Dana Mustata

Forging an Identity
for Early Romanian Television

Attention started to be paid to the television author around the time as the medium itself became an object of scholarly consideration. This early interest was, however, shaped by a conceptualization derived from understandings of other media such as film, theatre, and literature. It is perhaps unsurprising then that the foundational works of the 1970s and 1980s were mostly produced by journalists or scholars of literature. Indeed, it follows that these writers concentrated on the text while largely neglecting production processes and the specificities of the medium.[1] For instance, journalist critics such as Nancy Banks-Smith of London's *Guardian* newspaper focused solely on the content of television programs, and singled out their writers and stars. Similarly, one of the first books dedicated to the medium, George W. Brandt's *British Television Drama* (1981),[2] was organized around dramatists and screenwriters, with entire chapters dedicated to Dennis Potter, Jim Allen, Trevor Griffiths, and others.

In light of the development of new academic disciplines such as Television Studies, by 1990, the media scholars Robert Thompson and Gary Burns acknowledged that questions of television authorship needed to be revisited.[3] The identity of the television author had never been clear however. Programs were often positioned as the result of a collective effort subsequently associated with a specific company or broadcaster or channel.[4] Television was therefore declared an "authorless" or a "polyauthorial" medium. Paying attention to the production process, argued Thompson and Burns, promised to provide more fruitful ways of understanding television authorship.[5]

1)   Charlotte Brunsdon, 'What Is the Television of Television Studies?', in Christine Geraghty and David Lusted (eds), *The Television Studies Book* (London: Arnold, 1988), pp. 95–113.

2)   George W. Brandt, *British Television Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

3)   See Robert J. Thompson and Gary Burns (eds), *Making Television: Authorship and the Production Process* (New York: Praeger, 1990).

4)   See John Hartley, 'From Republic of Letters to Television Republic? Citizen Readers in the Era of Broadcast Television', in Lynn Spiegel and Jan Olsson (eds), *Television After TV: Essays on a Medium in Transition* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), p. 401.

5)   Thompson and Burns 'Introduction', pp. ix–x.

The recent expansion of television texts as components of complex multi-platform serial narratives within the hyper-competitive market of the "era of plenty" or the "post-network era" has inspired new interest in the television author.[6] In this "post-network era", authorship is understood as positing a single, unified author of the television text.[7] Increased interaction with Hollywood has thus transformed writers into brand names which provide a sense of coherency, continuity, and integration to fictional universes spread across multiple platforms; into "indicator[s] of legitimacy" and into valuable marketing hooks.[8]

While not wishing to diminish the importance of authorship and the text to understandings of the post-network era, I would like to suggest that, in the early age of television, the creation process played a key role in conferring an identity on television in terms of aesthetics, programming, and the organization of labor. This process of creation was carried out by personnel who imprinted a defining "look" on the medium. Negotiations between professionals, on the one hand, and, on the other, social and political actors were central to fashioning a specific identity for the television.[9] It was this initial lack of such an identity which left room for negotiations over what this new medium was, how it might look, and how it would function.

Thus, where television is typically considered to be authorless or poly-authorial, based on the collective efforts of scriptwriters, directors, and producers,[10] in the case of early Romanian television, individual professionals need to be singled out from the collective nature of the medium. These professionals contributed much to the identity of television in this country, not least because they played significant roles in decision-making and program-making. Having acquired "know-how" through professional exchanges with over-

---

6)   John Ellis, *Seeing Things: Television in the Age of Uncertainty* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2000); Henry Jenkins, *Convergence Culture: When Old and New Media Collide* (New York: New York University Press, 2006); Jason Mittell, 'Narrative Complexity in Contemporary American Television', *The Velvet Light Trap*, no. 58 (Fall 2006), pp. 29–40; Amanda Lotz, *The Television will be Revolutionized* (New York: New York University Press, 2007); John Thornton Caldwell, *Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008); Elizabeth Evans, *Transmedia Television: Audiences, New Media and Daily Life* (New York: Routledge, 2011).

7)   Evans, *Transmedia Television*.

8)   See for example Roberta Pearson, '*Lost* in Transition: from Post-network to Post-television', in Janet McCabe and Kim Akass (eds), *Quality TV: Contemporary American Television and Beyond* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007), p. 239; John Thornton Caldwell, 'Para-industry: Researching Hollywood's Blackwaters', *Cinema Journal*, vol. 52, no. 3 (Spring 2013), pp. 157–165; Matt Hills, *Fan Cultures* (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 132; Evans, *Transmedia Television*, p. 32.

9)   See Monika Elsner, Thomas Muller, Peter M. Spangenberg, 'The Early History of German Television: the Slow Development of a Fast Medium', in H.U. Gumbrecht, K. L. Pfeiffer (eds) *Materialities of Communication* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988); Daniela Mustata, 'The Power of Television: Including the Historicizing of the Live Romanian Television' (Dissertation: Utrecht University, 2011).

10)   See for example Thomas Streeter, 'Broadcast Copyright and the Bureaucratization of Property', in Martha Woodmansee and Peter Jaszi (eds), *The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994), p. 303; Thompson and Burns (eds), *Making Television*. Furthermore, television production has notoriously discouraged authorial creativity in favor of risk-aversion; and, for this reason, it has prioritized repetitive, format-driven, and serial narrative formulae over one-off creations. See John Ellis, 'Television Production', in Robert C. Allen, Annette Hill (eds), *The Television Studies Reader* (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 275.

seas broadcasters, it was they who did most to forge the look and feel of early Romanian television. Moreover, their actions made the consolidation of Romanian television part of a broader pan-European phenomenon. By centralizing such personnel we might depart from the nation-centric lens that has been typically applied to studies of European television.[11] Singling out those professionals who helped to forge an identity for early television qualifies as authorship, and it is this definition, which I will use for the remainder of the article. This concept of authorship extends beyond the studio and the text to include spaces of institutional decision-making and the transnational exchanges, which were central to defining a look and feel for early television in Romania.

When approaching the European dimensions of early television — beyond discussions of content — in former socialist countries we must recognize the extent to which official records will have been shaped by political interests. For example, a high-profile Romanian television executive's visits to the British Broadcasting Corporation (hereafter BBC) were not recorded by the Romanian authorities but were documented by the BBC.[12] Accordingly, the history presented below is derived from analyses of a variety of historical sources, including audiovisual material, oral testimonies, and written documents relating to nineteen public broadcasters.[13] Oral testimonies are drawn from the *Viziune Tele* collection, which was compiled by the Romanian broadcaster to mark its fortieth anniversary. They are, however, supplemented by references to documentation covering the same topics that are preserved in the BBC's Written Archives.

Authoring an Identity for Early Romanian Television

Romanian television's early years can be seen as a phase of "experimental visions". This phase started in December 1956 when broadcasting began. It would last until 1971, when the medium reached a point of maturity, marked by such developments as the consolidation of management close to Communist Party top brass and the establishment of a television centre distinct from the country's film studios.[14] This phase also coincided with what John Ellis has called the "era of scarcity", a period in European television history characterized by a paucity of content, a migration of personnel from radio and cinema, experiments with the artistic possibilities of the medium, and the social and functional reorganization of production, management, and institutional structures.[15] As Monika Elsner, Thomas Muller, and Peter M. Spangenberg note in relation to German television, this was

---

11) For a critical discussion of nation-centric approaches to television history see Catherine Johnson and Andreas Fickers, 'Introduction', in *Transnational Television History: A Comparative Approach* (New York: Routledge, 2012).

12) 'Visitors from Romania to Our Television Service' in E 1/2, 309/1 "Romania. Brucan Silviu", 5.11.1964, BBC WAC.

13) These are included on EUscreen, a database of thousands of film and television clips from broadcasters across Europe.
EUscreen, <http://www.euscreen.eu> [accessed 5 May 2014].

14) Mustata, 'The Power of Television'.

15) John Ellis, *Seeing Things: Television in the Age of Uncertainty* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2000).

a time in which across Europe this medium searched for its own identity as an artistic form, as an institution, and as work practice.[16]

Because Romanian television was only under the loose supervision of the State in its early years, creative personnel enjoyed a measure of freedom to engage in acts of experimentation. Within the national broadcaster was a group of workers familiar with the basics of programming, technology, organization, and audience targeting. Its efforts get to grips with the medium and to explore its possibilities ultimately overshadowed the ideologically driven interventions of the Party, which, we should note, was more interested at the time in the propagandistic potential of radio than that of television.[17]

Silviu Brucan, a former ambassador to Washington, was the first person to play a key role in constructing an institutional identity for Romanian television. In 1962, then Party leader Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej made him its first vice president, a position similar to that of the director general of the BBC. Brucan described his relationship to Gheorghiu-Dej as "unusual for someone who was ruling the country and the Party with a strong hand and who was used to everybody responding to his decisions as to a military command".[18] Brucan had made it clear that he would only accept the position if given considerable decision-making freedom. Dissatisfied with Romanian programming, Gheorghiu-Dej believed Brucan's exposure to American television during his time in Washington would help him to reform this institution. His influence was expected to increase the entertainment value and educational qualities of Romanian programs. As Brucan explained:

> I liked the idea of organizing television, and I thought some policies needed to be instituted. I warned Gheorghiu-Dej that I would only accept his offer if I was given the freedom to do what I thought was best, and if other officials didn't interfere. He agreed to this, and, at our first meeting, I told him that I had received five phone calls from Party members. Two of them felt current programming was informative and entertaining. However, three of them had complained about naked women, complained that I was allowing [comedy actors disliked by Party leaders] Mircea Crisan and Amza Pellea to satarize the Party, and complained that *The Saint* [1962–1969] incited juvenile delinquency. I asked Gheorghiu: "Who should I listen to?" He replied: "To yourself. It's your responsibility." He instructed everybody to let me do my job, because I knew what I was doing.[19]

While he brought entertainment such as satires and variety shows to the Romanian screen, Brucan's most significant contribution involved helping to form an institutional identity for the broadcaster. This identity was inspired by the BBC. It departed from the visions of the Romanian Communist Party. In October 1964, Brucan wrote a letter to the managing director of BBC radio, Frank Gillard, explaining "[e]ver since I was appointed to run our Radio and Television system, a visit to the BBC became an important objective

---

16) Elsner, Müller and Spangenberg, 'The Early History of German Television'.
17) Grigore Pop, *Viziune-Tele* (Bucharest: TVR Directia de Logistica si Memorie, 1996), p. 167.
18) Silviu Brucan, 'Idila mea cu televiziunea', in *Viziune-Tele* (Bucharest: TVR Directia de Logistica si Memorie, 1996), p. 41.
19) Ibid., pp. 41–42.

of mine".[20] In correspondence with the head of the BBC's Eastern European service, M.B. Latey, Brucan emphasized "[k]nowing the way TV programmes are done in England is a must these days".[21] By the end of the year, Brucan had spent three weeks at the corporation seeking "know-how from the BBC to help establish the new Television Centre in Bucharest".[22] "This know-how", he detailed, "extends over a wide range from architectural design through to the actual administrative structure of the television service".[23] A BBC memo stressed Brucan's was very much a working visit:

> He is a most engaging and amusing person and his English is fluent. I found him excellent company and very ready to talk freely, even dangerously. [...] He professes a life-long admiration of the BBC and wants to spend his time with producers and in studios, seeing how programmes are prepared and directed, not in a round of official lunches, dinners and receptions. What a relief to have a visiting potentate with that kind of purpose in mind![24]

A senior Assistant from BBC Television Liaison, A.S.W. Skempton, wrote:

> Mr. Brucan, as you know, is in sole charge of television in Romania, although he only carried the title of Vice-President, and he made it quite clear during his visit that he would be only too glad to help the BBC quoting specifically that we could send our cameramen freely throughout Romania and they could return with undeveloped film. There would be no restrictions of any sort and no censorship.[25]

Brucan also visited BBC West, a regional office of the corporation, in order to learn about color television trials being run in the city of Bristol. As a result of these visits, an agreement was signed between the corporation and Romanian television. It made BBC programming available at a reasonable price and promised Romanian delegations would be assisted on subsequent visits to the corporation.[26]

Brucan left his post in 1965 when Ceausescu came to power. He rationalized this decision thus: "I realized that I could no longer do things the way I had done them in the past".[27] Brucan's fears notwithstanding, Romanian delegations continued to visit the BBC. One such visit took place in 1966 and involved the new vice president of Romanian television Ioan Grigorescu, its editor-in-chief of children's and youth programs Ileana Pop, and its editor-in-chief of news programs Tudor Vornicu. This delegation travelled to Britain to learn more about the BBC's organizational structure, its editorial offices, and its ap-

---

20) E 1/2, 309/1, 'Romania. Brucan Silviu', October 1964, BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham (hereafter BBC WAC).
21) Letter from Brucan to Latey in E 1/2, 309/1 "Romania. Brucan Silviu", November 1964, BBC WAC.
22) E 1/2, 309/1, 'Romania. Brucan Silviu', 4.12.1964, BBC WAC.
23) Ibid.
24) E 1/2, 309/1, 'Romania. Brucan Silviu', 13.11.1964, BBC WAC.
25) Ibid.
26) Subsequent fact-finding missions of the 1960s were covered by a "Contra-account", a credit arrangement between the two broadcasters.
27) Brucan, *Viziune Tele*, p. 42.

proaches to genre programming such as scientific broadcasts and variety shows.[28] Two years later, another new vice president of Romanian television, Bujor Ionita, spent time at the BBC's engineering division to learn more about color television.[29] Soon after, producer/editor Catinca Ralea Petrut and camera operator Virgil Cojocaru liaised with the corporation, gathering information about audience research, acquiring serials and telefilms, and acquiring organizational insights in preparation for the launch of a second Romanian channel.[30]

The exchanges with the BBC that had been inaugurated by Brucan shaped the institutional and professional culture of Romanian television. Brucan had helped to cultivate an environment in which production took place free of political interference, where a broader range of content was broadcast, where entertainment was as valued as educational programming, where western imports were desired, and where "know-how" was gleaned from other European broadcasters. The identity Brucan inspired was thus rooted in international exchanges and in European models. In this respect, it needs stressing that Romania was not the only continental European country whose television sector was influenced by cross-border exchanges. The BBC was a key figure in the regional interaction which made the early development of Romanian television part of truly pan-European phenomenon. For example, in the 1960s, personnel working in programming, engineering, and audience measurement at broadcasters across the continent were inspired by, and acquired professional "know-how" from, the corporation.[31] The BBC's influence was especially strong in Scandinavia, where "television pilgrimages", as Jérôme Bourdon has called them (2008), also took decision-makers to Britain.[32]

Professional and Aesthetic Consolidation

The impact of the institutional consolidation of Romanian television was felt in its working culture. This culture bore a striking resemblance to those of other European broadcasters insofar as it was supported by staff and resources recruited from radio and cinema.[33] Enforced moves from radio to television are highlighted by a number of workers, including Editor-in-chief Sofia Sincan who has said that:

> In the spring of 1967, [director general of Romanian television] Octavian Paler came into my office at the radio and said in a low, stern voice: "Please take the night

---

28) 'Visit of Romanian TV Officials, 17th May' in E 1/2, 310/1, 'Romania. Brucan Silviu', 13.11.1964, BBC WAC.
29) Letter by L.E. Pauley dated 26.02.1968 in E 1/2, 311/1, 'Romania, Ionitza, B.', BBC WAC.
30) Letter to Stephenson from J.A. Birch dated 4.10.1967, E 1/2, 313/1, BBC WAC.
31) Jérôme Bourdon, 'Imperialism, Self-inflicted? On the Americanization of Television in Europe', in William Uricchio (ed), *We Europeans? Media, Representations, Identities* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), p. 96.
32) Other European broadcasters, including those in the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy and Spain, also visited their American counterparts to glean insights into program development. For example, the Italian broadcaster adapted American quiz shows, and French variety producers Maritie and Gilbert Carpentier visited the set of THE PERRY COSMO SHOW. See Ibid., pp. 96, 100.
33) See Michele Hilmes, *The Television History Book* (London: British Film Institute, 2003).

train to Timisoara. Tomorrow night, there will be a televised theater play and you will have to fill in the breaks between acts. Think of some ideas. There will be a TV director there. He will fill you in on the details."[34]

During the early years of Romanian television, working groups set about professionalizing and institutionalizing the new medium. Workers speak of brainstorming about program development in a courtyard at the Molière studio, a former film studio that was transformed into Romania's new television center. These professionals became known in the popular parlance as "the generation under the mulberry tree", due to the presence of such a tree in this location. "We were like a big family back then; full of youth and enthusiasm", explained artistic director Vlad Batca; "We were entrusted with this electronic toy and had to find out its secrets, at the same time we were discovering who we were as human beings and artists".[35]

Under Brucan a reliable management team was put in place at the Romanian broadcaster. Octavian Paler was appointed director general following a stint in Rome as a correspondent for the national news agency, Agerpress. Bujor Ionita, an engineer, became the new vice president of television (Paler's second-in-command), with Vornicu becoming editor-in-chief for news and eventually program director. Beneath upper management emerged a group of professionals characterized by a strong team spirit and solid work ethics. Program maker and reporter Carmen Dumitrescu recalled:

> I spent many happy years in the mulberry tree yard, where our programs were born. [...] I had superiors who were valuable to Romanian television and to us. With honesty and respect, I must mention Silviu Brucan, who in 1962 — perhaps confident in his friendship with Gheorghiu-Dej — recommended we choose our interviewees based on value, rather than political standing. [...] It was an honor for us to have Octavian Paler go from being our colleague to a superior who let us bloom. Year after year, we sat together in the same viewing rooms, pushing ourselves to go beyond journalistic mediocrity. When [vice president of the Radio and Television Committee] Ioan Grigorescu would come to viewing sessions, [Paler] would apologize and talk continuously, showing us that he trusted us, that he shared our ideas, and that he was responsible with us, without being the censor. [...] Vornicu, although he was our boss, used to call me "boss". Not only did he grant me decision-making power, he supported my decisions, especially when we made programs together.[36]

Among the various professionals contributing to the early identity of Romanian television, the director stood out however. Although they drew from other branches of the arts such as film and theater, the contributions of some directors nevertheless represented an effort to establish an artistic identity for television. The critical endorsements some of their ranks received would cement their status as such, and ensure that the figure of the director became the first internationally accepted reference point for the evaluation of tele-

---

34) Author interview with Sofia Sincan, 15 January 2008.
35) Vlad Batca in *Viziune Tele*, p. 20.
36) Carmen Dumitrescu in *Viziune Tele*, p. 86.

vision as an art form.[37] Several directors engaged in experimental creative practice to compensate for the technical limitations of the medium. Across Europe, festivals singled them out as a driving force behind the medium's aesthetic values. Thus, the Italian Salsomaggiore festival gave awards to several indigenous directors for their television work, and, in 1966, the Austrian director Helmut Zilk received a "Golden Camera" award for his achievements in the medium.[38] That year, the Golden Prague International Television Festival also applauded Europe's television directors.[39]

Several directors of early Romanian television rose to international prominence. By 1965, both Valariu Lazarov and Cornel Popa had become widely acknowledged as visionary talents. Lazarov brought home several accolades and awards. In 1964, his musical OMUL DIN UMBRA LA SOARE (Translation: "The Shadow Man in the Sun") received a special mention from the jury of the Monte Carlo International Television Festival.[40] Another Lazarov musical, OMUL SI CAMERA (Translation: "The Man and the Camera") won three awards: first prize at the Cairo International Festival of Television Films (1966), best directing and most original work at the Prague International Television Festival (1966), and an international critics' award and another special mention at the Monte Carlo International Television Festival of 1967.[41]

GAME PENTRU TELEVIZIUNE (English-language Title: GAME FOR TELEVISION, 1968) was widely seen to showcase Lazarov's artistic qualities as a television director however. For one, this musical film received a special mention from the jury of the Monte Carlo International Television Festival. A self-reflexive consideration of television directing, GAME PENTRU TELEVIZIUNE synchronized camerawork, editing, sound, and lighting in a manner that both emphasized the audiovisual possibilities of the medium and compensated for its technical deficiencies.[42] Lazarov used sequential cuts after every frame as a means of approximating the effect of the zoom-out transfocalization that television cameras were unable to achieve. This practice generated changes from frame to frame, giving the impression that the image was moving to the beat of the soundtrack.[43] Similarly, Lazarov used dissolves between the back- and foreground to give the illusion of the camera moving to the beat of folk music. Elsewhere, rapid editing complements drums in a manner akin to the aesthetics of much 1980s genre television. What is more, moving shots and editing were synchronized to create various lighting effects for a singer; the camera was all

---

37) See Dana Mustata: 'The Europeans of Early Television'. A History of European Television, <http://www.euscreen.eu/exhibitions.html#.U3s511xiC_s> [accessed 6 May 2014].

38) See SALSOMAGGIORE PREMI AI REGISTI TELEVISIVI, Cinecittà Luce, 18 June 1964 <http://euscreen.eu/play.jsp?id=EUS_EA563DB3334F4205B492B9F786051FB5>; SALSOMAGGIORE: PREMIO REGIA TELEVISIVA, Cinecittà Luce, June 1976, <http://euscreen.eu/play.jsp?id=EUS_214063F10C2B418998898B6976FC6AF9>; TV DIRECTOR HELMUT ZILK IS AWARDED THE „GOLDEN CAMERA 1966", ORF Austrian Broadcasting Corporation, 26 January 1967, <http://euscreen.eu/play.jsp?id=EUS_DDE49A45EB5B415689CDF1572A3B-DAF7> [all accessed 5 May 2014].

39) ČESKOSLOVENSKÝ FILMOVÝ TÝDENÍK 26/1971, Czech Television, 1971, <http://euscreen.eu/play.jsp?id=EUS_0B06A5147021494F93628693D49A5657> [accessed 5 May 2014].

40) T. Pasca, *TVR in competitii nationale si internationale (1962–2001)* (Bucuresti: Societatea Romana de Televiziune, 2001), p. 5.

41) Ibid., p. 6.

42) Mustata, 'The Power of Television', p. 160.

43) Ibid.

but transformed into a partner for this character. Another important director, albeit one not showered in accolades like Lazarov, was Alexandru Bocanet, who used monochromatic contrasts as a substitute for color at a time when Romanian television only broadcast in black and white. However, unlike Lazarov, Bocanet was only known locally. Ultimately it was Lazarov who brought home international awards and helped to make Romanian television part of a pan-European discourse on the artistic credentials of the medium.

Conclusion

Television undeniably remains a collective effort, acknowledgement of which has tended to exclude from histories of the medium discussion of the relevance of single authors. While the current era of media convergence may have brought into focus the notion of the television author as a single, unified persona, analyses of the formative stages of the medium continue to centralize collective effort. However, in this essay, I argued that certain individuals need to be singled out from such efforts if we were better to understand the early development of this medium's institutional, organizational, and aesthetic identity. Doing so helps us to extend the concept of authorship beyond the text and spaces of production to situate it within institutional decision-making and transnational professional exchanges, thereby promising more fully to address the formation of an identity for early television. The early period of Romanian television was characterized by an exploration of the medium's potential, thereby opening up a space for individuals to exert control over its consolidation as both an institution and an art form. They became negotiators between television staff and politicians, and between local needs and pan-European developments. In this case, the defining of the new medium — in terms of its social roles and artistic forms — took precedence over the televisual text. To conclude, I would like to suggest that examinations of authorship and early television might benefit from both comparative and bottom-up approaches. Acknowledging the transnational dimensions of the development of this medium in nations such as Romania indicates that we might best consider television's institutionalization a pan-European phenomenon.[44]

Dana Mustata is Assistant Professor in Television Studies at the Department of Media and Journalism Studies at the University of Groningen. She completed her Ph.D. in 2011 with a dissertation entitled "The Power of Television: Including the Historicizing of the Live Romanian Revolution". She is currently working on a research project entitled "Everyday Matters: Material Historiographies of Television in Cold War Contexts", and is leading the collaborative project "Television Histories in (Post)Socialist Europe", both funded by the Dutch Science Foundation (NWO). She is a co-founder and coordinator of the European (Post)Socialist Television History Network, and managing editor of *VIEW: Journal of European Television History and Culture*.

---

44) For an in-depth discussion see Dana Mustata, 'Television in the Age of (Post)communism', in Timothy Havens, Aniko Imre, and Katlin Lustyik (eds), *Popular Television in Eastern Europe During and Since Socialism: Entertaining a New Europe* (New York: Routledge, 2012).

SUMMARY

Forging an Identity for Early Romanian Television

Dana Mustata

The limited amount of attention paid to authorship has led to claims that television is authorless or poly-authorial. While such positions respect the collective efforts undergirding the medium, we should not underplay the extent to which authorship has contributed to its development. Alongside the current "post-network" era, a consideration of authorship promises to enrich our understandings of television's early development in Europe, especially its development of a medium specific identity. This essay therefore examines how authorship contributed to the institutional and artistic identity of Romanian television of the 1960s, singling out those individuals who took the lead therein. This process, I argue, was less a national than a pan-European phenomenon, one shaped by transnational exchanges, which are better understood when we broaden the national perspective traditionally applied to researching and writing television histories.