



The socialist Yugoslav paradox: Documentary cinema exhibition opportunities and the meaning of 'Dissent'

Dunja Jelenković

To cite this article: Dunja Jelenković (2021): The socialist Yugoslav paradox: Documentary cinema exhibition opportunities and the meaning of 'Dissent', Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television, DOI: [10.1080/01439685.2021.1936984](https://doi.org/10.1080/01439685.2021.1936984)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01439685.2021.1936984>



Published online: 18 Jun 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 8



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



THE SOCIALIST YUGOSLAV PARADOX: DOCUMENTARY CINEMA EXHIBITION OPPORTUNITIES AND THE MEANING OF 'DISSENT'

Dunja Jelenković 

This article will examine the position of critical cinema in socialist Yugoslavia by analysing the archives of the only documentary festival in the country, the Yugoslav Documentary and Short Film Festival in Belgrade (founded in 1954). It will compare the festival's most prosperous years, when a series of internationally acclaimed Black Wave films were screened (late 60s/early 70s), and its final socialist phase, when a series of 'patriotic' films, mostly seen as uninteresting by international programmers, were shown (late 80s/early 90s). Analysing the ideological change in the festival's programming, the article will show how Yugoslav documentary moved from a critique within a socialist perspective in the 60s to the promotion of a predominantly anti-socialist and nationalist perspective in the 80s. In doing so, it will demonstrate that although often regarded as 'the' dissident cinema of Yugoslavia, the Black Wave was in its essence in dialectical dialog with the socialist state, unlike the critical films of the late 80s and early 90s, which were arguing for regime change in favour of a nation-state. The article will shed light on the paradoxes of Yugoslav censorship and film exhibition opportunities, in the specific context of the only European country that was ruled by a communist government but that was outside of the Eastern Bloc.

This article analyses the position of critical cinema in socialist Yugoslavia through examination of the archives of the only documentary festival in the country, The

Correspondence to: Dunja Jelenković, Centre d'histoire Culturelle Des Sociétés Contemporaines (CHCSC), UVSQ, 47 Boulevard Vauban, 78280 Guyancourt. Email: dunja.jelenkovic@gmail.com

Yugoslav Documentary and Short Film Festival (YDSFF). Created in 1954 as the 'official' event for displaying national cinema, with the League of Communists well integrated in its structures, YDSFF was, somewhat paradoxically, often the only place where local audiences could see films that critically confronted the major Yugoslav socialist myths, that is the myths of Second World War and of the country's socialist revolution at the end of the war. We can define two pivotal periods in the festival's socialist history, both marked by programmes that were critical of the (political) situation in the country: its 'golden age', when a series of internationally acclaimed Black Wave films were screened (late 60s/early 70s), and its final socialist phase, when a series of 'patriotic' films, which usually attracted little interest from international programmers, were shown (late 80s/early 90s). The three questions that the article addresses are: What does the analysis of these programmes reveal about the evolution of political documentary in socialist Yugoslav history? What do these programmes tell us about the level of liberties and restrictions in filmmaking and programming in socialist Yugoslavia? What do the polemics that surrounded critical films tell us about their alleged dissident nature? By addressing these questions, the analysis will demonstrate how criticism within a socialist perspective in the 60s and early 70s gave way to the promotion of a predominantly anti-socialist and nationalist perspective in the late 80s and early 90s. In doing so the article will show that although often regarded as 'the' dissident cinema of Yugoslavia, the Black Wave was in its essence comforting with the socialist state, unlike the critical films of the late 80s and early 90s which were arguing for the change of the state order in favour of a nation-state. Focussing on the ideological change in the festival's programming, the article will shed light on the paradoxes of Yugoslav censorship and of film exhibition opportunities, demonstrating how they were influenced by the priorities of national and international politics, in the specific context of the only communist European government outside of the Eastern Bloc.¹

The article is written within the framework of historical studies of film festivals.² Following Venice (founded in 1932) and Cannes (1939), a wave of festival creation in the early years after the Second World War swept across the European cultural scene on both sides of the Iron Curtain: Karlovy Vary and Locarno (1946), Edinburgh (1947), Berlin (1951), Oberhausen, Pula/Belgrade (1954), Leipzig (1955). Places of considerable political, economic and cultural influence, they quickly became a theatre for both political confrontations and rapprochements.³ Few studies have examined Yugoslav film festival scene, although some research has been published on the Yugoslav Documentary and Short Film Festival.⁴ Regarding polemical films, the nonconformist tendencies in the Yugoslav cinema have been discussed in various works dedicated to the Black Wave, the most studied period of the Yugoslav cinema history, as well as in different publications on Eastern European cinemas.⁵ Particularly interesting for this study is Gal Kirn's insightful refutation of the contemporary cultural theory's 'humanist hypothesis' opposing the supposedly 'good' ('dissident') artists to 'evil' state, without necessary acknowledgements of the complex nature of avantgarde films from the 60s and 70s, as well as of the film production and exhibition opportunities in socialist Yugoslavia.⁶ When it comes to the cinema of the late 80s and early 90s,

existing scholarship has focussed on of the Yugoslav wars and break-up of the country.⁷ That said, researchers have more rarely opposed the polemical cinema of the 60s with the film production from the socialist Yugoslavia's final years.⁸ Within film festival studies, comparative analysis of these two periods has so far only been available in my doctoral research, from which this article is drawn.⁹

Historical sources used for this analysis include the festival's catalogues, administrative documents and reports, photo archives and press clippings, all dating from 1960 to 1991, as well as a selection of films screened in this period. One of the main methodological concerns which arose in this research is related to accessing the archives. Apart from the practice of archiving not being particularly valued in the event's post-socialist phase, majority of the festival's remaining documentation was thrown away in 2014 during a move to new premises.¹⁰ The majority of the documents used for this article are to be found in the Yugoslav Film Archive's Library in Belgrade, with supplementary from various private collections and the Yugoslav National Archives.

After explaining the circumstances and objectives of the festival's creation, the article proposes an overview of film censorship procedures in socialist Yugoslavia, and national and international screening opportunities for documentary film. It then proceeds to analyse the festival's programmes in the 60s and 70s and chart its development in the late 80s and early 90s, thereby demonstrating the ideological shift in its programmes.

A national film festival in a multinational country

The Yugoslav Documentary and Short Film Festival was started in 1954 as a part of the Yugoslav Film Festival in Pula (Croatia). After taking power at the end of Second World War, the supranational partisan movement, under the leadership of communist Josip Broz – Tito, transformed the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (1918–1941) into a union of six socialist republics, corresponding to the country's six constitutive nations (1943/1945–1991).¹¹ In line with the socialist idea that culture and education should be broadly available, but also in order to inform the widely illiterate population about their war efforts, immediately after the war the communists started to methodically organise, develop, and invest in the film industry.¹² Following the wave of festival creation in post-war Europe, amid the preparations for the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the official existence of Yugoslav (socialist) cinema, the national film festival was created.¹³ Its aim was to gather together filmmakers from throughout the Federation, presenting an annual overview of the national production of films of all kinds.

However, as the non-feature films remained insufficiently visible in Pula, in 1959 they were separated out and given their own event, The Yugoslav Documentary and Short Film Festival. Its objective was to reflect and stimulate the production of documentary and short films, compensating for the lack of their exhibition opportunities. The festival's first edition took place in Belgrade from 4 to 9 May 1960. Yet, both events kept presenting 1954 as the official year of their creation, thus insisting on their common tradition from the first years in Pula. By displaying works from all six socialist republics, they were celebrating the

country's federal structure and multinational identity, while simultaneously uniting productions from the different republics under the common 'Yugoslav' label.

'A black wave sweeps over our cinema'¹⁴

The relocation of documentary and short film presentations to Belgrade coincided with a shift in filmmaking trends. The first post-war years in Yugoslavia were marked by modernisation and rebuilding of the country and education of the citizens in the spirit of socialism. The political break with the Soviet Union in 1948 motivated the establishment of workers' self-management and the state's decentralisation on the local level, and the founding of the non-aligned movement internationally. Cinema responded to these changes, and through the early 1960s, documentaries that promoted the founding mythologies of Yugoslav socialism were given a prominent position both in national film production and in the film festival. These films often highlighted Second World War as the main point of remembrance related to the national past, and the socialist revolution, which was depicted as a continuous project of reforming society, as the main theme depicting the life in the present.¹⁵

Contemporaneous with the development of New Waves across Europe, from Prague to Paris, the 60s witnessed a radicalisation of cinematic expression. New Yugoslav Film (1961–1973) brought to the festival's screens nonconventional aesthetics, open sexual references, (ironic) criticism of the development of socialism, and lifting of taboos surrounding the history of the Second World War through the representation of the dark (and bloody) aspects of the socialist Revolution.¹⁶ The birth of this provocative and avant-garde film corpus was a result of contradictions of the system itself – it was made possible by the liberalisation of culture, but stimulated by the failure of the liberalisation of industry.¹⁷ Unsuccessful economic reform (1965) imposed higher prices and unemployment rates, lower living standards, deeper political instability and greater social inequality. Consequently, the thematic focus in documentary cinema switched from expensive representations of national parades and Second World War battles, to personal and provocative stories of antiheroes and people on the margins of society: the protagonists tended to be people directly suffering from the hardships of everyday life in Yugoslavia at the time, as I outline below. The most critical works within New Yugoslav Film were labelled as the Black Wave.¹⁸ As in several other cases in art history, the phrase was coined by a journalist who wanted to express negative criticism, but it was instead accepted as a term for critical works from the period.¹⁹

A greater degree of artistic independence compared to the countries under the hegemony of the Soviet Union, combined with the peculiar, unstructured, nature of Yugoslav censorship, explains how a series of such films came to be produced, screened at the national festival, and sent to the major festivals abroad. Yugoslav censorship was characterised by unclear procedures, freestyle judgements about film quality by members of different committees, and sparse documentation explaining their decisions, which were often communicated only informally, over the phone.²⁰ Once the project's script was approved and the film was completed, it had to obtain permission for public screening from the Commission for Film

Preview. Yet almost all the films that were successfully produced received this approval, and only one was officially banned: the feature *The City* (*Grad*, Kokan Rakonjac, Živojin Pavlović, Marko Babac, Sutjeska Film, 1963).²¹ Since all the films were produced within the system itself, only two methods of control remained for the 'unsuitable' ones that managed to pass through the first two levels of censorship (and self-censorship): attacking the film in the press, or, preferably, preventing it from reaching audiences by giving it unfavourable screening times or no screening opportunities whatsoever (the so-called 'bunkered' films).²²

The idea that YDSFF had to maximally reflect the national production enabled, paradoxically, a series of avant-garde, provocative, and critical films to end up on its screens, right before they would be hidden from the public eye. The festival's jury, which was at the time also in charge of the selection, usually accepted almost all the films that production houses submitted, only dividing them into competitive and non-competitive programmes.²³ That is how numerous Black Wave films were not only shown at the festival, but also how, through participation, they were ensured an invitation to Oberhausen, Krakow, Leipzig, Bilbao and other international festivals whose programmers often came to YDSFF to select films for their events.²⁴ As the sole documentary festival in Yugoslavia, YDSFF was a significant place of meeting, polemicising, but also of promotion of certain films – those that were endorsed through awards and good screening times inevitably gained more press coverage.²⁵ In other words, the festival was the place where filmmakers could ensure their ticket for national and international success. As Želimir Žilnik put it, it was 'like the Olympics'.²⁶

A programming power struggle (1961–1972)

On the other hand, the screening of Black Wave films did not go without controversy, thus marking the most polemical, but also the most fruitful period of the YDSFF's socialist history. Between 1961 and 1972 the festival's programming and award lists constantly alternated between enthusiastic, blissful images of prosperity and peaceful cohabitation between the Yugoslav nations on the one hand, and, on the other hand, realistic and often raw documentaries showing unequal opportunities and ideologically and nationally motivated tensions in a country whose watchwords were 'class equality' and 'brotherhood and unity'. The position of critical films within the festival, always oscillating between positive and negative critical responses, reflected the levels of liberties and restrictions in Yugoslav culture. The polemics surrounding these films also affirmed the socialist nature of their content – although attacked on an ideological basis, the 'black' filmmakers were not criticised for allegedly breaking with the socialist narrative, but for being too demanding in their socialist requests. In a clash that can also be considered as generational, sometimes they were also attacked simply because they were too alternative for some tastes. For instance, one press article wrote of conflict between 'famous and novice [filmmakers]', and 'veterans [who were] expected to do nothing but confirm their old, already used ideas'.²⁷ According to Dušan Makavejev, some of the older filmmakers' and critics' demands were related to the fact that they personally experienced strict censorship in the years right before and after the break with the USSR.²⁸

Among the first controversial documentaries to be screened were Makavejev's *Smile 61* (*Osmjeh 61*, Sutjeska Film, 1961, screened in 1962), and *The Parade* (*Parada*, Dunav Film, 1962, screened in 1963). Both films allowed viewers to peek behind the scenes of large gatherings that celebrated and further constructed the collective Yugoslav identity – youth work brigades in *Smile 61*, and May Day celebrations in *The Parade*. Makavejev approached these common subjects in an uncommon way: instead of focussing on the glamorous performances, the two films dealt with casual preparations for them, including some unappealing images, which suggested the backwardness of Yugoslav society. These two films show the reality of life in Yugoslavia through the contrast between the government's plans for industrial progress, material renewal, culture and education, and the situation on the ground, where the shortfalls in implementing these plans are obvious (especially for education and culture).

Smile 61 contrasted scenes of youth working on the construction of the Brotherhood and Unity Highway with those of a group of locals taking a bath in a mud lake near the construction site, believing in its healing capacities.²⁹ This met with disapproval from the renowned critic Milutin Čolić, who insisted that somebody needed to help the people get out of the mud. He suggested that the filmmaker was mocking them by editing a (metaphorical) scene in which they are trying to escape a bulldozer used for road construction.³⁰ On the other hand, the jury praised the film for a 'successfully expressed artistic attitude', and 'emotional and creative engagement'.³¹ They awarded it prizes for directing (second prize), best camerawork (Bakir Tanović), as well as the special award given by the Central Committee of the Communist Youth of Yugoslavia.³² The League of Communist Youth decided to give the film's first copy as a present to Tito at the occasion of the opening of one section of the highway, and despite the polemics around it, the film took part in the festival in Mannheim in October 1962.³³

When it comes to *The Parade*, the film unveils everything that we do not usually see in the May Day celebration – ordinary people dressed poorly, some fooling around with the national flag, a villager holding a sheep on his shoulders in the city centre of Belgrade and another one walking around with his pig. Tito appears only at the end of the film, for exactly 2 seconds (at 8'25' out of 10'), thus being presented as no more special than any other protagonist. As Makavejev explained, he inserted the scene with Tito only because he knew he was expected to have one, and even struggled to find suitable footage.³⁴ After talking to writer and theatre critic Eli Finci from the Commission for Film Preview, who accused him of 'making fun of the holiday of the proletariat', Makavejev modified some scenes in order to 'save' the film.³⁵ *The Parade* and *Smile 61* had similar critical trajectories – they sparked a certain amount of controversy, but in the end they were rather well accepted.

The real 'turmoil' in the festival's history started in 1967 with the debut of Želimir Žilnik, with his short documentary *Newsreel on Village Youth, in Winter* (*Žurnal o omladini na selu, zimi*). Produced by the freshly created production house Neoplanta Film, it brought to the big screen an unflattering image of young villagers from the region of Vojvodina, partying, drinking, and making crude jokes. The film was absent from the competition and was screened only towards the end of

the festival, so it was noticed quite late.³⁶ This raised questions and created a conflict between the jury, and journalists who were mostly united in their opinion that this was one of the most interesting films made that year.³⁷ At the final press conference, the president of the jury, Slovenian filmmaker and Second World War partisan, France Kosmač was not able to explain the 'nonsense', as some festival-goers defined it, of not including the film in the competition.³⁸ Film critic Ranko Munitić quit the jury in protest, criticising his colleagues for rigidity.³⁹ For the first time in the festival's history, a film was screened for the second time at the request of those present.⁴⁰ As the final proof of its value, *Newsreel* won two important special prizes: the award of the Slovenian magazine *Ekran* and one given by the Central Committee of the Communist Youth of Yugoslavia.⁴¹ The *Newsreel* episode was the first in a series of bitter controversies, resulting in the proliferation of two currents among the festival organisers, filmmakers and journalists, who had different political and aesthetic points of view.

Over the next few years, the festival screened a series of Žilnik's short documentaries, produced by Neoplanta, that criticised the situation in Yugoslavia: *The Unemployed* (*Nezaposleni ljudi*, 1968), about the high unemployment rate in a system that was supposed to enable its citizens to work, *Little Pioneers ...* (*Pioniri maleni ...*, 1968), on juvenile delinquency in a country that should take care of its youth, and *The Black Film* (*Crni film*, 1971) about homelessness in a country where a place to stay was supposedly allocated to everyone.⁴² The director criticised the shortcomings of the system, which allowed for these phenomena to exist. It is important to understand that his critique was still in line with the values of socialism as a system: it advocates housing for everyone, better employment opportunities, free education and health care, i.e., a social system that *cares* for (all) its citizens. These demands culminated in student protests in 1968, pictured in *June Turmoil* (*Lipanjaska gibanja*, 1968, screened in 1969). The socialist nature of the student demands is obvious from the slogans visible in the film, such as 'Down with red bourgeoisie,' 'We need jobs,' 'Students – workers,' and 'Who is responsible for chaos in the industry?' One of the protagonists describes the clash with the police and says: 'One of the biggest police offences was when they ordered us to take down the banners ... and among them there were portraits of Tito and Lenin.' This comment in particular demonstrates that the ideological struggle between the regime and its opponents, such as students and alternative filmmakers, was organised around the issue of which of these groups is understanding and implementing the socialist programme in a more genuine way. The Yugoslav press often accused Žilnik of 'staging' his documentaries and presenting reality as darker than it actually was.⁴³ One of the repeated critiques is that he was using his protagonists for personal gain, with the ultimate goal of making a film and obtaining international fame, instead of being genuinely interested in social issues.⁴⁴ The content of his films, as well as the polemics around them which never broke with a socialist framework, is what makes it difficult to analyse Žilnik's documentaries in a dissident paradigm, which view the Black Wave as simply anti-socialist or anti-communist.

Apart from the filmmakers associated with the Black Wave, other directors also presented somewhat harsher criticism of the society in this period. One of the

reasons is that they found inspiration in the turbulent events around them. Krsto Škanata, a committed communist and a Second World War partisan, shot *A Vampire's Nostalgia* (*Nostalgija vampira*, Dunav Film, 1968) and *Terrorists* (*Teroristi*, Dunav Film, 1970) which dealt with ideologically and nationally motivated crimes committed by the Croatian ultra-right organisation of Ustashes during, but also after the war. Both films won awards at the festival (*A Vampire's Nostalgia* – Golden Medal, *Terrorists* – Silver Medal) and were well received by critics who praised them as ‘the best’, and ‘the first real excitement at the festival’.⁴⁵ In line with mainstream socialist discourse, the two films firmly oppose nationalism and condemn xenophobic crimes without emphasising the nationality of either the offenders or the victims. The films condemned the political system whose dysfunctions allowed for the return of a war criminal to the village where he committed the crimes (*A Vampire's Nostalgia*), as well as for a terrorist attack in which ‘a young woman the age of [filmmaker’s] own children lost her legs in a movie theatre, decades after the war’ (*The Terrorists*).⁴⁶ Conversely, the film *Ambassador was Killed in Stockholm* (*Ambasador je ubijen u Stokholmu*, Ratko Ilić, Centar Film, 1971), which dealt with a similar topic, the terrorist attack in which the Ustashes murdered the Yugoslav ambassador Aleksandar Rlović in 1971, was not shown at the festival until 1991 out of fear that it could threaten national unity, further supporting a view that the dominance of different currents at the festival was interchangeable.

Although often heavily attacked in the local press, Black Wave filmmakers in only three years (1967–1969) won multiple awards in the most prestigious European feature and short film festivals, including Cannes, Berlin, Venice, and Oberhausen.⁴⁷ This was possible since the Commissions for Film Review and for Foreign Cultural Relations, as well as the YDSFF jury, did not consist of mere political officials, but of filmmakers. Some of the key figures of the Black Wave, Makavejev and Aleksandar Petrović were more than once their members, which shows that both the filmmakers associated with the Black Wave and their critics were a part of the same system.⁴⁸ Depending on the sympathies of the members of these bodies, different films were awarded in YDSFF and reached foreign audiences. This led to a paradoxical situation: certain films were disputed (although not banned) at home and acclaimed abroad. Did the international presentation of these films suit the Yugoslav authorities? On the one hand, it did not, because in the context of the exceptional position that Yugoslavia occupied in the Cold War, it was important to present Yugoslav socialism as a successful alternative both to Western capitalism and Eastern communism, and films showing national tensions, low levels of education, and lack of jobs and housing opportunities, did not necessarily do so. On the other hand, the international exposure of these films was convenient – the awards meant profit and prestige. Although the image that these films presented was not very flattering, the fact that they received awards was flattering indeed. In addition, the very fact that such films were produced and travelled internationally served as ‘proof’ of ‘democracy’ in Yugoslavia. As Radina Vučetić remarked, ‘[i]t was possible to criticise the system, and all that with the public money.’⁴⁹

Still, liberties had their limits. In 1972, a major showdown took place between the regime and artists, culminating in the arrest of filmmaking student Lazar

Stojanović for his graduation film *Plastic Jesus* and the expulsion of Professor Aleksandar Petrović from the Film Academy. This sudden and surprisingly harsh confrontation with the artists was possibly the regime's way to divert people's attention from the political instability in the country, following the Croatian Spring in 1970–1971 and settling of scores with the leading liberal communists in Serbia in 1972. The global situation was also challenging, with student protests reaching Yugoslavia in June 1968 and the invasion of Czechoslovakia the same year, which could be interpreted as a threat to Yugoslavia. In 1972 three Neoplanta's films, *I Miss Sonia Henie* (*Nedostaje mi Sonja Henie*, Karpo Godina et al., 1971), *The Cross with a Star* (*Krst sa zvezdom*, Karolj Viček, 1972) and *Women are Coming* (*Žene dolaze*, Želimir Žilnik, 1972), were not shown at YDSFF, but there exists little documentation about this.⁵⁰ In addition, similarly to what happened in 1967, several films were screened out of the competition, despite the disapproval of some of the filmmakers and journalists.⁵¹ Neoplanta's director, film producer Svetozar Udovički was fired, and new managers decided to withdraw twenty of their films from distribution in 1972.⁵² Under this pressure, three key filmmakers associated with the Black Wave, Makavejev, Petrović and Žilnik, all moved abroad. The polemics at the festival subsided. However, the existence of both the stricter and the more liberal current within the festival, as well as the fact that they debated publicly, reveal the freedom and a certain level of fairness typical for Yugoslav socialism and its cultural policies, which would have been unimaginable in most authoritarian societies. It also indicates that both the Black Wave and mainstream films, their admirers and critics, were a product of the same society and film system, whose gradual formation they all participated in together.

A nationalist revival (1981–1991)

A new turn in the festival's programming took place in the 80s, when increasing numbers of documentary filmmakers again started taking a critical stance towards the situation in the country, but now adopting nationalist language. As Yugoslavia plunged into the most serious economic and political crisis since its creation, the relations between the republics deteriorated. The year 1974 saw the proclamation of the new constitution reforming federal structures for the benefit of the republics and autonomous provinces. Having been granted greater autonomy, the Serbian province of Kosovo, the only federal unit whose majority population, the Albanians, did not have status as one of the constitutive peoples, began to demand the status of a republic. This request culminated in 1981, one year after Tito's death, with the protests of Kosovo Albanians, which ended with the intervention of the army and the proclamation of a state of emergency. In the context of the instabilities in Kosovo, fast growing inflation and rising unemployment, the republics started to increasingly focus on their own interests. The intensifying nationalist tendencies were more and more visible in cultural production as well, especially at the beginning of the 90s, after the fall of communist regimes across Europe and the end of the Cold War.

The 80s represent a hybrid period in YDSFF's history, marking a transition between a multinational Yugoslav event (1954–1992) and a local one, which

would be reduced to films from Serbia and Montenegro (1993–2004) after socialist Yugoslavia collapsed in war.⁵³ On a formal level, the festival still duly insisted on its ‘yugoslavism’: it screened films and included jury and council members from all the six republics.⁵⁴ In their speeches, reports and texts published in the catalogues they maintained their commitment to supranational Yugoslav values.⁵⁵ In terms of content, however, the festival allowed for a transformation of its programmes in favour of nationalist and pro-Serbian discourses.

The majority of the screened films were still in line with socialist discourse and themes related to it. The hardships of contemporary Yugoslav reality were documented in Krsto Škanata’s, Nikša Jovičević’s and Nenad Puhovski’s films about political protests, poverty and corruption.⁵⁶ However, as the number of films dealing with contemporary Yugoslav reality was in decline, an increased attention to exclusively Serbian subjects became evident. In view of the increasing tensions in Kosovo and the fear of expulsion of the Serbian population, the political and cultural elites began to craft a strong victimisation narrative, in which the Serbs were presented as the perpetual victims of history, starting from the Kosovo Battle with the Ottomans in 1389, through the Balkan wars and First World War, continuing through Second World War, to the wars of the 90s. This inspired filmmakers’ interest in historical topics and the Serbian national past. Although not very numerous, these productions were important because for the first time, they no longer sought to represent the interests of Yugoslavia as a whole but instead defended the interests of one national group. They were not looking for the solution to the crisis in a better implementation of the existing political program but were placing the blame for the crisis on the system as such and were proposing new standards. Unlike the films from the 60s and early 70s, this cinema was not campaigning for the reform of the system from within but was completely breaking with its values.

This change is evident in the festival’s approach to the memory of the two world wars. As the number of films on Second World War, the foundational myth of socialist Yugoslavia, was diminishing, the festival demonstrated an increased interest in First World War, a topic of major importance for pre-socialist and Serbian national history. In total, eight documentaries about First World War were screened in eleven editions of the festival (1981–1991) – almost twice as many as during the 21 editions between 1960 and 1980, when there were shown only five documentaries devoted to this subject that attracted some media attention.⁵⁷ The growing importance of this historical theme was obvious from the fact that *The March of Victory* (*Marš pobjede*, Miki Stamenković, Dunav Film), was given the most prestigious screening time, at the opening of the 1986 festival, while *The Creation of Yugoslavia* (*Stvaranje Jugoslavije*, Dunav Film, 1985) by the same director was screened two years after it was made, in 1987, contrary to the festival rules.

Serbia, which was together with Montenegro the only independent country in the region in 1914, played a determining role in Yugoslav unification. Its interest was double – unification of Yugoslav territories meant the unification of Serbia with Austro-Hungarian regions inhabited by the Serbs.⁵⁸ This, as well as extensive losses of the Serbian army in First World War, explains the importance of this historical period for Serbian national history. While films about this conflict from the

1960s and 1970s emphasised the common desire of Yugoslavs to unite into the first South Slavic state, in the second half of the 1980s the focus switched to the importance of Serbians' role in the creation of Yugoslavia, and their suffering in the process.⁵⁹

The transition from a Yugoslav narrative to a Serbian one in the films about First World War is particularly well illustrated in the feature-length documentary made of archival footage and photographs, *Yugoslavia by the Will of People, 1914–1918* (*Jugoslavija, po volji naroda, 1914–1918*, Miki Stamenković, Dunav Film, 1988, screened in 1989).⁶⁰ The film was produced on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of Yugoslavia's creation, but it abandoned the heroic Yugoslav narrative centred on the positive outcome of the war and the establishment of the first South Slavic state, in favour of a negative one, centred on the Serbian tragedy. In an interview given at the time, the filmmaker insisted that he did not want to be involved with any 'pathetic and patriotic slogans in the name of 'Serbianism''.⁶¹ Nonetheless, the film's narration qualified the Austro-Hungarian crimes against the Serbs as 'genocide' and took on a certain poetic freedom when describing these crimes in detail: '[The Austro-Hungarian army] are blaspheming, profaning, raping and slaughtering, taking out the eyes, and burning the helpless alive.'⁶² Apart from the accusations of blasphemy and profanation, the narration abounded in other religious references, among others labelling Serbia as a 'holy victim'.⁶³ Such a storytelling was unimaginable in the framework of genuine socialist discourse that was mostly oriented towards the future, materialist, free of religious allusions and focussed on history that was shared by all the Yugoslav peoples.

The situation in Kosovo also led to an increasing mobilisation of the myth of Kosovo as a holy Serbian land, as can be seen in the openly nationalist documentary *Fear of the Truth* (*Strah od istine*, Milorad Bajić, Art Film 80, 1988). The film, free of any trace of socialist rhetoric, discussed the controversial and highly media-tised case of Djordje Martinović, a Kosovo Serb who was hospitalised after being impaled with a stick capped with a broken beer bottle (1985). Martinović accused his Albanian neighbours of the assault, but the Yugoslav leadership accused him of lying – the official investigation concluded that Martinović hurt himself while seeking sexual pleasure. The film presented Martinović as a martyr who suffered a double tragedy: not only was he the victim of a vicious crime just because he was a Serb, but he was also the victim of a conspiracy, since this crime was left unpunished with the aim of preserving Yugoslav unity at the expense of Serbian national interests. The critics pretty much agreed that this film 'did not bring anything new.'⁶⁴ It did bring something new, however, in breaking with the Yugoslav discourse on two levels: it treated the Martinović case as a metaphor for the suffering of an entire national group, due to, firstly, national reasons (a nationally motivated crime) and, secondly, ideological ones (alleged ideologically motivated conspiracy to cover up for a nationally motivated crime), in a way that would have been previously unimaginable.

While critics of the socialist state had hitherto mainly focussed on social issues, critical films from the late 1980s and early 1990s increasingly began to examine the 'dark spots' of the socialist historiography, especially regarding its two main pillars, the war and revolution. Regarding the revolution, more and more films

presented the lack of democracy in communism (*Prinudni otkup i sudbina Ilije Nikolića/Enforced Sale of Crop in Vojvodina 1947–1952*, Prvoslav Marić, IKAR, 1991). As for Second World War, when it was still discussed, the focus started to shift from the *common* Yugoslav struggle in the partisan movement to the civil war, which *opposed* Yugoslavs between 1941 and 1945 (*Blood and Ashes of Jasenovac/Krv i pepeo Jasenovca*, Lordan Zafranović, JRT, 1984; *Madonna, the Queen of Croats/Gospa, Kraljica Hrvata*, Krsto Škanata, Dunav Film, 1991; *The Pit, Jama*, Milorad Bajić, Soko Film, 1991).⁶⁵ If we take into account that the socialist narrative about the war and revolution was carefully moulded in order to provide the very base of national unity, then the deconstruction of that narrative is the first sign of the breakdown of the festival's Yugoslav profile, as well as of the film production's departure from its Yugoslav features.

Another novelty of the period was the screening of previously unavailable films. They started appearing in the programme as of 1984 and continued to appear throughout the 90s. The festival had a tradition of screening controversial films, but now audiences had the chance to see films that had not even been screened in YDSFF, since they obtained screening permission only decades after they were made. Among others, the festival showed *12 Months of Winter (12 meseci zime)*, Krsto Škanata, Dunav film, 1971, screened in 1984), about the phenomenon of Stalinism (Grand Prix), *The Ambassador was Murdered in Stockholm* (1971, screened in 1991) and *A Cross with the Star* (1972, screened in 1993). Joca Jovanović's film *An Ongoing Revolution (Revolucija koja teče)*, Dunav Film, 1972), 'which showed that 'brotherhood and unity' was just a phrase beneath which serious political problems lurked' was shown in 1989 and awarded the Silver Medal.⁶⁶ Although numerous Black Wave films ended up at the festival between 1961 and 1972 as a result of insufficiently developed mechanisms of control (censorship) in socialist Yugoslavia, their screening in the 80s and 90s suggested the limits of programming freedoms in earlier Yugoslav history. Screening of these films implied a critique of the earlier socialist past, by pointing to greater liberties of speech characteristic of the late socialism and post-Tito era.

Despite all this turbulence, in comparison with the late 60s/early 70s, no significant controversies marked this period of the festival's history. Production dropped considerably: the report from the 1981 edition listed only 100 films programmed, proof of the Yugoslav film industry's poor financial situation due to the country's economic difficulties.⁶⁷ Selection committees, juries, journalists and critics also expressed their concerns about the quality of production and the lack of new ideas.⁶⁸ Some were critical of the fact that documentary films were becoming increasingly reminiscent of TV programmes, since filmmakers were accepting more and more projects commissioned by TV stations in order to survive.⁶⁹ The decline in films' quality is also apparent from the fact that only a few documentaries from that period had (inter)national success. The 1982 edition report highlighted the fact that, unlike in previous years, no quarrels had disturbed the press conferences: 'Since no film was really exciting, there was no reason for heated debates'.⁷⁰ The festival was about to end its Yugoslav era quietly. The purpose for which it was created in 1954 – to be one of the proponents of Yugoslav unity – was fading away. 1991, the year in which the war in Slovenia and in Croatia started, was the last year when all the republics took part in the festival.

Conclusion

This research, based on extensive archival work, allows me to draw the following conclusions. As YDSFF screened the majority of the produced films, the change of its programming reflected a change in documentary filmmaking styles in Yugoslavia. The festival's programs that contested the foundational Yugoslav myths – the myths of Second World War and the socialist revolution – gradually transformed from a socialist perspective in the early 1960s towards a more national cause by the late 1980s. Completely opposite in nature, the critical films from the 1960/1970s and the ones from the late 1980s and 1990 differed in three major points: their ideological framework (socialist vs. anti-socialist), the level of criticism towards the socialist state (extremely high vs. relatively high), and the choice of themes (contemporary vs. historical themes).

In terms of ideology, while the documentary programs from the 60 and 70s promoted the common Yugoslav (socialist) identity, many of those from the late 80s and 90s departed from it, whether or not the selected films dealt with the problems of the socialist state. Although oppositional to some phenomena within the Yugoslav socialism, the Black Wave, as I have demonstrated through analysis of Makavejev's and Žilnik's documentaries, argued for reforms to the socialist state, and not against the socialist state as such. Therefore, although they were clearly critical, it was within a socialist paradigm: the criticism they expressed demonstrated a strong socialist component, one which was aimed at improving the existing system, and not at capitalist restoration. On the other hand, although the late 80s programs did not always attack the socialist state at all, an important part of these programs did abandon socialist Yugoslav values, focussing instead on the interests of one particular national group, its national history and traditions.

That said, the level of criticism towards the socialist state expressed in the programs from the first period was significantly higher than in the ones from the second period. Concerned with the reforms to the socialist state, the majority of the 60s/70s films were very critical towards the specificities of how socialism was being implemented. On the other hand, the late 80s films, concerned with the interests of one particular national group, sometimes did not speak of the problems of the socialist state at all. The introduction of themes that focussed on the interests and history of particular national groups represented a definitive break with the socialist narrative. Although some of the documentaries from the late 80s harshly criticised socialist Yugoslavia, the change of the program's course from socialist to anti-socialist was reflected not in the level of criticism expressed, but in its kind and in the choice of themes.

Finally, the change of narrative introduced a change in theme choice related to the notions of past and present: as the narrative moved from socialist to nationalist, the focus moved from the present to the past. The socialist filmmakers were concerned with what they considered an unsatisfactory situation in Yugoslav socialism and hence they often discussed the contemporary themes, usually related to various injustices in the state's treatment of individuals. On the other hand, the filmmakers of the 80s whose work I discussed in this article, were concerned with making a distinction between the Yugoslav national groups. Therefore, they often focussed on national history, which they considered could enable them to prove these differences. If they discussed contemporary themes, they focussed on the

state's injustice towards a particular national group or an individual as a representative of a national group, and not on an individual as such.

The analysis of the polemics around of the Black Wave demonstrates the existence of a certain freedom of political criticism in socialist Yugoslavia, as well as the inconsistencies of the state's control in the field of culture, rather than the dissident nature of this film production. Both periods are marked by political and economic crises, but the response to these crises is different. In the first period the filmmakers are demanding that the state resolve these issues, while in the second one they are agitating for the change of the system, focussed on the resolutions of the problems within their own national group. While the 60s brought artistic experimentation and an avant-garde that contributed to the *development* of Yugoslav socialist society, the changing political climate of the (late) 80s, in Yugoslavia as well as in Europe, stimulated new approaches to cultural programming and production, and introduced a return to retrograde nationalist currents that assisted its disintegration. Last but not least, although the state brutally suffocated Black Wave production, when analysing its 'dissident' component, we must keep in mind that these films were produced within established production companies and, like other films from the period, co-financed by the state. With all this in mind, the first films that could be considered as anti-Yugoslav, and therefore 'dissident', appeared in the festival only in the late 80s, two decades after the controversial period of 1967–1973, and a few years before the total change in programming practices that accompanied the disintegration of the country – and the festival – in 1992.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Daniel Morgan and David Archibald for their invaluable comments on the draft of this article, as well as Dragana Milić from the Yugoslav Film Archives Library in Belgrade for her help in preserving the festival's catalogues and for being of continuous help throughout this research.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes

1. Soviet-Albanian split happened in 1961.
2. See Andreas Kötzing, *Kultur- und Filmpolitik im Kalten Krieg: Die Filmfestivals von Leipzig und Oberhausen in gesamtdeutscher Perspektive, 1954–1972* [Cultural and Film Policies in the Cold War: The Leipzig and Oberhausen Film Festivals from an All-German Perspective, 1954–1972] (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2013). Stefano Pisu, *Stalin a Venezia. L'Urss alla Mostra del cinema fra diplomazia culturale e scontro ideologico, 1932–1953* [Stalin in Venice. The USSR at the Venice Film Festival between Cultural Diplomacy and an Ideological Clash (1932–1953)] (Catanzaro: Rubbettino Editore, 2013). Caroline Moine, *Screened Encounters, The Leipzig Documentary Film Festival, 1955–1990* (New York, Oxford: Berghahn, 2018).

3. See Lydia Papadimitriou and Jeffrey Ruoff, eds., *Film Festivals: Origins and Trajectories*. Spec. Issue of *New Review of Film and Television Studies*, 14:1 (Taylor and Francis Online, 2016).
4. Dunja Jelenković, 'Politics, Ideology, and Programming Practices: How the Yugoslav Documentary and Short Film Festival Abandoned the Idea of Yugoslavia', in *New Review of Film and Television Studies* 14, no. 1 (2016), 76–92; 'The Film Festival as a Vehicle for Memory Officialization. The Afterlife of WWII in the Yugoslav Documentary and Short Film Festival, 1954–2004', in *Documentary Film Festivals: Methods, History, Politics*, eds. Aida Vallejo and Ezra Winton, Vol. I (Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), 101–122; 'Film Festivals as an Arena for Political Debate – Yugoslav Black Wave in Belgrade and Oberhausen Film Festival, 1967–1973', in *Cultural Transfer and Political Conflicts*, eds. Kötzing and Moine (2017), 47–62. Regarding other film festivals, see for example Dragan Batančev 'The Belgrade FEST, or What Happened when Peckinpah Met Wajda' in *Cultural Transfer and Political Conflicts. Film Festivals in the Cold War*, eds. Andreas Kötzing and Caroline Moine (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2017), 153–166.
5. See Lorraine Mortimer, *Terror and Joy, The Films of Dušan Makavejev* (University of Minnesota Press, 2008). Vlastimir Sudar, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Political Dissident. The Life and Work of Aleksandar Petrovic* (London: Intellect Ltd, 2013). Gal Kirn, Dubravka Sekulić, and Žiga Testen, eds., *Surfing the Black. Yugoslav Black Wave Cinema and Its Transgressive Moments* (Maastricht: Jan van Eyck Academie, 2012). Greg de Cuir, Jr., *Yugoslav Black Wave. Polemical Film from 1963 to 1972 in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia* (Belgrade: Film Center Serbia, 2011). For more general publications, see: Aniko Imre, ed., *East European Cinemas* (New York and London: Routledge, 2005), Julian Graffy, Dina Iordanova, Richard Taylor, Nancy Wood, eds. *The BFI Companion to Eastern European and Russian Cinema* (London: BFI, 2000).
6. Gal Kirn, 'New Yugoslav Cinema – A Humanist Cinema? Not Really' in Kirn, Sekulić, Testen (2012), 11–44.
7. See Nikica Gilić, 'Post-Yugoslav Film and the Construction of New National Cinemas', in *Contemporary Southeastern Europe*, 4, no. 2 (2017), 102–120.
8. Pavle Levi, *The Disintegration in Frames. Aesthetics and Ideology in the Yugoslav and Post-Yugoslav Cinema* (Stanford University Press, 2007). Daniel J. Goulding, *Liberated cinema – The Yugoslav Experience, 1945–2001* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2002).
9. Dunja Jelenković, *Une histoire culturelle et politique du Festival yougoslave du film documentaire et du court-métrage, 1954–2004. Du socialisme yougoslave au nationalisme serbe* [Cultural and Political History of the Yugoslav Documentary and Short Film Festival, 1954–2004. From Yugoslav Socialism to Serbian Nationalism], PhD diss., University Paris Saclay, 2017.
10. I was present when the institution's then director Gradimir Dimitrijević organized the books and documents to be thrown as 'old paper'. Trying to salvage what was possible under the circumstances, I contacted the Yugoslav Film Archives Library and the University of Arts in Belgrade whose employees came to collect what they could.

11. The partisans regrouped the leftist antifascist members of all the South Slavic national groups, as well as the antifascist of non-Slavic origin from the region. They were combatting the Axe, but also different collaborating groups, most notably, the Croatian ultra-right movement the Ustashes, and the Serbian royalist and ultra-right movement the Chetniks. All the six constitutive peoples in socialist Yugoslavia were South Slavs: Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians, Montenegrins, and, as of 1971, Muslims from Bosnia. The name of the country also refers to this: Yugo–South, Slavia–Slavic.
12. They quickly established the first military film units (1944), procured the necessary film equipment, and gradually opened film schools and production houses in all six republics.
13. Archive of Yugoslavia (AJ), 405, S27, Documents on the celebration of the Yugoslav cinema's 10th anniversary.
14. Vladimir Jovičić, 'Crni talas u našem filmu' [Black Wave in our Cinema], *Borba*, 3, no. 8 (1969), 17–24.
15. Films about Second World War and Socialist revolution were so numerous at the festival that until 1968 they even had their own category in the catalogues. Some of the filmmakers that most often dealt with this film theme in their documentaries were Stjepan Zaninović, Puriša Đorđević, Stole Janković, Žika Čukulić, Žika Ristić.
16. Filmmakers associated with New Yugoslav Film had different styles and approaches to these themes and have never formed any official or coherent group. See films by Karpo Godina, Dušan Makavejev, Živojin Pavlović, Aleksandar Saša Petrović, Želimir Žilnik.
17. Gradual liberalization of culture followed the separation with the USSR in 1948 and the victory of the "liberal" political option in Yugoslavia in the mid-60s.
18. New Film is associated with the period 1961–1973, and Black Wave with 1963–1972.
19. Such as impressionism, fauvism, etc. The term 'Black wave' was first used in: Jovičić, 'Crni talas ...', 1969.
20. Radina Vučetić, *Monopol na istinu* [Monopoly on the Truth] (Belgrade: Clio, 2016), 48.
21. According to the information from the documentary *Censored without Censorship* (Dinko Tucaković, Milan Nikodijević, Art & Popcorn, SRB, 2007) only about 20–30 documentaries did not get this permission at the time when they were made.
22. *Bunkerisani filmovi* – films that were not officially banned, but were prevented from being screened publicly, because they were 'put in a bunker'.
23. The production houses usually sent almost all the films that they produced between two festival editions. Out of that, the majority was accepted, as for instance in 1963, when out of 115 applied to the festival, 95 were screened. More than once all the received films were shown (1967, 1988). See Catalogues 1961–1991 and Lj. V. 'Nema odbijenih filmova' [No Film Was Rejected], *Politika*, 18, no. 3 (1988).
24. Films went to festivals abroad either by the decision of the Commission for Foreign Cultural Relations, or by direct invitation from foreign programmers. Among the most common international guests there were the representatives of

- the festivals in Oberhausen, Leipzig, Bilbao, and Krakow. See Report about the 1980 edition, published in the YDSFF Catalogue 1981, 67.
25. Some festivals, such as Manaki Film Festival in Macedonia (since 1979), screened documentaries as a part of their programmes, but YDSFF was the only event completely dedicated to this film kind.
 26. Želimir Žilnik, 'The Packed Hall of the House of Unions', in *Kratki metar – 60 godina/The Short Film Fest – 60 Years*, ed. Dunja Jelenković (Belgrade: Direkcija FEST-a, 2013), 297.
 27. M. Jovanović, 'Ej, vreme leti ... našem filmu' [Hey, the Time Flies ... for our Cinema], *Mladost*, 17, no. 4 (1969).
 28. Makavejev, 'Oko parade'. (For example, both Eli Finci, 1911–1980, and Milutin Čolić, 1919–2009, were about 20 years older than Makavejev, 1932–2019.)
 29. A highway that stretched across Yugoslavia, from Slovenia in the Northwest, to Macedonia in the Southeast.
 30. Mortimer, *Terror and Joy*, 42.
 31. Odluke žirija IX Festivala JDFK 1962. [Decisions of the 1962 YDSFF Jury], Catalogue 1963, 8, 'Najveće priznanje Dušanu Vukotiću' [The Greatest Recognition to Dusan Vukotic], without signature, *Oslobođenje*, 15, no. 3 (1962).
 32. Award list 1954–2002 is available in *Knjiga filma*, ed. Jelenković, (2003), 285–352.
 33. Mortimer, *Terror and Joy*, 42. Mannheim Film Festival website, Archives https://www.iffmh.de/the-festival/history/1962/index_eng.html (accessed November 16, 2020).
 34. Dušan Makavejev, 'Oko Parade' [About the Parade], *Mediantrop*, <https://www.mediantrop.rankomunitic.org/mediantrop-specijal-mak/161-dusan-makavejev-okoparade>. (accessed November 05, 2020).
 35. Ibid.
 36. Vladislav Urban 'Satisfakcija i priznanje Žilniku' [Satisfaction and Recognition for Žilnik], *Dnevnik*, 28 March 1967, *Neoplanta Film. Documentation, 1966–1971 (for internal use)*, 47.
 37. See *Neoplanta Film. Documentation, 1966–1971 (for internal use)*, 34–50.
 38. Bogdan Tirnanić, 'Želimir Žilnik, prvi put' [Želimir Žilnik, For the First Time], *Filmska kultura*, Nr 54, 18 June 1967, in *Neoplanta Film. Documentation, 1966–1971 (for internal use)*, 39.
 39. Želimir Žilnik, 'The Packed Hall of the House of Unions', 2013, 298.
 40. Urban 'Satisfakcija ...', 1967.
 41. Award list, 1954–2002.
 42. Regarding the film *Little Pioneers*... its full title is a quote from a famous pioneer song: *Pioniri maleni, mi smo vojska prava, svakog dana ničemo ko zelena trava* [Little pioneers, we are a proper army, Like the green grass, we grow daily]. Regarding the awards, *The Unemployed* and *Little Pioneers*... won the Silver Medal (YDSFF 1968), *June Turmoil*, a special diploma (YDSFF, 1969), and *Black Film*, a commendation (YDSFF, 1971).
 43. *Neoplanta Film. Documentation 1966–1971 (for internal use)*, 34–88.
 44. Ibid.
 45. Milutin Čolić, 'Sklad stvarne i umetničke slike' [A Harmony of Real and Artistic Images], *Politika*, 22 March 1968. Unsigned, 'Škanatin istraživački podvig' [Škanata's Research Accomplishment], *V. Novosti*, 07 March 1970.

46. Interview with Škanata in *Škanata. Pred izazovima stvarnosti* [Škanata. Facing the Challenges of Reality], Miroslav Jokić (Belgrade: Dunav Film, 2001), 117.
47. Cannes: Aleksandar Petrović, *I Even Met Happy Gypsies*, FIPRESCI & Jury's Special Grand Prix Ex-aequo (1967). Berlin: Živojin Pavlović, *The Rats Woke Up*, Silver Bear for Best Director (1967); Dušan Makavejev, *Innocence Unprotected*, Silver Bear Extraordinary Jury Prize (1968); Želimir Žilnik, *Early Works*, Golden Bear (1969). Venice: Puriša Djordjević, *Morning*, Volpi Cup for Best Actor for Ljubiša Samardžić (1967); Živojin Pavlović, *The Ambush*, CIALC Award (1969). Oberhausen: In the six-year period from 1967 to 1973, Yugoslav filmmakers received up to 26 awards at the festival in Oberhausen. See Jelenković, *Une Histoire culturelle et politique ...*, 2017, 217.
48. Petrović was in the jury of YDSFF in 1966 and Makavejev in 1968 (Award Lists, 1954–2002).
49. Vučetić, *Monopol na istinu*, 2016, 270.
50. *I Miss Sonia Henie* was directed by: Karpo Godina, Tinto Brass, Milos Forman, Buck Henry, Dušan Makavejev, Puriša Đorđević, Paul Morrissey Frederick Wiseman. The only available clue about these films not being screened is short news, which stated that one Neoplanta's film was withdrawn from the program. (LJ. K, 'Karta više za dokumentarce' [One More Ticket for the Documentaries], *Vjesnik*, 07 March 1972.) According to the memoir of Želimir Žilnik, three films were actually withdrawn (email correspondence with Želimir Žilnik from 27 December 2012 and 18 February 2013).
51. See M. Vujančić 'Uvrijedjeni lideri' [The Offended Leaders], *Oslobodjenje*, 26 February 1972.
52. See the case of Dušan Makavejev in the collection of documents on the most important political processes in Yugoslavia 1968–1990: Srdja M. Popović, *Poslednja instanca* [The Last Instance] (Belgrade: Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, Serbia, 2003), 161–80.
53. 1991 Slovenia, 1991–1995 Croatia, 1992–1995 Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1998–1999 Kosovo. The two republics that stayed together, Serbia and Montenegro, kept the name of (Federal Republic of) Yugoslavia until 2004.
54. It also kept the adjective 'Yugoslav' in its name until 2004 when it replaced it with 'Belgrade'.
55. YDSFF Catalogues 1980–1991.
56. *Thank you for the Freedom* (*Hvala na slobodi*, Krsto Škanata, Dunav Film, 1988), *Do as Ordered* (*Postupi po naređenju*, Nikša Jovičević, FRZ Beograd, 1989), *Edge Images of Hunger* (*Rubne slike gladi*, Nenad Puhovski, Filmoteka 16, 1989, screened in 1990).
57. Jelenković, *Une Histoire culturelle et politique ...*, 2017, 139.
58. Parts of contemporary Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina.
59. See for instance film trilogy by Sveta Pavlović: *The Sound of the Trumpet* (*Zov Trube*, Filmske Novosti, 1974), *The Last Goodbye* (*Poslednji pozdrav*, Filmske Novosti, 1982) and *The Story of Živojin* (*Priča o Živojinu*, Filmske Novosti, 1985).
60. Golden Medal.
61. Nevenka Opačić, Interview with Miki Stamenković, *RTV Revija*, no date, 1988, <http://www.yugopapir.com/2018/03/miki-stamenkovic-88-narodi-na-ovoj.html> (accessed November 16, 2020).

62. "Pogane, skrnave, siluju i kolju, vade oči, spaljuju žive nemoćnike"
63. "sveta žrtva"
64. Dragan Belić, 'Život se ne predaje' [Life does not Surrender], *Borba*, 30 March 1988; Milan Mitić, 'Kosovo u paketu' [Kosovo in a Package], *V. Novosti*, 31 March 1988.
65. *Blood and Ashes of Jasenovac* was in line with the socialist narrative, insisting on the ideological, and not national aspect of the crimes committed. Produced in Croatia, it is also in line with the socialist idea that nationalism should be first fought against in one's own republic. The film is mentioned here because, together with Škanata's film, it demonstrates a greater interest in the history of civil war in the 80s.
66. Bojan Munjin, Interview with Jovan Jovanović, 'Ne pripadam svetu cenzurisanih ljudi' [I Don't Belong to the World of the Censored People], *Novosti*, 18 June 2020, <https://arhiva.portalnovosti.com/2010/06/ne-pripadam-svetu-cenzurisanih-ljudi/> (accessed November 16, 2020).
67. The YDSFF Chronicles 1954–1982, Catalogue 1983, p. 64. For example, according to the catalogues, the festival screened 123 films in 1966 and 153 in 1974.
68. A. M., 'Produkcija slaba, festival dobar' [Production weak, festival good], *Politika Ekspres*, 18 March 1984.
69. Milutin Ćolić, 'Između brige i nade' [Between Worry and Hope], *Politika*, 21 March 1984. This was an overture for the complete dominance of TV documentaries as of 1992, due to the drastically reduced production because of the war and the reduction of the festival to Serbia and Montenegro.
70. The YDSFF Chronicles 1954–1982, Catalogue 1983, 64.

ORCID

Dunja Jelenković  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4626-1244>

Notes on contributor

Dr. Dunja Jelenković is a historian, specialist in the Yugoslav documentary cinema and cultural history of post-Yugoslav states. Her research deals with film festivals and the relations between image, history and memory. Her doctoral thesis focussed on the programming practices of the Yugoslav Documentary and Short Film Festival, 1954–2004 (Paris Saclay University, 2017). The project was funded by the Foundation for Cultural Heritage, laboratory of excellence LabEx PATRIMA (Paris, France). She is currently a Marie Curie Fellow at the University Ca' Foscari in Venice, working on her postdoctoral project 'CBA TRIESTE – The Cinematic Battle for the Adriatic: Films, Frontiers, and the Trieste Crisis' (since September 2021). She is also associated researcher at the Centre for Cultural History of Contemporary Societies at the University of Versailles and works as an independent programmer in the field of documentary cinema.
