance? Responding to graffiti and street art in Melbourne, *City* Vol. 14, Issue 1-2, London: Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 99-114.

Славица Радишић

Хаг, Холандија

### ГРАФИТИ МЕНАџМЕНТ И ЕДУКАТИВНИ ПРОГРАМИ У БЕОГРАДУ: СТУДИЈА СЛУЧАЈА ПРОЈЕКАТ *РАПРЕСЕНТ*

**Сажетак:** Графити представљају сложен феномен који се може истраживати на различите начине. У овом тексту истражују се из угла графити менаџмента и начина на који се градови баве овим феноменом. Мариса Гомез прави разлику између „графита умјетности“ и „графита вандализма“, наглашавајући важност разумевања мотива за настанак графита како би градови могли њима да се баве ефикасније. Овај приступ се огледа у менаџмент програмима после 2000. године који почињу да препознају графите као специфичан умјетнички израз и то инкорпорирају у своје стратегије. У тексту су приказане и описане основне стратегије које градови примењују са графитима као што су: уклањање графита, регулација и кажњавање, као и нови приступи засновани на превенцији који укључују различите едукативне програме, рад са младим графити умјетницима и покретање легалних програма мурала. У тексту се посебно фокусирамо на искуство Београда у овој области, мапирајући контекст и постојећи регулаторни оквир током последњих двадесет година. Представљене су постојеће стратегије Града Београда (уклањање, регулација и кажњавање), али се указује и на запостављене аспекте (превенција и едукација). Поред тога, идентификују се и постојећи проблеми који се огледају у непотпуној регулацији у овом домену као и недефинисаним надлежностима и процедурама. Посебна пажња у тексту је посвећена пројекту *Рајресент* Групе ИДЕ (од 2010. до 2015) као примјеру могуће образовне иницијативе у овој области. Циљ овог пројекта био је да трансформише градске подземне пролазе у легалне зоне за графите и пружи образовну платформу за младе графити умјетнике. Упркос бирократским препрекама, пројекат је показао потенцијал графита да побољшају запуштене јавне просторе ангажујући младе. Поред тога, показао је и колико је важно да Град Београд има јасно дефинисане прописе и процедуре у овој области, што је један од предуслова за успјешну сарадњу између града и графити умјетника у уљепшавању града.

**Кључне ријечи:** *графити менаџмент, Београд, регулатива и сировођење, образовни програми, „Рајресент“*