

Katja Stamboldžioski
University of Ljubljana

The Rise of the Ljubljana School of Documentary Film at TV Ljubljana (1981–1990) and the Transformation of the Documentary

1 Introduction

For public television stations, documentary film represents a prestigious genre with which they can carry out their public mission of informing and educating viewers (Biressi and Nunn, 2005), and thus such films were initially placed into schedules as a counterweight to entertainment-oriented television programmes (Kilborn and Izod, 1997). The medium of television, to which Slovene documentary production resorted because of the poor financial situation with regard to cinema production (Rezec Stibilj, 2005), had a significant impact on the transformation of the genre, to the extent that the lines between the documentary and television forms became blurred (Kilborn and Izod, 1997).

In Slovenia, research on documentary films on the TV Slovenija public broadcasting service, formerly TV Ljubljana,¹ is non-existent. When researching the production of documentary film between 1958 and 2011,² we identified three main periods of development based on the analysis of the documentary evidence: the first period that saw the establishment of documentary film as an extension of news broadcasts (1958–1980), the second period with the rise of documentary film and the Ljubljana School (1981–1990), and the third period with the revitalization of documentary film and co-productions (1991–2011).

The article researches and analyses the establishment of the production of the documentary genre on public television and its changes during the founding of the Ljubljana School of Documentary Film. Moreover, it answers the research questions of how the production practices and creators' routines of that time looked, and how these practices were reflected in the form and style of the documentary films of this period.

1 TV Ljubljana began operating in 1958, and in 1990 changed its name to TV Slovenija.

2 The article was written based on the research for my doctoral dissertation *The transformation of production, text, and audiences of documentary films on Slovenian public television from 1958 to 2011* at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana.



The research on the production aspects is especially important for understanding of the related texts, which can thus enable new findings in the field of media studies that place the production aspect alongside the analysis of the text and the audience (Cottle, 2003, Holt and Perren, 2009, Dwyer, 2019, Hesmondhalgh, 2006). When addressing production, we will lean on the production documents of this period (Caldwell, 2008), and thus on archival documents from the TV archive and the documentation at TV Slovenija, and the Programme Production Plans, which thoroughly described the functioning of the organization in this period. Owing to the reorganization of the editorial department, the documents from certain individual editorial offices are missing, and so five semi-structured in-depth interviews with former and present employees and honorary workers who were involved in the production of the documentary film as filmmakers³ and editors will be used for the analysis of the production of the documentary genre in the focal period. When choosing the participants, it was crucial that they had worked at TV Ljubljana and/or TV Slovenija over different periods of documentary film production, while they also needed to have important editorial or creative references. Three of these interviews are especially valuable for the discussed period and will be highlighted in the article. The interviewees are journalists, screenwriters, directors, editors, and editors-in-chief, and for most of them these roles overlapped over their long careers. As Mayer (2009) noted, in media production the macro and micro aspects are both important, and thus also the practices and experience of media workers. The interviews were recorded in Ljubljana between 3 July 2021 and 21 December 2021 and were transcribed. In the text, they are marked with the names of the interviewees: Drago Pečko, Helena Koder, Bojan Labovič, Majda Širca, and Jani Virk.

1.2 The problems of definition and genre in documentary film

Defining documentary film presents a challenge for theoreticians: for many, documentary film is a negation of fiction film, and this is precisely where they begin their definition, even though fiction and documentary film have more in common than appears at first glance. Casetti (2013, 86-87), who divides film into two genres – documentary and fiction – emphasizes that they use the same procedures, since film in general inherited a sense not only for documentation but also for storytelling, and simultaneously became the point of overlap. This overlap is historically conditioned, considering that from the beginning film has been developing in both directions. In relation to the definition of documentary film, we encounter various views from theoreticians, and their different

3 The expression (*documentary*) *filmmaker* defines a collective authorship of the documentary film and can encompass the screenwriter, the director, the cinematographer, the film editor, and the music composer (Kilborn and Izod, 1997, p. 191).

opinions about these two fundamental categories. These theorists understand or see documentary film as either a genre, style, type of artefact, or merely a specific way of filmmaking (Kilborn and Izod, 1997, 15). Bordwell and Thompson (2010, 353) include documentary film among a range of the film types that includes fiction, animated, and avant-garde films, while they include westerns, thrillers, musicals, etc. among the genres. Moreover, they further divide documentary film into genres, namely the compilation documentary film, which consists of archival footage, the interview or the *talking-heads* documentary film, which gives testimonies of events or social movements, the direct documentary film, which uses a film camera to record what is happening right now, the documentary film about nature, the portrait documentary film, and the synthetic documentary film, which mixes all the listed approaches and is common in television journalism (ibid, 351). In the literature, numerous divisions and classifications indicate dilemmas concerning the various documentary film genres. The extensive production methods, various approaches used, and the variety of content attest that this is a complex and wide field of artistic practice, and that the term documentary film encompasses a range of practices. In short, it remains “simply too all-embracing” (Corner, 1990, VIII). Nichols (1991, 12) approaches the definition by discussing documentary film from the point of view of the creators, the text, and the viewers.

When we try to define documentary film from the point of view of the viewers, it is necessary to address its conventions, with the help of which the viewers will recognize that they are watching a documentary film. Moreover, they will also expect the film to be in accordance with their expectations and to be able to make sense of it. Ellis (2005, 342) opines that this leads to a constant negotiation in the genre relationship, which is constituted by a tripartite negotiation among the habits and beliefs of the viewers, the demands of the medium (cinema or television), and the wishes of filmmakers. But for a documentary film to work as such, it is enough that the viewers “make more sense of it as a reality than as a representation” (ibid).

Chaney and Pickering turn around the paradigm of documentary realism (1990, 12), and are more interested in how the filmmaker constructs the realism of the documentary film with the use of aesthetic conventions and tools rather than in the question of what is real in such a film. The latter is answered by Nichols, as he understands the ways of representing reality in a documentary film as ways of organizing texts – another possible entry point for the definition of documentary film. Based on the form and structure of a documentary film, Nichols (2010, 31) differentiates between six modes of representation, which can overlap and intertwine, and help us recognize different types of documentary films with distinct forms and modes of addressing the viewers (Kilborn and Izod, 1997, 57). The *poetic mode* emphasizes visual associations and the characteristics of sound and rhythm, and is similar to experimental and avant-garde film (Nichols, 2010, 162). The *expository mode* is based on commenting

and argumentation, which directly addresses the viewers, while the image serves as an illustration of the commentary (ibid, 169), and this is currently the most prevalent mode, especially on television. The *observational mode* is based on the observation of social agents through an unobtrusive camera that follows events. It was developed in the 1960s when handheld 16 mm cameras came on the market (ibid, 172–173). The *participatory mode* emphasizes the interaction between the author of the film and social agents, since the author is included in interviews and is part of the action in front of the camera (ibid, 180). For the *reflexive mode*, it is important to be aware that the film is a construct and that it leads the viewer to reflect on their relation to the documentary film and, in general, on what a documentary film represents (ibid, 196). The *performative mode* deals primarily with the question of knowledge and how knowledge contributes to the understanding of the world, and it emphasizes that this knowledge is subjective and emotional (ibid, 201–202). It was developed in the 1980s and 1990s and uses imaginary events, combined with real events or even animations, where the emotional and expressive sides are important.

2 From the first documentary films to regular production: documentary film as an extension of daily news shows

Few documents have been preserved concerning the beginnings of the documentary genre on TV Ljubljana in a production sense, while the TV archive and the documentation stored at TV Slovenija keep records of film material in the Cinematheque books.⁴ However, genre was not recorded in these books, which makes these materials difficult to use. According to the records, *Borovo gostüvanje* by Boris Kuhar (1958), *Mesto na lignitu* by Vasja Predan (1958), and three films about concentration camps *Človek, postoj!* (1961) by Ernest Adamič, *Pekel žena* (1962) by Lojze Krakar and Milan Kumar, and *Pepel, ki žge* (1962) by Lojze Krakar and Ernest Adamič, belong among the first documentary films. The scope of the television schedule and production increased year by year. In 1959, TV Ljubljana broadcast 231 hours of their own programmes, while by 1987 this number had increased to 3,520 hours. This meant additional costs for the institution and a lack of (educated) personnel, as well as a limited production capacity, which was hard to control (RTV Ljubljana, 1988, 30). Alongside the rise of production, the documentary genre also developed. At first this happened in the documentary and feuilleton department, which was one of the editorial departments of current affairs programming. Numerous series that were more

4 One hundred and thirty-three Cinematheque books (*Kinoteka*) are preserved with information of the title and a short description of the material, the director, the screenwriter, and the cameraman are recorded. There were 45 books reviewed for the period between 1958 and 1982, while subsequent documentary films were written down on record cards. TV Slovenija does not have a complete list of all the documentary films that were made.

manageable from a production standpoint were produced in this context. These documentary films were understood as a “continuation of the daily news shows”, which should include “the development of a specific television expression, reaching for the top reporting achievements”, with which they were also supposed to prove themselves in the exchanges that took place at Yugoslav Radio Television (JRT), within which TV Ljubljana operated (RTV Ljubljana, 1979, 20). Some of the more important series were *TV akcija* and *S kamero po svetu*, which had been made since 1964 and are placed among the explanatory mode of representation, since the viewer was led by the journalist’s commentary.

A type of hierarchy ruled between the daily news and the current affairs and feuilleton editorial departments, since the latter was known as a “personnel dump”, since those who lacked skills and capability, or were politically unsuitable, were transferred there (Drago Pečko). The journalists felt free in their work, even though some topics were predetermined, particularly current events, and others were politically necessary for the public medium. “This was always a kind of pocket in this informative programme, where there was quite a lot of freedom, in terms of form as well as content” (Helena Koder). The working processes in the creation of the documentary genre were still closer to the journalistic processes for the preparation of reports, since at the beginning the journalists did not write scripts, and the visual part was subordinate to speech and illustrated it. “Well, the journalists equipped their texts with footage themselves or with the help of some directors; this was called covering” (Helena Koder).

3 The establishment of the Ljubljana School of Documentary Film

Alongside regular documentary production, more professional processes began to be established, and journalists started writing scripts and collaborating with directors. In a content, production, and editorial sense, documentary production underwent a fundamental turn with the arrival of the editor Drago Pečko, who took over the documentary and feuilleton department in 1981 and set the foundations for the development of documentary film on TV Ljubljana, while the changes were also visible in the form of the resulting documentary films. Pečko came to the editorial department after having been dismissed because he had made a story that was shown on *TV Dnevnik* (TV News) in 1981 about the violation of the social agreement on income and the distribution of income. Under this agreement wages were supposed to be frozen, but the Executive Council of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia violated the agreement (Drago Pečko). People being dismissed was nothing unusual, neither was withholding certain shows or pieces before publication, since politics had always influenced the work of the media. “The punishment was mild considering the demands, I believe

Avbelj was the president of the presidency, who demanded that someone ‘kill the kid’ just with words” (Drago Pečko).

In terms of content, the editor presented general guidelines and topics that the journalists should take into consideration, but he also allowed them to present their own ideas (Drago Pečko), although he had to approve each suggestion. “Of course, there was self-censorship, it’s not like it does not exist today. But there was definitely more of it then” (Helena Koder). Thus the journalists felt enough freedom in their work, while in the internal culture it appears it was clear which topics would not evoke possible negative reactions from the management or politics. For the journalists, this manner of cooperation with the editor represented an opportunity to explore their own creative drive, which was, however, greatly hindered by organizational, bureaucratic, and financial factors. In media organizations relationships based on power and inequality, which have an impact on the texts, always exist. However, as Hesmondhalgh pointed out (2006, 51), these are not unambiguous but rather complex, which is why it is important to thoroughly study the tension between control and autonomy, since even in the event of economic or political pressure, it is possible to produce innovative content.

3.1 A rigid system of production planning

The production system set numerous limitations for the employees, since TV Ljubljana still sought the most optimal organization of work along with an increased volume of production. One of its role models was the BBC, which is evident from a record of a professional visit to the BBC,⁵ in which the author realizes that “TV Ljubljana is technically and technologically only half a step behind the most ‘glorified’ European TV station” and that other problems are hidden behind the proverbial ill-equipment, such as an unprofessional usage of technological capabilities, insufficient organization and planning of work, as well as a lack of discipline (Fond vodstvo TVS I-66, 1981, 1). The “technocratic restriction” on TV Ljubljana signified the introduction of numerous purchase orders, forms, and standard hours for individual parts of production (filming, editing, synchronization) (RTV Ljubljana, 1981, 3). As such, the filmmakers did not have access to the production and post-production resources that were planned and restricted in accordance with individual projects and the Programme Production Plan. The production practice was highly controlled, while the self-reflection of the management is also evident (Caldwell, 2008, 5) in that such a method was necessary and right for the working of a public service and that all violations of it must be taken

5 TV Ljubljana had been opening up to the West from the beginning, as it bought technical equipment there (Pohar, 1993, 22, 44). In the broadcasting of Western television production, Pušnik (2008, 121) sees an important opening up of a socialist country to the West, and thus television cultivated people’s taste and promoted the Western lifestyle.

seriously. The internal production culture was not based on a creative or ethical attitude towards work, but rather on a bureaucratically repressive cultural model, which took out of the equation the creative part and renounced it *a priori*. Instead, bureaucratic tasks were placed at the heart of the production culture.

In the Programme Production Plan of 1982 numerous series can be found which were prepared in the documentary and feuilleton department (*Čas, ki živi, Sodobniki, Dosje našega časa, Oddaje o Kardelju, Zgodovina Slovencev*), and among them was also the series *Dokumentarci (če)*, which was broadcast once a month, on Thursdays from 21:35 to 22:05 (RTV Ljubljana, 1981, 57). For the filming of this series, 550 hours with team C were approved (cinematographer, sound recorder, gaffer), 6,480 m of film, and the filming was in a 1:2 ratio, or five days of 10 hours of filming for individual shows, 49 hours of editing, eight hours of synchronization (*ibid.*, 41).

3.2 The move away from daily news content and the *Dokumentarec meseca* series

Despite production obstacles, the move from informative content in documentary films towards the participatory and observatory modes of representation was already beginning to be seen in the resulting films, while a combination of both approaches was most common. The direction of the development of the documentary genre reached its peak in 1983 with the exceptionally important *Dokumentarec meseca* series, which stayed in production until 2011 and was, in terms of content, a continuation of the *Dokumentarcev (če)* series. According to the plan, eight shows of 40 minutes in length were expected (RTV Ljubljana, 1983, 22–23), while they continued with other sequences. However, among these the *Dokumentarec meseca* series had a more important role since it had a slightly higher standard of filming, which was 7x10 hours, film editing was 70 hours, synchronization was five hours, and the ratio of the length of the film available for use was raised to 1:3 (*ibid.*, 21–22). With the *Dokumentarec meseca* series, Drago Pečko wanted to establish a regular production of the documentary genre in such a way that it would be recognizable in domestic production as “one documentary form that must surpass everything. Including the feature film” (Drago Pečko), which at that time was known as the most expensive and respected type of film.

... when Drago Pečko came, he had an idea about the Ljubljana School of Documentary ... He believed that Ljubljana television would regularly produce documentaries ... And that the number of things made in this way would slowly create a concept of documentary which would be characteristic of Slovene television. (Helena Koder)

He wanted to exceed the boundaries of daily news approaches where the journalist created shows by him- or herself, so he used his acquaintance with the director Matjaž Klopčič and began to engage young directors from AGRFT (Academy of Theatre, Radio, Film and Television)⁶ (Drago Pečko). This collaboration led to a development which he likely could not have achieved if working only with his usual staff. At first, the journalists did not react well to collaborating with directors (Drago Pečko), however, it soon turned out that precisely because of such collaboration new approaches in terms of form could be achieved, along with better preparation and scriptwriting, and the regular production schedule established an oeuvre of works that was recognized as the Ljubljana School of Documentary Film. “I believe this school was created spontaneously. ... of course, with the then editor’s subtle art of detection of authors, to put it this way, of what someone is capable of and what their capabilities could contribute ... fresh blood was coming to this editorial department” (Bojan Labovič). The documentary form changed and began to move away from news coverage, since they wanted “the situation, the events, which are not communicated to the viewer by the journalist, to come to the fore” (Drago Pečko). According to the opinions of the editor and the filmmakers (Helena Koder), authenticity was the most important element, which they already pursued in scriptwriting since “... it was necessary to be very careful to not cross over to ‘insinuations’, to false constructions solely because of the film and thus blur the line between what is authentic and what is staged. This was a very thin line, which some mastered, and others did not” (Drago Pečko).

Knowledge was passed on among the members of the creative team, technical personnel and film editors (Helena Koder, Bojan Labovič) as part of industry practice (Caldwell, 2008, p. 7), which was exceptionally important for the development of television.

3.3 The original Slovene documentary genre

In 1986 the Documentary Programme Department became independent, formally separating itself from News and Current Affairs (RTV Ljubljana, 1986, 45). Within a few years, the *Dokumentarec meseca* series reached such a high quality that the shift in the valuation of the documentary is visible in the documents: “DOKUMENTAREC MESECA developed to the point that it is possible to speak about an original Slovene documentary genre” (RTV Ljubljana, 1989, 21). Such films obtained positive reactions in the scope of the JRT exchanges and festivals, where they “generally won first prize, ‘always the Ljubljana School of Documentary film’, they would say” (Drago

6 Among them were Polona Sepe, Žare Lužnik, Angel Miladinov, Miran Zupanič, Žare Lužnik, and Bogdan Mrovlje, while Helena Koder, Alenka Auersperger, and Dorica Makuc stood out among the journalists.

Pečko). The increased interest from the domestic and foreign public evoked envy in the organization, among the editors as well as fellow journalists (Helena Koder). However, their success did not protect them against the reduction of funds. “But if it was necessary to take something away, and to re-channel it to the informative programme, they took it away from us” (Drago Pečko).

In terms of content, the *Dokumentarec meseca* series varied greatly, and at least for the period between 1981 and 1990 it could be said that content-wise the common denominator were people’s stories, their life’s challenges and experience, through which they often showed the present or discussed the past, since they tried to place the stories into a social context, pointed out social inequalities, while sometimes it was also about exceptionally interesting individuals. Sometimes a space was placed in the centre of the stories, for example, a bar, a homestead, the living environment of Kolizej, or Cukrarna, an asylum home.

Starting in 1986, a greater number of co-productions with various independent producers can be observed within the *Dokumentarec meseca* series. At this time TV Ljubljana frequently collaborated with the film studio Viba (RTV Ljubljana 1986, 60). “I can say that around the 1990s...RTV Slovenija, former TV Ljubljana, was the largest producer of Slovene film. Or rather the most important, not the largest. Because Viba had trouble, etc. And the editors, the smart editors, were careful to produce quite a few films here” (Majda Širca). Co-productions of documentary films also signified the expansion of the production and the integration of a wider circle of filmmakers, which later became increasingly important and regulated with public tenders.

4 The transformation of the documentary and the turn toward entertainment

The end of the 1980s signified the end of one of the most fruitful periods of documentary film on TV Ljubljana, which was also felt by the filmmakers. “After Drago Pečko raised the documentary programming, probably in the 1970s and 1980s, the programming was actually in decline for some time. Now... more in regard to the schedule, but for a time also the production...” (Jani Virk). The reasons for the sharp decline in the production of documentary films can be found in the changed broadcasting schedule, which began leaning towards informative and entertaining content owing to the competitive media landscape after the arrival of commercial stations. The audience size and the marketing income were also becoming increasingly important for TV Slovenija (RTV Slovenija, 1993, 3), since it obtained part of the funds for its operation on the market. It appears that the *Dokumentarec meseca* series was not broadcast between 1989 and 1991, although it returned to regular broadcasting between 1992 and 1993. However, the *Dokumentarec meseca* series was placed on the

second channel, while the first channel was filled with news and entertainment, partly also with sport, which was in accordance with the leadership's vision that placed a greater amount of entertainment shows in prime time and thus fought for the "largest audience possible" (RTV Slovenija, 1995, p. 9).

The period of the Ljubljana School of Documentary undoubtedly laid the foundation of the documentary genre on TV Ljubljana in terms of content and production, since despite the limitations they faced the filmmakers surpassed news coverage and covered a varied collection of topics at a time when numerous propaganda series were being made. The *Dokumentarec meseca* series was able to depict current social issues and people's stories, and thus closely examine individuals through whom the filmmakers addressed social changes. They were developing their authorial approach, where the use of participatory, observatory or the combination of both modes was particularly evident and where the film aesthetic was important, from subtle, artistic elements, to searching for bolder impulses and motifs. Production standard hours reflected a growing awareness of the significance of aesthetic pleasure when watching a film, which was evident from the increasing number of hours for assigned for filming and editing. This era was characterized by careful consideration for the development of the documentary genre as one of the foundations of public service, and one that, according to the reactions of the public at the time when TV Ljubljana held a monopoly, occupied a special place in the culture. Thus, on the one hand it was about an important editorial vision, which, on the other hand coincided with the cooperation of numerous talented (part-time) directors and journalists, who were mostly employed at TV Ljubljana. Among them were also women filmmakers, which was extremely important considering that the film industry was dominated by men in those days. So, despite the political, production, financial, and bureaucratic limitations at TV Ljubljana, quality authorial documentary films were made. When the vision of the management turned toward entertainment, shows that expressed appreciation of the principles of reality shows and delivered high ratings and income became more common, and later the managing editorial section in charge of documentary programmes was also cancelled.

References

- Biressi, A. and Nunn, H., *Reality TV. Realism and revelation*, New York 2005.
- Bordwell, D. and Thompson, K., *Film Art: An Introduction*, New York 2010.
- Caldwell, J.T., "Both Sides of the Fence". Blurred Distinctions in Scholarship and Production (a Portfolio of Interviews) in: *Production studies. Cultural studies of media industries*, (ed. Mayer et al.), New York, London 2009, pp. 214–229.
- Caldwell, J.T., *Production culture. Industrial reflexivity and critical practice in film and television*, New York, London 2008.

- Casetti, F., *Oko 20. stoletja: Film, izkustvo, modernost*, Ljubljana 2013.
- Chaney, D., Pickering, M., Authorship in Documentary: Sociology as an Art form in Mass Observation, in: *Documentary and Mass Media* (ed. Corner, J.), London, New York 1990, pp. 29–44.
- Corner, J. (ed.), *Documentary and the Mass Media*. London, New York 1990.
- Cottle, S. (ed.), *Media Organisation and Production*, London 2003.
- Dwyer, P., *Understanding Media Production*, London, New York 2019, pp. 1–23.
- Ellis, J., Documentary and Truth on Television of 1999, in: *New Challenges for Documentary*, (ed. Rosenthal, A. et al., 2nd edition), Manchester, New York 2005, pp. 342–360.
- Fond vodstvo TVS I-66, Vtisi – za primerjavo ali posnemanje (delovni in organizacijski postopki na televizijah v V. Britaniji), Ljubljana 1981, unpublished.
- Hesmodhalgh, D. (ed.), *Media Production*, Maidenhead, New York 2006, pp. 49–90.
- Holt, J., Perren, A., *Media Industries. History, Theory, and Method*, Singapore 2009, pp. 1–20.
- Kilborn, R. and Izod, J., *An Introduction to Television Documentary. Confronting Reality*. Manchester, New York 1997.
- Mayer, V., Bringing the Social Back In. Studies of Production Cultures and Social Theory, in: *Production studies. Cultural studies of media industries* (ed. Mayer, V. et al.), New York 2009, pp. 15–24.
- Nichols, B. (2nd edition), *Introduction to Documentary*, Bloomington, Indiana 2010.
- Nichols, B., The Voice of Documentary. V Rosenthal, A. and Corner, J. (ed.). *New Challenges for Documentary*, (2nd edition) Manchester, New York 2005, pp. 17–33.
- Pohar, L., Televizija prihaja v Slovenijo, in: *Televizija prihaja: spominski zbornik o začetkih televizije na Slovenskem* (ed. Pohar, L.), Ljubljana 1993, pp. 21–48.
- Pušnik, M., Udomačenje televizije na Slovenskem. *Javnost (Ljubljana)*, volume 15, supl., Ljubljana 2008, pp. 113–131.
- Rezec Stibilj, T., *Slovenski dokumentarni film 1945-1958*. Ljubljana 2005.
- RTV Ljubljana, Predlog programov RTV Ljubljana za leto 1979, Ljubljana 1979.
- RTV Ljubljana, Programsko-produkcijski načrt TOZDa TV Ljubljana za leto 1982, Ljubljana 1981.
- RTV Ljubljana, Programsko-produkcijski načrt TOZDa TV Ljubljana za leto 1983, Ljubljana 1983.
- RTV Ljubljana, Programsko-proizvodni načrt Tozd-a TV Ljubljana za leto 1986, Ljubljana 1986.
- RTV Ljubljana, publikacija ob 60-letnici radia in 30-letnici televizije na Slovenskem, Ljubljana 1988.
- RTV Ljubljana, Programi radia in televizije za leto 1989, Ljubljana, 1989.

RTV Slovenija, Načrt televizijskih programov za leto 1994, Ljubljana 1993.

RTV Slovenija, Poročilo o prilagajanju delovanja in vodenja televizijskih programov RTV Slovenija določilom Statua RTV Slovenija in poročilo o priprava Programsko produkcijskega načrta televizijskih programov RTV Slovenija za leto 1996, Ljubljana 1995.

Šprah, A., *Prizorišče odpora*. Sodobni dokumentarni film in zagate postdokumentarne kulture, Društvo za širjenje filmske kulture Kino!, Ljubljana 2010.

The Rise of the Ljubljana School of Documentary Film at TV Ljubljana (1981–1990) and the Transformation of the Documentary

Keywords: TV Ljubljana, public media, documentary film, documentary film production

The article discusses a specific period of the production of the documentary genre at TV Ljubljana, known as the period of the Ljubljana School of Documentary Film (1981–1990). The focus of this research is predominantly the conditions and limitations of production, under which documentary films and practices, as well as the routines of the creators, were created, to analyse how production practices were reflected in the form and style of documentary films. The documentary films of this period began to move away from news coverage with current political content and the explanatory mode of representation, and moved towards the participatory and observatory modes of representation. The routines and practices became more professional. In particular, journalists began writing scripts and collaborating with talented directors from AGRFT (Academy of Theatre, Radio, Film and Television). Despite financial and production limitations, which placed numerous bureaucratic tasks into the creative process, and the self-censorship of creators, under the leadership of editor Drago Pečko and with the collaboration of directors, numerous authorial documentary films were made that were recognized in the Yugoslav space. Owing to the changed circumstances of the media, the management of public television saw the direction of the development of the medium after 1990 tend towards entertainment programmes, which meant that the documentary began losing its former importance in the name of ratings and advertising revenues.

Vzpon ljubljanske šole dokumentarnega filma na TV Ljubljana (1981–1990) in zaton dokumentarizma

Ključne besede: TV Ljubljana, javni medij, dokumentarni film, produkcija dokumentarnega filma

Članek obravnava specifično obdobje produkcije dokumentarnega žanra na TV Ljubljana, znano kot obdobje ljubljanske šole dokumentarnega filma (1981–1990). Težišče raziskave so predvsem produkcijski pogoji in omejitve, v katerih so nastajali dokumentarni filmi, ter prakse in rutine ustvarjalcev, da bi analizirali, kako so se produkcijske prakse odražale v formi in stilu dokumentarnih filmov. Dokumentarni filmi tega obdobja so se namreč začeli oddaljevati od reportaž z aktualno politično vsebino in razlagalnim načinom reprezentacije ter se vedno bolj približevali participatornemu in observacijskemu načinu reprezentacije. Rutine in praske so postajale bolj profesionalne, predvsem so novinarji začeli pisati scenarije in sodelovati z nadarjenimi režiserji iz AGRFT. Kljub finančnim in produkcijskim omejitvam, ki so v ustvarjalni proces postavljale številna birokratska opravila, ter samocenzuri ustvarjalcev, so pod vodstvom urednika Draga Pečka in s sodelovanjem režiserjev nastali številni avtorski dokumentarni filmi, ki so bili prepoznavni v jugoslovanskem prostoru. Zaradi spremenjenih medijskih razmer je vodstvo javne televizije smer razvoja medija po letu 1990 videla bolj v zabavnih programih, kar je pomenilo, da je dokumentarizem začel izgubljati nekdanji pomen v imenu gledanosti in marketinških prihodkov.

About the author

Katja Stamboldžioski is the Head of the Educational Programme Department at TV Slovenia and a screenwriter of numerous documentary films and shows. She obtained her Master of Science in the field of Sociology of Media in 2007 at the Faculty of Arts, the University of Ljubljana and is currently finishing her doctoral degree at the Faculty of Social Sciences, the University of Ljubljana in the field of Media Studies. Her field of study is specific cultural forms in the medium of television and documentary films.

Email: stamboldzioski@gmail.com

O avtorici

Katja Stamboldžioski je urednica Uredništva izobraževalnih oddaj TV Slovenija in scenaristka številnih dokumentarnih filmov in oddaj. Na Filozofski fakulteti Univerze v Ljubljani je 2007 pridobila naziv magistrica znanosti s področja sociologije medijev, trenutno zaključuje doktorat na Fakulteti za družbene vede Univerze v Ljubljani s področja medijskih študij. Njeno področje raziskovanja so specifične kulturne forme v televizijskem mediju ter dokumentarni filmi.

E-naslov: stamboldzioski@gmail.com