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The evolution of political science after World War II went in the direction of the pluralization of theoretical approaches and methods used in research and analyses of the political phenomenon in its various manifestations. The contemporary political science in its methodological dimension is consequently characterized by a plurality of methods, but within this diversity a few main streams can be distinguished. Thus, we can talk about the three dominant approaches to the study of politics. One group of political scientists analyses the phenomenon of the political primarily via the research of political institutions, the second has been trying to apply economic models to the study of political institutions, primarily the rational choice approach whose starting point in the analysis of political processes is the assumption that people are rational and interest-determined beings, while the third group claims that besides the objective aspect, the phenomenon of the political has its subjective dimension which in their works they identify with the concept of culture. In other words, the contemporary political science research focuses on the political sphere and the functioning of political systems by using one of the three following concepts: institutions, interest and culture.

If this classification is applied to the description of the situation in the Croatian political science, it could be said, based on a review of the recent publications by Croatian authors, that the institutionalist approach prevails, with the economic models gaining ground. It is also evident that the political/cultural approach has been exceedingly neglected. This is why the book Politička kultura demokracije by Vladimir Vuječić deserves our attention. In its introduction the author says: “This book deals with the political/cultural approach to the phenomenon of the political” (p. 11). This is the author’s second book that looks into the phenomenon of political culture and the political/cultural approach to the study of politics. While Vuječić’s first book, Politička kultura i politička socijalizacija (Political culture and political socialization), published in 1993, can be described as a pioneering attempt to describe the concept of political culture in Croatian political science, the new book is a major step forward in the theory of the phenomenon of political culture and the application of the political/cultural approach in the empirical analyses of political reality and is a must for the future study of political culture.

Apart from the introduction, the book Politička kultura demokracije contains three bigger, consistently written and well thought out sections. The introduction is important in its own right since it the author, besides explaining the basic layout of the book, describes what is differentia specifica of the political/cultural approach in relation to other approaches to the study of politics in contemporary political science. In the introduction Vuječić also provides a review of the authors who have explored political culture and evaluates their contribution to the headway of the theory of political culture. He points out that the ambiguity of the concept of culture is an obstacle when defining political culture. By combining the interpretations according to which political culture is only a series of subjective orientations towards politics with the interpretations of culture as an objective fact of social life, Vuječić provides his own definition: “In that sense, political culture should be defined as a series of subjective orientations towards politics with the interpretations of culture as an objective fact of social life, which are negotiated through the ‘objective’ (social and universal) values and norms of a community’s political life.” (p. 23).
The first section of the book *Fundamentals of the theory of political culture* consists of three chapters in which the author examines the concept, the dimensions and the typology of political culture. The outline of the evolution of the concept of political culture leads us to the conclusion that political culture is a new concept for an old phenomenon because the philosophers of the antiquity already noticed the subjective attitude of people towards politics. Vujčić points out that some more modern approaches to political culture emerged in the 20th century. He considers the American political scientists Gabriel Almond and Sydney Verba as the founders of this scientific approach. In their book *The Civic Culture*, published in 1963, they promoted the concept of political culture. On the basis of their research they demonstrated the importance of a democratic political culture for a stable and efficient functioning of the democratic political government. After them, an array of prominent political scientists studied political culture contributing to the development of the theory of political culture. In the author’s opinion, this has been of major importance since only a systematically developed theory of political culture paves the way to meaningful research. That is why Vujčić constructs a theoretical framework. One of the elements of this framework concerns the issue of the dimensions of political culture.

It is the chapter about the dimensions of political culture that shows how complex the phenomenon of political culture is, both theoretically and empirically. The dimensions represent citizens’ attitudes towards different objects of politics. The author’s classification involves three basic dimensions: the culture of the system, the culture of the process and the culture of governance. Each of these dimensions has several subdimensions, so the total number of subdimensions of political culture is 25. Some of them, for example political participation or political tolerance, are in themselves complex and are subjects of research. As the second major element of the theory of political culture, the author describes the typologies that enable the discussion about the fundamental characteristics of the political cultures of individual states. He devotes most space to the typology of Almond and Verba who defined three basic types of political culture: the submissive, the parochial and the participatory. There are other, different typologies of political culture, because these two authors use different criteria, but despite this, typologies are important as a starting point for a comparative analysis.

*Political culture and political system* is the title of the second section of the book, divided into three chapters. Underlying this section is the question: why at all to deal with political culture, i.e. what is its importance? The author answers this question through an analysis of the relationship of political culture and political system, and political culture and democracy. The perception of political culture as an important element of the functioning of political system is the result of the question to which the institutionalist approach has not been able to provide a satisfactory answer: why is the practice of politics so different in the states with very similar or identical political-institutional solutions? This question gained prominence at the beginning of the 1970s, during the third wave of democratization, when it became obvious that democratic political institutions were not enough for the stable and efficient functioning of democratic political systems. Vujčić thinks that the relationship between the political culture and the political system is manifested in the attitude of citizens towards the political system, i.e. in their political support. There are three basic forms of this relationship: political identity, political legitimacy and political trust. Each of these forms is important at some level of political system, so political identity is crucial for the survival of a political community and a political system, while political legitimacy is essential for the functioning of a political regime, i.e. the organization of government in a community, while political trust is crucial for the efficiency of power holders.

If the existence of a democratic political culture is positively correlated to the efficient and stable functioning of political systems, the fact corroborated by a large number of studies all over the world, the question is in what way political culture influences democracy. This is one of the most complex issues in the study of
political culture. The author analyses different approaches, and the analysis brings us to the conclusion that two approaches dominate in the research. The first, prevalent in the early studies, political culture, i.e. its democratic variation, is considered to be the key determinant that generates democratic polities. In later studies, the functioning of democracy was considered to be a result of a complex interaction of political culture and political structure. These interactive approaches, in the author’s words, “open a new, almost inexhaustible and perhaps most fruitful research discipline in the contemporary political science” (p.163).

The third section, *Fundamental dimensions of political culture*, consists of eight chapters in which the author looks into a few major dimensions of political culture. In these eight chapters Vujičić investigates eight dimensions of political culture: political interest, civic political competence, value basis of political competence and political trust, political support for a political system, political tolerance, party-ideological identity and electoral orientations, political participation, awareness of human rights. This part of the book is a combination of a theoretical analysis of certain dimensions of political culture and the description and the interpretation of the results of the author’s study of political culture. The research was conducted in 1998 and 1999 on a sample of 850 students of the Zagreb and the Split Universities. Where possible, the author incorporated the research findings into a comparative context of similar studies of political culture in other European states. Of particular interest in this third section are the topics of political interest and political tolerance.

By focusing on political interest as an essential dimension of political culture, Vujičić explains that political interest is not only a simple empirical fact that may be used only as a component of the models of explanation of some other dimensions of political culture, but as a complex phenomenon that requires a separate conceptualization and research. The author defines political interest as an “expression of cognitive, affective and evaluative orientation of people to politics as a venue of people’s social activity” (p.192) Following this theoretical discussion, the author describes the level of interest in politics among the Croatian university students. The results of his research show that only about 24% Croatian university students cite politics as important in their lives while about a half shows only some interest in politics. A comparison of these results with the results in the established European democracies as well as in other transitional countries has shown a low level of political interest among Croatian students.

The dimension of political tolerance was studied in great depth by the author in another book, *Politnička tolerancija (Political tolerance)*, published in 1995, while in this book he provides a review of some recent attempts at the conceptualization of this topic and also a review of several studies. More systematic research started with the realization that the existence of tolerance surely implies some disagreement with those who are supposed to be tolerated which has resulted in the distinction between tolerance and mere acceptance of differences. In later research, besides the attitudes towards certain groups, i.e. objects of tolerance, attitudes towards certain activities are also investigated, the so-called tolerance content. These studies have shown that it is justified to distinguish between the generic and the discriminatory intolerance. The first means that a certain activity is not tolerated, regardless of the group that is engaged in this activity, which means that intolerance is not a reflection of intolerance towards the group but of non-acceptance of certain activities, while in the second case a certain group is not tolerated and consequently the activities this group pursues are not tolerated as well, i.e. the same activities are approved or disapproved depending on the actors of these activities. By stressing the importance of political tolerance as an essential element of democratic political culture, Vujičić warns that it should not be equated with unconditional acceptance of all differences in a society. If political tolerance was to be defined in this way and affirmed as an absolute social value, the very survival of the political community could be jeopardized.

*Politnička kultura demokracije* is a valuable book due to several reasons. Together with its topic, its scope also makes it a significant contribution to the development and progress
of the Croatian political science. Since it contains a laudable quantity of information and insights into the phenomenon of political culture, it represents a starting point for further theoretical deliberations and empirical research but can also be interesting to all those who are more involved in the practice of politics. Also, the results of the study of political culture of Croatian students can be an incentive for practical involvement, particularly of educational authorities. The findings show that Croatian students score below the European average on many dimensions of political culture. Such findings must cause concern since these very students are one day going to be political subjects, and the functioning of our political community is going to depend on their activities and choices. The development of a democratic political culture is a lengthy process, but many studies show that it can be stepped up by creating and implementing good programmes of political education. This book can provide us with the guidelines in designing such programmes and its greatest achievement would be if it encouraged the public to start thinking about political culture, the phenomenon that often eludes us, due to our preoccupation with the political/institutional reformism, though political culture plays a major role in the democratic consolidation of our political community.

Berto Šalaj

Book Review

Ivo Banac

Raspad Jugoslavije (Disintegration of Yugoslavia)

Durieux, Zagreb, 2001, 165 pages

The tragic events on the territory of the former Yugoslavia have for years been focus of interest of experts from various social sciences. This interest has resulted in a number of books on the subject. However, the quality of the works varies, and there is ample room for more serious attempts at the interpretation of these events. The book Raspad Jugoslavije, by Ivo Banac, professor of history of South-East Europe at Yale, is the most recent in a long line of such efforts.

According to Banac, this book is a sequel to his monograph Nacionalno pitanje u Jugoslaviji (National question in Yugoslavia). Both books can be regarded as a sort of political science/history primer for all those interested in the historical roots of today’s conflicts. The book Raspad Jugoslavije consists of four essays that were published in various journals in the 1990s. They are methodologically different. The first and the last may be tentatively labeled as political science, since they focus on the issues of nation and nationalisms. The second, and to a large extent the third essay, are historical studies.

The opening claim of Banac’s first essay Nationalism in South-East Europe is that nationalism is modernity for the peoples of this part of Europe. He provides a typology of nationalisms on the Balkans, and emphasizes the central role that nationalism plays in the political conflicts in this region. Banac says there are two types of nationalism in the South-Slavic region: the East-European type in its Croatian variant and the Slovenian subtype, and the East-Balkan type in its Serbian variant with a multicultural sub-type in the Albanian variant. The East-European type is characterized by the corporative spirit of the aristocracy, a consequence of the lack of a more prominent bourgeois class. That is why the national movements from the beginning of the 19th century were largely characterized by the struggle of the aristocracy for national independence, while social reforms were put on the back burner.

Thus the Illyrists in Croatia built upon the baroque and the Enlightenment proto-national movement of the late 18th century and promoted national integration on the basis of a fine balance between the political Croatianhood (Croatian state right) and the supra-national cultural Illyrism (pan-Southslavism). In the context of aggressive Hungarianization, this marks the “transition towards modernism in which the aristocracy’s corporativism and the
romantic insistence on the vernacular were equated” almost without any role of religion (p. 20).

The East-Balkan type emerged as a consequence of the extinction of the Christian nobility during the Ottoman occupation. Thus the native Orthodox priests emerged as popular leaders. That is why the uprisings against the Turks at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century had a marked religious-national character. In the proto-national activities of the Srijemski Karlovec eparchy the notion of the Serbianhood was associated with the Orthodox (the modern national ideology of the Serbs came into being only with Karadžić’s linguistic reform based on the stokavian dialect).

The Slovenian national ideology was shaped by means of the German romantic identification of the nationhood and the language. That is why in Slovenia, just like in Serbia, the idea of the pure national revival prevailed, rejecting the supra-national Illyrian project, although it took – albeit very shallow – roots in Slovenia. The Albanian national revival was belated, and emerged in 1878 in the form of the Prizren League, with the sole purpose of overcoming the religious differences between the Christians and the Muslims; it was devoid of the elements of integral nationalism. Through the prism of the so formed national ideologies the author explains the relationships among the peoples and the historical events up to (and including) the disintegration of the SFRY. Banac concludes that the Balkan nationalisms are difficult to pinpoint since they have a thousand faces that are not autochthonous but are a reflection of the broader European picture.

The second essay, Emblems of identity: Heraldry and national ideologies of South Slavs brings a historical account of the development of the heraldry on the Balkans in the light of its influence on the creation of Croatian and Serbian national ideologies. The heraldry was first ideologically tinted with the Ohmučević’s heraldic history of 1594. It was a follow-up of the famous Stematografija (Stemmatography) by Pavao Ritter Vitezović, the heraldic appendix to the book Croatia rediviva of 1700. Stematografija depicts coats-of-arms of 56 Croatian or Illyrian noblemen, and is, according to the author, the proof of the Croatian national awareness for the future generations. Vitezović’s Stematografiija was given an entirely new meaning in Žefarović’s edition of 1753 in Slavo-Serbian, when the original’s coats-of-arms and their interpretations were given a new twist with the significant alterations of the heraldic devices, with the purpose of proving the identicalness of the Orthodox faith and the Serbianhood, and the desire for the unification of all the lands of the old Illyricum under the Serbian coat-of-arms. Žefarović’s “stemmography” became the foundation and the inspiration for the emblems of Serbian insurgents, and later the emblems of the Serbian state.

Vitezović’s Stematografiija was also the starting point for Ljudevit Gaj in designing the Illyrian coat-of-arms, Leljiva, a combination of a new moon and the six-pointed Danica (the morning star). According to Gaj’s design, these two symbols should have been joined with a red-and-white checkered ribbon, which would have highlighted the chief aspects of this movement: the Illyrian (pan-Southslavic) nationality and political Croatianhood (the Croatian statehood right). With these national movements, heraldry entered a new, democratic national phase in the South-Slavic region, brought to an end with communism that promoted the ideological five-pointed red star. And finally, the author describes today’s Croatian coat-of-arms and concludes that heraldry paved the way to the iconographic aspect of the Croatian and the Serbian national ideology much earlier than the emergence of national revivals.

The third essay, The religious ‘rule’ and the Ragusan exception: Genesis of Dubrovnik’s circle of Catholic Serbs provides an account of the origin, evolution and activities of Dubrovnik’s circle of Catholic Serbs. The author claims that the emergence of this group of Catholic Serbs in Dubrovnik was a consequence of the dissatisfaction with the position of this city in the first half of the 19th century. This resentment coincided with the zealous efforts of the first Orthodox Ragusan rector Đorde Nikolajević. The activities of this circle
are described mainly through the work of Matija Ban, a colorful Ragusan expatriate, and the writings of Medo Pucić, a Ragusan squire. Banac shows how the teaching of that circle, particularly by Pucić and Ban, was in fact very close to the Illyrian Movement, although officially it advocated Vuk’s linguistic theory and supported the expansionist politics of the Serbian state based on Načertanije of 1844. Medo Pucić, the leader of the conservative faction adapted the theory of the Croatian historical right to the demands of the linguistic nationality, deriving the Serbian pretensions regarding Dubrovnik under the surface some very convoluted legalistic explanations, as well as the need for the unification of all South-Slavic lands within the Habsburg Monarchy around Croatia. On the other hand, Ban as a pragmatist advocates the expansion of the Orthodox faith as the stronghold of Serbianhood, but at the same time he endorses Illyrism and exhorts against the parochiality of Serbian politics. Though the ideas of these Catholic Serbs in the 1890s spread considerably, they never caught on among the common folk. After 1890, and particularly following the Austro-Hungarian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Serbo-Catholic coterie increasingly adopted the anti-Croatian stance, its prestige went through its ups and downs until it foundered under Radić’s policies in the period between the two world wars.

In the last essay, Yugoslavia’s Death, the author analyses the causes and the process of the disintegration of Yugoslavia, and gives a review of the politics of each of the federal republics, now independent states. In the first part, he chronologically lists the causes of national frictions, from the creation of Yugoslavia to the rise of Milošević in 1987. According to Banac, the causes can be found in the already formed national ideologies that each nation brought into the unified state. Thus it is no surprise that the party life between the two world wars almost exclusively revolved around the national question. The amalgamated programme of the Yugoslav Communist Party after the war turned the national question into a taboo topic, although it was constantly simmering under the surface. This came to a head when Milošević became the leader of Serbian communists in 1987.

The very collapse of Yugoslavia is divided into ten stages. It commenced with the Kosovo crisis of 1987, and ended with the overthrow of the nationalist governments in 2000. After the description of these stages, Banac analyses the political events that went hand in hand with this process. He claims that the “ethnic cleansing and the creation of nationally homogeneous states were not the consequence but the objective of the war” (p.141). He gives an analysis of Milošević’s politics from the ideological and practical point of view. This is followed by an analysis of the Croatian politics from the same viewpoint, and the Bosnian politics which is characterized by the fact that the “war for the establishment of the nationally homogeneous states turned into the war for the division of Bosnia and Herzegovina” (p. 149). The last section of the essay is devoted to the “Albanian question”, the role of the international community in South-East Europe and the developments in Macedonia. Banac thinks that the pretty remarkable petering out of Serbian nationalism should be used to tone down the “aspirations of its, so far inferior, Albanian adversary”. In a practical sense, the Macedonian crisis calls for improved regional relations, but also for playing down the “importance of the new state borders established during the collapse of Yugoslavia” (p. 162).

By way of conclusion we might say that Banac’s book Raspad Jugoslavije is not burdened with political compromise and “patriotism”, so characteristic for the historiography of this region. Not in the least scientifically dull, the book shows that history cannot be wedged into the black-and-white propaganda framework, that it is a multifarious phenomenon that should be perceived in the context of time. Although the book Raspad Jugoslavije is only an introduction into a more systematic and comprehensive research by the author of the general problems of modernity in South-East Europe, it could be said that the result might be an intriguing book, on a par to the book The national question in Yugoslavia.

Stevo Đurašković
Book Review

Marina Mučalo

Radio u Hrvatskoj
(Radio in Croatia)

Biblioteka Politička misao, FPZ, Zagreb, 2002, 165 pages

Though the oldest electronic medium in the world, radio is insufficiently present in the Croatian literature, both in its journalistic and scientific fields. The published works that explore radio’s historical and legal development and that scientifically base the content of radio programmes are even scarcer. Some reasons for this can be found in the ephemeral content that is characteristic for the electronic media, which makes a scientific analysis of broadcasts even more difficult. That is why the book Radio u Hrvatskoj is even a more unique and valuable contribution to the exploration of this medium, now and in the future.

The author of the book, Marina Mučalo Ph.D., is a senior lecturer of the Radio department of Journalism at the Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Zagreb. As a highly experienced former radio journalist and editor of numerous radio broadcasts, Marina Mučalo is competent enough to compare the theoretical assumptions on the one hand and the practical examples in the field of radio journalism on the other. Also, she has conducted a research – as far as we know, the first research of radio content in the Croatian media. Due to her journalistic experience, this research is properly designed in terms of the contents and the form in the real radio.

The author has divided the book into several historical periods, based on the political context and the states that existed on this territory from the early 1920s until the independence of Republic of Croatia. Another important part of this book is a highly detailed presentation of the relevant legislation that accompanied the beginnings and the development of radio as a medium through those historical periods. The final part of the book brings scientific research and analysis of programme contents, conducted by the author in the first half of 1999; their goal was a scientific definition of real programme contents of some radio stations.

At first, the wireless sound transfer was regarded a highly impractical discovery. But at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, the first electronic medium – radio – evolved from this invention. November 2, 1920, is recognised as the unofficial beginning of radio broadcasting. Then, the KDKA radio station from Pittsburgh broadcasted the first results of the presidential electoral campaign, and with that, radio began to undermine the dominance of the daily printed media. Only four years later, there were 1,400 radio stations operating in the United States. Europe did not fall behind. Thanks to the skills of Marconi himself, the first European radio – the BBC – started broadcasting as a private company, but due to the licence expiry at the beginning of 1927, it became a state-owned radio station.

Due to the efforts of a few radio enthusiasts, especially doctor Ivo Stern, “Radio klub Zagreb” was founded in Zagreb in April of 1924, and in spite of the unfavourable political situation, the members of the club tried to get the licence for a radio station. The state was highly suspicious of radio as a new medium (in 1923 there were no radio stations in the Kingdom of SHS), but the state adopted the Regulations for private radio-telegraph-telephone receivers. Those regulations were exceedingly strict and limiting, the first in a long line of sets of rules that tried to control the future medium. In spite of this unpropitious political situation for the operation of a radio station in Zagreb, several years later “Radio Zagreb” began to broadcast. On May 15, 1926, the first radio-programme in South-East Europe began by intoning the national anthem, only six years after the first such attempt in the USA and four years after the BBC.

As already stated, in spite of the inopportune political situation, Radio Zagreb broadcasted its programme non-stop, mainly broadcasts about culture, without taking political sides. However, this apolitical approach did not prevent Radio Zagreb to become, shortly
before the Second World War, a state owned radio by an act of expropriation. It has remained state-owned until today. The programming of Radio Zagreb was strongly politically coloured during the Independent State of Croatia. This period is also significant because the first local radio stations were organized in Dubrovnik and Osijek, and the management of Radio Zagreb contributed greatly to the establishment of those two radio stations.

The author describes the history of radio development in this part of Europe, through an account of the situation in the SFR Yugoslavia. The strong political colouring of radio programmes continued, and radio became a sort of the “sound” propaganda for the new state and its political structures. Although local radio stations (often part of the already existing cultural organisations) mushroomed in the 1970s, the following decade brought a slow death to many local stations, due to their technical obsolescence, extremely poor radius of audibility and almost a total lack of influence. Radio Zagreb, the only radio station that broadcasted on the entire state territory (with the help of its local centres) remained the centre of radiophony in Croatia.

This situation changed dramatically during the Patriotic War. One of the reasons was the fact that the transmitting infrastructure suffered a lot of damage during the war, and this put Radio Zagreb in a precarious position, with a significantly lower broadcasting power and radius of audibility. On the eve of the war in Croatia, there were about 50 local radio stations that broadcasted their programs, and during the war they provided some sort of auxiliary transmitters through which radio Zagreb broadcasted its programme. Also, those local radio stations became a highly important source of information for local populations.

In the following chapter, the author describes the situation after the war and the period of transition from the state to the private ownership. This chapter describes in detail the process of privatisation in the Croatian electronic media. For the first time, after more than fifty years, it was possible to have a privately owned radio station in Croatia, which was enabled by the new Law on telecommunications of 1994. This Law was definitely the turning point in the manner in which the state treated the existing and future electronic media because it introduced the concept of concession as well as concessionaires for radio and television activities.

The last topic presented in the book is the research that the author carried out in order to define the programme content of 21 radio stations that broadcasted their programmes in Zagreb and the greater Zagreb area. The results of this research clearly show that radio programmes consist mostly of music (almost 80%) and advertising (10%). All other spoken contents are squeezed in the remaining 10%. Forty percent of the programme is given over to entertainment. It is obvious that other topics (politics, culture, sport, community issues, traffic etc.) are overlooked. There are many reasons for such a structure of radio programmes. Perhaps the most important ones are financial reasons, because concessionary radio programmes are market-oriented as are all other service providers. To be able to survive on that market, radio stations were turned into the so-called “choir singers” or entertainers of their listeners. This approach is the most appealing for listeners and it is reasonably cheap for the owners of radio stations, because the work of journalists is incomparably more expensive and more demanding.

Because of those reasons, the author came to the conclusion that the proclaimed democratisation of the electronic media in Croatia has resulted primarily in a big number of the electronic media outlets (126 radio stations and 14 TV stations). The quality content of those programmes was low on the priority list, which resulted in more or less uniformed programmes that do not sufficiently inform their listeners. The big audiences for largely music programmes resulted in the situation that radio stations started to lose all the characteristics of radio as a medium, turning into mass “jukeboxes”, which supports the thesis that radio is becoming a background medium, less and less interested in its role to inform. The market orientation has brought with itself its own rules that mainly go for profit. That leaves us with the media that collect subscription fees for their programmes and because of that they are
more or less market independent. In Croatia that is the *Hrvatski radio* with its regional centres (8 of them), because they are state owned stations and the Law on Croatian radio and television stipulates that they are the public media, primarily responsible for informing their listeners and promoting public interests.

The book *Radio u Hrvatskoj* gives a detailed account of the development of radio in Croatia, plus a review of the laws regulating the electronic media in the state. By placing important milestones of radio development into their political context, the author also gives us a historical frame, which makes it easier to see the bigger picture and the overall role of radio. The regulations presented in the book, which underline the conditions in which radio developed, provide the reader with some additional information. This book, with its appendices and the detailed lists of literature, laws and regulations, also includes copies of important historical documents as well as illustrations that show the development of radio technology. Numerous tables and diagrams as well as the resources that the author used in her research, make this book an important source of information for all future researchers of radio as a medium. Also, at the end of the book the reader can find a complete list of all concessionaires for radio and television in Croatia.

*Darko Tomorad*