

Milena Dragičević Šešić  
University of Arts in Belgrade  
Arts and Culture Program of Open Society Foundation, Budapest

**Conclusive remarks from the Conference:  
Facing the past / Creating the future**

Last week, here in Sarajevo, I had an opportunity to see two different faces of the region. One face open for dialogue, meetings, happy to meet the others and possibly create a platform for further common work and knowledge exchange – a face of independent cultural sector. This face thinks with criticism and asks difficult questions although still not being able to find all the answers.

Another face, strict, stiffed, tired, resigned and “professional”, but without contemporary knowledge or modern skills, is a face of public sector in the culture of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the whole region. A face that was split in the two room-ends both during the seminar (1) and during the coffee breaks. A face giving fast answers because it loyally accepts given Dayton's and other boundaries. A face that does not want to critically question neither itself nor others – particularly not development horizons and perspectives.

In both cases it is about, as Jasmina Husanović indicated in her text – the cognitive proletariat, the “precarious” society layer. It can be differentiated not only by affiliation to the particular sector, but also a particular way of thinking.

There was also a third face here – a face of Europe and the world which wants to give a hand to the region and hear region's needs and wishes without enforcing its own values and methods. A face of Europe ready to critically judge the potentials and the readiness of the society to pro-actively commit something on behalf of its own common future.

The aims of this conference were multilateral:

- To indirectly evaluate and celebrate the twenty years of Soros foundation presence in the region, especially in the domain of art and culture
- To outline and focus on existence of an independent, active scene and the activism that marked the war and the transition period
- To create the conditions for confronting the past through the debate, discuss the ways of construction of the past and its remembering – the ways of creating a collective memory of the nations, groups and local communities
- To give the encouragement for recognizing and for the support of the new energy in the cultural dynamics of the region (covering the art creation, production, collaboration and exchange practices)

We heard many different statements and approaches based on different theoretical bases, both modern and postmodern. Among the mentioned names were Brecht, Adorno, Kierkegaard, Canetti, Tsvetaeva, Bourdieu, but also Dragan Klaić, Mirjana Miočinović, Jacques Rancière, Alain Badiou...

What is particularly important: there was a lot of charm, raciness and optimism. There was neither cynicism, irony, bitterness, nor stubbornness and contumacy because of enjoyment in opposing -

none of those elements that had been so often denoting regional congresses in the past twenty years. However, there was analysis, criticism, protest against all those aspects in the society and in us, demanding judgments and changes.

Many participants were not able to appear. I will mention just a few of them: Maja Bajević because of performance in Madrid, Jasmila Žbanić because of a movie shooting; Oliver Frljić, Branko Cvejić, Dino Mustafić, Dušan Jovanović because of premiers they are working on, Boris Buden, Dubravka Ugrešić, Goran Stefanovski and Ana Vujanović because of international project assignments, Husein Oručević and Tanja Miletić Oručević because of PHD studies abroad, Biljana Srbljanović and Ivana Stefanović because of family obligations...

Confronting the past at this conference started in a bunker in Konjic – bunker ARK D 2, a bunker that is not only the cold war symbol but also a symbol of all the fears, phantasms that lead into self-isolation, into deviation from the world streams, as it is clearly outlined with the exhibition title – NO NETWORK.

Very important conclusion of the conference, which has never been noticed and discussed before, was the following:

We did not share a common past!

Moreover, in the same manner:

Since our past was not truly common (2), our future will not be truly common either! (Vladimir Milčín).

The sooner we acknowledge those statements, the better we will establish the platform for questioning different constructions of the past, different adopted narrations, the way of labeling and memorizing. The platform for questioning the policy of remembrance is to reach a new culture of memory which is different from the policy of "antiquization" (Macedonia), anticommunism (Croatia), Middle Ages heritage revival (Serbia) and also different from the policy of self-victimization.

Who are the actors of the policy of remembering, who are the ones having RIGHTS FOR NARRATION? When did we start, like individual artists and intellectuals to take over the responsibility?

Milica Tomić showed us when and how the Albanian victims from March 28th 1989, together with Serbian military and police crimes, reached the public political and media life as a fact. The public and media silence made this affair invisible and non-existing. Even in the collective remembrance of "Second Serbia" (opposition to Milosević's regime), the first military intervention on the streets happened on March 9th 1991 in Belgrade. Art work of Milica Tomić makes this affair visible because it describes it like a historical fact (3). Therefore "XY-crime reconstruction" became a creation written into the "policy of remembering from the bottom" – and it enables one new culture of memory in Serbia, a culture in which Serbian crimes (crimes committed in the name of the nation) and Albanian victims (which do not exist in the collective consciousness of the Serbian people) are possible to be remembered ...

The right for narration, for our own story, confirms power of those who are controlling media and public space. Conquering that right and the right for the public act – through a creation of public space – is part of a battle for the community and collective emancipation. Performance art should not

only be an instrument that enables us to criticize society, but also the position of performance artists itself needs a critical look. (Aleksandra Jovičević).

A publicly read out poem of Ferida Duraković was part of a process for public space conquering, confirming that in the wider society space, instead of scientific, political, media and cultural establishment, truly THE ARTIST takes over THE RIGHT OF PUBLIC CRIME INTIMATION!

Maja Bajević, Milica Tomić, Mrđan Bajić, Sanja Iveković, Andrea Kulundžić... many of those activist and artist groups – The Right for the City from Zagreb, The Fifth Park from Belgrade - claim themselves the right to create a public space in the moments when the same is getting narrower and to bring in the disturbing themes, to confront the public audience with the things it doesn't want to see and hear.

Therefore the project of Monument Group: "Yugoslav Studies", as a platform for a public speech about the wars and the experiences of the nineties, a platform for community affirmation and development, represents rare case where the responsible speech about the war victims and the antifascist opinion can be heard in Serbia.

Two, seemingly simple, questions have been asked (Milica Tomić):

1. How to name the war that happened during the nineties?
2. Did the war finish at all, or it was continued using different instruments?

The answer came from Lev Kreft: Maybe through the culture again!

Although the answer on the first question, accepted by the majority and by acclamation, was that it is about the war for relocation of social fortune into the private pockets (Žilnik), further discussions showed that some other demands resided in the root of the conflict – the demands for collective rights, for "our own" narration about the past, for "our own" creation of the attitude towards the present.

The answer to another question – that instead of a peace we have an ideology of reconciliation, ideology that hides the crimes, insists on ethnic separation and balance - results in creating the conditions for general irresponsibility and apathy.

Therefore, it is important to find the way to accept the responsibility – the responsibility for the crime of silence, not only for war speeches staying unnoticed, but also for this crime of silence happening nowadays. For example, for the situation of forced isolation of Kosovo citizens whose free traveling is limited to Albania, Macedonia and Turkey. Do we have an answer?

Although a light skepticism was shown towards emancipating power of art, it was indicated that there is also a culture of resistance, dissent and non-compliance. The artists bring the conscious decision and publicly refuse to participate in dominant opinion. The culture **of resilience**, is practice of the Monument group ("Spomenik"), Women in black ("Žena u crnom"), "Dah theater", "Škart" group, etc. Those resistance points are the points of the future!

Those points are connected in the present (Janko Ljumović) through the fight for the wider public space and against neo-liberal strategies. "The fight for the common future will be possible only if we accept the importance and create consensus around those two questions" (Teodor Celakoski).

Art exists exactly to continuously question the things that are considered normal, common and self-explanatory (Predrag Cvetičanin). Specially the premise like: the decision-making is in the hands of

the politicians and political parties, and if we want to change the world, we need to join (some) party and its activities. Or the attitude: ethnic separations are the necessity, we could go further only if we accept the necessity of the ethnic separations and if in our future conversations we start from the point of ethno-separation, ethno-politics and ethno-economy as a REALITY.

The art constantly provokes and questions those common attitudes and points to their destructiveness in turning the citizen into a voter in the culture of lies (Dubravka Ugrešić).

We live in the culture of remembering that is ruled by two terrors:

The terror of forgetting – which forces us to forget the things we remember

The terror of remembering – which forces us to remember the things we do not remember, the things we do not have in our personal experiences (Andrea Zlatař Violić)

This culture of remembering creates new myths – fast and proficiently. It doesn't matter if they are created in connection with new events (“Knin has been liberated!”), or as cults of the new heroes or about the cults of the victim. Sometimes even five minutes in the media is enough for creating a myth (Andrea Zlatař Violić) and for demystification is needed at least ten years. Very often that new mystification bares the processes of self-victimization with the amnesty of own ethnic group for the crimes over others.

Jeton Neziraj outlines that the art, instead of the question “What did the others do to us?” should ask “And what did we do to them?” Of course, the art and the artists who are asking those questions, together with the ones working in a community, are becoming stigmatized, “because they touch the wounds that hurt” (Jeton Neziraj).

The other red line of the Conference considered the controversial attitudes about the role of an artist and the art in the society especially within a subject: *The traces of previous country in the art*. Pavle Levi showed that the art can offer depoliticized, cultured perspective and objectification and commodification of the cultural products (“boutique Yugoslavia” – where the art becomes the place for garbage accumulation). However, he is interested for the art that does not accept the flow of history and “de facto” current situation, the art practice that always doubts governing definitions and ruling braces: ethnic-nationalism and global neoliberalism! He studies the art that produces new platforms of public policies, to contribute to new agendas, to emphasize the questions from the past by confronting them with the dominant, conjectured thesis.

The artist's experiences brought numerous multi-perspective approaches in this Conference, and that diversity of the perspectives was a direct consequence of the belonging to the different age generations.

Following Želimir Žilnik, whose creative work still today is produced, shown and debated all over ex-Yugoslavia and the art of Mrđan Bajić, who invents his own, personal institution (Yugo-museum), at the time when the official institutions are dying away, and in whose work the remembering (as a battle against the emptiness of an amnesia) is a crucial part of the art practice. This is how his art works like “Who is responsible - I am responsible” and the monument to “Fića” in Kragujevac were created.

Haris Pašović's engagement opened a new perspective, who presents his art work in the other environments (regions of Bosnia and in Serbia), considering himself responsible for establishing the

conscious, critical communication within the region... Communication, defined not only by act, but also by directly declared attitude, without sentimentality and selective memory.

“Yes, I remember the previous life – the period when I was the happiest, but I also remember the five years of war – the period that was extremely important in formative and every other sense – and, I go further, living in this reality.” Haris Pašović also asks important questions for the future of common living in this region. How to perform in the towns whose name opens the unhealed wounds? How to perform when a part of the audience enjoys opening those wounds again? The answer is simple – perform for that group of people which wants it (however small the group it is). Perform for the people who in actors from Sarajevo theatre do not see the “other side”, another ethnic group, but the colleagues from whom they can learn and with whom they can create in joy. It should not be forgotten that in every community there are not only open and positive people. Unfortunately, the shouts like: “yes, we are the ones who raped your mothers” will still be heard in the audience as an attempt to decry the “others”. Still a lot of projects, meetings, conferences, collaboration workshops and changes in the public policies should happen in this region in order to go beyond (with the appropriate culture of memory) the open wounds from the past.

There is another one, often marginalized and forgotten perspective, brought by the artist Erzen Shkolloli from Kosovo. For Erzen, remembering Yugoslavia means remembering the schools they had left, remembering the isolation and growing up in the basements, in the parallel education system. It is also important to bring back that way of remembering Yugoslavia. Remembering not only the minorities with the rights (high minority standards in Vojvodina considering four minority groups: Hungarians, Romanians, Rusyns and Slovaks), but the minorities that those rights never had: like Roma and Vlachs. Those minorities were exposed to different strategies, for example the strategy of ignoring and forgetting the fact that the majority of Roma children never attended school (in socialist Yugoslavia the percentage of seven years old scholars never exceeded 90% and the percentage of scholars finishing the first grade of primary school hardly exceeded 80%). The inclusive strategy towards Vlachs reflected in active preparations of the six years olds for the school (for example learning the Serbian language before the first grade) and their integration into the institutions that glorified the Serbian heroes from the historical liberation wars (Karađorđe, Hajduk Veljko,..). This strategy was sending different message to the scholars than their schoolmates had in the other parts of Yugoslavia (school names were mostly connected with the heroes of the partisan liberation war and communist movement). So, the past was not the same for everyone, we do not have the same references on Yugoslavia, not only because of generation diversity but because of different key references.

There were numerous reactions on “remembering Yugoslavia”:

What is the heritage of Yugoslavia if it collapsed in the blood? (Slaven Tolj)

Did we finish the heritage sharing (probate division) and do we know who owns what? (Not yet, there is still a conflict – including the sharing of the literature and art heritage. However, there is a natural acceptance of once common heritage as our own, despite of ethnicity (for example acceptance of Meštrović in Serbia, as expressed in Mrdjan Bajić's speech).

Were we able to extract from the past the things that could be potential for the future – self-management for example (Branislav Dimitrijević)? The later workshop (A - *Dynamics of Civil Society Cultural Activism: Perspectives of the NGOs* ) showed that the peer-to-peer work norm in a civil sector, which rejects the competitiveness and ideology of “success”, is also a prestige of classical hierarchical leadership.

This part of the discussions and confronting the past had been ended with the optimistic estimation: We will easily create common past, if we DECIDE to create common future! (Lev Kreft)

The second part of the conference was dedicated to the conditions, the circumstances and the needs of creating the new strategies for the future of the region. Without recognizing the change leaders in the public policies and being aware of the much wider, global turbulences (Bojan Munjin), the participants of the conference were outlining the importance of the civil sector, not only because of its responsibility but also because of its “readiness” and “capability to evaluate” (Boris Bakal) – therefore because of possessing the knowledge, the skills and the critical perception (ethics) which motivates its action.

However, there are recognized potentials in the minority cultural institutions, no matter if they are newly formed or the old ones being developed under the new public policies. They are among the rare institutions free of political influence (which oppress the majority institutions) and free of market. This is how the journalist of *Feral Tribune*, critical voice suppressed by the “market”, could find the public space in the “Novosti” (the paper of Serbian minority in Croatia) – paper that wants and supports that critical attitude (4).

This dependent position of the culture and the relationship towards the “three headed dragon”: the state, the market and the international sponsors, is stated to be the biggest frustration of the critical intellectuals and artists throughout the region. Public policies are still ethnically based and if you are not recognized as an important institution for particular (minority or majority) group, if you try to develop “territorially and citizen-based” cultural policy (Sanjin Dragojević), then you will not belong to anyone and you will not get any material support. This is why, in its speech during the MESS opening, which we could consider as a conference speech, Dino Mustafić indicated the hard position of seven “federal” or “state” cultural institutions – institutions that no one cares about (5). It is important here to present his speech fully:

“This Festival tonight wants to protest against the catastrophic conditions in the culture. Against the closing of Art Gallery in Sarajevo, against the shameful ignorance of the Museum of Contemporary art “Ars Aevi”, against the fact that almost half of the century no dedicated specific building had been built for the culture, against non-investment in the culture, against the performing under the open roof, against the closing of our theaters, against the decline of our cultural and historical monuments, against the fact that the Ministry of the civil works BH this year did not give a coin to the National Museum of BH, Art Gallery BH, National University Library BH, Film Archive BH, History Archive BH, Literature and theater museum BH,... against the fact that the cultural budget of Federal Ministry for 2007. gets decreased by 73% and the cultural budget of Ministry of culture and sport for canton Sarajevo from 2008 gets decreased by 30%, against the absence of cultural policy, against the cultural darkness, against the the isolation of BH artists.. this is why I would ask from you to switch on the lights. **Let's switch on the lights and cure the darkness of the cultural policy in BH. Let's open the 51st<sup>st</sup> MESS with the lights.**”

It is important to outline, and that was mentioned in the discussion about cultural policies, how much the festivals and the festival policy have different meaning in different environments within South-Eastern Europe. As Florent Mehmeti said, festivals on Kosovo could be of crucial importance for opening the society and, as shown in the previous example, it could be seen how MESS directorate uses the festival as a public platform for advocacy and lobbying for public cultural interests (6).

Although during the whole conference there was noticeable criticism towards the public sector (especially regarding the functioning of the cultural ministries in the region), it is important to mention that there were also the examples of “good practices”. Two good examples of public policies were outlined – the promotion campaign of Montenegrin language (Varja Đukić) and the project of the center “Marina Abramović”, about post-industrial heritage of Cetinje (Svetlana Racanović). They showed the possibility of good cooperation between civil and public sector and the potentials to rationally heddle the arguments into the public debate and clearly ARTICULATE the public interest. (Advocating Montenegrin language: “Yes, I speak with the dialect of Eastern-Herzegovina, with literacy standard of my father’s generations and mine, but now for the first time I can write down the speech of my grandmother, “šjutra” (“tomorrow”) and many other expressions” – Varja Đukić).

It is clearly proclaimed in those examples that, even when being initiated by the state, the quality, the depth, the inclusivity of the project will primarily depend on civil sector participation in its realization.

The second “dragon head” – the market, aroused the emotional and flagrant comments. The general consensus was that the market, as a completely “free” market, doesn’t exist, and this applies even less for the cultural and art market. However, some differences regarding the attitude towards the market were outlined:

- a. Abandon the market and market’s operation laws – fight neoliberal paradigm! (Dejan Ilić, Teo Celakoski)
- b. Exploit at least part of the possibilities from the market, develop diversified sources of financing (public sector, donations, market...).

It was obvious that the ones coming from the countries with more transparent and better public policies had favored this second approach (Katja Praznik). Negative reactions regarding possibility of diversification of financial sources had been closely connected with the, usually, very strict donator’s demands, having the obligations towards “market effectiveness” even in their application form, leaving you with the feeling that you are “unsuccessful” and “unskillful” by only turning to them (Dejan Ilić). (The questions about the successful sale, distribution channels and marketing are dominant, while cultural quality of the project is usually pushed aside).

There are objective reasons why there is still a need and an importance of foreign donator’s presence in the region. Those reasons lie in the inordinacy of the SYSTEM (direct responsibility of the public sector), lacking the instruments of cultural policy, inability of the market and economy actors (companies, corporations) to include sponsorship into its marketing policy, the omission of philanthropy culture, low standard of the population, lost cultural capital of the population... In spite of this, we have heard a lot about recent donator’s withdrawal from the region and transferring this role to the local actors (i.e. Swiss cultural program). However, there are also new efforts on engagement of the art and cultural sector in the processes of the society transformation (open society foundations) through activities belonging to different domains (education, social work, political and legal agendas).

The most important point is that the new energy regarding realistic and possible new actors has been identified at the conference: student associations, trade union movements (in spite of strong criticism towards them), action groups, societies, networks – especially the ones active in cross and trans-sector.

The agreement was reached in the statement: “Our future is one great work” (Bojan Munjin).

Free public space, which had been continuously abolished, is the necessary condition both for modern creativeness (and that is the tradition we are carrying to the future) and for democracy and the truly living in the culture. Andrea Zlata quoted Primo Levi that the beginning of public space is where we “have the place to say and when we want to hear the story of the others”. The art became de-political, because it had to be liberated of subversion, criticism, questioning in order to “reach the market”. This is how sequentially the art public area is stopping to be the area for debate (and this was the main area of the free public word between the sixties and the eighties in this region).

On the other side, the art in the public (para-state) sector exists in the conformist atmosphere, where the principle of surviving dominates, so the ideas about the necessity of “loyalty to the institution” became “loyalty to the government” (B. Pavićević). The result is that the principles of freedom, critical thinking and the culture of resistance and dissent are being moved from the institutions of the public sector into civil, independent sector, and especially into relatively big space of free digital world.

Exactly those new generations of the artists-activists, who were wading the way from Linux to public space, today arrived first with the questions of social justice and public policies (Emina Višnić and T. Celakoski). This is why the importance of new media for Eastern-European artistic activism is indisputable. Here Vuk Ćosić spoke about immense possibilities digital media are giving to us, i.e. they enable us to react to anomalies in the so called real time, and not to react to consequences afterwards.

The testimony of Alban Muja confirmed that the new relations, like solidarity movements and fight for the public space, are focused on new media: including video-art, music and film projects initiated by establishing the new media organisations (radio stations) and new organizational structures (film festivals).

For the public good – for the public space... although the meaning was changed (hybrid, new, virtual... public space) – what are then these “commons” - common public good?

Many questions have been raised:

Are we self-marginalizing ourselves through the civil society logic?

Did we maybe create the new public space for the political activity?

Maybe we should accept the democratic play through multiparty system and create or join one of these parties we have to enter directly to the battlefield of political public space (through the pirate party like that of Vuk Ćosić or the Green party, etc.)?

Are we ready to accept the artist not only as an individual but also as a person coming from another country (crucial for Erzen Shkolloli) or a person speaking language now named differently (Varja Đukić)?

Are we ready to work together, on equal basis? (workshop A has just suggested the creation of “Foundation KULTURA NOVA” where everyone will be able to decide about the resource sharing, not only the experts).

Did we establish the connection between the ideas (thinking) and the activism (realization of the ideas)?

Moreover, in the end: How to fight against the party (direct political) influence in culture and against professionalism in politics (excluding politics in a specific sphere)?

How to fight against the glorification of the copyrights, as a prerequisite for the creative industry development (copyright-based industries), and at the same time, not to suppress the cultural rights such as the right for access to culture and the rights for common cultural heritage of the mankind?

The answers on many of those questions however were avoided. In the discussion about our languages it was never mentioned the different naming of Bosnian and “Boshnyak” language or different perceptions of having one language with four names or four languages with one name...

Even, we are not aware enough that the participants from Kosovo, Macedonia and Slovenia do not easily take part in the debate, although the English language always stays as an option. “Our” language, our mother tongue facilitates the communication in the “center” but it can raise a barrier for those ones who don't speak it good enough, coming from the edges of ex-Yugoslavian spaces.

Therefore, it is obvious that in the cultural field we need the following:

- Critical historiography (Andrea Zlutar)
- Complete change of the educational system (Andrea Zlutar)
- Contextualize and build the new methodology of activism and cultural work (Katarina Pejović)
- develop different language of the civil society in which we will not hide the art under the carpet of “reconciliation” (Borka Pavićević)
- Different monuments and different heroes (Shkelzen Malliqi)
- Political subject that is able to remember (Milica Tomić)
- Culture of resistance and resilience (Dijana Milošević)
- Non-compliance with the compromises using the matrix of ethnocapital and ethno politics as a norm
- Trans-sectoral, disciplinary and contextual acting
- Self-activism through a self-connecting of the actors of change and the artistic practices.
- Development of the competences, the skills of advocacy and persuasion, on every level: local, national and regional
- Development of the advocacy on the European level (in the name of the region) which would help in bringing back the general regional capacity and opens regional horizons of development
- Knowledge transfer from the civil towards the public sector, from one environment into another, from the world towards us and vice versa

Especially we need the action plans for the following:

- Completely new platforms for the future collaborative, cross-sectoral processes (art-scientific, business-artistic, education-artistic...). International platforms, not only regional and European but also covering regions like the Black Sea, Danube, Africa and Asia
- New collaboration projects with the possibility of the prolonged action (for example DVD collection of artist's work with paid author's rights, recognizing the rights of further free usage within cultural, media and educational processes.
- New relationships with the media, actually the re-creation of a standard mass media having not only “market orientation”, but also “social responsibility”.
- New policy of mutual translation (to re-introduce ourselves to each other and make each other understood) in which the funds like Traduki's will be supplemented with regional funds for translation

- and cooperation including Albanian, Greek and the other language of our societies.
- Regional foundations (The KULTURA NOVA) and regional process which we already have named as Sarajevo process

**Let us switch on the lights and cure the darkness of the public policies in the region! Let us enlighten the new ways of work and cooperation!**

**Our future is one great work for all of us!**

## **Appendix**

(1) The seminar of the strategic planning for the public sector institutions

(2) Of course, the past of Haris Pašović is not the past of Erzen Shkolloli. Their statements clearly show that Haris's Yugoslavian experience ended in 1992 and Erzen's "Yugoslavian" experience starts just in 2000 with the exhibition of "Balkan art generator" in Brussels (curator Branislava Anđelković, producer Violeta Simjanovska, Multimedia Skopje) which was created after the First regional conference of independent cultural scene in Sarajevo 1999 and which brought together again the independent actors of civil and private sector (publishers). (The years of Erzen's life in Yugoslavia were the years of nationalism, separation, wars, therefore the memory of one isolated parallel educational system in Kosovo, the memory of Serbia, which under the Yugoslavian name, enforces the repression. So this is not the memory that "includes", but "excludes".

(3) It is important to say that she received this information through the media – Slovenian "Mladina" - and not through some Serbian daily or weekly newspaper.

(4) However, it is important to mention that, unfortunately, the newspapers of the minorities are not always areas of freedom, because their directors are usually set and dismissed by the National Minority Councils, and those positions are politically motivated. This practically means that there is no any critical word towards their "own" politicians and their policies. See:

<http://www.magyarszo.com/fex.page:2011-06-24-Ni-Dunav-nece-oprati-Nacionalni-savet-Madara.xhtml>  
<http://www.magyarszo.com/fex.page:2011-09-27-Teska-vremena-za-novinarstvo-vojvodanskih-Madara.xhtml>

(5) It is interesting that, although written as a second chapter in the book of M. Dragičević Sešić and S. Dragojević (Intercultural mediation in the Balkans, OKO, Sarajevo 2004), the text "Why Bosnia and Herzegovina cannot have cultural policy?", UNESCO, as a publisher and donator of the book, did not want to publish. So the book was censored and this chapter which was trying to outline the problems in establishing any kind of coherent cultural policy of the BH on the state level was never published.

(6) So, the 50th MESS was aiming to support the initiative for REKOM (<http://www.zarekom.org/vesti/MESS-u-znaku-REKOM-a.sr.html>), while in the 49th MESS, the speech of Dino Mustafić promoted antifascism and its values, etc.