

Strasbourg, September 2003

DGIV/CULT/POL/trans (2003) 9

**TRANSVERSAL STUDY  
CULTURAL POLICY  
AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY**

**NATIONAL REPORT  
SERBIA**

**prepared by  
Branimir Stojković**

Cultural Policy and Action Department  
Directorate General IV - Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport

The Council of Europe Transversal Study Project on ***Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity*** was implemented between 2000 and 2003. The object of the Study was to help develop cultural policy capable of sustaining new forms of cultural diversity in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

It was developed over three phases.

In the first phase, research focused primarily on western Europe, with studies of diversity undertaken in seven countries (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Luxembourg, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and also, for comparative purposes, Canada).

In the second and third phases of the project's life, eight further studies were undertaken, with an emphasis on diversity in different parts of Eastern Europe (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Hungary, Romania, the Russian Federation, "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Serbia, and Ukraine). In each of these countries, reports were commissioned on the situation of cultural diversity and on the situation with respect to national diversity policy.

The following text is a national report developed in the context of this study.

--oOo--

The opinions expressed in this work are those of the author and do not necessarily engage the responsibility of the Council of Europe.

# NATIONAL REPORT

## SERBIA

National co-ordinator: Branimir Stojković, Ph. D. Professor of Cultural Policy  
with  
Vojislav Stanovčić, Ph. D, Professor of Political Sciences  
Miroljub Radojković, Ph. D, Professor of Communication Sciences

---

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

I Introduction.....	2
II Mapping cultural diversity.....	3
1. Basic data about the ethnic minority diversities.....	7
2. Minority rights: from severe violations to reasonable legal protection.....	15
3. Prospects for preserving and promoting diversities .....	17
III Mapping cultural policy .....	19
1. History.....	19
2. Definitions.....	20
3. Constitutional and administrative framework .....	21
4. Media system and media policy .....	24
IV Cultural and media policy responses to cultural diversity .....	28
V Conclusions .....	36
VII Appendix.....	37
VIII Selective bibliography .....	38

## I. INTRODUCTION

The political and especially territorial map of Europe was defined after World War II. Most of the states formed at that period continue to exist. The fact of political and territorial continuity of these countries lies at the very heart of their cultural policies, even though these policies have changed over time, sometimes quite radically.

Serbia is one of the few European countries whose political and territorial continuity has been undermined in at least two ways. First, Yugoslavia – the federal state to which Serbia had belonged as one of its republics – underwent violent disintegration during the 1990s. Secondly, while the province of Kosovo is formally part of the Republic of Serbia, it is de facto governed by a UN administration.

All this was happening to Serbia at a time when the neighboring countries were preoccupied primarily with transition – the change from the one-party state socialist system to the multi-party market system, followed by the process of joining the European Union. Simultaneously, in 2003 an arrangement has been struck between Serbia and Montenegro to form a state community of the two republics. This community has been internationally recognized and accepted in the Council of Europe. However, the arrangement has a specified time limit – i.e. it is subject to reconsideration within three years. This fact influences greatly the national cultural policy, particularly the one concerning ethnic minorities, since their status is legally regulated at the level of the state community rather than at the level of the Republic of Serbia.

The disintegration and successive "shrinking" of the former Yugoslavia, which had consisted of six republics, resulted in increasing ethnic and cultural diversity of the "rump" Yugoslavia. Members of formerly Yugoslav nations that have remained in Serbia – Bosniacs, Croats, and Macedonians – have become new minorities. Likewise, during the 1990s several hundred thousand refugees from former Yugoslav republics that in the meantime have become independent states – especially Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia – have come to Serbia. Their situation may be likened to the condition of people who were "repatriated" into their ancient homeland within the operations of "redressing historical injustices" after WWII. Upon arrival, they were received as foreigners – of the same ethnic background, but of different culture and language. Culturally speaking, the situation of people – Serbs, Roma, Ashkali – forced to leave Kosovo after 1999 is the same. They are not even refugees, according to the international definition of the term, but rather "internally displaced persons", since they have not left the territory of their state. The cultural and social distance of the domicile population towards the refugees from other parts of the former Yugoslavia and IDPs from Kosovo is sufficient to make them feel not at home.

The Law of Protection of National Minorities (2002.) does not explicitly list ethnic minorities living in Serbia and Montenegro; instead, it only specifies the features a group has to possess in order to be recognized as an ethnic minority. Due to this fact, it may be assumed that the process of constitution and recognition of ethnic groups in Serbia is not yet finished. Insofar, the Law... performs the function of the *unmelting pot*, since it not only prevents the assimilation of the existing minorities but also contributes to the affirmation and recognition of new ones. The examples of Ruthenians (Ukrainians), Vlachs (Romanians), and *Bunjevci* (Croats) may be taken as illustrations. Had the Law on Minorities defined these three groups as minorities whose mother-countries are, respectively, Ukraine, Romania and Croatia, they would have been forced to renounce some of their cultural diversity (language, customs, etc.) and adapt to the culture of the nation ascribed to them as their mother-nation. The legislator rightly refused to do so and left freedom of choice to the members of minority groups. They can opt either for claiming autochthonous origins or for acknowledging a mother-state. In all three cases listed above, both options have proved to enjoy sufficient support. Therefore various forms of cultural and civic organization emerge within each of them. Still more importantly, there is no either/or exclusivism, so that we may find associations gathering adherents of both the autochthonous and the mother-nation options alike.

## II. MAPING CULTURAL DIVERSITY

“Mixed” population is the general characteristic of the wider area of Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe, and particularly of the Balkans. But the Republic of Serbia has so obviously and to such a degree “mixed population” that in regard to other former communist countries it is comparable only with some of former Soviet Republics. Diversities that characterize different groups of population in terms such as names of a group, language, religion, cultural tradition, customs, and other traits (like folk songs, costumes, specific foods, myths, symbols, even superstitions, prejudices and stereotypes etc.) make an important part of the past history and of the present features of the population. And minority groups taken together make about one third of the population of the country as a whole, or in absolute numbers (including Kosovo and Metohija) about 3.3 million, and both Serbia and Montenegro have almost equally diverse ethnic population composition.

Diversities that contribute to the ethnic (national) kaleidoscope of the Republic of Serbia are results of historical processes; voluntary and forced migrations; wars; centuries of life under different states, empires and of contacts with different cultures; influence of three main religions that encounter here; ethnic engineering during foreign domination including policies to mix population in order to weaken national resistance of any single group; as well as of social, political, cultural and demographic development (differences between groups in regard to the natural birth rate are such that some groups have it among the smallest in Europe, and some other groups undoubtedly the largest). Combination of elements used to determine in the past which group(s) will dominate and which one(s) will be subdued. In some areas “model” of domination prevailed, though the group(s) would change their positions of being the dominant or dominated. Beside the variety of diversities, most of groups also share some common values and basic civilization achievements mutually acquired from each other as a necessity of everyday life during centuries, treasure some valuable experience concerning “mutual aid” at some difficult times, but in several cases also preserve and treat almost as sacred memories of suffering at hands of neighbors in turbulent times of conflicts.

Most of existing groups are autochthonic at certain territories where they also live with others, though there are disputes about who was the first to live somewhere and who expelled whom from his hearthstone at some point of time. Only some groups live in internal diaspora, i.e. dispersed all over the country without any dense regional concentration (Roma are the largest statistically and socially very relevant group that lives all over Serbia). When groups are “territorialized” as it is the case with most of groups in the Republic of Serbia then different political requests are raised than if groups live in diaspora, and also specific procedures and institutions can or have to be established concerning the implementation of minorities’ educational and cultural rights and power sharing arrangements.

Status of some of these groups has been changed recently, after the disintegration of the SFRY, as a result of border and other significant territorial-political changes. After such changes, some groups that in constitutional and legal terms used to be treated as “constituent nations” or so called “entitled nations” (this term is familiar from some foreign legal systems and terminology, but had never legal grounds and was not used in former Yugoslavia), after these changes turned into “national minorities” and they take it as worsening of their status and as a degradation. That’s the case particularly with Croats and Muslims (Bosniacs) who represent numerous groups in the Republic of Serbia and are concentrated in some regions, and less with Macedonians and Slovenes, though they are in the same status situation, but these groups are smaller and live in diaspora (except Macedonians in Kačarevo and Jabuka settlements in Vojvodina).

As in some other countries, too, some groups do not like to be treated as “national minorities”. For instance, Albanians of Kosovo and Metohija for decades were even angry if somebody would address them as national minority, and they aspired to be treated as a “nation”. For quite different reasons, Jews also do not wish to be treated as national minority, but prefer to be treated as an ethnic group. The Roma people, however, who were earlier treated as “ethnic groups” and they assume that because

of that they were denied rights belonging to national minorities, are very eager now to acquire exactly the status of “national minority” in a hope that it will help them to improve their social, economic, educational and political chances and opportunities, and to improve their overall situation. Many of these diverse expectations may be understood only in the context of past or recent events, experience and historical circumstances. We will explain later below how these diverse requests were treated in legal and constitutional terms, particularly in two most recent decades, and how after the changes of regime in the year 2000, these expectations and requests were reconciled and covered by legal provisions at the satisfaction of most and explicit or tacit approval of all groups.

In the course of February and March 2003, the State Union (S&M) was established instead of the former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY), which itself had been proclaimed in April 1992, as a federal state consisting of two equal member republics – the Republic of Serbia and the Republic of Montenegro – of which Serbia comprises two autonomous provinces (APs): AP Vojvodina and AP Kosovo and Metohija established in 1945 as autonomous units with an aim to accommodate territorial-political organization of the state to some of ethnic diversities. This predecessor state (FRY), sometimes by journalists called “rump Yugoslavia”, was the outcome of the disintegration of the former communist Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY) usually referred to as “Second Yugoslavia” and ruled by communists from 1945-1990.

Some terms used in this mapping of diversities, as well as at least dates and official names of the country require to be mentioned to make it easier to follow the text and to avoid misunderstandings. This is very important to explain some elements which are part of public attitudes and consciousness, and even more because ethnic kaleidoscope is very much affected and changed by recent changes of borders and political structures which make the area susceptible for further fragmentation, and as a result of these processes, so called “new national minorities” had appeared, and the number of refugees and internally displaced persons amounts to three quarters of a million, and their future status will depend on the further political development and not only on their rights, but also on their economic and social opportunities to survive. .

The “ethnic revival” is a world-wide phenomenon. “National question” was permanently a big problem in most of former communist countries. But the genuine study of nationalism was discouraged or suppressed, and ethnicity was examined in its folklore or historical aspects and in prevailing ideological frames. “National question” was officially treated as a solved problem, and so forbidden as a part of any genuine political discourse, and consequently suppressed by official policy, propaganda and police actions (many “nationalists” of all kinds were imprisoned or ousted from public life at one time or the other). But nationalism was also one of very effective means of undermining and dismantling communism. In the context of such a background already set, two processes were taking place in former communist countries of Eastern Europe which affect multiculturalism, particularly the status and situation of national/ethnic minorities.

Another process was the religious revival. After years of atheistic (communist) propaganda and political repression, religions regain their role as a relatively influential political force and even more important as an essential element of group identity, and became associated with political movements inspired by nationalism. This can particularly be illustrated by experience of countries where followers of three main religions – Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Muslim – live in the same state as it was the case of former SFR Yugoslavia, and in later FRY and present-day Republic of Serbia. . When any one of mentioned religion groups, makes majority in such a state, then nation-building based on preferences of one group only, leads to what some scholars call “constitutional nationalism” (R. Hayden). Also, between the universal values and messages of e.g. the Gospels (or Koran) and practical policies of hierarchies of churches, or individual priests, very big discrepancy can be noticed. Churches sometimes follow state politics, or behave themselves like secular organizations. And *vice versa* i.e. political organizations and even state bodies are involved in materializing some religious goals. So the process of the nation-building or state-building becomes more complex when population has different religious, ethnic, national background and origin. These processes make political mobilizations easier, increase tensions and may cause conflicts.

One of issues which is interpreted as very important now in the process of drafting new constitution for the Republic of Serbia is how to define the state in the constitution - as a state of Serbian nation and of national minorities whose members are equal citizens, and any discrimination would be unconstitutional and illegal; or to define the state as multicultural or multinational one. Some propose to mention all minority groups. It is very difficult to achieve a consensus over this and similar issues, and it would perhaps be the best to avoid "constitutionalizing" such issues and to disregard them in constitution-making, but both opposing sides are reluctant to accept that. It is not of much help to point that many constitutions, including the first modern still in force - the US Constitution, do not touch anyone of let us say "metaphysical" issues irrelevant for the functioning of democratic government). Without treating such issues in the historical context it is not easy to understand consequences of one or the other option nor to comprehend the relevance of similar cases and issues for the Republic of Serbia and some special concerns of minorities, like of Bosniacs/Moslems part of whom live in Serbia and part in Montenegro, and their group can be further divided if a split of the State Union would take place. Namely, they are already divided over the name of the group: majority of those in Serbia adopted a new name - Bosniacs, while those in Montenegro stick to earlier name of the group - Muslims, and in both cases the reasons are more of political than of cultural or religious character.

Having in mind not only diversities inside former Yugoslavia and similar one in S&M, but all changes and accommodations tried over decades, and also a mixture of political and ideological influences and ideas, from monarchist to communist, it will be no surprise that three constitutions "in force" till March 2003 in the FR Yugoslavia, predecessor of S&M (two of these still in force) had all three different approaches to diversities, and even different terms used for groups that we talk here about. There was not (and there is no) standard in the country how to treat these groups concerning their "generic" character. Namely, in three constitutions in force until the beginning of 2003, these groups were treated and named in three different ways (each constitution in a different way). Constitution of Serbia (1990) used terms "nations and nationalities" as they were employed in the former SFRY; Constitution of FR Yugoslavia (1992) had "returned" to the terminology of international law - "national minorities" - but with an aim not to implement international law, but probably to limit what provisions earlier were guaranteeing to "nations and nationalities"; and the Constitution of Montenegro (1992) introduced the terms "national and ethnic groups" and so leaving wide option for groups to be included and avoiding tensions with such groups inside Montenegro. And when the federal ministry in charge of protecting rights of minorities (established in 2000) was established its name was "the Federal Ministry of National and Ethnic Communities", after March 2003 also changed into the Ministry for Human and Minority Rights.

There were many terminological confusions and inconsistencies between three constitutions in force in the FRY concerning the status of minority and ethnic groups and their protection. The inconsistency was particularly serious between the FRY Constitution (1992) and it was not concerning terminology only. The Constitution of Serbia (1990) was enacted during former SFRY, and its Constitution had to be adjusted to the federal Constitution of the new federal state of Serbia and Montenegro. But it has not happened in the course of 10 years during which these constitutions were in force. It's easy to conclude that constitutions were not respected (that is true then and even today in many respects). On the other side, from plethora of diversities and even more diverse self-perceptions and self-styled roles and names of different groups, we have to realize that it was not easy to define and to find a general name which would fit to all groups that are subject of legal protection and to gain their approval. That protection was the obligation of the former federal state and now State Union on the ground of the ratified [European] Framework Convention (1995) and on the ground of the federal Law on Protection of Rights and Freedoms of National Minorities (2002). In this Law the subject of the protection was defined (in Art. 2) in the following way: "A national minority for the purpose of this Law shall be any group of citizens of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia numerically sufficiently representative and, although representing a minority in the territory of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, belonging to a group of residents having a long term and firm bond with the territory of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and possessing characteristics such as language, culture, national or ethnic affiliation,

origin or confession, differentiating them from the majority of the population and whose members are distinguished by care to collectively nurture their common identity, including their culture, tradition, language or religion. All groups of citizens termed or determined as peoples, national or ethnic communities, national or ethnic groups, nations and nationalities, and which meet the conditions specified under paragraph 1 of this Article shall be deemed national minorities for the purpose of this Law.”

This means that under the Law now in force (basic principles and provisions are turned into clauses of the Charter on Human and Minority Rights, which is one of founding documents of the State Union S&M) the same rights are enjoyed by all national and ethnic communities, which have the freedom to choose how they define their own group (as peoples, national or ethnic communities, national or ethnic groups, nations and nationalities, national minorities). Independently from terms (names) they will enjoy the rights guaranteed by international, European and Yugoslav (legal) standards to persons belonging to national minorities. In drafting and preparing the Law, and introducing the new democratic policy, the government wanted to give equal rights to all groups regardless of how they call themselves. Each individual, based on the constitutions and this Law, has a right to declare or not to declare him/herself in terms of ‘nationality’.

The Republic of Serbia, with so different situations in her two autonomous provinces, Vojvodina and Kosovo, and two other above mentioned regions can be taken as an example of very complex cultural diversities. Different situations in different parts of this Republic also demonstrate how important and beneficial it may be if there were even in some parts of the country some features seeds of the civil society and some elements of the rule of law, be it even in the limited form of the "Rechtsstaat" encumbered with bureaucracy. Namely, under the reign of Austria some of these elements were developed in Vojvodina, preserved during the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and have left patterns and manners that preserve and promote multiculturalism. Thanks to these facts and perhaps also to the high degree of ethnic diversities living together for a long period of time - Vojvodina may be seen as in practice a successful “consociation”, a community where multi-culturalism indeed means the society's valuable treasure.

Quite different from Vojvodina - Kosovo and Metohija, regardless of who was the authority ruling it from the Ottoman times to the present, has never experienced either the process of developing civil society or of the rule of law. Here various models of authoritarian domination were replacing each other. Kosovo and Metohija for Serbs is their Holly Land, the cradle of their state, region where important Serbian Orthodox Church monasteries and sacred places are located, and where the seat of their Church was (in Peć) before Serbs were forced to emigrate collectively in 1690 after the war between Austria and Turkey in which they supported Austria. This emigration had left the region almost without Serbs, and deep scars in their memory, so after the region was liberated from the Ottoman rule early in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the very liberal regime in Serbia as a whole at that time was not extended to Kosovo and Metohija and this region lacked the rule of law, and did not develop into a multi-cultural community. One could say it "developed" on the principles of apartheid, two groups, and two "communities" living separate lives with different social and religious organizations.

Central Serbia in terms of minorities is characterized with two mentioned regions which have no separate regional government entity; and by the fact that overwhelming majority of Roma live in Central Serbia.

Region which is unofficially called Sandžak is a part of historical Novopazarski sandžak (part of which is also called Stara Raška – Old Raška), which was liberated by Serbian and Montenegrin troops in the I Balkan War and at the London Peace Conference in 1913 was divided so that three districts (present-day municipalities) belong to Montenegro, and six to Serbia. Since 1918 (when Serbia and Montenegro united as former independent states) all the people of Sandžak lived in the same state. That is a region where Moslems who are living in Serbia are concentrated, and they make roughly over half of the population there, but in such a way that out of six municipalities they make majority in three and Serbs in three. Moslems of Sandžak are of Slav origin. On the ground of historical evidence



and family histories, overwhelming majority of them are of Serbian and Montenegrin background. But, on several occasions in the past (particularly during WWII) they were victims of religious hatred, and in recent conflicts that followed the disintegration of the SFRY they became very politically agitated, concerned and worried because of events in Bosnia and Herzegovina. At a Conference in Sarajevo in 1993 they accepted to be named – Bosniacs. Quite many of them were maltreated by police (with the pretense that they were armed themselves, they would be requested by police to surrender arms and were tortured, though most of them did not have arms at all; some of them were prosecuted, but trials which started were given up because of lack of evidence for charges). In three cases several dozens of them were abducted by paramilitary units and some facts support assumption that they were killed. Some participants in these criminal actions are known, and some of them even arrested and brought to trial in Montenegro, but the appropriate judicial process was not accomplished. They are quite concerned today to preserve the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro; otherwise they would be split to live into two states.

The Preševo Valley is a small region of three municipalities (Bujanovac, Preševo, and Medvedja) which are inhabited by overwhelming Albanian majority. There were terrorist actions and guerilla warfare here, but were stopped in 2001 through negotiations between representatives of the Serbian government and local Albanian leaders with mediation of West European and American diplomats. This is an underdeveloped region where many problems that characterize the whole country, like unemployment, upset the population and from time to time tensions grow here.

## **1. Basic data about the ethnic minorities diversities**

To be able to give relatively complete data concerning the population in general and minorities for the Republic of Serbia, we have to combine results of three censuses - 1981, 1991 and 2002. The reason is that population of Albanian “nationality” boycotted censuses after 1981, so the census of that year is the last one in which they participated, and all figures of later dates concerning the size and other demographic characteristics of this group are estimations of experts on the basis of natural birth and mortality rates and other relevant criteria that refer to this group. (Government of Montenegro, due to disagreements with the federal government, rejected to take the census in 2001. This came as a surprise for the federal government, and for some organizational reasons Serbia also was asked to postpone the census for 2002. Government of Montenegro again rejected to participate.) In the Appendix are given two tables. Table 1 contains the data about the whole population and of persons belonging to national minorities, based on the 2002 census that includes all parts of Serbia except the AP Kosovo and Metohija. Table 2 gives similar data based on 1991 census, which gives data for Montenegro and for Serbia with estimation for the southern province (Kosovo and Metohija). So, the last census taken in all parts of S&M was really in 1981, and when some more recent figures are missing or seem unreliable, we will quote data from 1981 census. Wherever the census 2002 data are available, we give them priority.

Since 1999 the international forces are deployed in the AP Kosovo and Metohija on the basis of the UN Security Council Resolution No. 1244. When we try to map diversities we have to include that area, too. Not only because the quoted Resolution of the Security Council confirmed the sovereignty of FRY over this Province, but because one can not neglect effects of the situation in the AP Kosovo and Metohija on multiculturalism and general prospects of the wider region. Significant non-Albanian minorities from Kosovo and Metohija (about a quarter of a million treated as “displaced persons”) have no real chance of safe return to their homes. Such situation contributes to instability in the whole region, hinders prospects of democracy and the rule of law, and presents a real obstacle for implementation of the Law on Protection of Rights and Freedoms of National Minorities (2002) not only in southern Serbia where in three municipalities Albanians make overwhelming majority of population, but at the whole territory because of the discontent with the status of Serbian and other minorities in the Province (Serbian, Muslim/Bosniacs, Roma, Egyptians and Hashkalis minorities; Hashkalis are Roma people whose native language is Albanian).

In analyzing and interpreting census figures one also has to take into account different methodologies used in 1991 and 2002. Also, that in 1991 Muslims were treated as a nationality, while in 2002, depending on how they declare themselves, some of them were registered as Bosniacs, some as Muslims (this last option was particularly practiced in Montenegro). In ten years the number of “undeclared or undecided” has been increased for ten times from 11.849 in the whole FRY and 10.906 in Serbia in 1991 to 107.732 in Serbia alone in 2002. These persons were using legal right not to declare, but such a significant change can also be connected with some concerns of those who opted not to declare (one could just guess that reasons could be security, employment, education in another school etc.). It has also to be noted that the number of those whose nationality was recorded as unknown increased from 56.443 in FRY as a whole in 1991 to 75.483 in Serbia alone in 2002. It’s interesting that the number of undeclared/undetermined and those “unknown” was relatively small at Kosovo and Metohija in comparison to population there (see the tables). In comparison with the number of those who declared as Yugoslavs (because of mixed marriages or other reasons) in 1991 - 349.784 (of which 25.159 in Montenegro), such option significantly dropped in the 2002 census to 80.721 in Serbia (data for Montenegro unavailable). These figures we quoted because they prevent us from reaching any certain conclusion about the significance, rate and the direction of changes (up or down) for many groups, particularly smaller ones. For some big changes in numbers between two censuses we will give some available explanations. It is important to keep in mind that to declare one’s nationality is not a legal obligation and refraining from declaring oneself can not have any impact on one who does or does not declare. Because of that there are some fluctuations from one group to the other for social, economic, political, psychological, religious or other reasons. There are many cases that two or three brothers from the same parents can on the legal grounds of their origin and place of birth or living declare different ethnic nationality, and in some extreme cases several brothers could all declare differently.

According to 2002 census, total population of Serbia (without AP Kosovo and Metohija) is 7,498.001. Of that number Serbs are 6,212.838 inhabitants or 82.86 % of the total population of Serbia, and in Central Serbia they make 89.48 % of the population or in numbers: 4,891,031. In AP Vojvodina there live 1,321.807 Serbs, who make 65.05 % of the population of Vojvodina. The overall decrease in numbers of the Serbian nationality by about three hundred thousand between 1991 and 2002 is significant demographic change in the region. Namely, despite the immigration to Serbia of up to seven hundred thousand (most of them Serbs) from other parts of former Yugoslavia, who increase the number of Serbs-inhabitants, this overall decrease of number of Serbs demonstrates an enormous emigration to other countries (one has to estimate that about one million, mostly young and educated people emigrated to West European countries and North America).

**Albanians** are the second largest group in the country. In Central Serbia in 1991 there were 75.725 (i.e. 1 %) of Albanians, 2,556 (0.12 %) in AP Vojvodina and in Serbia as a whole 1.674.353, which made 17.5 % of the total population of Serbia. In the Autonomous Province of Kosovo and Metohija Albanians made 77 % of the population in 1981, but in 1990s estimations were from 82.6 % (official statistics) to 85 % or even 90 %. The Albanians form the absolute majority in two Southern Serbian municipalities – Preševo and Bujanovac. In Preševo, whose population totals 38,934 people, there are 34,992 ethnic Albanians. In Bujanovac (population: 49,238), there are 29,588 Albanian nationality members. Also bordering on Kosovo, the Medvedja municipality (population: 13,369) has 3,832 Albanians. Albanians do not live in any large number in any other towns and villages in the Republic of Serbia and no more than 4,378 of persons belonging to the Albanian nationality were registered in the capital Belgrade. The increase of the Albanian population in general is due to the very high natural birth rate, to the decrease of mortality thanks to better medical care over a longer period after the W.W.II, and in Kosovo and Metohija relative increase is also result of very numerous emigration of Serbs and Montenegrins from this Autonomous Province as a result partly of socio-economic causes, but to the largest degree as a result of political pressure and uncertainty. The comparison of the population censuses taken in all three Yugoslav states from 1921 to 1991 indicates that after the borders had been drawn between the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and Albania there were 203,000 Serbs and 140,000 Albanians living in Kosovo and Metohija. Only a quarter of a century later, in 1948, the

Albanians were dominant in Kosovo in demographic terms accounting for 68.5 % of the population. In the following 25 years that %age gradually went up to the mentioned 80.9.

From 1948, when the first after W.W.II census was taken to the last one which covered Kosovo and Metohija (in 1991), the changes in the structure of the population had no other parallel not only in Yugoslavia but in the whole Europe since after the World War II. In 1948 (first after-war census) Serbs and Montenegrins made 27.5 % of the population of Kosovo and Metohija, though about 60.000 of them were expelled from Kosovo and Metohija during W.W.II and they were not allowed by communist government to return to their homes after 1945. In the course of 1990s Serbs and Montenegrins were reduced (according to official statistics) to 10.9 %, unofficially to less than that. Earlier methodology of census taking would also include the number of those who worked abroad (as Gastarbeiters) if their family members lived at Kosovo and Metohija. All these things make data on population just approximate. Currently, Kosovo and Metohija is mostly populated by persons belonging to the Albanian nationality. At the same time all other ethnic communities living in Kosovo declined with the exception of the Roma that also registered a positive trend in terms of population growth, but in 1999 most of them were expelled from Kosovo and Metohija.

After the Serbs, Albanians and Montenegrins, in 1991, according to the census, the next group in size in FRY were **Yugoslavs**. But already an then it was clear that this group was decreasing in numbers. There were 441.000 persons belonging to this group in 1981; then in 1991 there were 349.714 (3.4 % in the total population); and in 2002 census only 80.721 Yugoslavs in Serbia without Kosovo and Metohija. In 1991 in Serbia as a whole, there were 323.625 Yugoslavs, and of that in Central Serbia 145.873; in Vojvodina 174.295; in Montenegro 26.159; and at Kosovo and Metohija 3.457. Many of them were involved in or coming from mixed marriages. But the census data for the year 2002 for Serbia as a whole show only 80.721, and of that in Central Serbia 30.840; in Vojvodina 49.881. All these changes show some deep processes among the population with certainly relevant indications in regard to multiculturalism because trends were in the direction of people's returning to their ethnic nationalities.

**Hungarians** make another significant group, not only in terms of numbers - 344.147 or 3.3 % of the FRY population according to 1991 census, but also as a group with educational, technical and scientific potentials (at two universities - in Novi Sad and in Subotica the instruction, beside in Serbian is also in Hungarian language; they are far better off than all other groups in regard to the quite developed net of elementary and secondary schools; cultural institutions, media etc.; several outstanding men of letters, members of the Serbian Academy of Sciences come from this group). This group relatively homogeneously inhabits the northern Autonomous Province of Vojvodina, and they are requesting and organizing a kind of autonomy in that region. Large group of Hungarian lives in capital of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, and there were always only small groups of them in other parts of FRY. In 1991 there were 4.309 Hungarians in Central Serbia; only 205 in Montenegro, and 142 in Kosovo and Metohija. The census of 2002 gives numbers of Hungarians all together in Serbia 293.299, which makes 3.91 % of the population of Serbia, and in Central Serbia the number also dropped to 3.092. In AP Vojvodina they make 14.28 % of the population (290.207).

The Hungarians live in largest numbers in the following municipalities: Ada (where they account for 77.3 %), Bačka Topola (64.7 %), Bečej (54.4 %), Kanjiža (87.6 %), Mali Idjoš (58.7 %), Senta (80.9 %), and Čoka (56.5 %). In Subotica they form a relative majority (42.7 %). The share of the Hungarian population in the municipalities of Nova Crnja, Bečej, Žitiste and Srbobran does not exceed 30 %. In 16 other municipalities, including the capital of Vojvodina town of Novi Sad, they constitute between 5 and 20 % of the population. The Hungarians share with less than 5 % in the population in only 15 municipalities. A survey of the regional distribution of Vojvodina population indicates that 75.63 % of the population of the Hungarian nationality inhabit Bačka, 21.56 % - Banat and 2.81 % - Srem. The Hungarian language is in official use in 29 Vojvodina municipalities where the concentration of the Hungarian population varies from 2.8 % in Bela Crkva (Banat) to close to 88 % at Kanjiža (Bačka). That language belongs to the Ugrofinnic group of languages.

**Muslims'** share in the total FRY population, according to the census of 1991 was 336.025, or 3.2 %. Of the quoted number in Serbia as a whole there lived 246.411 Muslims, and in Montenegro - 89.614. Of the number of Muslims who lived in Serbia 174.371 lived in Central Serbia, i.e. in Sandžak region, while 66.189 Muslims lived at Kosovo and Metohija, and 5.851 in Vojvodina. The area of Sandžak is rather poor, its economy and infrastructure are underdeveloped so that there is a great deal of mobility of the population towards urban areas and more developed centers in Yugoslavia, the neighboring and other countries. An exception in terms of economic development is the Novi Pazar municipality that has improved the living standards of its citizens with the help of private enterprise.

At the Congress of Bosniacs Intellectuals held in 1993 in Sarajevo, most intellectuals reached agreement on the common name of the people - **Bosniacs** - which Sandžak parties and associations accepted in 1996. However, the perception of Bosnia as the Bosniacs' kin state has its opponents both in the states formed in the space of the former Yugoslavia and among a part of the Bosniacs population in Yugoslavia. Persons belonging to this people, rallied around the Muslim Homeland Society in Montenegro, insist on the earlier name of the people - Muslims -, whereas a part of mostly urban population of the Islamic faith in Montenegro define themselves as Montenegrins of the Islamic faith.

So, according to 2002 census (we give figures only for Serbia where the census was taken): there were 136.087 **Bosniacs**, and 19.503 **Muslims**. The decrease in number of Muslim population is obvious and, beside their emigration to other parts and countries, it requires some studies to give a full answer concerning causes. The decrease also indicated a sharp diverting from previous trends. Namely, the growth of the share of Moslems in the total population from 0.3 % in 1948 to 3.2 % in 1991 is not result of the higher birth rate only (though it is higher than among others, except among Albanians), but also because of the political/ideological change followed by statistical implementation, which took place at the end of 1960s and was for the first time expressed in the 1971 census when Muslims (with capital "M" which means members of a nation) and it would be written with small "m" if one would have in mind a religious group, according to Yugoslav constitutional terminology of that time and grammar rules of the Serbian language.

**Roma** population is among relatively numerous, despite the fact that an assumption is proved by social research that many of them are not registered as Roma but as some other groups (it's possible having in mind the freedom to express one's national belongings according to one's wish). According to the population censuses, the number of persons belonging to the Roma nationality decreased from 168,099 (in 1981) to 143,519 (in 1991, which accounted for 1.4 % Roma in FRY population), and out of that later number in Serbia lived 140,273 persons - 24,366 in Vojvodina, 45,754 - in Kosovo and 70,126 - in Central Serbia. The census for 2002 in Serbia gives the figure of 108.193 of Roma in Serbia, and of that 79.136 in Central Serbia, and 29.057 in Vojvodina (in which only 24.366 Roma lived in 1991; quite a number of Roma expelled from Kosovo and Metohija went to Vojvodina where they face an opposition as new comers; similar in Montenegro where they are treated in that way by Roma groups which lived in Montenegro earlier). Roma also make the group which has relatively high birth rate and so fast growth from 0.8 % (1948) to 1.4 % (1991) at the time when many other groups (except Albanians and Muslims) had relative stagnation of numerical growth or decreased in numbers. A recent research on the settlements where Roma live has discovered that many of them do not want to declare themselves as such but opt for other alternatives. So it has been established that the number of Roma is about twice as big as what the census figures show.

The big fluctuation of Roma at different censuses has to be attributed to some reasons that determined more or less of them to declare as Roma. Namely, figures for several censuses show drops and rising that can not be real. Here we give the total number of the Roma and their share in the population of Yugoslavia: 1948 - 72.736 (0.5 %); 1953 - 84.713 (0.5 %); 1961 - 31.674 (0.2 %); 1971 - 78.485 (0.4 %); and 1981 - 168.197 (0.7 %). Regional distribution of the Roma in Serbia is an important indicator that helps understand particular issues concerning the status and the life of the Roma both due to historical circumstances and their lifestyle or the degree of their integration in society and the promotion of their social and economic status. The largest number the Roma and their highest

concentration is to be found in the Southern-Morava River basin (4.2 % in local population), in the Niš area (1.4 %), and in municipalities in these areas, notably Surdulica, Bujanovac, Bojnik, Vladičin Han that, at macro-level, have been labeled as economically underdeveloped, the share of the Roma in the total population goes as high as up to one third.

Comparing data from population census, one can realize that the main demographic characteristic of the Roma population was a high birth rate. Data for 1981 show the birth rate of 25.2 per 1,000 (the birth rate for the entire FRY population was 16.5 per 1,000), and the mortality rate dropped to a fairly low level of 6.2 per 1,000. The Roma ethnic group is characterized by a low age and, as a result, the mortality rate (6.1 per 1,000) in 1981 was below the Yugoslav mortality rate (9.0 per 1,000). However, if we take a look at that year's infant mortality rate (one of the most telling indicators of the attained living standards and the achieved educational level), we shall come to a data indicative of the Roma's low social and economic status. Namely, in 1981 infant mortality rate in Yugoslavia was 30.8 and among the Roma it was 51.5 per 1,000. Although this rate was almost cut in half relative to its 1971 level (95.3 per 1,000), it still remained rather high. Given the overall social and economic conditions that deteriorated in the FRY over the past decade, it is estimated that infant mortality rate has gone up. An Oxfam research (not the one that we quote) concerning health conditions of Roma people demonstrates much higher rate of many diseases than in the rest of the population. In FRYugoslavia, the Roma are the ethnic group that has the highest rate of illiteracy (34.8 %) and the highest number of elementary school dropouts (78.7 %) while no more than 0.4 % of the Roma acquire university qualifications. One of problems of Roma people is also that they use several dialects of the Romany language, and some kind of unified language is a prerequisite for the education in the Romany.

According to the 1991 census **Croats** (111.650) made 1.1 % of the FRY population, and had an absolute decrease in numbers in comparison with 1981 (149.000) when they made 1.5 % of the population of Serbia. Of 111,650 persons belonging to the Croatian nationality who lived in FR Yugoslavia (1991), 105,406 lived in the Republic of Serbia and 6,244 in the Republic of Montenegro. In Central Serbia lived 22,536, in Vojvodina 74,808 accounting for 3.7 % of the population of the Province, and 8,062 lived in Kosovo (mainly in the Janjevo municipality and they left in the course of 1990s). The census of 2002 indicated further decrease of Croats in Serbia (figures for Montenegro are not available): in Serbia without Kosovo and Metohija lived 70.602 persons belonging to Croatian minority. Out of that number in Central Serbia 14.056, and in Vojvodina 56.546. The largest number of Croatian minority members lived in the municipalities of Subotica, Sombor, Šid, Indjija, Apatin, Ruma, Bač, Kula, Sremski Karlovci, Bačka Palanka, Beočin, Irig and Novi Sad. In 10 of these municipalities, the Croatian minority accounted for over 5 % of the population. The war in Croatia and Bosnia that broke out with the dissolution of the second Yugoslavia caused a part of the Croatian population to move to Croatia. Many from Western Vojvodina (particularly from Srem region in Vojvodina, also left for Croatia under a local and the pressure of paramilitary groups. With the signature of the Inter-Governmental Agreement on the Normalization of Relations between the Republic of Croatia and FR Yugoslavia (1995), Article 8 thereof indirectly recognized the status of a national minority to the Croats in Yugoslavia. Rights and freedoms of all groups have been protected since 2002 by the Law on National Minorities (see below).

According to the 1991 population census, 66.863 **Slovaks** lived in FR Yugoslavia. The largest number of persons belonging to this people – 63.545 - live in Vojvodina where they account for 3.2 % of its population. In the Bački Petrovac municipality, the Slovaks form the absolute majority of the population (70.8 %). They live in considerable numbers also in the municipalities of Kovačica (40.8 %); Bač (21.4 %); Stara Pazova (12 %) and Bačka Palanka (11.3 %). Overwhelming majority of Slovak population in Vojvodina (92.83 %) of the live mentioned municipalities and in Novi Sad and the Slovak language is used on an equal footing with Serbian there. The academician Jan Kmeć wrote that thanks to their own understanding of freedom, the Vojvodina Slovaks preserved their national singularity. At the same time, their creative and cultural contribution to overall-Slovak developments, starting with the days of the “Narodni preporod” (People's Renaissance), played a major role in shaping both Slovak and broader Slavic cosmopolitan and humanist values. In the past, the Slovaks influenced the development of civil society in Vojvodina. They did it through their religious and

cultural activist Jan Scehl, philologist and historian Pavel Josef Šafarik and others. As early as in 1849, the Slovaks requested from the Imperial authorities the permission to establish a grammar school in Bački Petrovac. In FR Yugoslavia, the Slovaks maintained the tradition of a people that has managed to integrate in the broader community without compromising its cultural, linguistic, religious and national identity (76.35 % of children receive schooling in their mother tongue and in previous periods that %age was even larger).

The **Vlach** (Walachian) ethnic community lives in North-Eastern Serbia that had 17,672 members in this part of the country in 1991. In Montenegro and Kosovo there were only 3 members of this minority each and in Vojvodina - 132. There is no municipality, not even in the Homolje area or the Timok River Krajina (Military March), where the Vlachs mostly live, where they form a majority in the population of the local community. The comparison of the results of the census is confusing and difficult to explain in demographic parlance. Namely, 93,444 persons in Yugoslavia in 1948 declared that they belonged to the Vlach ethnic group; soon thereafter, in 1953, this number dwindled to a third, i.e. to 28,047. After the 1961 census, this number plummeted to the negligible level of 1,369 persons. The following three censuses monitoring the changes in the makeup of the population on a ten-year basis indicated the influence of non-demographic factors on the Vlachs' ethnical commitment. In 1971, the number of 14,730 persons belonging to this community were registered, in 1981 - 25,597 and in 1991 census this figure once again fell to 17,810 citizens. But, in the 2002 census 40,054 declared as Vlachs.

Anthropologists, ethnologists and particularly historians have their dilemmas about the origin of the Vlachs and wonder whether they are an indigenous ancient Balkan people whose members gradually embraced the values of the majority Slav and Romanian neighbors or an indigenous population of Romanian extraction. Members of this people, undoubtedly, have borderland characteristics and the language, folklore and, partly, customs point to their Romanian origin while a part of their customs, personal names and toponyms support the claims that Vlachs are of an ancient Balkan or Slav origin. The Vlach minority members pursue their cultural activities at their folklore societies that guard and hand over their traditions.

The 1991 census figures tell that there were 42,364 persons belonging to the **Romanian** national minority in FR Yugoslavia, 38,809 of which were inhabitants of Vojvodina, primarily its area of Banat (91 %), and 3,507 Romanians lived in Central Serbia, 33 - in Montenegro and no more than 15 members of this people in Kosovo. According to census 2002 the number of persons who declared their belonging to this group dropped to 34,576, similar in Vojvodina to 30,419, but the number of them living in Central Serbia has increased to 4,157. Over 90 % of the Romanians in Yugoslavia live in 10 Vojvodina municipalities and they are most numerous in Alibunar - 8,402 (21.78 % of the municipality population), Vršac - 8,051 (20.75 %), Pančevo - 5,502 (12.88 %) and Zrenjanin - 3,140 (8.2 %). However, the Romanian population is in the majority in 17 settlements. In 12 municipalities where there is a significant number of Romanians, the Romanian language, too, is in official use. The Romanians settled in the area of the Yugoslav part of Banat from different parts of what is now Romania. The largest number of Romanians settled in these parts in the course of the 18th century during which time the Habsburg dynasty pursued a policy of colonization of the Balkans and of consolidation of the Monarchy's borders with Turkey. The Romanians promote the wealth of the multi-cultural society by contributing their cultural works and achievements that have a long-standing tradition associated, among other, with the names of such academicians as Vasko Popa, Aleksandar Fira and Radu Flora. Education in the Romanian language, similarly as with the Hungarian and Slovak minorities, has a tradition dating back to the days of the Monarchy.

There were 47,118 **Macedonians** in FRY according to the census of 1991, but this number decreased to 25,847 according to 2002 census. These are the people who come from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, which is by FRY recognized as Republic of Macedonia, located to the south of Serbia, bordering with FRY, Albania, Greece and Bulgaria. They speak Macedonian, which is a Slav language that Serbs can understand, and most of them live in Kačarevo and Jabuka. The decrease

in numbers should not be interpreted that persons belonging to that have left FRY, but more likely is that they did not declare their ethnic nationality.

The **Bulgarian** national minority had, according to the 1991 recent census, 26.922 members in FR Yugoslavia accounting for 0.3 % of its population. The regional distribution of persons belonging to the Bulgarian nationality indicates that the largest number of them live in Eastern Serbia, in the area bordering on Bulgaria. In Dimitrovgrad, the Bulgarians account for 52 % of the population. In Bosilegrad that has a population totaling 11.644 inhabitants, 8.807 declared themselves as ethnic Bulgarians. In three more Southern Serbian municipalities - Pirot, Babušnica and Surdulica - there is a significant %age of Bulgarians. 2,363 Bulgarians live in Vojvodina, mostly in the village of Ivanovo in Banat. Although Bulgarians are Eastern Orthodoxes, these in Banat all are Roman Catholics. 178 members of the Bulgarian national minority lived in Kosovo and 46 in Montenegro. The 2002 census data tell us that there are 20.497 Bulgarians, which accounts for 0.27 % of the S&M population. Out of that number in Central Serbia live 18.839 (0.34 % of the population of Central Serbia) and the number in Vojvodina has decreased to 1.658 (0.08 %). Since 1953 when there were 60.167 people of Bulgarian nationality in the FRY, their numbers have persistently declined. This can be accounted for by migrations, a lower birth rate, and a high degree of their integration in the social mainstream and by ethnic mimicry.

The **Bunjevtsi**, of which there were 21,434 members in 1991, inhabit Vojvodina, namely the northern Bačka municipality of Subotica (17,527) and the Sombor municipality (9,755). Of all Bunjevtsi, 95.97 % live in these two municipalities. In addition, they also inhabit, but in smaller numbers, Bajmok, Gornji and Donji Tavankut, Djurdjin, Kelebija, Mala Bosna, Novi Žednik, Palić and several other villages in Vojvodina. Since 1981, when no more than 9,755 Bunjevtsi lived in this area, the number of Bunjevtsi in Yugoslavia has almost doubled. And according to 2002 census it doubled too since 1991, and the number of them now is 20.012, of which number only 246 live in Central Serbia, all others in Vojvodina (19.766).

Concerning the origin of the group and the name of Bunjevtsi, there is a number of quandaries, theories and dilemmas. A number of experts and members of the Bunjevtsi community believe that they are an indigenous ancient Balkan population that settled in Vojvodina in the 17th century from their ancient homeland in Dalmatia, Herzegovina and Lika. According to the most widely accepted theory, it originates from the name of the dwelling - Buna (a circular structure made of stone without a binder and topped with an irregular conical cupola) - in which they used to live in their ancient homeland. This kind of structure is typical of the culture and geography of the Mediterranean region from which the ancestors of the present-day Bunjevtsi probably came to Vojvodina. The theory that they originated from the area around the Buna River in Herzegovina has been abandoned. According to another theory, the name has its origin in the personal name of "Bun" (Bounü), a famous figure that must have belonged to the ancient Roman, Vlach ethnic community that used to live in the areas of Istria and Dalmatia in ancient times. Others, however, point out that the Bunjevtsi are a part of the Croatian ethnic corps. As elements of the Croatian national identity, they point to the Roman Catholic religion. The recognition of the Bačka Bunjevtsi started in 1870s with the activities of Ivan Antunović, the culture promoter and politician, and of Lazar Mamužić, a longtime Mayor of Subotica at the same time the President of Bunjevtsi Association. The Bunjevtsi political movement actively participated in the events leading to the integration of Vojvodina with the Kingdom of Serbia in 1918 when a decision to that effect was taken at the Great People's Assembly of the Serbs, Bunjevtsi and other Slavs. Soon thereafter, the Bunjevats-Shokats Party was established as well. In the Parliament of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, this Party had 26 and MPs. The cultural and political life of the Bačka Bunjevtsi came to a standstill after the Second World War when the activities of the Bunjevtsi Homeland Society were abolished, and in the late 1970s, the Bunjevtsi traditional gatherings and activities were reintroduced.

There were 18.099 **Ruthenians** in FR Yugoslavia 17.652 of which lived in Vojvodina Of that number, as many as 93.36 % lived in the municipalities of Kula, Vrbas, Žabalj, Šid, Sremska Mitrovica and Novi Sad. 400 persons belonging to the Ruthenian national minority lived in Central Serbia and 26 in

Montenegro. According to the census of 2002 there are 15.905 Ruthinians in Serbia, and only 279 in Central Serbia. Concerning the decrease of the number of Ruthinians between 1991 and 2002 censuses, one has to take into account that the number of Ukrainians has been increased, and it could be that some Ruthinians declared themselves as Ukrainians, as it is not easy to draw the line of separation between them. There were 18.099 **Ruthenians** in FR Yugoslavia 17.652 of which lived in Vojvodina and of that number, as many as 93.36 % lived in the municipalities of Kula, Vrbas, Žabalj, Šid, Sremska Mitrovica and Novi Sad. 400 persons belonging to the Ruthenian national minority lived in Central Serbia and 26 in Montenegro. According to the census of 2002 there are 15.905 Ruthinians in Serbia, and only 279 in Central Serbia. Concerning the decrease of the number of Ruthinians between 1991 and 2002 censuses, one has to take into account that the number of Ukrainians has been increased, and it could be that some Ruthinians declared themselves as Ukrainians, as it is not easy to draw the line of separation between them. They also have a joint association: The Ruthenians and Ukrainians Alliance in Yugoslavia, which is active in Novi Sad.

In regard to their regional distribution, the Ruthenians are most numerous in the areas of Bačka (86.28 % of them) and Srem (13.37percent) but they do not form the majority in any municipality. It is only in the settlements of Ruski Krstur, Kucura and Bikić where they form the simple majority (over 50 %) of the population. The Ruthenian language is in official use in Novi Sad and in five other Vojvodina municipalities. The first wave of this population when they were coming was made up mostly of stockbreeders, and later on, farmers reached Vojvodina and the Sava River basin in the 18th century. Since then the Yugoslav Ruthenians developed a specific identity that was shaped through the gradual rapprochement between the local population and the migration waves of this ethnic group different from local people in terms of religion, language and habits.

In FR Yugoslavia, 4.565 persons belonging to the **Ukrainian** nationality lived in AP Vojvodina in 1991 accounting for 0.22 % of the total population of the Province. The census of 2002 records the number of 5.354 of which 719 live in Central Serbia, and 4.635 in Vojvodina. The majority of persons belonging to the Ukrainian nationality inhabit the municipalities of Vrbas, Kula, Sremska Mitrovica, Indjija, Bač and Novi Sad.

According to the 1991 census, 5.387 persons belonging to **German** nationality lived in FR Yugoslavia. 3.873 persons belonging to the German minority lived in AP Vojvodina accounting for 0.19 % of the province's total population. At the same time, 779 Germans lived in Belgrade. According to the data of the German People's Alliance, the association of Germans based in Subotica, around 12.000 persons belonging to this people live in Vojvodina alone (in the municipalities of Apatin, Zrenjanin, Pančevo, Vrbas, Subotica, Kula, Sombor, Sremska Mitrovica, Odžaci, Novi Sad, Bačka Palanka and Bela Crkva. The census of 2002 did not confirm estimations of the number of Germans living in FRY, as it recorded 3.901 of whom 747 live in Central Serbia. The present-day persons that live in FRY and belong to German nationality are the descendants of the people who settled here in the 18th century. This was done under the planned settlement programs designed by Austria. It follows from the Austro-Hungarian censuses that people were settled in particular areas according to plan in order to respond to the Monarchy's military, economic, cultural and other needs. Numerous experts and their families, mostly hired from among persons belonging to the German and Czech nationalities, were settled in the eastern and southern parts of the state in order to perform administrative, technical and military duties. The best known colonization of south-east provinces was carried out in the 1720s when tens of thousands of families from western parts of Germany, where technological development made this population a surplus, were settled in Erdelj, Banat and Bačka. The development of particular economic sectors made it necessary to resettle experts and workers who were willing to move from traditional industrial centers in Alsace, Lorraine, Northern Italy and Bohemia to the areas with mostly Serbian, Romanian and Hungarian populations. According to the census taken in 1910, there were 324,779 Germans who lived in Vojvodina.

There are also 5.104 **Slovenians** (according to 1991 census there were 8.630), then smaller numbers of the Turks, the Checks (2.211) the Russians and several other smaller groups which made the rest, neither one of these small minorities making more than 0.6 % of the FRY population. The two groups



indigenous to the Balkans (and in Serbia) - Cincars (Tzintzars) who are dispersed over a larger region, have also to be taken into account though their origin, way of life, language, customs, status in society are still the subject of studies. All together we can consider some twenty ethnic/national groups/minorities (some of these groups interpret the word "minority" as pejorative and discriminating).

Some so-called “new” **minority communities**, like the Slovenes and more numerous Macedonians, were part of the constituent nations (people) from the former Yugoslav states. The Czechs, Poles and Jews, albeit present in small numbers only, have helped to a significant extent shape institutions of civil society in Serbia. The small number of members of the Russian minority, who came to Vojvodina in several migration streams following the First World War, have also managed to preserve their community. In some cases members of small minority communities in Serbia as a compact group inhabit certain areas, like the Gorantsi and the Turks who live in parts of Kosovo and Metohija; the Czechs - in the area around Kovin; and the Jews, Poles, Tzintzars and the Slovenes live mostly in urban areas.

## 2. **Minority rights: from severe violations to reasonable legal protections**

In the course of the last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, **new ethnic communities** emerged in Kosovo and Metohija - the Hashkalis/Egyptians. Experts in ethnology and history are trying to solve some dilemmas regarding the identity of this ethnic group. This population, that mostly inhabits Kosovo in Yugoslavia, and parts of Macedonia and Albania, was for a long time identified with the Roma or with the Albanians due to their unfavorable social status and language. With the disintegration of Yugoslavia, the representatives of the Hashkalis/Egyptians demanded the recognition of their national identity and the promotion of their national rights. French Professor Marcel Cortiades assumes that the Hashkalis were a population that, in a migration stream, left Egypt and settled in the Balkans in the 3rd century A.D. and that they differ by the organization of their life, customs and national awareness from the other population at territories at which they settled. So, their ethnic 'mimicry' was covered by the Empires and the states that had jurisdiction over parts of South-East Europe that the Hashkalis inhabited. They call each other the Hashkalis, but the loss of their earlier language made them undistinguishable from those around them. The name of another group, “Egyptians”, as Cortiades explains, was only given in the 20th century when the younger generations became aware of their country of origin and sought to institutionalize their status based on facts of their linguistic, socio-anthropological and other diversities. The representatives of the Egyptians and the Hashkalis in Yugoslavia do not have identical views on the past and the future of this ethnic community but point out that these are two different ethnic “masses”. The most of the Hashkalis/Egyptians that used to live in Kosovo are expelled from that area in 1999 and nowadays inhabit different parts of Serbia and Montenegro.

In the course of the 1990s many provisions guaranteeing to national minorities “international law standards and provisions” were included in three mentioned constitutions (Serbia, September 1990; FRY, April 1992; and Montenegro, October 1992). The Constitution of Montenegro was the last one enacted among the three and the Republic of Montenegro found better constitutional solutions for the status of national and ethnic groups than Serbia.

In terms of present-day standards and enactments of documents of the Council of Europe, such as the European Charter on the Regional and Minority Languages (EChRML), the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM) and several recommendations concerning education, effective participation and local self-government, Montenegro too is lagging behind. Local self-government that is guaranteed by the Constitution (Article 66) is in practice rather restricted in the jurisdiction controlled by the central government (just as in Serbia before the Law on Local Self-Government, 2002). Since 1992 the government of Montenegro relied on the electoral support and participation of some representatives of minorities in government, and on the government’s policy of pursuing independence.

Unfortunately, in Serbia constitutional provisions in practice have been violated or neglected. The situation has been additionally worsened due to the growth of xenophobia, chauvinism and intolerance, the radicalization of politics, close links between the government and underground criminals and mafia, wrong policy of government and a whole series of regrettable and criminal actions against the minorities (particularly Muslims, later Bosniacs, in the Sandžak area, and Albanians in Kosovo and Metohija, who also undertook terrorist attacks on a large scale against government forces and civilian population of Serbian and other non-Albanian nationalities at Kosovo and Metohija). To a lesser degree, Albanians in the south of Serbia and persons belonging to some minorities in western Vojvodina were also the subjects of law violations by police and paramilitary units. Among other details, due to the re-shaping of electoral districts by means of so-called electoral geometry and 'gerrymandering', some minorities were deprived of the possibility of representation even at a local level, according to their numbers and homogeneity in respective territorial and political units. In short, the regime was authoritarian, oppressive, and laws and "constitutions" were "empty words". Non-implementation and violation of legal norms was widespread practice.

After the victory of the Democratic Opposition of Serbia in the September 2000 elections, parallel with the efforts for democratization of society in all spheres of life, special attention was paid to the status and protection of national/ethnic minorities. The new authorities announced a democratic policy that would in many respects make a turning-point in the history of the country, including the status, treatment and protection of minorities. The basic idea of the overall new political orientation and the inspiration in drafting a Law on Minorities was to incorporate minorities into society, into its political, economic, cultural and other forms, and institutions, without assimilating or isolating them in ghettos. The whole process has been conceived to be realized through cooperation between minorities, and of them with the majority population, based on the principles of the rule of law and democratic society and government.

The newly-elected federal government instantly undertook a series of measures on the internal and international plan. Internally the government established a Federal Ministry of National and Ethnic Communities and initiated the drafting and later adopted the federal Law on Protection of Rights and Freedoms of National Minorities (hereinafter "the Law"). On the international plan the government demonstrated its efforts for the protection of minorities by joining and ratifying the FCNM in 2001, by preparing to join the EChRML and by preparing relevant bilateral agreements with the neighboring countries.

Steps were undertaken to develop the legal and (later) constitutional frameworks which would guarantee the preservation and promotion of all the basic elements which are important for the identity of minorities, and for their effective participation in social life, government and administration. The starting *rationale* was that democracy could not be established if the government were to turn a deaf ear to the rights and expectations of one third of the population.

The aim of the Law was to secure national minorities' identity and their rights to participate in the government and administration of public affairs, in accordance with the constitution and laws (the assumption was that all old laws and constitution would be changed and adjusted to democratic principles and institutions). The drafting of the law took the team of experts about one year and was accompanied by consultations with representatives of the Council of Europe, the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM) the European Union and the UN, particularly the United Nations Development Program Office in Belgrade. Drafts were presented at various stages to representatives of minorities, as well as to the media and to many open conferences with minorities in areas where they live. The team of experts as well as the responsible government bodies analyzed some 30 laws (federal and of both member-republics) in order to learn about their consequences for minorities having in view the complaints that several laws are discriminating minorities. The team of experts had widely consulted all acts and documents of the UN, the Council of Europe, the OSCE, and the European Union. They particularly carefully studied and were inspired by general ideas and provisions of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedom, the EChRML, the FCNM and the Hague, the Lund and the Oslo Recommendations of the

OSCE. All these documents were carefully studied and many relevant provisions accommodated to local circumstances having in view the policy of the country to join the Council of Europe, and hopefully in the near future the European Union.

The basic principles of the Law include equality and a ban on discrimination (except positive discrimination or affirmative action, Articles 3 and 4), freedom to declare and express one's nationality and no obligation to declare the minority one belongs to (Article 5), freedom of association, the right to co-operate with compatriots at home and abroad (Article 6), the duty to respect the principles of international law, public morality and constitutional order (Article 7) as well as the protection of acquired rights (Article 8).

A separate part of the Law comprises provisions laying down the right of national minorities to preserve their identity, ranging from the right to choose and use personal names (Article 9); the right to use one's mother tongue (Article 10); the right to officially use a minority's mother tongue if the %age of its members in the total population in a particular territory reaches the legally prescribed level of 15% (Article 11); the right to use national symbols with the parallel use of the symbols of the state (Article 16). Article 12 provides for the right to preserve Culture and Tradition, and 13-15 provide for different rights in the field of education: the right to pre-school, elementary and secondary education in one's mother tongue when the conditions are met regarding the number of pupils (here the state seeks, subject to material conditions permitting, to create conditions for the use of this right as well as for the establishment of departments or faculties at colleges and universities so as to provide education for the required teaching staff) and the right to a certain space for minority history, culture and traditions in the curricula, the participation of National Councils or other bodies in developing such curricula; the right to establish private educational institutions based on self-financing. Article 17 of the Law provides for the right of minorities to have media or programs and cultural institutions in their mother tongue.

To ensure an effective participation in decision-making on issues of specific concern for minorities in government and administration, several institutions have been established: the Federal Minority Council (Article 18) made up of representatives of minorities and of the government; National Councils (Article 19) as self-government bodies for each minority, and elected by electors who themselves are elected from among and by minority members; a Federal Fund for National Minorities (Article 20) aimed at supporting social, economic, and cultural development of national minorities. Article 21 calls upon the government bodies at all levels to take care of the national composition of the population and the knowledge of languages spoken at the territory of the authority or service when they elect or employ persons in public offices. All measures which change the proportion of the population in areas inhabited by national minorities and which hamper the exercising of rights of national minorities are prohibited (Article 22).

### **3. Prospects for preserving and promoting diversities**

A number of problems concerning the implementation of the Law on Protection of Rights and Freedoms of National Minorities are related to the constitutional situation of the country and the fact that many of the issues regulated by the law fall under the competence of the member-republics. These republics are very eager to keep full jurisdiction in their power, particularly in the light of discussions and proposals about replacing the federation by two independent states. However, since it was FRY that had undertaken commitments *vis-à-vis* the international community, the Council of Europe and the OSCE, it was FRY which was required to regulate this area by its law in accordance with international instruments.

The FRY Constitution allocated the protection of rights and freedoms of citizens and particularly the rights and freedoms of national minorities to the federation (*i.e.* federal state). Hence, this Law intended to administer that responsibility of the federation and carry out its duties. The team of experts working on the Law was aware of the impossibility of foreseeing the precise territory where it would

be implemented: Representatives of Montenegro did not attend the meeting of experts, and do not feel obliged by this Law. However, deputies in federal parliament from Montenegro voted for the Law.

Considering the problems of making new constitutions and implementing the Law, one has to take into account that of the three constitutions neither one was implemented or respected. It remains to hope that some problems were settled in March 2003 by the adoption of the Constitutional Charter with the Law on Implementation, and the Charter on Human and Minority Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. These two Charters have to serve as the basis for the future constitutional and legal structure of the state union and of both republics, and also eventually of their laws protecting national minorities.

The fact that both republics have agreed that the former (established in 2000) federal Ministry of National and Ethnic Communities (with the new name: Ministry for Human and Minority Rights) remains as one among only five ministries in the Federal Government of the S&M State Union proves that the importance of this field is fully realized, as well as the intentions to continue the protection of minorities as provided by the Law and to pay great attention to human rights in general, because this ministry is authorized by the Law on Implementation to cover the problems of human rights and their protection in general. This ministry already established good relations with minorities and will continue to serve as a tool for their rights to be respected and implemented.

Serbia and Montenegro have taken the obligation to adjust their constitutions to be in line with the quoted Constitutional Charter. It is very good that the Constitutional Charter contains the phrase “the international and European standards and provisions” because that obliges S&M to guarantee that such laws will be directly implemented by the courts. Such a clause existed in the former FRY Constitution and courts had the possibility to implement directly clauses of the international Human Rights Covenants<sup>1</sup> but there was not one single case that courts relied on those Covenants, despite so many violations of human rights and of domestic laws and the constitution.

The change of the constitutions will be a difficult process as the two governments in their respective parliaments do not have a majority, which is required by the earlier constitution. The DOS in Serbia missed an opportunity when they had more than a two-third majority in 2001 to make a democratic Constitution of Serbia. A reasonable and liberal policy (with some institutions of consociational democracy and the principle of subsidiarity) should be initiated for the constitutional/legal status of the two Autonomous Provinces of the Republic of Serbia.

As for Vojvodina, in which members of numerous national minorities live, there is a wide consensus for its self-government to be broadened to make autonomy ‘meaningful’. That is partially done through the adoption of the special Law (the so-called Omnibus Law) on Defining of Competences of an Autonomous Province, which the National Assembly of Serbia adopted on the 7th February 2002. This Law had transferred more than twenty large subject-matters (like education, culture, urbanism etc.) to the jurisdiction of the AP. Such changes need to be part of the Constitution of Serbia, the making of which was postponed for two and a half years after October 2000 without any good reason, creating many negative consequences for democratic transformation. Therefore, instead of making a constitution in which the problems of autonomy for the AP Vojvodina and perhaps for the AP Kosovo and Metohija (despite uncertainties about the future of this region) could be regulated, the government pushed through the parliament the “Omnibus Law”, a kind of “patchwork” of legislation, which rightly returned a part of autonomy of which Vojvodina was deprived by the Milosevic regime. But the previous practice of not respecting the constitutions leave a bad heritage and repetitions can not be excluded.

Some further remarks concerning the new/amended constitutions refer to a more appropriate and satisfactory representation of minorities in parliament that could be facilitated by a constitutional or statutory provision prohibiting the inclusion in any election law or relevant decision of a state agency

---

<sup>1</sup> The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

of a clause that could discriminate against minorities in determining the criteria for entering their representatives into the legislative body. The existing limit of 5% of obtained votes for entering the parliament should be eliminated or decreased, as it could not be easily achieved by minorities except Albanian (that also refers to political and not only ethnic or national minorities). On the other hand, the negative potential of this could be surpassed by coalitions, which is a practice favored by multinational states and by advocates of the so-called 'consociational' democracy or 'consociation'.

### III. MAPPING CULTURAL POLICY

#### 1. History

According to a historical overview of cultural policy in Serbia (National Report, Draft, 2002), after World War II the cultural policy of Serbia was developed within the general political and ideological framework of a more or less orthodox concept of Marxist socialism; eventually, ethnocentric nationalism prevailed. This half-century period may be divided into four phases.

**1945-1953: Socialist Realism and the Repressive Cultural Model.** This phase was characterized by socialist realism copied from Stalin's model of culture employed in the USSR. Within ideologized space, culture performed an exclusively utilitarian function; this did not allow for understanding culture as a field of individual freedom of any sort.

**1953-1974: Democracy in Culture.** The second phase evolved in two parallel cultural developments: one was still under strong state and ideological control, but the other (known as *socialist aestheticism*), more creative and more vivid, gradually conquered artistic freedoms. By the end of the 1960s and beginning of the 1970s many art forms acquired their institutions: prestigious international festivals were established, as well as a large network of municipal cultural institutions. At the same time though, many individual artists were sanctioned and their work banned (e.g. the protagonists of the so-called "black wave" cinema) in spite of the officially proclaimed freedom of artistic expression. Repressive judgments, politically and ideologically based, were - if necessary - the last instance in the field of culture.

**1974-1990: Decentralization and Self-Management.** This phase is unique for its cultural decentralization and specific cultural policy all around former Yugoslavia. But Serbia had some additional peculiarities due to its multi-ethnic and multi-cultural character. Two autonomous provinces (Vojvodina and Kosovo) obtained full competences over cultural policy on account of their multi-ethnic population structure. The cultural system was transformed, stimulating close links between cultural institutions and local communities and their economies (e.g. theater companies or corporate galleries and colonies). The system entitled the so-called "self-government communities of interest in the area of culture", as para-state bodies, to define cultural policy at all administrative levels: from municipality and province to the republic. It also gave these bodies an active role in all the phases of cultural policy: from planning and designing programs of cultural development, to making financial plans and implementation - distribution of funds, founding of cultural institutions, all the way to monitoring and evaluation of the results achieved. At the same time, from the mid-1980s on, a strong nationalistic movement emerged among official and unofficial political institutions, and even more prominently among cultural ones.

**1990-2000: Culture of Nationalism.** Culture in Serbia was characterized by the lack of a general concept and strategy or, to put it ironically, precisely by the lack of a clear definition of cultural policy. This situation consequently resulted in a marginalization of culture as creative impulse and process of societal modernization. Instead, culture's role of "guardian" and promoter of national identity was emphasized. The first radical measure of Milošević's regime was to deprive the Serbian

parliament of its jurisdictions. For instance, the Government was never submitting annual reports to the Assembly, except once in 1995, which was a relatively quiet year in those turbulent times. Significantly, the Serbian Government pronounced that year (1995) "the Culture Year". Another consequence was that the Parliament was de facto deprived of any mechanism and decision-making procedures of public dialogue aimed at achieving consensus regarding the most crucial strategic issues. Not a single trace of public dialogue, once known as "social negotiation and agreement" survived. Self-management was abolished as a system, and cultural institutions were subjected to state/municipal authority, which appointed directors and controlled their activities.

This counter-transition period in Serbian culture began with Milošević's coming to power in 1989. Its basic feature in the field of culture was discontinuity: with the cultural policy trends characteristic of previous regimes, as well as with the dominant trends in South-Eastern Europe. All parameters of the cultural policy analysis show this discontinuity. First of all, this model of cultural policy explicitly articulated the role of the state in cultural development, while other parameters – such as decision-making mechanisms and procedures through public dialogue and consensus on the most crucial strategic issues among different sectors of culture and art production, diversity of instruments, and transparency of the whole model also make obvious this discontinuity.

In the last decade of the 20th century, the concept that prevailed was the one calling for a reaffirmation of the Serbian national and cultural identity. The basic problem with such a concept lies simply in the fact that national values could be neither protected nor defended in isolation. A national culture develops and affirms itself in contact with other cultures rather than in blocking the free flow of knowledge and ideas and turning its back to the world. The reductionist approach of Milošević's era isolated Serbia, making it turn to itself, confining it within the borders of national culture, and dooming it to spiritual insulation from international cultural trends.

The 1990 Constitution, generally known as "Milošević's Constitution", completely changed the state and modified thoroughly its very foundations. This implied discontinuity with many achievements in the field of culture. The most important among them was definitely the abolishment of the existing system of self-government social planning and agreement that had functioned since 1975 in the field of culture. This rupture was made as early as the beginning of the year 1990 when the Culture Funds Act was adopted. This Act introduced a crucial change in the manner of organizing and financing culture. After 25 years of delegated para-state decision-making in culture, Fund for Financing Culture was established to replace the "self-government communities of interest". According to the new legislation, the Fund does not define cultural policy but only implements it, making sure that cultural institutions and other Fund's beneficiaries perform their activity in the field of culture efficiently and rationally, along the prescribed policy lines. Like all other state institutions of the time, the Fund was founded on the principles of state centralization rather than on para-state principles. This is clear from the very fact that this body does not define cultural policy but only implements it.

## **2. Definitions**

There are many theoretical definitions of culture from the perspective of sociology, anthropology and cultural studies, but there is no explicit definition of culture that may be used in Serbian cultural policy. In a narrow sense of the term, culture is defined ostensively: the word is used to denote areas of competence of the Ministry of Culture, such as: the arts, artistic production, institutions, projects, and heritage. However, the Ministry of Culture has recently encompassed the media domain as well, being renamed the Ministry of Culture and the Media in 2002. In this way, cultural policy and media policy have become intertwined, in an appropriate modern way. In a broader sense, the meaning of culture also covers artistic education, research in the field of arts and culture, cultural industries, cultural tourism. All of these are areas of responsibility of other Ministries within the Serbian Government too. In the widest sense, the word 'culture' is used to cover lifestyles, values and the vision of the Serbian multi-ethnic society. Very often in public discourse government officials use the notion of culture in this widest meaning – using sometimes the phrase "changing the cultural model" -

to stress the necessity for a value change within the cultural system which includes norms, opinions, and lifestyles.

### **3. Constitutional and Legislative Framework**

From the constitutional and legislative point of view cultural policy in Serbia is made on national or state, provincial, city and municipal levels. At the state level there is the Ministry of Culture and the Media of the Government of the Republic of Serbia. Within the Republican Parliament there functions the parliamentary Board for Culture and Information. The key decision maker on the level of autonomous province is the provincial Secretariat for Culture, Education and Science of the Vojvodina Executive Council. At the city level, and there are only four cities in Serbia (Beograd, Novi Sad, Kragujevac and Niš), key decision makers are members of executive boards of city assemblies in charge of culture, in cooperation with secretaries of the secretariats for culture, as executives. At the level of municipal assemblies (164 in Serbia), only secretariats of social affairs exist, dealing also with culture.

According to the current Ministries Law (article 18), the scope of activity of the Ministry has been broadened and it has become the Ministry of Culture and the Media. Now the Ministry performs the following functions: state administration related to the development of culture and art production; follow-up on the research in the field of culture; providing materially for cultural activity; developing and promoting literary, translation, musical and stage production, visual and applied arts and design, film and audio-visual media; protecting cultural valuables; library, publishing, cinematographic and music-stage activities; trusts, foundations and funds; system of public information; information in the field of printed media, radio, television and other channels of public information; running the register of public media; and other activities stipulated by law. According to the current Act on Activities of General Interest in the Field of Culture, the Ministry of Culture is authorized to distribute funds from the budget of the Republic of Serbia in order to pursue the general interest in the field of culture.

The Ministry is divided into five sectors: cultural heritage and librarian activity; art production, cultural production and cultural relations; international relations and European integrations; material-financial activities and investments; and the media sector. To perform activities of interest for Ministry as a whole a special organizational unit was established - secretariat of the Ministry. Sectors are further divided into departments, divisions and groups.

There is a permanent Parliament Board for Culture and Information. This Board of 15 members discusses drafts of acts, other regulations and other issues related to culture and public information. As provided in the general clause on parliamentary boards and other bodies of the Parliament, these boards consider and discuss all issues falling within the competence of the Parliament, as well as assess policy implementation, implementation of laws, and other regulations of the republican government in the field a particular board is appointed for.

The autonomous province of Vojvodina is an autonomous region in Serbia. It is established by a special law, and in the sphere of culture operates the provincial Secretariat for Culture, Education and Science as a body of the Executive Council of the autonomous province of Vojvodina. Since the Act Defining the Special Competences of the Vojvodina Autonomous Province (known as the Omnibus Law) came into force, a more detailed legislation has been prepared, especially in the fields in which the Republic defines the system. In the sphere of culture the law stipulates that the autonomous province is in charge of protecting cultural valuables; monitoring in the field of cinematography; exercising founder rights regarding the appointment of directors and members of executive boards of the institutions (i.e. their functioning, maintenance and programs) completely or mostly funded from the budget of the autonomous province; providing the resources for covering the costs of production, investment and ongoing maintenance, as well as two-thirds of program costs of certain cultural institutions listed in the law; covering operating costs or programs of other institutions and organizations if these contribute to the development of culture and the arts in the autonomous

province, or to the development of minority cultures. The Culture Sector is in charge of culture within the provincial Secretariat for Culture, Education and Science.

There are four cities in Serbia: Beograd, Novi Sad, Kragujevac and Niš, Beograd being at the same time Serbia's capital. The city of Belgrade's Executive Board and City Assembly are key decision-makers in the field of culture. In order to encourage efficient discussion of cultural issues and relevant proposals to be put on its agenda, the Executive Board establishes permanent bodies, such as commissions and councils. The councils offer expertise in dealing with strategic aspect of an issue, while commissions consider practical matters related to functions and competences of the Executive Board. In the field of culture a number of commissions operate, but there is no council. The Commission for Culture is central, since it deals with fundamental programs, but there are also a number of other commissions devoted to particular matters. The Commission for Culture is comprised of prominent figures from the cultural and art scene. The main role of the Commission is to discuss applications submitted at publicly advertised calls for support to programs and projects, and to make a preliminary selection with the assistance of experts from the Secretariat for Culture. After that, the Secretariat prepares a preliminary version of the next year's plan. Negotiations in the Assembly regarding financial aspects follow (taking into account total available funds), and joint planning results in optimal solution - mid-way between wishes and demands, on one side, and real budget capacities, on the other.

Everything that had previously had an element of decentralization in decision-making was centralized in Milošević's Serbia. The decentralization issue was raised again in Serbia after the fall of Milosević and the republican elections of 2000, with the issue of Vojvodina's autonomy and devolution of certain republican competences to the provincial level, including those relevant for the cultural sphere in the province of Vojvodina. With the Omnibus Law adopted in February 2002, Vojvodina was granted the right to develop cultural policies and strategies of its own.

Since other regions in Serbia do not have the same right, it means that cultural policy has been decentralized in just a part of Serbia. As for local cultural policy, the new Local Government Act of December 2001 has no provision explicitly related to culture, though it generally encourages municipalities and cities in Serbia to devise their own development plans and strategies. In the case of cultural policy, minimal preconditions for that exist in the few cities and municipalities in Serbia that have the institution of a member of the Executive Board in charge of culture, and a relatively developed, though mostly bureaucratized local cultural administration. Most other municipalities only have secretariats for social affairs, covering education, science and culture. They lack both authority and competence to develop autonomous local strategies in all of these highly important social spheres.

The coordination between different levels of management in culture in Serbia is not optimal, efficient and effective, because the existing legislation does not define clearly enough their competences in the field of cultural development. And where it does so, as in the case of the Vojvodina Omnibus Law, the coordination is yet to be established, since the law has been in effect for a year now. However, the decentralization of financial resources brought about by the Omnibus Law and the Local Government Act, in Vojvodina as well as in cities and municipalities in Serbia, has resulted in conditions favorable for a more decentralized decision-making and implementation of local cultural policies. Besides, the Act has been in effect for a short time, and has not yet brought about visible results to be analyzed in the general context of cultural policy decentralization.

As figures indicate, the cultural institutional system in Serbia is very complex. In the beginning of 2002 there were over 3,150 registered cultural institutions. Of this number, 324 were traditional elite-type institutions - archives, libraries, museums and galleries, theaters, centers for the protection of cultural monuments and nature, including 22 institutions of national cultural interest.

The first document in which the Ministry of Culture briefly described the inherited situation and the chief problems it was facing, and identified its basic objectives and the effects of its first year in office, was its Work Report. The following points were identified as cultural policy priorities:



- deetatzation,
- democratization,
- decentralization,
- pluralism of cultures,
- alternative sources of financing,
- harmonization with EU legislation, and
- establishment of regional and international cooperation.

By mid-2000 it was a decade since citizens of Serbia had for the first time associated and organized themselves in nongovernmental organizations. According to the database "The Geo-Cultural Map of Serbia", at the end of 2001 there were 183 NGOs with programs in the area of cultural policy, management in culture and cultural production (64 located in Beograd). Most of them went a long way from small, alternative, informal protest groups, through half-organizations, to well-organized nongovernmental institutions. So, in the sphere of culture the third sector has contributed to shaping the civil, nongovernmental or non-profit dimension of cultural policy; apart from providing financial support to new cultural and art production, it has also done much for the building of a new cultural institutional framework.

There is a number of cases of institutionalization of NGOs in the field of culture, such as "Konkordija", the Vršac Cultural Center; the Beograd Center for New Theater Initiatives - CENPI; the Center for Cultural Decontamination - "Paviljon Veljković", an alternative Beaubourg including theater, visual arts, etc; literary manifestations (such as FAKK), and so on. Of course, this has been an implicit (not explicit or publicly declared) cultural policy, for its objectives, priorities and instruments could not be found in any documents issued by the Ministry or the DOS coalition. Still, they could be reconstructed, at least in the form of basic indicators, from the essential cultural trends in the country. The debate held on November 22, 2001 at the Center for Study in Cultural Development was an attempt to assess the role of NGOs in innovating and setting in motion cultural trends, and to reconsider the position of the third sector as a challenge and corrective of the public and private sectors of the cultural system in Serbia. Representatives of 11 NGOs active in the field of culture took part in the debate: CENPI, Center for Contemporary Art, Association of Independent Theaters, Remont, YUSTAT (Yugoslav Center for Performing Art and Technology), and others. The Editorial Board of *Kultura*, journal for the theory and sociology of culture and cultural policy, organized the debate with the intention to launch discussions of current issues of cultural policy. The proceedings have later been published in this journal. Fund for an Open Society supported the whole project.

The Fund for an Open Society of Serbia is greatly appreciated for its support to numerous civic initiatives that helped them survive and develop, but also for its contribution to the development of an alternative cultural scene in Serbia. The Fund supported more than 5,000 projects. To take one year (1998) as an example, in pursuing this mission the Fund supported activities of Open Clubs (in which nearly ten thousand children and young people socialize, learn, and have fun, with three hundred expert associates and numerous parents being involved in many projects: traveling libraries, English teaching, computer essentials, etc.); nearly 50 university, scientific and professional institutions (support to research projects and publications, organization of conferences, equipment of laboratories, covering costs for visiting professors); in the field of communication (financial support to media projects in agency journalism, printed and electronic media); publishing (the publication of more than 70 books and 30 journals in Serbian; 35 books and 13 journals in minority languages, with special emphasis on electronic publishing, professional training of librarians, etc.); in the field of culture (financial support to the functioning of many cultural and art institutions and individuals, theater tours, manifestations, etc.); the Center for Contemporary Art (supports and initiates a number of individual and institutional projects in FR Yugoslavia); development of civil society (support to NGOs, trade unions, women and student organizations); medical programs (health care programs).

The NGO "G17plus" has gathered experts from all fields of social life in many cities around Serbia. With its programs, projects and overall public activity it has contributed to the promotion and implementation of ideas of an open and democratic society, modern market economy and the rule of

law, with the aim of speeding up the transition process in Serbia. In the sphere of culture, before the 2000 elections G17plus had led a number of development projects. The most important one was the organization of education seminars for capacity building of city and municipal administration in the field of local cultural policies, entitled "Implementation of City Models of Cultural Policy". With the support of the OSI "Arts & Culture Network" the project was realized in 14 towns in Serbia during 1999/2000. Advocating the reform of the cultural system, the group for national cultural revival gathered around G17plus implemented its innovative ideas in the sphere of culture but also in project management - in the production of a theatre play *Golden Fleece* (after B. Pekić's novel of the same title, directed by Nebojša Bradić, 2000/2001), as a test for a new model of theater policy rare in Serbia - "production as a project", quite different from company or repertory theater model.

Thus, the 2002 annual report of the Ministry of Culture and Information, in the section devoted to the results achieved by the Sector for Current Cultural Production, Cultural Industry and Cultural Relations, listed the balancing of private, public and nongovernmental sectors among its most important achievements. In this context, striking the balance means "encouraging a great number of artists, NGOs and art institutions and organizations in Serbia to give a creative contribution to the challenges of reform". The examples mentioned include NGOs such as "Rex", "Remont", Center for Cultural Decontamination, Video Medeja, Valjevo Center for Visual Culture, Low Fi Video, Led Art, and others.

#### **4. Media System and Media Policy**

In the period before 1990 the citizens of former Yugoslavia were denied the right to private possession of the mass media. The right to communicate, in line with socialist ideology, was considered to be a collective rather than individual freedom. The mass media system was extremely decentralized, with each federal unit (six republics and two autonomous provinces) being allowed to develop and take care of its own press and broadcasting media. There were eight major broadcasting networks covering federal units in the form of social property, named after the capital cities (RTV Belgrade, RTV Zagreb, etc), 214 local radio stations and some 20 local television emitters. The press consisted of 27 dailies and some 60 local newspapers, and more than 600 factory press outlets.

As the events following the break-up of former Yugoslavia showed, after the demise of the one-party state the media in almost all parts of Yugoslavia hindered rather than advanced the processes of democratization. This is particularly true for the Serbian media, from which some reverted to state control, such as the most powerful broadcasting network, Radiotelevizija Srbije (see the Broadcasting Act of 1991). For pragmatic reasons it was immediately centralized (units in Priština and Novi Sad being subordinated to Belgrade) and redefined as the watchdog of the "national and state interest" under strict control of Milošević's government. Ordinary citizens were embarrassed by the flood of nationalistic propaganda and manipulative messages in the form of semi-truths, negative stereotypes of national or ethnic "others", and the so-called "hate speech".

During the 1990s the media in Serbia were divided into two groups: pro-regime on one hand, and oppositional (or "independent", as they preferred to call themselves), on the other. The RTS had at its disposal the best infrastructure (terrestrial) and the biggest number of RTV frequencies. Its infrastructure was not used as a common carrier serving public interest, offering pluralism of information to the public. That is why during this period the fight for change had one pivotal goal: to break down the monopoly of the state and government over national TV and radio networks. This monopoly existed in all aspects: technical, financial, program-making and personnel. Allocation of frequencies was in the hands of the government. The RTS had the right to hold in reserve a large number of frequencies, and at the same time the privilege of lending or denying their use to other broadcasters. If newly emerging emitters were obedient to the regime, this technical resource was at their disposal; and vice-versa. Some of the currently biggest private RTV media became leaders in the market thanks to the advantages in frequency allocation, e.g. coverage, they enjoyed in those days of authoritarian regime.

Regarding the financial aspect, there was a clear distinction between state-run and independent (opposition) media. The latter had no right to collect subscription, but neither did they have enough revenues from the commercials due to the impoverished economy. In many cases, state enterprises did not advertise in press and broadcasting media with oppositional editorial policy. Furthermore, pro-regime media were purged of disobedient journalists. In the year 1993 some 3000 journalists were fired from state-controlled RTV and press. Finally, having won the war inside the media, the regime was capable of dictating and controlling a great deal of media production. This influence was exercised overtly during all election campaigns until 1996, when the opposition parties won local elections in 44 major cities for the first time. This segment of the media, performing the role of propaganda machine, was eventually damaged badly during NATO bombing of Serbia in 1999. Terrestrial broadcasting infrastructure lost 17 from altogether 19 masts. 25 transmitters of RTS and 11 belonging to other, local RTV stations were destroyed in addition. The entire buildings of RTV Priština and Novi Sad were leveled by air strikes, and the main building of TV Belgrade was hit by NATO vessels, killing 16 employees on the spot.

In practice, during the 1990s all independent media found themselves under cross pressure. On one hand, they were struggling for an alternative approach to the provision of information, so that the citizens could exercise their right to know the truths suppressed by the official media. On the other hand, independent media as a rule were privately owned, which means they pursued commercial concerns. They entered mutual competition, quarrels and accusations that were weakening all of them. At the same time, the economic potential of the country did not provide enough income for the wild proliferation that was going on. In spite of general poverty, the number of media was steadily growing during the 1990s. The number of both press and broadcasting newcomers was as follows: in 1997 – 123, in 1998 – 114, in 2000 – 157, and in 2001 – 132. The same source reports data for 513 radio and 216 TV channels and 656 press outlets in 2001.

Currently, the number of radio and TV stations in Serbia is estimated at about 1200 (nobody knows the exact figure), more than 90 per cent of them completely illegal. Their equipment is often out of date, mutually incompatible and unreliable. In case of the opposition media, a part of the equipment was obtained through foreign aid. The main body of the program consists of the cheapest shows, movies, serials, quiz shows and interviews in the studio. A great number of local, even municipality-owned stations do not serve information functions at all. A majority of RTV stations is oriented towards entertainment of the lowest taste, presenting video-cassettes (mainly pirate ones), or towards re-distributing programs “stolen” from the satellite dish (without authorization). Instead of “micro-wave stations”, they might more appropriately be called “micro-wave ovens”, because they simply “warm up” foreign products, broadcast them at the local market, and gather a few advertisements. On the other hand, the political-informative press has decreased to only 12 dailies with aggregate average daily circulation of 600,000 copies only! More than 30 % of the adult population do not read any daily newspaper at all. The %age of non-readers, so far weeklies are concerned, is double (60 %). Credibility of the newspapers is low and their content is almost uniform, due to the absence of qualified, well-paid journalists.

If one wants to measure the intensity of intercultural communication stemming from cultural diversity, one must take into consideration, among other things, the structure and functioning of the mass media of both the majority and minority populations. Though the notion of culture has a broader meaning, the permanent mutual influencing of people living within a relatively tight space contributes to the wealth of cultural varieties. It is usually the protection of customs, folklore, literature, artistic creativity and use of the media that constitutes the main cultural issues for minority communities.

There is a certain paradox concerning the treatment of national and other minorities in Serbia as far as their mass media are concerned. As one of the republics of ex-Yugoslavia, Serbia used to offer a propitious context for free and broad intercultural communication. The concept of federative state, minority rights, the power of local authorities, self-management, respect for cultural uniqueness and linguistic equality – all these achievements were better elaborated in former Yugoslavia than in the European Community before the 1990s. In the field of communication, the policy of “positive

discrimination” of minority media was in effect. According to this concept, ethnic minorities were favored in such a way that they were all represented in public offices and institutions proportionally to their real participation in the population. As a result of this policy, information institutions of all national minorities were founded, and supported regardless of their economic viability. This meant that minority media were highly subsidized, that neither the scarcity of the audience nor the scarcity of market constituted any threat. All this was being done in order to realize truly the principle of communication equality of these social sub-groups. Thanks to such a policy, public and mass communication in Serbia was conducted in fifteen languages and all national minorities had at least one relevant means of public communication in their jurisdiction.

Serbia entered the transition period with a very high and hardly sustainable number of minority media. Just to remind, Radio Novi Sad had 24-hour program in Hungarian, a phenomenon unprecedented worldwide. Television Novi Sad also underwent similar expansion – it was making programs in Hungarian, Romanian, Slovak and Ruthenian. On the radio, the program in Slovak usually lasted for 7 hours a day, in Romanian also for 7 hours a day, and in Ruthenian for 4 hours a day... Towards the middle of 1992 Radio Novi Sad also started programs in Ukrainian and Roma languages... RTV Priština expanded in a comparable fashion. It had to meet information needs in Albanian and Turkish; since 1992 it also made programs in Romany. The programs in Albanian run for 10 hours a day on 2 TV channels, and 34 hours a day on 3 radio stations. According to the 1990 Statistic Yearbook, Serbia also had a rather large number of newspapers in minority languages: in Albanian – 27 titles, in Hungarian – 18 titles, in Czech and Slovak – 26 titles... In addition to this, the Assembly of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina was the founder of three more newspapers in Romanian and as many (3) in Ruthenian” (Lučić, 1993, 55-57). Radio Belgrade and Radio Niš were serving communication needs of the Bulgarian national minority living in eastern Serbia.

Apart from the outburst of nationalistic policy, two more factors were responsible for the collapse of the policy of “positive discrimination” of minority media in Serbia: economic disaster and international sanctions. Catastrophic economic situation ruined the federal, republican and provincial budgets, imposing a reduction in all kinds of expenses. This applied to the subsidized for minority media as well, which were reduced but not completely canceled. However, later on the dependence of minority media on state subsidy proved to be a tool by which Milošević's regime could switch towards “negative discrimination” of these media. This was extremely successfully exercised in Kosovo and Metohija, following the attempts of the Albanian minority to form an illegitimate Republic of Kosovo and a parallel government. The Serbian government dissolved the Albanian publishing company “Rilindja” and transformed it into a state-owned company (“Panorama”).

With the introduction of the - factual but never proclaimed - state of emergency in Kosovo and Metohija (1991), RTV Priština was made part of the state-owned RTS. 1300 out of 1800 Albanian journalists were fired, or boycotted the new employer. At the same time, the amount of the programs in Albanian was drastically reduced. After 1992 there were 3 hours of program a day and 16 hours of radio program – only one-half of what there had been before. Even worse, this Albanian-language program was just a translation of the official propaganda from Serbian information sources.

The Kosovo crisis ended up in an armed conflict, resolved by NATO intervention in 1999. According to the UN Security Council Resolution No. 1244, the Province is brought under UN protection and Serbia currently has no legal rights and duties in the media field there. Hence, changes that happened during the nineties brought about an ambiguous political situation so far the treatment of national minorities and their media was concerned. In spite of that, all preconditions and needs for intercultural communication survived, since Serbia has remained and still is a really multi-ethnic society.

With the upheaval of October 2000, Serbia turned towards a European perspective again. The newly elected government of the DOS (coalition of 18 ex-opposition parties) opened the process of harmonization with EU laws and rules. The same is true regarding minority cultural rights and media. European standards require any state to secure through the publicly owned media a minimum of information, education and entertainment to all minorities in their mother tongue (European Charter on

Regional and Minority Languages, 1998, paragraph 11). Also, another standard invites states to secure any technical and financial help to the members and associations of minority groups, in order to enable them to found their own mass media as well as other cultural institutions (Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, 1998, paragraph 9). Hence, any country aspiring to join the European Union has to meet these standards and principles.

Interestingly enough, Serbia's first attempt to comply with European standards goes back to 1993, when the working paper "Democracy and Minority Communication" (Beograd – Subotica, 1993) composed under the auspices of the Federal Government (FRY consisting of Serbia and Montenegro) was made public. In its paragraph 13, the document states: "Anyone is free to launch private and joint foundations for the development of radio-television stations or programs in the language of minority communities, as well as for the development of programs and the media aimed at mutual understanding and interconnecting of different national and ethnic communities." Apparently, the lawmakers were following the intention of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. For, their recommendation was to establish a special budget line from which individuals and associations of national minorities could obtain "soft" credits in order to start their indigenous media. Unfortunately, this policy never came into being, since soon afterwards Milošević took power at the federal level, closing at the same time the space for pro-European efforts.

The current media restructuring in Serbia has been marked by the harmonization of their legal framework with European standards and norms. This endeavor should change their structure by introducing a set of so-called "media laws". These involve five new acts: Public Information Act, Broadcasting Act, Telecommunication Act, Advertising Act, and Freedom of Information Act. All of them have been prepared basically by domestic experts and specialized NGOs, with the support of the OSCE office in Belgrade and the assistance of consultants from the Council of Europe. In this regard, one can notice that representatives of civil society have a substantial say in this process. However, since they are not the final lawmakers, in many cases their drafts have been distorted through the legislative process in undesired directions.

Among the five acts listed above, the three first have been adopted thus far. For the purpose of this report, the Broadcasting Act of 2002 and the Public Information Act of 2003 are most important, as real promoters of substantial change. The most important novelties introduced by the Broadcasting Act are the following: an independent broadcasting regulatory body, public service companies for Serbia and Vojvodina, dual property of electronic media, and the introduction of new forms of broadcasting stations. On the other hand, the Public Information Act is important too, because it denies the right of the state or any state institution to found and possess mass media. This is substantial change, bearing in mind that the founder of many national minority media are municipal and Vojvodina provincial assemblies. Hence, according to the 2003 Public Information Act such media must get new (private) owners by 2005.

The 2002 Broadcasting Act demands a change in the media ownership structure too. In line with European standards, it requires dual media ownership – with public services at one side, and private broadcasting media at the other. It has no consequence upon printed press. Similar to other European countries, Serbian newspapers are already privatized, since the state plays the role of founder in just three out of 12 existing daily papers (one of them in the Hungarian language). In broadcasting, on the contrary, among the total number of 1200 stations, some 175, or 14.5%, are still in quasi-state ownership. As a rule, these are RTV stations run by local authorities, e.g. municipalities. As a remnant of "social property", they will have to be privatized by the year 2005.

#### IV. CULTURAL AND MEDIA POLICY RESPONSES TO CULTURAL DIVERSITY

The site where cultural policy and cultural diversity meet may be visualized in the form of a triangle. Its top consists of the Government of Serbia, more precisely its Ministry of Culture and the Media, while its base is made of the local communities or municipalities, with their main urban centers. The central part of this imagined triangle is occupied by the Province of Vojvodina, i.e. the provincial Secretariat for Culture, Education and Science, since Vojvodina has rightly been called a "multiethnic haven" (A. Dević).<sup>2</sup> On the basis of such a visualization we may conclude that concrete forms and contents of cultural diversity are concentrated at the local level, while higher levels (provincial and republican ones) deal mostly with cultural policy, i.e. regulating (channeling and encouraging) diversity.

As for the Ministry of Culture and the Media, within its range of competences as defined by the Ministries Law (Article 18) minority culture or cultural diversity are not mentioned specifically. One would be tempted to conclude therefrom that the Ministry is "diversity insensitive". The conclusion however would be unwarranted. For, among nine long-term strategic goals set by this Ministry there is "Advancing the cultural heritage and creativity of ethnic communities". This is followed by an explanation that this commitment stems from the "respect for the fact that citizens of the Republic of Serbia have multiple roots and identities". Furthermore, in its 2002 Annual Report the Ministry states that it "supported numerous projects and programs of **ethnic communities, encouraging** thereby the expansion of the idea of **tolerance and coexistence**, and the **affirmation** of the multicultural character of our Republic".

The Report goes on to list the examples of special attention the Ministry devoted to the culture of ethnic and minority communities, including activities and projects it supported. Among them, we find instances of amateur artistic production, folklore, literary manifestations, and children's creativity of the following communities: **Roma** (World Roma Day), **Slovaks** (the 70th anniversary of the Slovak *Matica*<sup>3</sup>), **Romanians** ("Koleda" and Winter Customs Festival), **Ruthenians** ("Red Rose" Culture Festival), **Hungarians** (Folklore Festival), **Bunjevci**<sup>4</sup> (Festival of *Bunjevci* Folk Culture), and two highly successful music festivals – "Aven Romalen" and "Ring-Ring", held in Belgrade. The Report also emphasizes the series of **public panel discussions** organized in cooperation with the Civic Parliament of Čačak, entitled "**Truth and Reconciliation**", as well as the project "**Dialogue, Culture and Civilization**" in Novi Pazar, devoted to the topic of interethnic relations and affirming the idea and practice of interethnic tolerance. In addition, within its sphere of competence related to the media, the Ministry has supported the Beta News Agency to establish daily news services in Hungarian and Roma languages, with the aim of offering them free of charge to the interested minority media.

The Vojvodina provincial Secretariat for Culture, Education and Science, i.e. its Culture Sector is in charge of minority culture in the territory of the Province. It appoints directors and members of managing boards of the institutions whose work, maintenance and programs are financed wholly or in part from the provincial budget. Similarly, financial resources intended for cultural institutions listed in the Law are channeled through the Culture Sector: this covers the entirety of costs of regular activity, investments and maintenance, and two-thirds of program costs. The Sector is especially concerned to provide resources for the regular activity and/or program realization of the institutions devoted to the advancement of ethnic minority culture. Since over one-third of Vojvodina's population consists of members of ethnic minorities, minority cultural institutions, organizations and manifestations obviously occupy an important place in the work of the provincial Secretariat for

<sup>2</sup> Ana Dević, Nationalism, Regional Multiculturalism and Democracy in the Province of Voivodina, Serbia's "Multiethnic Haven".

<sup>3</sup> *Matica* is a traditional form of cultural self-organizing in Central and Eastern Europe. It is the central cultural institution of a national/ethnic community, maintaining and advancing its identity and serving as the focal point for its different associations and initiatives.

<sup>4</sup> *Bunjevci* are a specific localized ethnic group whose name cannot be translated. See the explanation below.

Culture, Education and Science. Recipients of financial support include not only minority cultural programs with province-wide significance, but also many local institutions, and particularly cultural manifestations. Publishing in minority languages must also be mentioned. This refers to the culture of Ashkali, *Bunjevci*, Croats, Hungarians, Germans, Ruthenians, Slovaks, and Ukrainians.

Since the beginning of the 1990s, minorities have been using the possibilities offered by urban cable TV systems for transmitting TV program from their mother-countries. Thus, cities (and even villages) with a substantial concentration of Hungarians, Romanians or Slovaks take over (via satellite) the programs of their respective national televisions. In this way members of minorities are actually enabled to abide within the virtual electronic environment of their mother culture without leaving the territory of the country whose citizens they are.

The positive, pro-diversity attitude toward minority cultures is confirmed for instance by the fact that the Culture Sector of the provincial Secretariat allocates resources for advancing the Ashkali culture, although the 2002 population census registered just 146 members of this minority in the entire territory of Vojvodina. What is more, they are not an autochthonous group, but emerged in Vojvodina only after 1999, when they left Kosovo and moved to different towns in Serbia and Vojvodina. The situation is similar with Slovenians, whose number in Vojvodina is also counted in hundreds. Their cultural association, named "Kredarica", enjoys the support of the provincial Secretariat for Culture although, unlike the Ashkali, they are not "internally displaced persons". Cultural diversity is most strongly manifested at the local level – in towns and villages where ethnic minority members live. This is particularly the case in the communities where they are numerically dominant, like Hungarians in some Vojvodina municipalities and towns (Ada, Bečej, Kanjiža, Subotica...), or Bosniacs in south-western Serbia (Novi Pazar, Priboj, Tutin...) or Bulgarians in the south-east of Serbia (Dimitrovgrad, Bosilegrad). This also holds for two (of the three altogether) municipalities in southern Serbia inhabited by Albanians: Bujanovac and Preševo.

This local quality of ethnic minorities is further confirmed by the fact that in Vojvodina, characterized by a large number of different minorities, there is a special provincial Secretariat for Minorities, Local Administration and Regulations. Its basic function is to implement effectively the regulations concerning minority rights at the local level. This is an indirect proof of upholding the principle of subsidiarity (though perhaps the term itself is not used), i.e. the idea that problems should be solved at the level where they arise, and that, in the case of minorities, means the local level.

The development of the culture, language and identity of the **Hungarians** in Yugoslavia would not be possible without an appropriate system of education in the Hungarian language. The development of education in this language, as well as in other national minority languages, had been taking place at an accelerated pace until the mid-1980s when first restrictions were imposed. Particularly difficult moments were experienced in the past decade. The Hungarian language is in official use in 29 Vojvodinian municipalities where the concentration of the Hungarian population varies from 2.8 % in Bela Crkva (Banat) to close to 88 % at Kanjiža (Backa). In particular local communities, the exercise of the right to the official use of the Hungarian language and script has been difficult. A particular problem is the (lack of) bilingual inscription of names of towns and villages, streets, squares and institutions in the municipalities where the Hungarian population does not form a majority. These problems stem from the different approach to the problem by the local authorities within whose competence the implementation of this right falls.

A large number of authors write and their works are published in the Hungarian language that belongs to the Ugrofinnic group of languages. In the period from 1993 to 1996 over 20 new titles were published in this language annually but the volume of the publishing activity in the Hungarian language has been decreasing relative to the period prior to 1990. In the early 1990s, 48 titles of books and brochures were published in Hungarian every year.<sup>72</sup> Already in 1991 no more than 23 titles came out and in 2000 - 27.<sup>73</sup>

The authors writing in Hungarian in Yugoslavia promote annual happenings the following of which enjoy a reputation transcending local borders: the "Szenteleky's Days" that are traditionally held at Sivac; the "Ferenc Feher Memorial"; and the "Karoly Szirmai Memorial". The libraries in 27 Vojvodinian municipalities, as well as in Novi Sad, hold over half a million books in the Hungarian language. In addition to the Novi Sad libraries, the libraries in Subotica and Backa Topola have the largest holdings in this language.

Although in the 1990s there were cuts in the information sector in the national minority languages in FR Yugoslavia, including Hungarian, the following continued to be published in Hungarian: the daily "Magyar Szó" (Hungarian Word); the weekly "Het" (Seven); the youth bi-weekly "Képes Ifjúság" (Youth in Pictures); and the children magazines: "Jo Pajtas" (Good Friend) and "Mezes Kalács" (Honey Cookie). In addition to local and regional papers and magazines in Hungarian established by the local administration or private individuals, some more come out in Novi Sad. These are: the magazine for culture, literature and the arts "Híd" (Bridge); the magazine for scientific and social issues "Letünk" (Our Existence); the magazine on the arts containing critical reviews "Szimpózium" (Symposium); the magazine for literature and culture "Zenet" (Zenith); the bilingual (Hungarian/Serbian) magazine for literature, the arts and culture "Orbis" (Lat. World); and the journal "Hungarológiai közlemények" (Hungarological News).

Television Novi Sad and its regional center in Subotica broadcast annually 865 programs or 30,125 minutes in Hungarian. Despite numerous personnel, financial and program-related problems, the situation at this desk improved. In 2001 broadcasts in Hungarian have included the following: TV news bulletin - twice a day, total duration 45 minutes; the weekly news programs "Our Days" and "Jelenlet" (Presence) taking up 60 minutes each; the program for farmers "Furrow" twice a month lasting 45 minutes; and the weekly 90-minute call-in show "Hello, TV". According to the data of the Provincial Secretariat for the Exercise of the Rights of National Minorities, Radio Television Serbia (RTS) Novi Sad broadcasts a whole day program in the Hungarian language. In addition to entertainment (35.5 % of the total programming time) and other similar programs (19.2 %), it also includes of the Novi Sad Faculty of Philosophy. News programs (15.4 %) and news and politics programs (14.3 %). Educational programs account for no more than 4.3 %. Twenty-two other local radio stations also broadcast radio programs in the Hungarian language.

Hungarian minority members take part in the cultural life of Vojvodina and Serbia by working actively both at the institutions implementing various programs in Serbian and at the institutions preparing programs in Hungarian. Since 1973 the "Ujvideki Színház" (Novi Sad Theater) has been active in Novi Sad. The "Népszínház" (National Theater) in Subotica, established immediately after the Second World War, promotes drama in Hungarian. For a long time this theater played a prominent role in the cultural life of the country. Numerous members of the Hungarian nationality act at the amateur theaters in 16 municipalities in Vojvodina. In 1997 they established the Amateur Theater of Vojvodinian Hungarians. This theater puts on stage one play in Hungarian every year and gives performances in all towns and villages where Hungarian minority members live. The amateur actors who perform in the Hungarian language get together at annual amateur theater festivals of the Hungarian national minority.

Persons belonging to the Hungarian national minority foster and develop their culture and customs by meeting within over 80 culture and art societies. At these societies, folklore groups are particularly successful and present their achievements at the following annual festivals: "Durindo"; "Gyöngyösbokreta" (Pearly Bouquet); "Vive" and at the municipal festival of amateurs the "Tisa River Valley Games". In addition, also traditional have become the visual arts colonies that are organized at Becej, Senta, in Backa Topola, Subotica, Ečka, Pancevo and Mali Idjos.

The center of **Slovak** cultural life is in Bački Petrovac. This town is the site of the Slovak *Matica* in Yugoslavia. This organization was established as far back as 1937. With its 22 local branches and about 15,000 members it is the most important cultural organization of Slovaks in Vojvodina. In the territory of the municipality of Bački Petrovac there are three Slovak-oriented cultural institutions: "28



October" House of Culture, "Bački Petrovac" House of Culture with "Štefan Homola" Library, as well as the Zuska Homolova Gallery. There is also a cultural journal in the Slovak language, "Novi zivot" (New Life), and the theatrical journal "Igric".

Each year the Slovak *Matica* organizes Slovak Popular Festivities devoted to cultural, commercial, sports and educational pursuits. Slovaks from the Republic of Slovakia and those living in diaspora in other parts of Serbia or in other countries also attend. Furthermore, there is the international festival of soloist singers of original Slovak folk songs held at the village of Pivnice, as well as the Slovak Music and Folklore Festival "Tancuj, tancuj" at Gložan. Slovaks have their own professional theater "Vladimir Hurban Vladimirov" that performs in all communities in Bačka with a substantial proportion of Slovak population. Finally, let us mention Centrum – the Slovak Cultural Coordination, with headquarters in Novi Sad. This organization used to accomplish some of the jobs currently being taken over by the recently established National Council of Slovaks.

Speaking of the media, there are three papers in the Slovak language founded by the Assembly of Vojvodina. These are: the weekly "Hlas ľudu" (Voice of the People), youth paper "Vzlet" and children's paper "Zornička". Being the founder, the Assembly of Vojvodina appoints the directors, editors-in-chief and members of managing boards of these papers. In addition to these three printed media, there are twelve more Slovak language periodicals. Since Slovaks live mixed with members of other ethnicities, local papers often appear in Slovak and in some other language. Thus "Opštinske novosti" (Municipal Newsletter) in Alibunar are published in Slovak, Romanian and Serbian languages, while "Pazovačke novine" (Pazova Newspaper) use Slovak and Serbian.

The Slovak-language program of the Radio Novi Sad is broadcast for 7 hours a day on the average, while Slovak-language TV programs take up about one third of this time. In addition, local TV and particularly radio stations, such as Radio "Bačka" from Bač, Radio Bački Petrovac, Radio Kovačica, Radio Stara Pazova and Radio Šid broadcast programs in the Slovak language. Slovak-language programs are also broadcast by the local Radio 021 from Novi Sad. A short time ago the local TV station Kovačica TV was opened, also broadcasting in the Slovak language. The same is the case with local (village) TV stations in Vojlovica and Orlovat.

**Ruthenians** or Carpatho-Ruthenians (they call themselves *Rusjaci*) is an ethnic group living in Bačka and Srem. Some of them consider themselves to be a separate ethnic community originating from the border area between Poland, Slovakia and Ukraine, while the others claim they are just the southernmost branch of Ukrainians that preserved the old cultural traits but also acquired new ones, typical for Ruthenians. It is not surprising therefore that among cultural associations and manifestations some are organized specifically as Ruthenian or Ukrainian, while some others are of combined Rutheno-Ukrainian character, such as the League of Ruthenians and Ukrainians. Ruthenians do not comprise a majority in any single community, but Ruski Krstur (located in the municipality of Kula) is held to be the center of Ruthenians from Bačka and Srem. In this township almost exclusively Ruthenian is spoken, the street names are in Ruthenian, and there is a high school where teaching language is Ruthenian. There, the most important Ruthenian cultural institutions are concentrated: "Peter Riznič Đađa" House of Culture, with theater with the same name. Here also the "Red Rose" Cultural Festival takes place, bringing together all Ruthenians from the territory of the former Yugoslavia. Ruthenian is an official language in five Vojvodina municipalities: Bačka Topola, Vrbas, Žabalj, Kula, Šid and Novi Sad. In addition to books, the "Ruske slovo" Newspaper and Publishing House publishes the literary magazine "Svjetlošč", as well as "Rusinski kalendar" (Ruthenian Calendar). The Society for Ruthenian Language and Literature publishes its own journal "Studia Ruthenica", while Ruthenian artistic colony publishes its annual for literature, art and culture entitled "Erato nad Kucurom".

The Assembly of Vojvodina is the founder of four Ruthenian-language papers, which means it finances them from the budget and appoints directors and managing boards. These are: the weekly "Ruske slovo", youth magazines "Vzlet" and "Mak", as well as children's paper "Zahratka". RTV Novi

Sad broadcasts special programs in Ruthenian for the entire territory of Vojvodina, while local radio and TV stations in places with Ruthenian populations have several-hour daily programs in Ruthenian.

The **Romanian** ethnic minority is mostly concentrated in Banat, but they do not comprise a majority in any of the 11 municipalities where they live. The Romanian language is in official use in ten municipalities: Alibunar, Vršac, Žitište, Zrenjanin, Kovačica, Bela Crkva, Kovin, Pančevo, Plandište and Sečanj. Their main cultural organization is the Community of Romanians of Yugoslavia, with headquarters in Vršac and branch offices in several places. It has departments for science, culture, education and information. A prominent cultural role is also played by the Society for Romanian Language, which organizes literary meetings of Romanian-language writers, as well as the international literary manifestation "Writers at the Border".

Literary journal "Lumina" publishes prose and poetry by Romanian writers, as well as numerous translations from other languages into Romanian. In addition, there is the "Libertatea" newspaper and publishing house which, apart from the weekly with the same name, publishes books in Romanian. In Uzdin, the Romanian-language magazine "Tibiscus" is published, also acting as a publisher of books in Romanian. The Romanian Society (Foundation) for Ethnography and Folklore also plays a significant role. It undertakes field (ethnographic) studies in Romanian culture in Vojvodina, organizes festivals and publishes a quarterly named "Traditia".

The theatrical manifestation of Romanians in Vojvodina takes place in Alibunar. Theater companies that win the first four awards at this manifestation enjoy financial support from the Vojvodina budget in the next year, according to the criteria applying to professional theaters (subsidies for covering staging expenses, authors' honoraria, etc.).

In addition to the weekly "Libertatea", there is the Romanian-language youth monthly "Teneretea", as well as the monthly aimed at children "Bucuria copilor". Local papers in Romanian include "Familia" in Vladimirovac and "Gazeta de Seleus" in Seleuš.

On Radio Novi Sad a Romanian-language department has existed since 1945. On the average, 5.5 hours are broadcast daily. In addition, there are several local stations broadcasting programs in Romanian. These are: Radio VAP (Vršac, Alibunar and Plandište), Radio Zrenjanin, Radio Kovin and Radio Kovačica. TV programs are substantially less numerous – there is a 15-minute daily program "Spectry" on TV Novi Sad, and one-hour weekly "TV Magazin" on Sundays.

**Croats** live predominantly in Bačka (Subotica and its environs), but also in Srem and in border regions with the Republic of Croatia. They belong among the new minorities, since they have become one only after the break-up of the Yugoslav state. Their cultural life is centered primarily at the Croatian Cultural Center and the Croatian Reading Room in Subotica. The latter organizes, among other things, a manifestation of poetry readings in the Croatian language for elementary and high-school pupils. At Tavankut, Croatian Cultural and Educational Society "Matija Gubec" is active. In Sombor, there is a Croatian House, housing Cultural and Artistic Society "Vladimir Nazor". Each August, "Dužijanica" – the festivity celebrating the end of the harvest – is traditionally held in Subotica.

The Croatian-language fortnightly "Žig" is published in Subotica. In the same town the "Hrid" Publishing House is located, publishing Croatian-language books. There are Croatian language programs at the local radio station in Subotica, running for two hours daily. The Croatian department of RTV Novi Sad has been active since 2001, making one weekly program.

**Bunjevci** are an ethnic group that, presumably originating from Dalmatinska Zagora, settled in northern Vojvodina several centuries ago and preserved their peculiar cultural features. They have managed to resist attempts at assimilation from both Croats (they are Catholic like them) and Serbs, who have sought to prove that *Bunjevci* are actually Catholicized Serbs. They have their own *Matica*, the *Bunjevci* Cultural Center and "Bunjevka" Cultural and Artistic Society. As for the media, let us

mention "Bunjevačke novine" (*Bunjevci Newspaper*), and the annual "Bunjevački kalendar" (*Bunjevci Calendar*).

**Roma** are in Serbia (like everywhere in the world) spatially dispersed so that there is no municipality, town or even village where they comprise a majority. Still, it can be noted that the %age of Roma is higher in southern and south-eastern Serbia, in municipalities and towns such as Leskovac, Surdulica, Vranje, and Niš. Roma culture may be taken as a paradigm of cultural diversity, because they differ considerably among themselves, depending on the majority culture of the milieu they live in. Linguistic differences are sometimes so great that they cannot understand each other. Religious differences must be added to this, so that in Serbia there are Orthodox, Muslim, Catholic and Protestant Roma. It may be argued that, in spite of all these differences, the cohesion of Roma as an ethnic group is ensured by the fact that others see them as Roma – a group that is socially underprivileged everywhere and discriminated against, not just by the majority but also by other minority groups.

Roma are a minority everywhere in the world, which means that there is no nation-state of their own that would proclaim one of the many Romany dialects the standard language and, along with standardized orthography, make it obligatory in the educational and media systems. Yet, it was precisely the Association of Vojvodina Roma that suggested, in 1990, a phonetic script for the Roma language that was later accepted as the common script of European Roma.

Roma preserve and cherish their cultural heritage and contemporary culture through their organizations. Most of these organizations in the territory of Serbia, about 40 of them altogether, date back from the period between 1965 and 1985. They were registered as associations for science, culture, education and social issues, cultural and artistic societies, the ROM society, Roma culture clubs, Roma associations, etc. In the period 1985-1999 thirty-odd new organizations were established, so that in Serbia at the beginning of the third millennium there are about seventy Roma organizations devoted to issues ranging from culture, through sports, to environmental protection. The Cultural-Educational Community of Gypsies of Serbia was active from 1965 to 1982. The manifestation of cultural achievements of Serbian Roma is held each year in Niš. Let us mention a couple of Roma organizations currently active in Serbia: the League of Roma of Yugoslavia (established 1995), the Roma *Matica* in Yugoslavia (1996), Council for the Protection of Human Rights of Roma in FR Yugoslavia (1997), Roma Information Center – Kragujevac (1999), and Roma Community Center (2000).

Within the publishing activities of Rrominterpress the series "Special Editions" has been launched, in which 8 books with Roma topics have appeared so far. Rrominterpress is currently preparing the publication of the book "The People that Does Not Exist", devoted to the problems of Roma displaced from Kosovo.

"Glas Roma" (Roma Voice) is one-hour program in Romany and Serbian languages. It is broadcast once a week. It invites people interested in Roma issues and emancipation as guests. The program consists of national and international news, a weekly commentary, and a special guest. Apart from news and political contents, which predominate, it also includes cultural contents. It pays much attention to the problems of Roma displaced from Kosovo. The young generation of Roma is another special concern of the program. Rrominterpress plans to enlarge the program and to have it broadcast by as many local radio stations as possible. At this moment it is broadcast at 24 local radio outlets, but this has proved to be insufficient. For this reason a dozen more stations are planned to be included.

Radio Novi Sad has two-and-a-half hours of Roma-language program daily. The program is called "Amen Ades". In addition to this, several local stations in Vojvodina (Radio Sombor, Radio Kovačica, Radio Srbobran, Radio Bela Crkva) broadcast programs in Romany. Since Romany programs at the local radio stations are not timed at the same hour, parts of these local programs are exchanged and later rebroadcast. Also, on TV Novi Sad there is Romany program which, depending on the day of the week, lasts between 30 and 90 minutes.

"Chavrikano Lil", a children's magazine, started in 1985. The first three issues of this bilingual (Romany-Serbian) paper were published by the "Dečje novine" publishing house from Gornji Milanovac. Shortage of financial resources caused a ten-year pause in the publication of the paper. In September 1995 it was renewed by the independent publishing and information organization "Rrominterpress". 48 issues have appeared so far. The paper is distributed through Roma organizations and individuals, as well as through schools with a substantial share of Roma pupils.

"Romani cara", or Roma stall, is the first Roma street bookstore in the world. It offers not only books written by Roma. This bookstore is actually a street stall in Belgrade's main street (Knez Mihajlova) often annoying to the local authorities. About 500 titles by Roma writers from the country and abroad are offered there. In addition to books, magazines such as "Chavrikano lil" (Children's Paper), "Romano lil" (Roma Paper), "Romological Studies", and other publications in Romany can be bought there.

The **Bulgarian** ethnic minority in the south-east of Serbia lives predominantly in two municipalities – Dimitrovgrad and Bosilegrad. These two sparsely populated and economically underdeveloped municipalities are not adjacent. They are located right by the Bulgarian border. The two towns are at a 100 km distance and there is no direct road between them. This is the main reason for the headquarters of the Bulgarian-language newspaper and publishing house "Bratstvo" to be located in the regional center of Niš. In this city, incidentally, Bulgarians are not very numerous. Apart from the weekly with the same name, "Bratstvo" publishes a Bulgarian-language children's paper "Drugarče" and the literary and artistic journal "Most". Cultural organizations of Bulgarians in Serbia sometimes criticize the linguistic practice of "Bratstvo" which, they claim, in its texts uses the local dialect spoken by Bulgarians from southern Serbia rather than the Bulgarian standard language.

Center for Culture in Dimitrovgrad is the main cultural institution in this town. A similar center exists in Bosilegrad. Both are financed from the municipal budget. In addition, in Dimitrovgrad there is a Cultural and Information Center of the Bulgarian minority, registered as an NGO. It has a Bulgarian library and invites guest artists from Bulgaria. The amateur theater in Dimitrovgrad stages performances in both Bulgarian and Serbian (the same company does both).

Of electronic media, in Dimitrovgrad there is the local RTV "Caribrod" broadcasting in both Bulgarian and Serbian. As far back as the early 1990s, Dimitrovgrad was one of the first towns in Serbia that had a cable TV system. Later on (officially, due to the absence of the license, although cable TV remains legally unregulated in Serbia to this day), the cable TV in Dimitrovgrad was closed down, reopening after the year 2000.

**Vlachs** are an ethnic minority living in eastern Serbia. They inhabit 134 villages, while in three towns – Bor, Majdanpek and Kučevo – they comprise a significant minority of the total population. In the wake of WWII the attitude towards Vlachs was favorable, so that between 1945 and 1954 the Vlach language paper "Voarba nostra" (Our Word) was published, while Radio Zaječar used to broadcast program in Vlach language. The conflict with Stalin resulted in a complete icing of relations with all Eastern Bloc countries, including Romania. More or less overtly, the loyalty of Vlachs – whose Romanian origin was undisputed at the time – was questioned.

The current movement for Vlach cultural emancipation is facing the question of their origins and divides into three currents. The first insists on Vlachs being an autochthonous ethnic group, belonging among the natives of the Balkans, that over time has undergone cultural (particularly linguistic) influences of the Romanized population, as well as of the Slavs that arrived later on. The second current believes Vlachs to be actually Romanian with Romania as their mother-country, while the Vlach language is just a dialect of Romanian. There is also the third, conciliatory current, holding the question of origins to be not so important; for them, what matters is the project of cultural emancipation and self-consciousness raising among members of this ethnic group. Each of these orientations has its own organizational forms. As a rule, these are NGOs, such as the Society for the

Culture of Vlachs-Romanians of North-Eastern Serbia “Ariadnae filum” from Zaječar, Forum for Vlach Culture from Bor, or the Vlach Cultural Initiative.

The electronic media with programs in the Vlach language are predominantly local and private. The first to be mentioned is TV “Salaš” from the village of the same name, specializing in music program in Vlach. In this way, the Vlach language was present in the waves at the time when it was absent from the state-run local TV Zaječar. Another local TV, “Fira“, has recently introduced the practice of leasing out airtime for showing video recordings of private feasts – generally weddings, where Vlach folk customs abound. Let us also mention the issuing of a CD with Vlach music, a specialty of the Radio “Doina” production from Kladovo.

Apart from Kosovo, where they comprise an overwhelming majority, **Albanians** as an ethnic minority live in three municipalities in southern Serbia ( Bujanovac, Preševo and Medveđa). Due to the recent armed conflicts in the neighboring Kosovo, culture has long been accorded a secondary place. The basic cultural institutions in Preševo and Bujanovac are houses of culture. Albanians also have the Cultural and Artistic Society “Veliki Trnovac”, whose latest performance in the local cultural center took place in 1997. In the village of Veliki Trnovac a museum was founded in 1993. The library in Bujanovac has about 35,000 books, just 1,000 of which are in Albanian.

The extremely unfavorable situation in terms of the supply of information for members of the Albanian minority was somewhat improved during 2001. This may be attributed to the presence and aid of the OSCE, to private initiative in the media sphere, and to the democratic change in Serbia in 2000. Another significant step was the permission for the Albanian-language press published in Kosovo to be distributed in this region.

*Jehona* is the only printed media in the Albanian language in Bujanovac. After a long break, the *Jehona* paper restarted on 25 April 2000. The circulation of the paper is about 3,000, and it covers topics from the political and cultural life of Albanians.

Radio Toni, the only Albanian-language electronic media in the municipality of Bujanovac, has been working since June 2001. At the moment, it broadcasts experimental, commercially oriented program. The Radio plans to launch its own news programs, as well as to rebroadcast newscasts from other radio stations. In 2001, *Jehona* and Radio Toni launched a journalist school whose students, after completing the course, were supposed to work in local Albanian-language media. Radio Preševo broadcasts news, cultural and entertaining programs in the Albanian language. The Radio works within the Cultural Center at Preševo.

When speaking of **Bosniacs**, the very double name of the region in western Serbia where they live – called Raška by Serbs, and Sandžak by Bosniacs – is an indicator of the cultural diversity prevailing there. Both names originate from the past. The first recalls the domination of the medieval Serbian state (Raška), while the second is the name for an administrative unit (*sanjak*) in the Ottoman Empire which ruled the region until 1912. Of six municipalities comprising the region, in three (Novi Pazar, Sjenica, Tutin) Bosniacs make up a majority of the population, while in the remaining three they are below 50 %. They are one of the new minorities in Serbia, being established only after the break-up of the former Yugoslavia. Until 1993, Bosniacs called themselves Muslims – with capital M, to distinguish the name of the people from religious designation. In recent years, a growing influence of Islam is felt in Sandžak, resulting in a retraditionalization of cultural life. The existing forms of cultural activity, e.g. the Society for Bosniac Culture "Preporod", are increasingly turning to activities tied to the celebration of Muslim religious holidays.

The cultural center of the whole region is Novi Pazar, a town where two universities have been opened in the past two years. One of them is secular, while the other has been founded by the Islamic community. There is also the "Damad" publishing house, publishing the magazine "Mak". Since 1997 there is also the independent fortnightly "Parlament". In Sandžak there are several local electronic

media. These are mostly local radio stations. Among regional ones we may single out RTV "San" which can be viewed throughout the region.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

Decentralization and development of local and regional self-government, both *de facto* and *de jure*, will increase the possibilities offered to minorities to preserve and to promote diversities. Institutions such as ombudsman, parliamentary interpellations, parliamentary investigating committees, the supervision of the police and the army by working bodies of the parliament, new electoral laws and territorial division into electoral units, and laws on education and the schooling system, on the official language and languages of minorities, those regulating media and information, state symbols, and many other matters outside the scope of the Law, will affect the position and life of minorities. Three levels of legislation (the one of the State Union, of the two republican and of the Autonomous Provinces) imply an increased possibility of lack of harmonization among laws.

Some difficulties in putting some good basic ideas into effect, including the fundamental principles of the Law and its provisions, would certainly be caused by differences between various minorities in terms of their economic position, schooling infrastructure, education level, material and human resources. To these one should add even greater obstacles for the advancement of all minorities found in the widespread corruption, crime and absence of social and moral standards already obvious in the former SFR of Yugoslavia, particularly expressed during the past decade, and continuing some kind of anomy.

The exercise of minority rights guaranteed by the Law and the Charter on Human and Minority Rights may be considerably hampered by the unfavorable economic and social situation in the country, as well as by the situation in Kosovo and Metohija where conditions are not ready for the return of Serbs, Montenegrins, Roma, Bosniacs, Hashkalli and other expelled groups. Against the backdrop of this situation it will be difficult to defend certain broad minority rights that the Law and the Charter guarantee. Texts of these valuable documents will remain 'in force' but the spirit could disappear in an atmosphere of discontent, tension and intolerance. The prerequisites for settling a whole series of the outstanding problems are: (1) rule of law; (2) a reasonable, moderate and liberal constitutional system as well as corresponding institutional arrangements; (3) a political culture of tolerance and respect for differences, adjustment, compromise and dialogue; (4) a developed civil society encompassing both the majority and the minority groups. All this may be achieved only by a long-term endeavor in the right direction, coupled with wise policy inspired by valuable principles.

To conclude, one might rightly expect a rational approach and moderation from all those regulating this subject-matter, formulating the policy and implementing the laws, which also includes those voicing, on behalf of minorities, their requests and criticism. As the chorus says in the finale of the great Greek tragedy *Antigone*: "Prudence is the hammer by which wellbeing is forged".

## VI. APPENDIX

Table 1: Results of the Census 2002 in Serbia (Excluding the Province of Kosovo and Metohija)

Nationality	Republic of Serbia					
	Serbia total		Central Serbia		Vojvodina	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Total	7,498,001	100.00	5,466,009	100.00	2,031,992	100.00
Serbs	6,212,838	82.86	4,891,031	89.48	1,321,807	65.05
Montenegrins	69,049	0.92	33,536	0.61	35,513	1.75
Yugoslavs	80,721	1.08	30,840	0.56	49,881	2.45
Albanians	61,647	0.82	59,952	1.10	1,695	0.08
Bosniacs	136,087	1.82	135,670	2.48	417	0.02
Bulgarians	20,497	0.27	18,839	0.34	1,658	0.08
Bunjevtsi	20,012	0.27	246	.00	19,766	0.97
Croats	70,602	0.94	14,056	0.26	56,546	2.78
Czechs	2,211	0.03	563	0.01	1,648	0.08
Germans	3,901	0.05	747	0.01	3,154	0.16
Goranians	4,581	0.06	3,975	0.07	606	0.03
Hungarians	293,299	3.91	3,092	0.06	290,207	14.28
Macedonians	25,847	0.35	14,062	0.26	11,785	0.58
Muslims	19,503	0.26	15,869	0.29	3,634	0.18
Roma	108,193	1.44	79,136	1.45	29,057	1.43
Romanians	34,576	0.46	4,157	0.08	30,419	1.50
Russians	2,588	0.03	1,648	0.03	940	0.05
Ruthenians	15,905	0.21	279	0.01	15,626	0.77
Slovaks	59,021	0.79	2,384	0.04	56,637	2.79
Slovenians	5,104	0.07	3,099	0.06	2,005	0.10
Ukrainians	5,354	0.07	719	0.01	4,635	0.23
Vlachs	40,054	0.53	39,953	0.73	101	0.00
Other	11,711	0.16	6,400	0.12	5,311	0.26
Undeclared/ undecided	107,732	1.44	52,716	0.97	55,016	2.71
Regional affiliation	11,485	0.15	1,331	0.02	10,154	0.50
Unknown	75,483	1.01	51,709	0.95	23,774	1.17

Source: Publication No. 295 of the Republican Institute of Statistics, Belgrade, 2002; figures for regions and communes (districts) are not available yet, will be processed and published in the near future.

Table 2. Nationality of the Population of FRY According to the Census of 1991

Nationality	FRY	Serbia Total	Central Serbia	Vojvo- dina	Kosovo and Metohija	Monte- negro
Total	10,394,026	9,778,991	5,808,906	2,013,889	1,956,196	615,035
Serbs	6,504,048	6,446,595	5,108,682	1,143,723	194,190	57,453
Montenegrins	519,766	139,299	74,096	44,838	20,365	380,467
Albanians	1,714,768	1,674,353	75,725	2,556	1,596,072	40,415
Yugoslavs	349,784	323,625	145,873	174,295	3,457	26,159
Hungarians	344,147	343,942	4,409	339,491	142	205
Muslims	336,025	246,411	174,371	5,851	66,189	89,614
Roma	143,519	140,237	70,126	24,366	45,745	3,282
Croats	111,650	105,406	22,536	74,808	8,062	6,244
Slovaks	66,863	66,798	3,227	63,545	26	65
Macedonians	47,118	46,046	27,596	17,472	978	1,072
Romanians	42,364	42,331	3,507	38,809	15	33
Bulgarians	26,922	26,876	24,335	2,363	178	46
Bunjevtsi	21,434	21,434	-	21,434	-	-
Ruthenians	18,099	18,073	400	17,652	21	26
Vlachs	17,810	17,807	17,672	132	3	3
Turks	11,263	11,235	603	187	10,445	28
Other	44,244	42,338	15,754	18,944	7,640	1,906
Undeclared/ undecided	11,849	10,906	5,291	5,427	188	943
Regional affiliation	5,910	4,912	2,338	2,503	71	998
Unknown	56,443	50,367	32,465	15,493	2,409	6,076

Source: *National Minorities in FR Yugoslavia*, published by the Federal Ministry of National and Ethnic Communities, Belgrade, 2001.

## VII. SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACT OF THE PROTECTION OF NATIONAL MINORITIES, Institute of Comparative Law, Belgrade, 2002. ( in English and Serbian)

Antić, Petar, ABUSES OF ROMA RIGHTS IN SERBIA, Report No 2, Minority Rights Center, Belgrade, 2003. ( in English and Serbian)

CULTURAL POLICY IN SERBIA: EXPERTS REPORT, European Programme of National Cultural Policy Reviews, MOSAIC PROJECT, 2003.

DEMOKRATIJA I NACIONALNE MANJINE ( Democracy and National Minorities), Centar za studije etniciteta, Punta, Društvo dobre akcije, Niš, 2002. (in Serbian).

Dragomir Dragić, VLASI ILI RUMUNI IZ ISTOČNE SRBIJE I "VLAŠKO PITANJE" – PITANJA I ODGOVORI (Vlachs or Romans from Eastern Serbia and "Vlach question" - Questions and Answers), Helsinški odbor za ljudska prava u Srbiji, Bor 2002, ( In Serbian and Vlachian or Romanian)



IZVEŠTAJ MINISTARSTVA KULTURE I JAVNOG INFORMISANJA ZA 2002. GODINU ( Ministry of Culture and Public Information – 2002. Annual Report )

KULTURA ROMA (Roma culture), ed. by Dragoljub M. Djordjević, thematic issue of review KULTURA no 103-104/2002 (in Serbian)

KULTURNA PRAVA ( Cultural Rights), Beogradski centar za ljudska prava, Beograd, 1999. (in Serbian).

MANJINE I TRANZICIJA ( Minorities and Transition), Helsinški odbor za ljudska prava u Srbiji, Beograd, 2002. (in Serbian).

MANJINE U SRBIJI ( Minorities in Serbia), Helsinški odbor za ljudska prava u Srbiji, Beograd, 2000. (in Serbian).

Milena Dragičević Šešić, Branimir Stojković, KULTURA–MENADŽMENT, ANIMACIJA, MARKETING, ( Culture – Management, Animation, Marketing), Clio, Beograd, 2000. (in Serbian)

Miroslav Samardžić, POLOŽAJ MANJINA U VOJVODINI ( Minorities Position in Vojvodina), Centar za antiraktnu akciju, Beograd, 1998. (in Serbian).

NATIONAL MINORITIES IN FR YUGOSLAVIA, Federal Ministry of National and Ethnic Communities, Belgrade 2001.

NATIONAL CULTURAL POLICY REVIEW, Milena Dragicevic Sesic (project Director), Ministry of Culture and Public Information, Republic of Serbia, Belgrade, 2002.

POLOŽAJ MANJINA U SR JUGOSLAVIJI (Minorities Position in FR Yugoslavia), SANU, Beograd, 1996.

ROMI U SRBIJI ( Roma in Serbia), Centar za antiraktnu akciju, Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, Beograd, 1998. (in Serbian).

TOLERANCE – MEETING DIFFERENCES, ed. Tatjana Živković, Federal Ministry of National and Ethnic Communities, Belgrade, 2002 (in English and Serbian)

Vesna Djukić Dojčinović, CULTURAL POLICY OF SERBIA 1989-2000. (final research paper), International Policy Fellowships, Center for Policy Studies, OSI Europe Foundation, Budapest, 2003.

Vladimir Biljnja , RUSINI U VOJVODINI ( Ruthenians in Vojvodina), Dnevnik, Novi Sad, 1997. (in Serbian).