

---

**NEVIDLJIVO  
NASILJE:  
PRIČE IZ  
REDAKCIJE**

---

SRBIJA  
KOSOVO  
CRNA GORA  
MAKEDONIJA  
BOSNA I HERCEGOVINA



# NEVIDLJIVO NASILJE: PRIČE IZ REDAKCIJE

2018.



Western Balkan's  
Regional Platform for  
Advocating Media Freedom  
and Journalists' Safety



This project is funded by  
The European Union



# Sadržaj:

<b>Uvod</b>	<b>07</b>
OD MEDIJSKE POSLUGE DO DŽELATSKE SLUŽBE Piše: <b>Viktor Ivančić</b>	09
ČUVARI JAVNOG ILI DRŽAVNOG INTERESA Priredila: <b>Žarka Radoja</b>	15
PRIVATNI MEDIJI ZA PRIVATNE SVRHE Priredila: <b>Nidžara Ahmetašević</b>	23
(NE)ZAVISNOST NEPROFITNIH MEDIJA Priredila: <b>Milica Bogdanović</b>	29
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>39</b>
FROM MEDIA SERVANTS TO HANGMAN SERVICE By <b>Viktor Ivančić</b>	41
GUARDIANS OF PUBLIC OR STATE INTEREST By <b>Žarka Radoja</b>	47
PRIVATE MEDIA FOR PRIVATE PURPOSES By <b>Nidžara Ahmetašević</b>	55
(IN)DEPENDENCE OF NON-PROFIT MEDIA By <b>Milica Bogdanović</b>	61



## Uvod

Koliko su novinari zaista u mogućnosti da se bave svojim poslom u redakciji i koliko su njihova radna prava poštovana? Ovo su bila početna pitanje istraživanja "Nevidljivo nasilje: Priče iz redakcije" koje smo, kroz intervju sa kolegama i koleginicama, sproveli u pet zemalja – BiH, Srbiji, Crnoj Gori, Kosovu i Makedoniji.

Novinarstvo objedinjuje lični, interes profesije i opšti interes. Kako kaže sociolog Srećko Mihajlović, od novinara se često traži da daju odgovore koje samo društvo u celini ne može da pruži. „A ako novinari ćute, onda se pitamo zašto ćute?“

S jedne strane, pod otvorenim političkim pritiscima i pretnjama, često prozivani direktno sa konferencija za medije vodećih ljudi u zemlji, s druge strane u sukobu sa uredništvom zbog određenih tema, i na kraju u prekarnom položaju, novinari i novinarka glavni deo posla obavljaju u uslovima nesigurnosti, diskriminacije, cenzure i otvorenih pritisaka, koji rezultiraju autocenzurom.

O tome najbolje govori činjenica da je većina novinara i novinarki s kojima smo razgovarali insistirala na anonimnosti – što zbog straha od gubitka posla ili nemogućnosti da ga u budućnosti nađu, što zbog ne-ugodnosti jer su pristali na pritiske.

Kroz preko 50 intervju sa kolegama i koleginicama zaposlenim u javnim, komercijalnim i neprofitnim, odnosno medijima civilnog društva, s kojima smo razgovarali od januara do maja 2018. godine, pokušali smo da približimo javnosti uslove u kojima rade, jer se o njima retko ili uopšte ne govori u javnosti. Dok se društvena atmosfera u svakoj zemlji preslikava na novinarski način bavljenja poslom, ono što je svim našim sagovornicima i sagovornicama zajedničko jeste strah, a društva u kojima se novinar plaši, nisu slobodna društva.

Uprkos činjenici da smo sve svesne nivoa cenzure i autocenzure, kao i procesa kroz koje prolazi novinarstvo na globalnom nivou, stepen straha novinara i novinarki da govore o tome sa kakvim pritiscima se suočavaju u obavljan-

ju posla na dnevnom nivou, otvorio je pitanje o samoj profesiji i mogućnosti da se aktuelna situacija potpune nesigurnosti u finansijskom, socijalnom i političkom smislu prevaziđe. Čak 70 odsto anketiranih novinara u regiji, u maloj anketi koju smo proveli u pomenutih pet zemalja, odgovorilo je da bi promenilo posao ili redakciju u kojoj radi, a glavni razlozi su na prvom mestu niske plate (42 odsto), a na drugom cenzura unutar redakcije (15 odsto). Na pitanje da li su slobodni da javno govore o pritiscima sa kojima se suočavaju u redakciji, najviše odgovora, 32 odsto, bilo je – ne.

Tekstovi koje ćete imati priliku da pročitate zbir su pojedinačno objavljenih tekstova svake od autorki u matičnim zemljama, a svi su objedinjeni na portalu KontraPRESS, u rubrici “Nevidljivo nasilje”. Specijalno za naš zbornik tekst je napisao novinar Viktor Ivančić, osnivač kulturnog splitskog lista “Feral Tribune”, kolumnista nedeljnika “Novosti” i autor knjige o novinarstvu “Zašto ne pišem i drugi eseji”.

Uverene smo da je odgovor u prepoznavanju problema u svim zemljama – delimo nesigurnost, devastirane sindikate, preopterećena ili nedovoljno fokusirana novinarska udruženja i nezadovoljstvo zbog situacije u kojoj se profesija nalazi – i u većoj solidarnosti u otporu.

*Biljana Sekulovska,  
Una Hajdari,  
Nidžara Ahmetašević,  
Milica Bogdanović,  
Žarka Radoja.*



# **OD MEDIJSKE POSLUGE DO DŽELATSKE SLUŽBE**

Píše: Viktor Ivančić

Već duže vrijeme su informativni mediji – pogotovo oni za masovnu namjenu, kojima se obično tepa kao „vođećima“ – najinteresantniji po onome što je u njima cenzurirano. Otkako je cenzura prestala biti pojava ekscesne prirode i postala takoreći temeljna uređivačka tehnika, prioriteti „korisnika medijskih usluga“ također su bitno promijenjeni. Čitati novine (slušati radio, gledati televiziju, pratiti portale) s ambicijom da se detaljno informiramo o onome što u njima nije objavljeno, oblik je intelektualne relaksacije koji bih svakome preporučio. Dakako, nužno je prije toga uvid u najvažnije elemente stvarnosti steći izvan medijskoga polja, ili barem izvan njegove središnje struje.

Kada bi mi netko danas ponudio da po vlastitome nahođenju izaberem bilo koji posao u novinskome pogonu i osigurao mi minimalan radni i kreativni manevar, umjesto za funkciju kakvog odgovornog urednika, opredijelio bih se za dužnost odgovornog skarednika, lica zaduženog za sadržaje iz oblasti žurnalističke loše savjesti, koji bi čitatelju pomagao da se sa što manje ozljeda probije kroz blještavi informativni paket ispunjen ekskluzivnim, senzacionalnim i sličnim banalnostima. Dovoljna bi mi bila četvrtina naslovne stranice u čijem bi gornjem lijevom uglu stajala crvenim slovima otisnuta egida: „U današnjem izdanju ne donosimo...“

Istini za volju, rubriku takvoga naslova objavljivao sam u tjednome satiričnom prilogu još sredinom osamdesetih godina prošloga stoljeća. No bila su to drugačija vremena: jednopartijska država niti na razini proklamacija nije imala u vidu obaviještene građane, a zauzvrat sama nije bila obaviještena o tome što građani doista misle o njoj. Kasnije, kada je na scenu stupilo mnoštvo partija i mnoštvo „slobodnih medija“, pa se ta šarolika množina, uz spasonosnu pomoć krupnog kapitala, sljubila i uhodala na rajskim poljanama „slobodnoga tržišta“, svatko iole otvorena uma mogao se upoznati s paradoksom koji je u novinarsku svakodnevicu unijela provala demokracije: što je više formalno zajamčene slobode, to je više faktički provedene cenzure.

Prije desetak godina, u vrijeme dok sam koristio blagodati profesionalne dokolice, ispisao sam nekoliko podužih eseja koji su se na ovaj ili onaj način bavili novinarstvom (kasnije okupljenih u knjizi „Zašto ne pišem i drugi eseji“, Fabrika knjiga, 2010.). U jednome od njih, pod naslovom „Siva zona ljubičice bijele“, analizirao sam medijsku propagandu u službi Ivice Todorića, tadašnjega vlasnika kompanije Agrokora i najmoćnijeg tajkuna u Hrvatskoj. Za predložak je poslužila reportaža zamjenika glavnog urednika najutjecajnijega dnevnog lista, kojom je ovaj – obilazeći s Todorićem (u helikopteru) njegovo poslovno carstvo – vlasniku Agrokora spjevao svojevrsnu titoističku poemu. Tajkun je tu prikazan kao „čovjek koji pokreće Hrvatsku“, kao hodajuće božanstvo, kao jedini garant nacionalnog progresa koji se čitav predaje svakome detalju svojga mesijanskog pothvata, do toga da su mu, kako piše autor reportaže, „jabuke poput djevojaka“, da bi „bika ljubio među rogove“, ili da „hranu za krave prebire po prstima toliko zadovoljno da se čini kako bi je i sam kušao“...

Sličnim su porcijama ditiramba Ivicu Todorića u redovitim sljedovanjima častili i svi drugi „vodeći mediji“. Važnije od toga: o razbojničkoj metodi kojom je izgrađen gospodarski gigant, o problematičnim aspektima Agrokorova poslovanja, o koruptivnim vezama s državnim institucijama, o savezništvima s potkupljenim političarima preko kojih je konstituiran ekonomski monopol, o bezdušnome izrabljivanju radnica i radnika... u hrvatskome medijskom prostoru nije se mogla pročitati ni jedna kritička riječ. Čak ni dvorac s četrdeset soba (i vjerojatno isto toliko članova posluge) u kojem je tajkun s obitelji živio, nije mamio novinarske podsmijehe – makar je krasno dočaravao feudalne moke snove naprasno obogaćena skorojevića – već je u bogato ilustriranim prikazima reklamiran s punim poštovanjem, kao dokaz elitnoga stila, kao prikladan simbol moći nacionalnog spasitelja.

Koncern Agrokor, između ostaloga, obilno je hranio oglasima hrvatsku medijsku industriju, a trudbenici u ostakljenim pogonima za proizvodnju sadašnjosti bili su dobro upoznati – što putem direktnih naloga, što uz pomoć instinkta samoodržanja – s krucijalnom devizom: ne pljuj u zdjelu iz koje jedeš! Na taj su se način suočili i s drugim paradoksom postsocijalističkog žurnalizma: što su u većoj mjeri bili socijalno zgaženi, što su im nadnice bile niže, što su temeljitije bivali izloženi prekršnim uvjetima rada, što im je egzistencija bila nesigurnija, to su s većom predanošću u svojem novinarskom poslu morali zastupati interese bogatih i moćnih.

Danas, kada nastaje ovaj zapis, Ivica Todorić više nije vlasnik Agrokor, kompanija zbog prezaduženosti proživljava agoniju raskošne propasti, protiv tajkuna je pokrenuta istraga, pa je pobjegao u Veliku Britaniju gdje se pravnim sredstvima bori protiv izručenja i vjerojatnog zatvora, nekadašnji prijatelji iz vrha političke vlasti sada su njegovi najljući neprijatelji, ukratko – dojučerašnja nacionalna svetinja postala je nacionalna lovina. „Vodeći mediji“ rutinski slijede taj trend: „čovjek koji pokreće Hrvatsku“ preko noći je postao „grobar hrvatske ekonomije“, isti autori koji su Todoriću sricali panegirike danas mu bez milosti raskopavaju crijeva, nasrtljivi fotoreporteri logoruju pred njegovim londonskim stanom, a tajkun od njih panično bježi, psuje i pokušava zakriti lice otvorenim kišobranom, novine donose stotine prljavih detalja o poslovanju korporacije i rastrošnom životu dekadentne obitelji, objavljuju policijske fotografije na kojima su dokumentirane kolekcije cipela i kožnih torbi ženskih članova familije, snimci interijera dvorca sada su krunski dokaz korumpiranosti, halapljivosti, bešćutnosti i lošeg ukusa dežurnoga zlotvora...

Tajkuna mi, priznajem, nije ni najmanje žao, ali ta novinarska sposobnost munjevitog preobražaja, spremnost da se masovno i bezbolno nastupa iz radikalno suprotstavljenih perspektiva, da se Todorićeva medijska posluža u trenu preobrazi u dželatsku službu, da glorifikatori nastupaju kao egzekutori, i to bez trunke samorefleksije ili pokušaja osvještavanja vlastite uloge, nešto je što, boraviš li duže u ovome poslu, ispunjava tjeskobom. Poznato mi je ko-

liko može biti silovita energija osvete dojučerašnjih pokornika, ona je svakako umnožena frustracijom zbog dotadašnje prisile na šutnju, no ipak mi se čini da je to tek pirotehnički efekt temeljnijega zločina, naime – profesionalne i moralne normalizacije plaćeničke pozicije novinarstva.

Nitko se više osobito ne iznenađuje grotesknim transformacijama prioriteta i namjena informativne industrije – kada njeni poslušni kruhoborci, na primjer, udarnički podižu spomenik izabranj nacionalnoj veličini, a zatim, u istome sastavu, postavljaju dinamit kojim će ga spektakularno raznijeti – jer se već podrazumijeva da je riječ o djelatnosti servisnog karaktera, o struci koja je odavno potrošila svoje ideale. Ako se stječe dojam da tipski novinar, kao u „slučaju Agrokor“, u svojoj težnji za „istinom i pravdom“ šizofreno juri u suprotnim pravcima poput loptice u stolnom tenisu, ne libeći se pobijati samoga sebe, to je zato jer njegova profesionalna i moralna putanja više nije podložna utjecaju vlastite volje, već joj smjer zadaje onaj koji udara drvenom palicom.

Tekstovi u ovoj publikaciji približavaju nam atmosferu „na terenu“ – tj. u novinarskim redakcijama – koja dovodi do raspleta sličnih gore opisanom, pa je riječ o nekoj vrsti forenzičkoga istraživanja, vrijednome uvidu u samu infrastrukturu medijske manipulacije. Tu se govori o političkim i ekonomskim pritiscima, o nesmiljenoj eksploataciji, o brutalnim egzistencijalnim ucjenama, o trgovanju informacijama, o gaženju zanatskih i etičkih normi, o nemogućim uvjetima u kojima novinari rade... a naposljetku su nam predočeni različiti modusi kontrole i oduzimanja slobode, koji variraju ovisno o karakteru i vlasničkoj strukturi pojedinih medija, o tome da li su oni javni, korporativni ili neprofitni. Bilo bi, dakako, pogrešno te priloge čitati kao zbir pojedinačnih socijalnih drama, jer je ulog znatno veći: izloženo nam je ono što je Pierre Bourdieu, baveći se drugom temom, svojedobno nazvao „strukturnim mehanizmom koji proizvodi manjak morala“.

Zbog prirode tih priloga, uostalom, osjećam se slobodnim ukratko izložiti i „vlastiti slučaj“, barem da bih razjasnio one „blagodati profesionalne dokolice“ što sam ih ranije spomenuo, a usput i ukazao na to da narav egzistencijalnih ucjena može biti vrlo šarolika, do toga da uključuje i egzistencijalne privilegije.

Prije desetak godina, nakon što je ugašen Feral Tribune, tjednik u kojem sam petnaest godina radio kao novinar i urednik, zaposlio sam se u uglednome dnevnom listu, na poziv uredništva, sa statusom kolumnista. Ubrzo sam shvatio da bih plaću (inače u vrlo pristojnom iznosu) trebao primati zato da – ne pišem. Vlasnik medijske kompanije zatražio je od uredništva da ne objavljuje moje tekstove, ali da mi se redovno isplaćuje mjesečni dohodak, a uređivačko tijelo je taj nalog krotko provelo u djelo. Ne mireći se s takvom bizarnom situacijom, uspio sam poslije priličnih peripetija utanačiti sastanak s Vlasnikom – koji se primarno bavio proizvodnjom naftnih derivata, a bio je i član vladajuće stranke – pa mi je ovaj tom prilikom ljubazno objasnio da „ne može preuzima-

ti moje neprijatelje“ i dao do znanja kako je zahtjev za cenzurom stigao od predsjednika Vlade. „Uživajte“, rekao mi je. „Pišite knjigu.“

Budući da mi se taj filantropski oblik gušenja moje autorske osobnosti nije ni najmanje dopao, odlučio sam intenzivno kršiti ugovor o radu. Počeo sam pisati za druge novine – što prema normativima matične kuće nisam smio činiti – trudeći se birati teme koje će izravno tangirati cenzorski raspoloženog Premijera, a posljedično i cenzorski raspoloženog Vlasnika. Uprava novinske kuće u više mi je navrata prijetila sankcijama zbog nepoštivanja radnog ugovora, a ja sam ih nutkao da mi daju otkaz, uz obećanje da ću na to uzvratiti tužbom, te će onda netko od nadležnih valjda biti obavezan pred sudom objasniti kakva je to forma radnog odnosa u kojoj primam dohodak uz obavezu da ne pišem. Nisu se odlučili na takav korak i moja „profesionalna dokolica“ – kada sam plaću dobivao od jednih, dok sam pisao za druge novine – potrajala je skoro godinu dana... Završilo je očekivano ljigavo: Premijer je abdicirao, Vlasnik se hibernirao, kasnije završio i kao svjedok-pokajnik na suđenju zbog korupcije, a uredništvo uglednoga dnevnog lista uljudno me zamolilo da počnem pisati, uz jamstvo da ću na „svojoj stranici“ uživati punu autorsku autonomiju. To sam, pak, s gađenjem odbio i dao otkaz. Zaposlio sam se u marginalnom tjedniku gdje me je čekala dvostruko manja plaća i stostruko veća sloboda.

Ispovijesti u ovoj publikaciji mnogo su dramatičnije. One upozoravaju na to da u medijskim pogonima cenzura odavno nije dobroćudna bolest, već je svojim malignim širenjem zahvatila samo srce sistema i preuzela njegovu funkciju. Novinarstvo, reklo bi se, preživljava u svojim smrtonosnim varijantama. Slavne parole poput „slobode“ i „nezavisnosti“, što su se nekoć kočile na zastavama „sedme sile“, opstaju još samo kroz legende o staroj slavi i klate se kao otužne prnje na jarbolu.

Ipak, u ovim prilozima, barem što se mene tiče, naročito se snagom ističe jedan detalj – detalj koji bi trebao istinski zastrašivati – a to je činjenica da su mnogi od svjedoka mračnih zbivanja unutar medijskih redakcija, „zbog opravdanih razloga“, odlučili ostati anonimni. Imajući u vidu žurnalističke svete spise i nekakvo profesionalno poslanje, s „pravom javnosti da bude objektivno informirana“ u prvome planu, ta vrsta tranzicije, kroz koju novinar postaje „anonimni izvor“, djeluje kao nesporazum apokaliptičnih razmjera. Kako god okreneš, jedva da je moguće zamisliti turobniju sudbinu od one da, kao novinar, ostaneš nepoznanica u vijesti o vlastitoj nesreći.



# **ČUVARI JAVNOG ILI DRŽAVNOG INTERESA**

Privedila: Žarka Radoja

“

*U prvom momentu nam ništa nisu davali da radimo. To je trajalo dosta dugo. Dodeš na posao, odeš u kafić i sediš i piješ. Nemaš šta da radiš. Niti oni žele da ti daju nešto, niti prihvataju tvoje predloge. Nikad nije rečeno ne može, nego hajde, videćemo. Na kraju shvatiš gde si. Vremenom odustaneš od tih priča za koje znaš da u startu neće proći, vidiš da ne vredi i predaš se.”*

*“Da mi nije neophodno to sjeme od plate, ne znam da li bih sve to trpjela. ‘Biće bolje, samo budi strpljiva’ je rečenica koju slušam svakodnevno, a sve manje vjerujem u to.”*

*“Ni držanje mikrofona nije više jednostavno. Znam ljude koji su odradili sve kako im je traženo, ali slučajno nisu izbrisali dve reči iz priloga. Suspendovani su na sedam dana, uz preporuku da se više ne šalju na bitne događaje. Pri tom, u pitanju je potpuno banalna stvar koja ni na koji način ne menja ton priloga. Tako da ni držač mikrofona nije više tako lako biti.”*

*“Kada sam se otvoreno pobunila zbog nekih nepravilnosti moj rad je odjednom postao neadekvatan i o njemu su sudove donosili oni koji su nekompetentni za oblasti praćenja kulture. Bila sam nadređena osobi koja je bila bez radnih navika, sa političkom i menadžerskom podrškom.”*



*“Stav uredništva je bio da treba slediti upute suda, da su snimci (afera prisluškivanja op.a) nezakonito stečeni pa samim tim, kao javni servis, mi to ne smemo da objavimo. Procena nije napravljena u javnom interesu, nego je bila slepo praćenje odluka institucija. Zato smo i došli u smešnu situaciju da svakodnevno puštamo reakcije stranaka na objavljene snimke, a da sam povod tih reakcija ne emitujemo.”*

*“Postoji apsurdna situacija u javnom servisu, da novinar što se manje bavi istraživačkim novinarstvom, to ga uredništvo i menadžment više cene. Što se više bavi istraživačkim pričama, to se više smatra ‘rizikom’ za menadžment televizije, jer njegov posao ugrožava njihov dobar odnos sa najvećim političkim strankama. Uloga top menadžmenta u televiziji je da u svakom trenutku dokažu svoju lojalnost i servilnost prema vladajućim strankama, i to je glavni uzrok za unutrašnji pritisak na novinare i urednike. Menadžment će zadržati svoje pozicije samo ukoliko se budu ponašali u skladu sa željama političara. Dakle, najveća pretnja po njihov rad dolazi iznutra, ne iz vani.*

”

\*Citati iz intervjuva novinara i novinarki prikupljenih tokom istraživanja

“

*Ljudi su nam govorili: ‘Kad dođe nova vlast, uvek su smene. Šta sam se ja smena nagledao.’ Oni ne razlikuju smene na rukovodećim mestima (od smena nižerangiranih urednika op.a.). I to ne odobravam, ali mogu da shvatim. Ali ako ti vidiš da ti sistem radi i da daje rezultate, onda valjda taj sistem nećeš dirati. I onda mi dođeš s pričom da je to normalno. Pa nije normalno. Gde je to normalno?’*  
 - novinar Javnog servisa u Srbiji

Cenzura i autocenzura, diskriminacija zbog profesionalno obavljenog posla, pritisci preko uredništva na sadržaj programa, zapošljavanje “nenovinara” koji su deo stranačkih struktura, negativna selekcija, odnosno odabir “prihvatljivih” izvršilaca radova, sve su ovo problemi koje navode novinari zaposleni u javnim medijima u Srbiji, BiH, Makedoniji, Crnoj Gori i Kosovu.

Pritisak koji zaposleni u medijima trpe utiče na njihov profesionalizam, i ne odvija se samo spolja, političkim i ekonomskim sredstvima, nego i iznutra. O takvim pritiscima se u javnosti malo govori, iako za direktnu posledicu imaju javnost koja ne dobija pravovremene, potpune pa čak ni istinite informacije. U intervjuima koji su skupljani nekoliko meseci, može se zaključiti da novinari iz ovih pet zemalja dele probleme obavljanja svoje profesije unutar redakcija i da su jednako izloženi raznim vrstama pritisaka koji na kraju rezultiraju nedovoljnom informisanošću javnosti, a u određenim slučajevima i propagandom, zavisno od stepena političke kontrole u zemlji.

U javnom servisu su standardi radnih prava jasno definisani, ali su, kako kaže izvršna direktorka Centra za istraživanje javnih politika, dugogodišnja novinarka i urednice Tanja Jakobi, jasno postavljena i pravila autocenzure. Javni servisi u regiji služe političkim elitama iako je njihova nezavisnost garantovana zakonom, a regulatorna tela u sferi medija percipirana su kao slaba, neefikasna i politički kontrolisana, jedan je od zaključaka regionalnog istraživanja “Sloboda medija i bezbednost novinara na Zapadnom Balkanu”, objavljenog 2016. godine.

## CENZURA I AUTOCENZURA

Situacija dve godine kasnije, prema izveštajima organizacija za praćenje slobode medija, nije bolja, a tome najbolje svedoči činjenica da se mali broj novinara odvažio da govori imenom i prezimenom o radnim uslovima u redakciji, bez obzira da li ju je u međuvremenu promenio.

“Retko ćete čuti od novinara da se žale na bilo kakve pritiske. Mnogi od njih su svesni da kad se menja stranka na vlasti, da se menja i izveštavanje. Ovo ostavlja sumnju u njihov posao i otvoreno pitanje da li su tu da zastupaju partijske interese. Autocenzura je sveprisutna”, svedoči jedan od novinara, sagovornika iz Makedonije, koji je radio u Makedonskoj radio-televiziji (MRT).

Tokom vladavine VMRO DPMNE i nekadašnjeg premijera Nikole Gruevskog, javni servis bio je pod potpunom kontrolom te stranke. Nakon promene vlasti, novinari i novinarka očekuju i promenu politike unutar javnog servisa, no, Vlada na čelu sa Socijaldemokratskim savezom Makedonije (SDSM) i dalje produžava život ovako ustrojenom propagandnom servisu, što je razočaralo mnoge jer su očekivali da će krenuti u procese reforme i restrukturiranja, počevši od vrha na niže.

Skoro identično iskustvo, kao kolega iz Makedonije, ima i kolega koji radi u sistemu javnih servisa u Srbiji, koja je trenutno u obrnutom procesu od Makedonije – aktuelna vlast kontroliše većinu medija, a u pokrajinskom javnom servisu Radio-televiziji Vojvodine nakon promene vlasti, došlo je i do velike političke čistke urednika i novinara.

“Ljudi su nam govorili: ‘Kad dođe nova vlast, uvek su smene. Šta sam se ja smena nagledao.’ Oni ne razlikuju smene na rukovodećim mestima (od smena nižerangiranih urednika op.a.). I to ne odobravam, ali mogu da shvatim. Ali ako ti vidiš da ti sistem radi i da daje rezultate, onda valjda taj sistem nećeš dirati. I onda mi dođeš s pričom da je to normalno. Pa nije normalno. Gde je to normalno?”, kaže jedan od zaposlenih u javnom servisu u Srbiji.

Na Kosovu, kao i u Crnoj Gori, od proglašenja nezavisnosti vlast se nije menjala. Mila Radulović iz Društva profesionalnih novinara Crne Gore napominje da se novinari uglavnom žale na težak, odnosno stresan posao, niske plate, na mobing... “Kolege sa javnog servisa žale se na politički pritisak pod kojim rade”, kaže Mila Radulović.

Prema rečima našeg sagovornika sa Kosova, novinara na Javnom servisu Radio-televizije Kosova (RTK), cenzura i autocenzura su postali sastavni deo posla. “Prilozi koji naglašavaju nedostatke, greške i manipulacije vladajućih stranaka, a posebno ako su bilo kako povezane sa Demokratskom strankom Kosova (PDK) su strogo zabranjeni.”

Našem sagovorniku se dešavalo da mu “nestaju” prilozima iz dnevnika, a nekad se od njega tražilo i da plasira lažnu vest za nekog člana opozicione stranke, čiji su ciljevi oprečni ciljevima vladajućih stranaka. “Neko objavi vest da je gradonačelnik Prištine zaustavljen na aerodromu tokom putovanja u Italiju. Mnoge se vladajuće stranke raduju toj vesti, jer je to dokaz da je neko iz opozicije ‘kriminalac’ kao i oni. U međuvremenu, gradonačelnik na svom fejsbuk profilu objavi sliku sa prištinskog aerodroma sa nekim poznatim fudbalerom, na kojeg je naišao u povratku iz Italije. Nama je rečeno da moramo da pustimo vest da je zaustavljen u Italiji. Meni je lično rečeno da ću biti otpušten ako ne budem objavio tu vest.”

U BiH, koja ima jedan od najkomplikovanijih sistema javnih emitera u regiji, pritisci su isti, samo dolaze sa više strana. Novinarka Kristina Ljevak je zbog njih napustila javni servis Bosanskohercegovačke radio-televizije (BHRT). Priseća se kolegijuma na kojima se ujutro dogovori dnevnička košuljica, a naveče u dnevniku je drugi sadržaj. “Ali ne zbog toga što se desio državni udar pa su se informacije mijenjale, već što su ih tokom dana oblikovali partijski jataci. Vremenom se takav način rada postavio kao standard i urednici i urednice ne vide ništa pogrešno u tome što im izvori nisu samo izvori već nalogodavci. Jednom mi je jedan urednik rekao kako se nijedna velika priča ne može napraviti bez bliske saradnje sa državnim vrhom i obavještajnim službama. Tada sam shvatila kako sam godinama vjerovala da Deda Mraz postoji.”

U takvim okruženjima novinari koji su se trudili i trude da profesionalno obavljaju svoj posao, suočavaju se sa čitavim nizom teškoća – diskriminacijom, negativnom selekcijom, mobingom, nemoćnošću rada na temama, nemoćnošću profesionalnog rada, kao i uskraćivanjem rada na temama od javnog značaja.

„Ranije smo radili kritički priče, istraživali, zvali, mučili javne službe dok ne dobijemo odgovore i pitali zašto im je toliko potrebno za te odgovore. Danas, u mojoj medijskoj kući novinar nazove, recimo vodovod jer stanovnici jedne ulice nemaju vodu i oni kažu – biće rešeno. I novinar stavi da će problem biti rešen i tu se cela priča završi. To nije novinarstvo“, kaže naš sagovornik koji je sklonjen sa svoje pozicije jer je pripadao „prethodnoj“ uređivačkoj politici.

Dok kolega sa Kosova rad na javnom servisu naziva “protokolarnim novinarstvom”, koleginica sa lokalnog medija u Crnoj Gori ovako pojašnjava uređivačku politiku: “Generalna politika nezamjeranja formira atmosferu u kojoj se naklonost apsolutnoj slobodi rada po svijesti i savjesti tretira kao nepoželjna”.

## NEPOZNAVANJE SOPSTVENIH I BORBA ZA PRAVA DRUGIH

Jovanka Matić sa Instituta sa društvena istraživanja u Beogradu, koja je radila na projektu „Kontrola i sloboda medija: Svedočenja novinara“, fondacije „Slavko Ćuruvija“ kaže da je jedan o problema javnih servisa taj što su još uvek na braniku državnog, a ne javnog interesa.

„U javnom servisu još uvek postoji ideologija da smo dužni da štitimo državni interes. Preokret u novinarskoj profesionalnoj ideologiji – mi smo javni servis, a ne državna televizija - se odvija jako sporo. Oni prosto prihvataju da zbog značaja koji imaju moraju da štite interese države. Jedan od intervjuisanih novinara u pomenutom istraživanju kaže: ‘Meni je urednik rekao mi smo javni servis, a ne perjanica opozicije. I ti to sebi treba da utuviš u glavi.’ Još uvek su važniji državni nacionalni interesi, a ne javnost i to se vidi. Ta nepromenjena profesionalna ideologija, to se u javnom servisu vidi“, kaže komunikološkinja Jovanka Matić.

Svi javni servisi u ovih pet zemalja imaju sindikate, i to novinarima, iako zvuči iluzorno i često i jeste, ipak daje određenu bazu za bavljenje svojim pravima. No, sindikati su često neefikasni i vođeni politikom nezameranja, zbog čega novinari nisu zainteresovani da se uključe u njihov rad. Međutim, situacija na Radio-televiziji Vojvodine je pokazala da velike krize mogu da dovedu i do jačanja sindikata, pa je u toj medijskoj kući od smena povećan broj članova jednog od sindikata. U anketi koju smo, u okviru istraživanja, sprovedi u pet zemalja, 49 odsto ispitanika smatra da sindikati nisu efikasni u pravnoj zaštiti zaposlenih u medijima, a čak 79 odsto bi bilo voljno da se uključi u novi sindikat, udruženje ili bilo koju drugu organizaciju koja se zalaže za radna prava novinara.

U Crnoj Gori zaposleni u javnom servisu su sindikalno organizovani i njihov Sindikat pristupio je prošle godine Uniji slobodnih sindikata i Sindikatu medija, kao reprezentativnom granskom sindikatu medija. Sindikat medija ukupno ima 600 članova, od čega su dve trećine zaposlene u javnim medijima.

Međutim, jedna od novinarki, koja je želela da ostane anonimna, kaže da sindikati ne uspevaju da se izbore za prava radnika. “Ne vidim da za sada sindikalci utiču na one koji odlučuju o položaju novinara u društvu, ali verujem da će ipak uspjeti”, kazala je ona.

Sindikalna organizovanost u javnim servisima jedna je od prednosti u odnosu na komercijalne ili neprofitne medije, u kojima takva organizovanja uglavnom nedostaju. Međutim, zbog politike nemešanja, novinari na prvom mestu traže pomoć od esnafskih udruženja, jer kažu da sistem sindikata ne funkcionise u njihovu korist.

Prema rečima izvršne direktorke Centra za istraživanje javnih politika Tanje Jakobi, koja je radila na istraživanju "Od novinara do nadničara. Prekarni rad i život.", novinari su ljudi koji, dok pišu o pravima svih drugih, najmanje znaju o svojim pravima, čemu u prilog ide i podatak iz ankete – čak 71 odsto zaposlenih u medijima odgovorilo je da nije bilo upoznato sa pravima u slučaju otkaza.

"Novinari umeju svakoga da pitaju sve, ali kad dođu do sopstvenih prava, oni su najverovatnije među najmanje obrazovanim radnicima. Najčešće ne znaju kakva su njihova prava. Pošto ne znaju, onda nemaju nad čim ni da plaču. Većina ih se u istraživanjima izjasnila da ne zna mnogo ni o sindikalnim ni o radnim pravima. O tome počinju da razmišljaju kada stignu do otkaza i onda traže od profesionalnog udruženja da zaštiti njihova radna prava bez obzira što to udruženja ne bi trebalo da rade. Novinari se sa sindikalnim i pitanjima o radnim pravima obraćaju profesionalnom udruženju, pa su i ona sama počela tim temama da se bave i da vuku svakog novinara koga mogu za ruku do nekog advokata i suda", kaže Jakobi.

Novinarka iz lokalnog medija u Srbiji počela je sa drugim kolegama da se bavi svojim radnim pravima kad im je rečeno da postoji šansa da medijsku kuću izgube, jer je sledio proces privatizacije, a uredništvo zaposlenima nije davalo nikakve informacije. „Uredništvo nas je držalo u potpunoj neizvesnosti, s tim da nisu hteli da dele informacije s nama kakva prava imamo, kako da se ponašamo glede privatizacije, pa smo sami morali da idemo u granski sindikat i da se sami brifujemo kakva su nam prava. Nekoliko dana pre samog procesa direktor je popustio i sazvao sastanak da je došlo do kraja, da je radio prestaje da postoji, da nema finansiranja od grada, da dođemo da potpišemo da ćemo dobiti otpremnine i to je to.“

Njene reči potvrđuje svedočenje jednog novinara sa BHRT: "O pravima se nikada ne govori... Postoje samo obaveze. Novinari sami moraju da se obrazuju i tako upoznaju nadređene o svojim pravima."

Novinar BHRT-a Aleksandar Brezar također kaže da se uglavnom sam morao informisati o pravima koja ima. "Smatram da svaka kuća mora imati svoj pravilnik koji će definisati i prava i obaveze", pojašnjava Brezar, uz napomenu da činjenica da mali broj novinara poznaje svoja radnička prava jeste "osnova velikog broja problema".

Zaposleni u javnom servisu, uprkos tome što rade u mediju koji finansiraju građani, zbog pitisaka i često nepoštovanja radnih uslova, ne osećaju se sigurnima, mada se posao na javnom servisu u nekim od ovih pet zemalja, poput Kosova, smatra boljom opcijom, pa čak postoji i trend prelaska u tu medijsku kuću. Međutim, kad su u pitanju plate i zaposlenje mnogi godinama čekaju na stalan posao, o čemu svedoči novinarka sa lokalnog medija u Crnoj Gori

na kojem radi pet godina kao honorarna saradnica.

“Konstatno mi se spočitava da moram obuzdati svoje nestrpljenje u namjeri da dobijem stalni posao, jer po riječima mog direktora, ja trebam biti prezdovoljna što imam priliku biti saradnik u lokalnom radiju u rodnom gradu kojem sam se vratila nakon studija.”

U Crnoj Gori i Srbiji, zbog političkih pritisaka, čistki i dovođenja na čelna mesta ljudi po partijskoj liniji, novinari, građani i pripadnici civilnog sektora izašli su na ulice. Pokret #PodržiRTV imao je nekoliko hiljada ljudi na protestima koji su trajali nekoliko nedelja, dok su u Crnoj Gori organizovani protesti “Nezavisni Javni servis i tačka”, kako bi pokušali da zaustave vlast da smenama nepodobnih u Savetu RTVCG povrati kontrolu nad crnogorskim javnim servisom.

Organizovane su i pobune novinara na lokalnu zbog loše privatizacije, poput one u Radiju Subotica. Sem podizanja svesti o stanju koje ih je zadesilo, javnog iskazivanja neposlušnosti i nepristajanja na pritiske koji će uslediti, ovi protesti su pokazali da jedan deo novinara na javnim servisima i te kako ima volju da se bori za svoja prava, profesiju i pravo građana da se informišu. No, ta borba bez podrške javnosti unapred je izgubljena bitka.





**PRIVATNI MEDIJI  
ZA PRIVATNE SVRHE**

Priredila: Nidžara Ahmetašević

“

*Vesti se prave na šablonski način, nema zapitkivanja... Reci-  
mo slučajevi 'Savamala' ili ostavka gradonačelnika Beograda  
zbog tog slučaja, građani nemaju to gde da čuju. Mi njima  
dajemo potpuno pogrešnu sliku i manipulišemo njima. Nema  
kritičkog osvrta prema događaju, da bi javnost mogla da  
shvati šta se stvarno desilo.”*

*“Novinari i novinarka koji rade u medijima koji se doživljava-  
ju, a i jesu mehanizmi vlasti, jednako vode borbu sa političkim  
elitama i pod jednakim su pritiscima od njih ukoliko postave  
pitanje koje im je problematično, ali u svojoj redakciji nema-  
ju zaštitu ni podršku. Na kraju dobiješ i osudu javnosti jer  
si doživljavao kao prorežimski novinar i u potpunoj si pat  
poziciji, nemaš podršku ni sa jedne strane.”*

*“Kada se dođe do velikih oglašivača obično se tu diže ručna.”*

*“Postoje emisije, čak i one koje nisu komercijalne prirode koje ‘indirektno’ promovišu velike kompanije. Svi znamo da su ovo ‘sponzorisane’ emisije koje su nametnute od strane vlasnika kompanija.”*

*“Gde da odem? Vi ste u Srbiji dovedeni u situaciju da nemate mnogo izbora. Pritisnuti ste finansijskim razlozima i ostajete do trenutka kad sebe više ne možete da gledate u ogledalo, više ne vidite nikakav smisao, ili dok ne nađete izlaz. Meni je trebalo vremena da to shvatim, jer vi s jedne strane pokušavate da opravdate sebi da imate novac koji stiže neko vreme i da možete na to da oslonite, iako s druge strane postoji problem koji ne možeš da rešiš – problem sa samim sobom kad odradim nešto što nije onako kako bih ja htela da bude. Kad se sve završi, krene griža savesti. Često sam govorila da mi je najteže sa ovom drugom ja s kojom treba da vidim zašto sam nešto uradila. Jedan period sam to pokušavala sebi da opravdam, ali sam shvatila da više zaista ne mogu. Da ne mogu da skinem prilog koji ne treba da se skine. Nisam ga skinula. Dobila sam ekspresan otkaz. Više me bar nije sramota posla koji radim.”*

”

*\*Citati iz intervjuva novinara i novinarki prikupljenih tokom istraživanja*



*Tabloide i novine ne uređuju urednici, nego kapital, a tekstovi služe da samo popune onaj prostor koji nisu zauzeli oglasi.”*

*- Bojan Bednar, novinar*

Istraživanje o uslovima rada uposlenika u privatnim medijima koje smo, kroz razgovore s novinarima proveli u pet zemalja - Bosna i Hercegovina, Crna Gora, Kosovo, Makedonija i Srbija - ukazuje na niz kršenja tih prava, te na visok stepen autocenzure koja je posljedica pritisaka, uglavnom ekonomskih, a koji su nerijetko povezani sa političkim elitama.

Još jedan problem koji se ponavlja od zemlje do zemlje je da pravi vlasnici medija nisu uopće poznati kako javnosti, tako ni uposlenicima. To je, kako stoji u tekstu iz Srbije ali se lako može prenijeti na svaku od ovih zemalja, pokazatelj nivoa volje države i svih aktera uključenih u medijsku politiku, da se medijski prostor uredi.

U istraživanju Udruženja BH novinari “U potrazi za boljom regulacijom transparentnosti vlasništva i finansiranja medija iz javnih budžeta”, navodi se kako nedostatak regulacije medijskog vlasništva rezultira u “apsolutnim odsustvom uvida u to koji pojedinci i interesi stoje iza medijskih operacija, što državi onemogućava adekvatno reguliranje koncentracije vlasništva, stranog vlasništva i konflikta interesa u medijima i povezanim sektorima i, u konačnici, sprečava razvoj naprednih politika koje bi promovirale kvalitetno novinarstvo od javnog interesa. Nadalje, nedostatak informacija o vlasništvu povlači mogućnost pritisaka i utjecaja na uredničku autonomiju i medijske sadržaje, koji ostaju skriveni od suda javnosti i onemogućavaju građanima racionalan osnov za izbor medija kojima će dati povjerenje.”

Novinari koje rade u privatnim medijima u regiji koja je bila u fokusu istraživanja, govore o nesigurnosti, nezaštićenosti i strahu pri obavljanju posla, što utiče na njihovu profesionalnost. Ili, kako su to rekli neki od sagovornika, zbog ekonomskih pritisaka im je uskraćena mogućnost bavljenja novinarstvom, dok bivaju prisiljeni da se bave propagandom.

## **KOMERCIJALIZACIJA PROFESIJE**

Jovanka Matić, komunikologinja Instituta za društvena istraživanja, ovaj fenomen opisuje kao “porobljavanje medija od politike ekonomskim sredstvima”.

“Medijsko tržište se ovde zloupotrebljava jer mu nikad nije omogućeno da se funkcionalizuje i normalizuje i da se razvije”, kaže Matić dodajući da se to sada radi “pre svega ekonomskim sredstvima.”

Novinari u svim zemljama opisuju kako im nije omogućeno da izvještavaju o temama koje su suprotne onom što oglašivači u njihovim medijima žele. No, još ozbiljniji problem je ako znamo da su oni koji imaju novac u ovim zemljama vrlo često povezani sa vladajućim strukturama, što ukazuje na visok stepen političke kontrole.

Zbog toga, uposlenci i uposlenice medijskih kuća pribjegavaju autocenzuri, te neke teme jednostavno izbjegavaju. Jedan sagovornik iz Srbije nam je rekao kako novinari u mediju u kojem radi znaju kako glavne oglašivače niko ne smije da dira. “Tabloide i novine ne uređuju urednici, nego kapital, a tekstovi služe da samo popune onaj prostor koji nisu zauzeli oglasi”, svjedoči naš sagovornik.

Slično je u Makedoniji gdje su mediji nedavno izašli iz više od decenije stroge političke kontrole. Smjena vlasti u ovoj zemlji je značila nadu za novim, slobodnijim medijima, no pokazalo se da to nije tako lako. Mediji koji opstaju, zaključak je istraživanja u Makedoniji, “nastavljaju tradiciju ropstva, poslušnosti i servilnosti”, dok je motiv “da služe u političke svrhe, kupuju sopstvenu ekonomsku održivost, transformišu uredništvo u mehanizam kontrole medija i skrivenu ili otvorenu propagandnu službu”.

Jedan od novinara sa kojim smo razgovarali kaže da pritisak često dolazi od nekadašnjih kolega, sada glasnogovornika koji “u ime prethodne saradnje pokušavaju da traže da poštujemo nekoga”.

Istraživanje Makedonskog instituta za medije (MIM) “Analize kapitala i finansijskih modela najuticajnijih TV stanica u Makedoniji, Hrvatskoj i Sloveniji”, pokazuje da nijedna od kompanija koje poseduju komercijalne zemaljske TV kanale u ovoj zemlji nije registrovala medijski posao kao osnovnu djelatnost.

U Srbiji je nedavno urađeno istraživanje Centra za sindikalizam “Od novinara do nadničara. Prekarni rad i život.”, u kojem je 67 odsto ispitanika reklo da interes oglašivača mnogo ili prilično utiče na uređivačku politiku. Dodatno, korporativni vlasnici ne zanimaju se za medijske sadržaje, već za pravac uređivačke politike koji će obezbijediti profit, stoji u istraživanju “Kontrola i sloboda medija” fondacije “Slavko Ćuruvija”.

Oba istraživanja ukazuju kako u Srbiji uređivačka politika u privatnim medijima podliježe zahtjevima vlasnika o komercijalizaciji, što nerijetko vodi u tabloidizaciju. Isto bi se moglo reći za uslove rada u drugim zemljama, a direktna posljedica je samocenzura koja je, čini se, glavni medijski pristup u ovih pet zemalja.

Urednici u privatnim medijima su nerijetko ljudi koji su bliže biznisu nego novinarstvu, i vođeni su korporativnim ciljevima, dok je interes javnosti - ako je to uopće još poznat termin u privatnim medijima u regiji - gurnut u zapeće. Novi uposlenici su, kako svjedoči i bivša urednica u komercijalnoj televiziji, došli sa idejom da rade u korporaciji, a ne u medijima: "Da rade od devet do pet, kao da rade u fabrici, da zavrću šarafe. Nema mozga, posao se tehnički odrađuje, nema kreativnosti, inicijative, ni po čemu nisu osobeni. Došli su da budu deo sistema."

## **INTERES OGLAŠIVAČA ISPRED INTERESA JAVNOSTI**

Novinari koji nisu poslušnici nalaze se u opasnosti da izgube posao. Drastičan je primjer iz Srbije, ali takvih je sigurno lako naći i u drugim zemljama. Bojan Bednar, koji je godinama radio na mjestu urednika u velikoj meidjskoj kući čiji su vlasnici stranci, u jednom trenutku je dobio položaj "pomoćnika novinara", funkcije koja ne postoji u redakcijama. No, nije mogao uraditi ništa.

"Prosto, kažu ti da si od sutra pomoćnik novinara ili fotografa, umanje ti platu i to je to. Trajalo je mesec dana, ugovori su tako fino osmišljeni da ti nakon tog perioda donesu papir da potpišeš da prestaje potreba za tvojim radnim mestom jer kome treba pomoćnik novinara, zaboga, i tako dobiješ otkaz. Meni su objasnili nakon sedam godina rada tamo da se nisam uklopio u redakciju", kaže Bednar.

Novinari na Kosovu govore i kako znaju za slučajeve u kojima se u komercijalnim medijima objavljuju lažne informacije, ili se neke teme prikrivaju, a sve u interesu oglašivača.

No, ono što je drastično, i na što su nam ukazali novinari u svim zemljama u kojima je obavljeno istraživanje, je da među kolegama nema solidarnosti, te da im nedostaje sindikalna organizacija ili udruženja koja zaista ispunjavaju svoju funkciju.

U Crnoj Gori na ovaj problem ekonomskog pritiska, koji dolazi preko urednika na novinare, i ogleda se u uredničkoj politici, ukazuje Sindikat medija u analizi "Indikatori nivoa medijskih sloboda i bezbjednosti novinara". Tu se ukazuje na postojanje problema neodvojivosti marketinga službe i redakcije. U slučaju BiH se to ogleda u činjenici da je u nekim medijima glavni i odgovorni urednik ujedno i direktor, što su dvije nespojive funkcije.

Primjetno u svim državama je da novinari u privatnim medijima imaju najmanje zaštite, te su često meta mobinga, a nisu rijetki ni slučajevi neosnovanog otpuštanja. U tim slučajevima, nema nikoga ko ih štiti, a što je još gore, kolege ostaju nijeme na takvu nepravdu u strahu da se i njima može isto desiti.

Sagovornica u istraživanju na Kosovu nam je rekla kako novinari pokušavaju raditi svoj posao, zastupati interese javnosti, zbog čega često gube posao. “Ako ne odmah posle kritičkog intervjua, to sledi kasnije jer tada institucija ili političar počinju bojkotirati novinara da bi se na taj način ‘osvetili’ i oštetili njihovu karijeru. Novinari tako postanu beskorisni za svoje poslodavce i onda ih se oni reše”, zaključuje.





**(NE)ZAVISNOST  
NEPROFITNIH MEDIJA**

Priredila: Milica Bogdanović

“

*Prednosti ovakvog nezavisnog glasila ili medija su apsolutna sloboda, u izrazu, viziji i načinu djelovanja, ali je mana to što za sada ne možemo omogućiti zaposlenje uredničkom timu nezavisno od profita.”*

*“Neki projekti su nam prolazili, ali to nije dovoljno ni za približno pristojan život. Zbog toga smo prinuđeni da radimo nešto drugo što nema veze s novinarstvom. Ja se, recimo, danju bavim administracijom u jednoj firmi, a onda kad dođem noću kući - pišem. Pitanje je dokle je to izvodivo.”*

*“Bojim se da neprofitni mediji u nekim slučajevima svojim novinarima čine ‘medvjeđu uslugu’ jer ih ne pripremaju na realnost rada u bh. medijima.”*

*“Bilo je cenzure i u komercijalnom i u neprofitnom mediju. Razlike među njima odnosile su se na specifične teme, koje su u jednom mediju bile u fokusu, a u drugom se zataškivale.”*

*“Prednosti ovakvog tipa finansiranja su što ipak imaš nezavisnost od direktnog državnog pritiska i pritiska tajkunske hobotnice bliske vlasti. Naravno, ti si pod pritiskom nekih drugih, uglavnom stranih institucija koje su tobože objektivne i progresivne, a u stvari guraju soptvenu ideološku agendu. Na primer, jako je teško pisati kritički o neoliberalnoj tranziciji na Balkanu i uticaju stranog finansijskog i političkog faktora na zakonodavstvo u Srbiji, a gotovo je nemoguće pisati o radničkim pravima u istom tom kontekstu.”*

*“Problem sa donatorskim načinom finansiranja je što ste tematski određeni, odnosno vezani za teme kojima se projektno bavite. Iz tog tematskog kruga je teško izaći da bi ispratili sve teme koje se nameću. Uvek je pitanje kako doći do novaca za sve teme koje su važne za medije, pošto retko koji donator izdvaja novac za produkciju tekstova.*

”

\*Citati iz intervjua novinara i novinarki prikupljenih tokom istraživanja



*Dogma o novinaru kao psu čuvaru koji bdi-  
je nad javnim interesom besomučno se eksp-  
loatiše u cilju eksploatisanja samog novinara  
ili novinarke. Iako su radni uslovi jasno i rela-  
tivno korektno ugovorno definisani, u praksi  
uvek dođe do toga da još nešto mora da se radi  
i da još malkice duže treba da se ostane.”*

*- novinar nekoliko neprofitnih medija u Srbiji*

Iako su neprofitni mediji oslobođeni uticaja države i biznisa i predvodnici su pluralizma u današnjim društvima, oni još nijesu uspjeli u potpunosti da obezbijede održivost i budu istinska alternativa javnim i komercijalnim medijima.

U postjugoslovenskim zemljama model medija civilnog društva nije previše rasprostranjen niti je razvijen sistem koji bi omogućio stabilno finansiranje i nesmetan rad novinara. Taj model je jedino u Hrvatskoj donekle zaživio jer je najprije kroz program Nacionalne zaklade za civilno društvo, a onda kroz nadležnost Ministarstva kulture nekoliko godina izdvajan novac iz budžeta za rad neprofitnih medija. Međutim, promjenom vlasti i dolaskom HDZ-a dolazi i do ozbiljnih poteškoća, pa je i u ovoj zemlji finansiranje neprofitnih medija sada u zastoju. Zbog nedostatka sredstava bili su prinuđeni da vode „crowdfunding“ kampanje ili da obustave svoj rad.

Kolika je važnost postojanja ovakvih medija u zemljama koje se suočavaju sa polazirovanim medijskom scenom, porastom lažnih vijesti, uredničkim pritiscima na medije i lošom ekonomskom situacijom, opisuje Dinko Gluhonjić u knjizi “Mediji civilnog društva – uputstvo za upotrebu” koju je izdalo Nezavisno društvo novinara Vojvodine.

“Oni su od velikog značaja za manjinsko, višejezično, regionalno i lokalno informisanje, ali i jedini su model medija koji može efikasno popuniti praznine u informisanju na lokalnom i regionalnom nivou, nakon gašenja ili najavljenih gašenja mnogih medija posle traljave privatizacije. Zbog toga treba prestatno raditi na ohrabrivanju novinara koji su ili ostali bez posla u procesu kontroverznih privatizacija ili ne žele da trpe cenzorske pritiske, da osnivaju medije civilnog društva i da uče o načinima kako obezbediti održivost takvih medija.(...) Takvi mediji, za razliku od komercijalnih i stranačkih medija, imaju agendu posvećenu javnom interesu u sferi javnog informisanja, što je jedna od ključnih stvari za proces demokratizacije zemlje, ali i za očuvanje osnovnih vrednosti novinarstva kao profesije. iako su dometi ograničeni“.

Upravo u tim ograničenim dometima leži dio problema.

Njihov opstanak je i u Srbiji, na Kosovu, u Bosni i Hercegovini, Makedoniji, ali i u Crnoj Gori, mahom zasnovan na projektnom finansiranju koje im omogućava preživljavanje u određenom vremenskom periodu. Zato se u slučaju medija civilnog društva teško može govoriti o tradicionalnom, dnevnom novinarstvu, ali i o sigurnom poslu u kojem su obezbijeđena sva radna prava novinara.

## **MALO ZAPOSLENIH, MNOGO POSLA**

Novinari koji rade u neprofitnim medijima nerijetko imaju honorarne ugovore uz koje im se ne plaća osiguranje, a rade i više od osam sati dnevno. Uz novinarski posao, često pišu projekte i rade sve ostale administrativne poslove koji su tipični za nevladine organizacije.

Mediji civilnog društva u Srbiji uglavnom imaju po nekoliko zaposlenih i fokusirani su na određene teme. Dio novinara koji je bio prisiljen ili dobrovoljno odlučio da napusti javni sektor i komercijalne medije, odlučio je da preko neprofitnih medija pokuša da nastavi da se bavi svojim poslom. Nerijetko, takvi mediji se zasnivaju na entuzijazmu i strasti osnivača.

“Nama je ubijanje lokalnog medija bio podstrek da pokrenemo nešto svoje. U prvo vreme je funkcionisalo, ali smo u međuvremenu shvatili da moramo i od nečega da živimo. Medij još uvek radi, ekipe su se smenjivale, ali se uvek vrti dvoje- troje ljudi koji rade glavni posao. No, od ovoga zaista ne može da se živi. Neki projekti su nam prolazili, ali to nije dovoljno ni za približno pristojan život. Zbog toga smo prinuđeni da radimo nešto drugo što nema veze s novinarstvom. Ja se, recimo, danju bavim administracijom u jednoj firmi, a onda kad dođem noću kući - pišem. Pitanje je dokle je to izvodivo”, kaže naša sagovornica iz neprofitnog medija koja je željela da ostane anonimna.

Ni u Makedoniji nije bolja situacija. Samo dio portala ima profesionalan pristup novinarima: radnička prava se u potpunosti poštuju, imaju dostojanstvene plate, regulisan servis i druge zakonom garantovane operativne troškove, ali su uslovi rada polu-profesionalni, s obzirom na praksu da mnogi od tih portala rade u iznajmljenim stanovima.

“Prema sindikatima i profesionalnim udruženjima, radna prava u Internet medijima su na najnižem nivou u medijskoj industriji. Što se tiče organizovanja sindikata u internet medijima, stvari su ovde lošije, toliko da ih je teško uspoređivati i sa mejnstrim medijima”, kažu sindikati iz Makedonije.

U online medijima u ovoj zemlji postoje određene specifičnosti, koje su drugačije od klasičnog novinarstva, jer ljudi koji u njima rade nisu nužno fizički prisutni u redakcijama, rade uglavnom na osnovu sporazuma o autorskim pravima, i najčešće su u prekarnom položaju.

„Nemaju sigurnost i ne mogu da se bore za svoja radna prava jer neki od njih u stvari nemaju posao, nego privremeni angažman koji, kao što je sindikat informisan, bude prekidan porukom preko mobilnog telefona”, kaže predsjednica sindikata makedonskih novinara Tamara Čausidis.

Mlada novinarka koja je za šest godina radila na nekoliko uticajnih portala, prenosi iskustvo eksploatatorskog odnosa vlasnika, koji su cijenjeni novinari sa dugogodišnjim iskustvom.

„Od kad sam u novinarstvu, nisam dobila naknadu za prekovremeni rad, vikende i praznike. Prava radnika se ne poštuju, a mi ih ni ne znamo. Osećamo se eksploatisanima“, kaže naša sagovornica.

## **NEJASNA LINIJA RAZGRANIČENJA MENADŽER - UREDNIK**

Sa sličnim problemima se suočavaju i novinari neprofitnih medija u Bosni i Hercegovini koji ukazuju i na nedostatak jasne odvojenosti između uloga menadžera i urednika, što uveliko može da utiče na novinarsku nezavisnost.

„Na sastancima koji su namijenjeni novinarima za razmjenu ideja i mišljenja, pojavljuju se menadžeri neprofitnih medija, te je njihovu poziciju u takvim trenucima teško definisati“, smatra jedan od novinara iz BiH.

Taj problem prepoznaju i novinari u Srbiji koji smatraju da postoji unutrašnje nerazumevanje onih koji rade u civilnom sektoru prema samim novinarima i njihovoj profesiji.

Nerijetko se menadžment nevladinih organizacija miješa u rad redakcije, ili se od novinara očekuje da rade i druge poslove potpuno nevezane za njihovu profesiju. Prema riječima naših sagovornika, čak i kad medijske kuće vode cijenjeni, nezavisni novinari, u redakcijama se odluke donose na vrhu.

„Većina naših medija, bar onih koji se kite etiketom ‘nezavisni’, izuzetno su hijerarhijski ustrojani i često se čeka odluka sa ‘vrha’ za temu kojom biste se bavili – naravno, ne političkog, nego uredničko-vlasničkog“, kaže jedan od novinara koji je bio zaposlen u nekoliko neprofitnih medija.

U slučaju problema sa menadžmentom i uredništvom, novinari neprofitnih medija nemaju od koga tražiti zaštitu.

“Vrlo bitna stvar u neprofitnim medijima je da na visokim funkcijama, kao što su direktor ili urednik, budu osobe koje su adekvatne da obavljaju te funkcije”, kaže novinarka koja je napustila neprofitni medij u BiH nakon što je postala žrtva mobinga, kao i brojne druge kolege iz te redakcije.

Naši sagovornici, ipak, smatraju da neprofitni mediji često sebi mogu dozvoliti potpunu nezavisnost od domaćih političkih elita, te su zaštićeni od ekonomskih pritisaka koji dolaze od oglašivača.

“U privatnim medijima, vlasnici se ponašaju kao mali bogovi - imao sam sreću da sam se jako kratko zadržao u privatnom sektoru, pa se nisam dugoročno izlagao ‘vedrenju i oblačenju’... Neprofitni mediji su možda i u najboljem položaju, jer privlače i kvalitetne profesionalce, te postoji novac, kao i prilika da se mediji specijaliziraju za ono što nam fali u javnim ili privatnim medijima - od istraživačkog novinarstva do factcheckinga”, kaže Aleksandar Brezar, koji je u svojoj dvije decenije dugoj karijeri imao prilike raditi za privatne, javne i neprofitne medije.

## NEIZVJESNOST POSLA

Za razliku od BiH u kojoj ima donatorskog novca za medije civilnog sektora i u kojoj novinari neprofitnih medija često zarađuju više nego zaposleni u javnim ili komercijalnim medijima, u Crnoj Gori su donacije za ovu oblast rijetke. Uz to, ni zakon ne prepoznaje ove medije. Institucije u toj zemlji se i dalje pridržavaju starih propisa koje ovaj segment medija prepoznaje kao elektronske publikacije i ne odvajaju posebna sredstva iz budžeta za njihov rad.

Pored ovog problema, naši sagovornici iz neprofitnih medija, koji su vrlo rijetki u ovoj zemlji, kažu da se suočavaju sa istim problemima kao i njihove kolege iz javnog ili profitnog sektora.

„I jedni i drugi slabo zarađuju (čast izuzecima), i jedni i drugi muku muče da dođu do informacija koje čuvaju kerberi partikularnih interesa, i jednima i drugima je posao neizvjestan i nije cijenjen“, smatra Duško Vuković, osnivač PCNEN-a (Prvih crnogorskih nezavisnih elektronskih novina).

Ipak, slobodni novinari ili novinari koji rade u neprofitnim medijima na Kosovu imaju status “jedini pravi novinari u zemlji” i takva pozicija ih je dovela do toga da sada nisu u mogućnosti da se razvijaju i šire svoj rad.

Oni uglavnom uspijevaju da postignu dobru i efikasnu pokrivenost nekih tema, a ništa ili vrlo malo o drugim značajnim pitanjima, ne pružajući na taj način redovno i sveobuhvatno izvještavanje o događajima i političkim dešavanjima u zemlji.

Takođe, u ovoj zemlji, ali i ostalim bivšim jugoslovenskim zemljama, neprofitnim medijima se zamjera i to da isuviše liče na think tank-ove ili druge organizacije civilnog društva. Razlog je taj što su poput većine nevladinih organizacija, često uključeni u projekte sa fokusom na monitoring, istraživanje i analizu, ne uspijevajući da ovo istovremeno pretvore u “novinarski sadržaj”.

“Ja sam se zaposlio u mediju kao novinar. Zbog dobrog poznavanja engleskog jezika – iako moj medij ne objavljuje na engleskom – bio sam zadužen za praćenje suđenja koja se održavaju pri misiji Evropske unije za vladavinu prava na Kosovu. Prvo mi je to bilo jako zanimljivo. Onda sam shvatio da sam ja zapravo tu da radim kao ‘nadgledač’, a ne kao novinar. Nisu mi davali previše prostora da radim intervjue, nego su hteli da pišem izveštaje sa suđenja. Čak sam nekad morao da pišem i izveštaj za donatore”, kaže naš sugovornik, koji je zaposlen u jednoj nevladinoj organizaciji na Kosovu.

## **KAKO OJAČATI MEDIJE**

Uprkos nedostacima koje imaju neprofitni mediji u svim bivšim jugoslovenskim zemljama, naši sagovornici iz većine zemalja koje smo obuhvatili ovim istraživanjem kažu da ne bi željeli da rade u komercijalnim ili javnim medijima. Koliko god situacija u medijima civilnog društva nije sjajna, ipak se plate, uslovi rada, posvećenost i kvalitet teško mogu porediti sa tradicionalnim medijima.

Uz to, svako društvo kome je stalo do većeg prostora slobode za svakog čovjeka trebalo bi da podstiče medijski pluralizam, da osigura ambijent u kojem će se medijska scena razvijati i u kojem će mediji civilnog društva osigurati stabilno finansiranje i tako ostvarivati svoju ulogu.





...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

## Introduction

To what extent are journalists able to do their work in the newsroom and are their rights respected? These were the opening questions of the research “Invisible Violence: Stories from The Newsroom”, which was conducted through interviews with our colleagues in five countries: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, Kosovo and Macedonia.

The journalism combines personal, interest of profession and public interest. Srećko Mihajlović, sociologist, points out that journalists are often asked to provide answers which the society as a whole cannot give, “and if journalists remain silent, we wonder why.”

Journalists are on the one hand under open political pressures and threats, often being put on the spot during press conferences by country leaders, and on the other in conflict with editors regarding certain subjects. They are in a precarious position and they do their work under the conditions of insecurity, discrimination, censorship and open pressures, which in the end result in self-censorship.

The best proof is the fact that most journalists whom we have talked to insisted on staying anonymous, due to the fear of losing their jobs or being prevented from finding one in the future, or due to the feeling of embarrassment for having succumbed to pressures.

With fifty interviews with our colleagues working in the public, commercial and non-profit sectors, in other words, civil society media, conducted from January to May 2018, we tried to present to the public their working conditions – something that is rarely talked about in public or not at all. While the atmosphere in each society influences the way journalists do their work, our interlocutors have one thing in common and that is fear; and societies where journalists are afraid are not free societies.

Despite the fact that we are aware of the level of censorship and self-censorship, as well as the process that journalism is going through on a global scale, the degree of journalists' fear speaks of the pressures they are facing on daily basis while working and begs the question about the profession itself and the possibility for overcoming the current situation of utter insecurity in the financial, social and the political sense. As many as 70% of the interviewed journalists, in a small survey conducted in the afore mentioned five countries, stated that they would change their jobs or the newsroom they are working in, citing as the main reason low salaries (42%), followed by censorship inside the newsroom (15%). Answering the question if they felt free to publically talk about the pressures they are facing in the newsroom, the majority, 32%, said "no".

The articles you are about to read are a collection of the independently published texts in each of the authors' countries. They are all published together on the portal KontraPRESS in the column "The Invisible Violence". Viktor Ivančić, the founder of the cult Split magazine "Feral Tribune", columnist of the weekly "Novosti" and the author of the book on journalism "Why I Do Not Write and Other Essays" has written a text especially for this collection.

We are convinced that the answer is the recognition of the problems in these countries – problems we all share, like insecurity, destroyed syndicates, professional associations that are overloaded or out focus and an overall dissatisfaction with the position of the profession – as well as a greater solidarity in the resistance.

*Biljana Sekulovska,  
Una Hajdari,  
Nidžara Ahmetaševi,  
Milica Bogdanović,  
Žarka Radoja.*

**FROM MEDIA SERVANTS  
TO HANGMAN SERVICE**

By Viktor Ivančić

For a long time now, informative media are most interesting by what is censored in them, especially the ones meant for the masses, usually with the pet name “leading”. Ever since censorship has stopped being a thing out of the ordinary and became so to speak a thorough technique of editorship, priorities “of media service users” are also significantly altered. Reading newspaper (listening to the radio, watching television, following news portals) with the ambition to be thoroughly informed about what is published in them, is a form of intellectual relaxation that I would recommend to everyone. Of course, beforehand, it is necessary to acquire some insight into essential elements of reality outside media field, or at least outside its central current.

If I was offered today to pick any job in journalism I wanted and guaranteed minimal work and creative manoeuvre, instead of choosing an executive editor’s position, I would opt for a position of the bawdy writer, a person in charge of content from the journalism’s bad conscience area, which would help the reader to get through the shiny informative package filled with exclusive, sensationalistic and similar banalities, with as few injuries as possible. A quarter of the front page would suffice, in upper left corner an aegis would be printed in red: “In today’s edition we don’t bring you...”

Truth to be told, I used to publish a rubric of such title in a weekly satirical article in mid-80’s of the previous century. But those were different times: a single-party government didn’t have in mind informed citizens even on the proclamation level, and in return it wasn’t itself informed of what the citizens really thought about it. Later, when numerous parties and lots of “free media” came to the scene, so all that various vastness, with the beatific help of big capital, united and walked on heavenly fields of “free market”, anyone remotely open-minded could get to know the paradox brought to journalism’s daily routine by the outburst of democracy: the more formally guaranteed the freedom is – the more factually applied the censorship.

About ten years ago, at the time when I used the benefits of professional idleness, I wrote several lengthy essays concerning journalism one way or another (they were later collected into the book “Why I don’t write and other essays” Fabrika knjiga, 2010). In one of them, called “Grey area of the white violet” I analysed the media propaganda in the service of Ivica Todorić, then owner of the company “Agrokor” and the most powerful tycoon in Croatia. I used a story of deputy editor in chief of the most influential daily newspaper as a base, which was a sort of a Titoesque poem to the owner of “Agrokor” made during a helicopter visit to his business empire. The tycoon was pictured as “the man putting Croatia in motion”, as a walking deity, as the sole warrant of national progress who dedicates his whole self to every detail of his messiah emprise, so much so that, as the author wrote, “his apples are like maidens”, he would “kiss a bull between the horns” or that he “picks the

cow food amongst his fingers so happily that it seems that he would taste it himself”...

All other “media leaders” regularly praised Ivica Todorčić with similar portions of dithyramb. More importantly: about criminal methods used for building his masterful giant, about problematic aspects of Agrokor’s business, about corrupt connections with government institutions, about partnerships with bribed politicians who helped build economic monopoly, about cruel abuse of workers etc., not a single critical word could be seen. Even the castle with forty rooms (and probably the same amount of staff) the tycoon and his family lived in, couldn’t bring out the journalists’ mockery – at least it beautifully depicted feudal wet dreams of suddenly wealthy upstarts – but he was advertised with deep respect in heavily illustrated displays, as a proof of elite style, as an appropriate symbol of national saviour’s power.

Agrokor concern was heavily advertised in Croatian media, and labourers in glass covered machinery for production of the present were well aware – by direct orders or self-sustainability instincts -of the crucial motto: do not bite the hand that feeds you! That way they were faced with the other paradox of post-socialistic journalism: the more they were socially endangered, the lower their wages were, the more thoroughly exposed to precarious working conditions, the more insecure their existence was – all the more dedication they had to show in representing the rich and the powerful in their work as journalists.

Today, when this writing takes place, Ivica Todorčić is no longer the owner of Agrokor, the company is going through the agony of majestic failure due to excessive debts, investigation about the tycoon is in progress so he ran away to Great Britain where he is fighting the legal battle against extradition and probably prison. Former allies from political elite are now his biggest enemies, shortly – yesterday’s national saint is today’s national prey. “Media leaders” are routinely following that trend: “the man who sets Croatia in motion” became “the undertaker of Croatian economy” overnight, same authors who wrote panegyrics about him, are today mercilessly gutting him, pushy photo reporters are camping in front of his London home and the tycoon panicky runs away swearing and hiding his face behind an umbrella, newspapers bring out hundreds of dirty details about corporation’s business and the decadent family’s big spender lifestyle, they publish police photos of documented shoes collections and leather bags of female family members, shots of the palace interior are now key evidence of corruption, greed, insensitivity and poor taste of the usual evildoer...

I admit, I don’t feel sorry for the tycoon at all, but this ability of the journalists to instantly shapeshift, the readiness to painlessly stand from a radically opposite perspective, to momentarily shift Todorčić’s media servants

into hangmen service, that glorifiers act as executioners with even a hint of self-reflection or attempt to realise their own role, is something that's, if you are in this line of work for a longer time, fills with painful anxiety. I know how forceful the energy of former subjects' revenge can be, it is naturally multiplied by the frustration because of all the previous silencing, but it still seems to me that it is but a pyrotechnical effect of a more thorough crime, namely – professional and moral normalisation of mercenary position of journalism.

No one is too surprised by the grotesque transformation of priorities and information industry's use – when its obedient labourers, for example, dedicatedly raise a monument to a national hero, and then the same team sets the dynamite to spectacularly blow it up – because it is already a given that it is an act of service, about a profession that had long used up all its ideals. If there's an impression that a journalist of a certain type, such as the one in "Agrokor case", while longing for "truth and justice", manically runs in opposite directions like a ping pong ball, not shying away from beating his own arguments, it is because his professional and moral path is no longer affected by his own will but is defined by the one holding the racket.

The stories in this publication are giving us a closer look at the situation "on the field" – i.e. in journalist redactions – which brings to the outcomes like the one described above, so it is really about some sort of forensic investigation, a valuable insight in the very infrastructure of media manipulation. It is talked about political and economical pressures, about cruel exploitation, about brutal existential blackmails, about trading information, about breaking professional and ethical norms, about impossible working conditions of journalists... and in the end we were introduced to different modules of control and depriving of freedom, that vary depending on the character and ownership structure of certain media outlets, on whether they are public, corporate or non-profit. It would be, of course, wrong to read those articles as a collection of separate social dramas, because the stake is much higher: we are shown what Pierre Bourdieu, while talking about a different topic, once called "structural mechanism that produces a lack of moral".

Because of the nature of those articles, I feel the freedom to briefly present "my own case", at least to clarify those "blesses of professional idleness" I mentioned earlier, and also point to the fact that the nature of existential blackmails can be very diverse to the point of including existential privileges.

About ten years ago, after "Feral Tribune" was shut down, a weekly magazine I had worked for as a journalist and editor for fifteen years, I started working as a columnist for a reputable newspaper, through an invitation from the editorial office. Soon I realised that I was supposed to be paid (very nicely, by the way) not to write. The owner of the media company asked the edito-



rial office not to publish my articles, but that I get regularly paid monthly, and the editorial office acted as instructed. Not accepting such a bizarre situation, I managed, after numerous obstacles, to arrange a meeting with the Owner – who was primarily in the oil business and was also in the ruling political party – so he then politely explained that “he cannot take over my enemies” and let me know that the censorship request came from the Prime minister. “Enjoy your time,” he said. “Write a book.”

Since I didn't like a bit of this philanthropic form of suffocating my creative personality, I decided to intensively break my contract. I started writing for another newspaper – which, according to my contract, I wasn't allowed to do – trying to pick the topics to directly concern the censorship loving Prime minister, and subsequently censorship loving Owner. The management of the newspaper repeatedly threatened me with sanctions for contract breaching, and I kept suggesting them to fire me, promising I would sue, and that someone from the authorities will probably be obligated to explain in court what form of employment requires me not to write while getting paid. They decided not to go down that road and my “professional idleness” – when I was getting paid by one and writing for another newspaper – lasted almost a year... It all ended pretty sleazy: the Prime minister abdicated, the Owner hibernated, and later ended up as a repented witness in court for corruption, and the editorial office of a reputable daily newspaper politely asked me to start writing, with a guarantee that I would have full author's autonomy on “my page”. However, I disgustedly declined and quit. I found a job in a marginal weekly magazine where I had half the salary and hundred times the freedom.

Testimonials in this publication are much more dramatic. They are warning that the media censorship hasn't been a benign disease for a long time now, but that the malignant matter has spread the very heart of the system and taken over its function. Journalism, it seems, survives in its lethal situations. Famous paroles like “freedom” and “independence” that used to be on the flags of the “fourth estate” survive only through legends of what used to be and now are only pathetic rags on a pole.

Nevertheless, in these articles, at least as far as I'm concerned, one detail is emphasized with significant effort – a detail that should truly terrify – the fact that many of the witnesses of the dark occurrences within media outlet redactions decided to remain anonymous “for justified reasons”. Bearing in mind the sacred books of journalism and some professional commission, primarily with “the public's right to be informed objectively”, that kind of transition, where a journalist becomes “anonymous source”, seems like a misunderstanding of an apocalyptic scale. One way or another, a fate worse than one where, as a journalist, you remain the unknown factor in the news about your own misery is barely imaginable.



**GUARDIANS OF PUBLIC  
OR STATE INTEREST**

By Žarka Radoja

“

*At first they wouldn't give us anything to do. It lasted for quite a while. You come to work, and then go to a café and sit there. You've got nothing to do. They don't want to give you anything to do, and they don't accept your suggestions either. And you are never told "no", but rather "we'll see". In the end you realise where you stand. In time you give up the stories that you know won't be accepted, you see there's no point and you just surrender."*

*"If I didn't need that lousy salary, I don't know if I would put up with all that. The sentence "It'll get better just be patient" is what I hear on daily basis, and I believe it less and less."*

*"The editorial office's stand was that court orders need to be followed, that the recordings (the surveillance affair, author's note) were illegally obtained and so as a public broadcaster, we are not allowed to publish them. The estimate wasn't made in public interest but was rather mindless following of institutional decisions. That's why we are in a ridiculous situation to release political parties' reactions to the published recordings, without broadcasting the reasons for those reactions."*

*“When I openly objected because of some irregularities, my work suddenly became inadequate, and was judged by the ones incompetent for cultural matters. I was a superior to a person with no work ethics, with political and management support.”*

*“Not even holding the microphone is easy anymore. I know people who did everything as they were asked to, but they accidentally didn’t cut two words from the story. They were suspended for a week, with a recommendation not to be sent to important events anymore. And it was a completely meaningless thing that didn’t change the tone of the story in any way. So, it’s not that easy to be even a mic holder.”*

*“There is an absurd situation in the public broadcaster, that the less a journalist does investigative journalism the more they are appreciated by the management and editorial office. The more they do investigative stories the more of a “risk” they are for the television management, because their job endangers their good relationship to the biggest political parties. The role of the top management in television is to constantly prove their loyalty and servility to the ruling parties, and that is the main reason for the inside pressure on journalists and editors. The management will keep their positions only if they act according to the politicians’ will. So, the biggest threat to their work comes from the inside and not the outside.*

\*Quotes from interviews with journalists gathered during the survey

”



*We were told: ‘When the regime changes, everything always changes. I’ve seen so many people being replaced.’ They don’t separate replacing the management from replacing low level editors. I can understand that, even though I don’t approve of it. But if you see that the system is working, and you see the results, then you don’t change the system, right? And then you’re selling me the story that it’s normal. Well, it isn’t normal. Where is that normal?’*

*- Serbian Public broadcaster service’s journalist*

Censorship and self-censorship, discrimination for a job professionally done, editorial board’s pressure about programme content, hiring “non-journalists” who are part of political structures, negative selection, i.e. selection of “acceptable” executors, all these are the problems mentioned by journalists employed in public media in Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Montenegro and Kosovo.

The pressure that media workers are under, affects their professionalism and doesn’t come only from the outside via political and economical tools, but from the inside, too. Those pressures are rarely talked about in public, even though their direct consequence is public not getting timely, complete or even true information.

In interviews collected over the course of several months, it can be concluded that journalists from these five countries share problems in doing their jobs within redactions and that they are equally exposed to various kinds of pressures that eventually result in insufficient informing of the public, and in certain cases propaganda, depending on the level of political control in the country. In the national public broadcaster, working rights standards are clearly defined, but so are the rules of self-censorship, says experienced journalist and editor, Tanja Jakobi, executive director of Public Policy Research Centre.

One of the conclusions of regional research “Media freedom and journalists’ safety in Western Balkans” is that national public broadcasters in the region serve to political elite even though their independence is guaranteed by law, and regulatory authorities for media are precepted as weak, inefficient and politically controlled.

## CENSORSHIP AND SELF-CENSORSHIP

According to the reports of organisations for monitoring freedom of the media, two years later the situation is no better, and the best indicator for that is the fact that very few journalists had the courage to use their real name and speak about working conditions in the redaction, regardless whether they meanwhile changed it.

“You will rarely hear journalists complaining about any kind of pressures. Many of them are not aware that when the ruling party changes, reporting changes, too. This leaves doubt in their work and an open question whether they represent the party’s interests. Self-censorship is all-present,” say one of the journalists from Macedonia, who used to work in Macedonian national broadcaster (MRT).

During the rule of VMRO DPMNE and former prime minister Nikola Gruevski, public broadcaster was completely controlled by that party. After the regime change, journalists expect politics inside public broadcaster to change, too. However, government with SDSM in charge still prolongs the life of this kind of propaganda service, which disappointed many, because they expected to start processes of reform and restructuring, starting from the top down.

An experience almost identical to the Macedonian colleague’s, happened to a Serbian colleague who works for public broadcasters’ system, where the process is currently opposite than in Macedonia – current regime is controlling most of media, and in provincial public broadcaster Radio Television of Vojvodina, after the regime change, a big purge of editors and journalists happened.

“We were told: “When the regime changes, everything always changes. I’ve seen so many people being replaced.” They don’t see the difference in executive changes, and I can understand that, even though I don’t approve of it. But if you see that the system is working, and you see the results, then you don’t change the system, right? And then you’re selling me the story that it’s normal. Well, it isn’t normal. Where is that normal?” (Serbian Public broadcaster service’s journalist). In Kosovo, like in Montenegro, the regime hasn’t been changed since the declaration of independence. Mila Radulović from the Association of Professional journalists of Montenegro remarks that journalists mostly complain about difficult and stressful jobs, low salaries, mobbing... “Colleagues from the public broadcaster complain about the political pressure they work under,” says Mila Radulović.

According to the journalists we spoke to in Kosovo, from the public broadcaster Radio Television of Kosovo (RTK), censorship and self-censorship have become a part of the job. “Feature stories emphasizing shortcomings,

mistakes and manipulations of the ruling parties, and especially if they are connected to Democratic party of Kosovo (PDK) – are strictly forbidden.”

It happened to him that his feature stories would “go missing” from the News, and he was sometimes asked to publish fake news about an opposition party’s member whose goals were opposite to the ones of the regime. “Someone publishes news that the mayor of Priština is held at the airport during his travel to Italy. Many ruling parties are happy about that news, because it’s an evidence that someone in the opposition is a “criminal” like them. Meanwhile, on his Facebook profile, the mayor publishes a photo from Priština airport with a famous footballer that he met on the way back from Italy. We were told that we must publish the news that he was held in Italy. I was personally told that I will be fired if I don’t publish that news.”

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, with one of the most complicated systems of public broadcasters in the region, the pressures are the same, they just come from more sides. Because of them, journalist Kristina Ljevak left the public broadcaster Radio and Television of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BHRT). She remembers collegiums where in the morning a content outline would be made, and in the evening, the news would have different content.” But not because a coup happened so the information changed, but because parties would shape the information during the day. In time, such way of working was set as a standard and editors see nothing wrong in their sources aren’t just sources, but also ordering parties. I was once told by an editor that no big story can come out without close cooperation with the regime and intelligence service. Then I realised that I had been believing in Santa Claus.”

In such environment, journalists who have tried to do their job in a professional manner, face a whole set of difficulties – discrimination, negative selection, mobbing, impossibility of working with topics, impossibility of working professionally as well as being denied working with topics of public interest.

“We used to have a critical approach to the stories, investigate, call, harass public services until we get our answers and ask why they needed so long to respond. Today, in my media outlet, a journalist calls, say, the waterworks, because people in one street are out of water, and they say – it will be solved. And the journalist writes that the problem will be solved and that’s where the story ends. That’s not journalism,” says a journalist we talked to, who was removed from his position because he was a part of “previous” politics in editorial office.

While a colleague from Kosovo calls working for the public broadcaster “protocol journalism”, a colleague from a local media outlet in Montenegro explains editorial politics like this: “General policy of not antagonizing forms an



atmosphere where tendency to absolute freedom of work by awareness and conscience is treated as unwanted.”

## **NOT KNOWING OWN RIGHTS AND FIGHTING FOR OTHERS’**

Jovanka Matić, from the Institute for Social Research in Belgrade, who worked on the project “Control and Freedom of Media: Journalists’ Testimonies” of “Slavko Ćuruvija” foundation, says that one of the problems of public broadcasters is that they still represent government and not public interest.

“In the public broadcaster there is still the ideology that our duty is to protect public interest. The change in journalists’ professional ideology – we are public service, and not government television – is happening very slowly. They simply accept that because of the significance they have, they must protect the government’s interest. One of the journalists spoken to during the mentioned research says: “The editor told me that we are the public broadcaster, and not opposition’s representative. You need to understand that.” Government national interest is still more important than the public, and that is obvious. That unchanged professional ideology, that is obvious in the public broadcaster,” says Jovanka Matić, expert on communication studies.

All public broadcasters in these five countries have syndicates, and even though it sounds illusory and it often is, that gives the journalists a certain base for pursuing their rights. Nevertheless, syndicates are often inefficient and led by the policy on not antagonizing, which is why journalists are not interested in joining their work. However, the situation in Radio Television of Vojvodina showed that big crisis can lead to strengthening the syndicate, so in that media outlet, since the changes, the number of members of one syndicate raised. In a poll conducted in five countries in the survey, 49 percent of respondents believe that unions are not effective in legal protection of media employees, and even 79 percent would be willing to join a new union or association or any other organization that is committed to the working rights of journalists. In Montenegro, public broadcaster’s employees are syndically organised and their syndicate last year joined the Union of Free Trade Unions and Trade Union of Media of Montenegro as a representative branch. Trade Union of Media of Montenegro has altogether 600 members, of which two thirds are employees in public media.

However, one of the journalists who requested to remain anonymous, says that the unions don’t manage to win the fight for the workers’ rights. “I don’t see that unions influence the ones who decide about the position of journalists in the society, but I believe that they will,” she said. Syndical organ-

isation in public broadcasters is one of the advantages compared to commercial or non-profit media which usually lack that form of organization. However, because of the policy of not interfering, journalists primarily seek help from corporations, because they say the syndicate system is not working in their favour.

According to Tanja Jakobi, executive director of Public Policy Research Centre, who worked on the research “From a journalist to a day-labourer. Precarious work and life”, journalists are people who, while writing about everybody else’s rights, know the least about those of their own. This is supported by the survey data - as many as 71 percent of media employees said that they were not familiar with their rights in case of termination.

“Journalists can ask anyone anything but when it comes to their own rights, they are probably among the least educated workers. Most often they don’t know what their rights are. Since they don’t know, they have nothing to cry about. Most of them said in the researches that they don’t know much about either syndical or workers’ rights. They start thinking about that when they get fired and then they ask professional associations to protect their rights even though the associations shouldn’t be doing that. Journalists turn to a professional association with questions about syndical and worker’s rights, so the associations started dealing with those topics and dragging journalists to lawyers and courts,” says Jakobi.

A local Serbian media outlet’s journalist started dealing with her rights with her co-workers when they were told that there was a chance to lose their media outlet because privatization process was about to take place and the editorial office gave no information to the employees. “The editorial office kept us in complete uncertainty and they didn’t want to share with us any information regarding our rights or what to do regarding privatization, so we had to go to the branch union ourselves and brief ourselves about our rights. A few days before the very process, the director gave in and called a meeting to announce that it was the end, that the radio was ceasing to exist, that there was no funding from the city, that we should come in and sign severance pay papers, and that was it.” Her words were confirmed by a BHRT journalist’s testimony: “The rights are never talked about... There are only duties. Journalists have to educate themselves and thus introduce the superiors about their rights.”

BHRT journalist Aleksandar Brezar also says that he had to get the information about his rights mostly himself. “I think that every media outlet needs to have a set of rules to define rights and duties,” explains Brezar, adding the fact that few journalists know their rights is “the basis of numerous problems.” Public broadcaster employees, despite working in a media outlet funded by citizens, because of pressures and often not respecting working

conditions, don't feel safe, even though working for public broadcaster in some of these countries, like Kosovo, is considered a better option, so there is even a trend of moving to that media outlet. However, when it comes to salaries and employment, many people wait for years to get permanent jobs, to which testifies an example the journalist in a local media outlet in Montenegro who has been working as a part time associate for five years.

“I am constantly being scolded that I need to restrain my impatience about getting hired permanently, because as my director says, I should be happy to have a chance to be an associate in a local radio station in my hometown that I returned to after my studies.”

In Montenegro and Serbia, due to political pressures, purges and bringing executives based on political connections, journalists, citizens and civil sector went to the streets. The movement #SupportRTV had several thousands of people in protests that lasted several weeks, while in Montenegro “Independent public broadcaster and that's final” rally was organised to try to stop the government to regain the control of the Montenegrin public broadcaster by replacing the unfit in the Council of RTVCG. Journalists rebelled locally because of bad privatization, like the one in Radio Subotica. Beside raising awareness of the situation they fell into, public disobedience and not agreeing to the pressures that will follow, these protests showed that a part of the journalists in public broadcasters are more than willing to fight for their rights, profession and the citizen's right to be informed. But that fight is a lost cause without the support of the public.



**PRIVATE MEDIA FOR  
PRIVATE PURPOSES**

By Nidžara Ahmetašević

“

*The news is made via pattern, no questions asked... For example, cases “Savamala” or Belgrade mayor’s resignation over that case, citizens have nowhere to hear about that. We give them completely wrong picture and manipulate them. There is no critical point of view about the event, so the public could understand what really happened.”*

*“There are shows, even not of commercial kind, that “indirectly promote big companies. We all know those are “sponsored” shows imposed by company owners.”*

*“Journalists who work in media perceived as (and being) mechanisms of the government, equally battle political elite and are equally pressured by them if they ask a problematic question but are neither protected nor supported in their own redaction. In the end, you even get judged by the public because you are perceived as a pro-regime journalist and you are in a stale mate, unsupported by either side.”*

*“When you reach big advertisers, you usually hit the brakes there.”*

*“Where should I go? In Serbia, you are in a situation where you don’t have much choice. You are pressured by financial reasons and you stay until the moment when you can’t even look yourself in the mirror, see no point, or until you find a way out. I needed time to understand that, because you, on one hand, are trying to justify yourself by having money that is coming for a while and that you can rely on that, even though, on the other hand, there is a problem you cannot solve – a problem with yourself when I do something that is not the way I would want it to be. When it’s all over, guilt arrives. I often say that it’s the hardest with this other me that I need to confirm why I did something. For a while I tried to justify it to myself but then I realized that I really can’t do it anymore. That I can’t cut the report that should not be cut. I didn’t cut it. I got instantly fired. At least I’m not ashamed of the job I am doing anymore.*

”

\*Quotes from interviews with journalists gathered during the survey



*Tabloids and newspapers aren't being edited by editors, but rather by the capital, and the articles are there merely to fill in the space unoccupied by the advertisements."*

*- Bojan Bednar, journalist*

The research about the private media employees' working conditions that we have conducted by speaking to journalists in five countries: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Kosovo, Macedonia and Serbia - indicates a series of violation of these rights and a high degree of self-censorship because of pressures, mostly economical, and that are often connected to political elite.

Another problem, reoccurring from one country to another, is that the real owners of the media aren't even known, neither to the public nor to the employees. As the text from Serbia implies, but can easily be transferred to each of these countries, this shows the level of state's will and all the acting entities involved in the media politics to order the media space.

A research of the Association BH reporters "In search of a better regulation of the ownership transparency and media financing from the public budget" states that lack of regulation of media ownership results in "absolute absence of understanding which individuals and the interests are behind media operations, which disables the state to adequately regulate the concentration of the ownership, foreign ownership and conflict of interest in media and related sectors, and, finally, prevents development of advanced politics that would promote quality journalism of public interest. Furthermore, lack of information on the ownership draws the possibility of pressure and influences on editor's autonomy and media contents, that remain hidden from public judgement and deprive citizens of rational base for choosing which media to trust."

Journalists who work in private media in a region that was in the research focus, speak of being unsafe, unprotected and feeling fear while doing their job, all of which affects their professionalism. Or, as some of the people we spoke to said, economic pressures denied them the possibility to perform journalism while being forced to perform propaganda.



## COMMERCIALIZATION OF THE PROFESSION

Jovanka Matić, expert on communication studies of the Institute for Social Research, describes this phenomenon as “enslaving the media by the politics using economic tools.”

“Media market is here being abused because it was never allowed to functionalize, normalize and develop,” says Matić, adding that nowadays it is being done “primarily using economic tools”

Journalists in all countries describe how they weren’t allowed to report on the topics opposing what advertisers in their media want. The issue is even more serious if we know that the ones who have the money in these countries are often connected with the governing structures, which appoints to a high degree of political control.

Because of that, employees of media companies resort to self-censorship, and therefore simply avoid some topics. One of the people we spoke to in Serbia told us that journalists in his media know that major advertisers cannot be touched. “Tabloids and newspapers aren’t being edited by editors but rather by the capital and the articles are there merely to fill in the space unoccupied by the advertisements.”

Similar situation is in Macedonia, where the media have recently exited more than a decade of strict political control. A change of government meant a hope for new, more free media, but it turned out to be not that easy. A conclusion is drawn from the research in Macedonia: Media that survive “continue the tradition of slavery, obedience and servility” whereas the motive is “to serve for political purposes, buy their own economical sustainability, transform editorial into a mechanism for media control and hidden or open propaganda service”.

One of the journalists we spoke to says that the pressure now often comes from former colleagues, current spokespersons asking us to spare someone, for the sake of past collaboration.”

The research of Macedonian Institute for Media (MIM) “Analysis: Ownership and Financial Models of the Most Influential TV-Channels in Macedonia, Croatia and Slovenia” shows that none of the media companies that own the commercial terrestrial TV-channels in this country is registered as having media as a core business.

In a research recently conducted in Serbia - Centre for Syndicalism “From a journalist to a day-labourer. Precarious work and life” - 67% of people said that the interest of the advertisers significantly affects editing policy. Addi-

tionally, corporate owners are not interested in media content, but in currents in editing policies that will ensure profits, as stated in a “Slavko Ćuruvija” foundation’s research named “Control and Freedom of Media”.

Both researches show how in Serbia the editing policy is subject to owner’s commercialization requests, which often leads to tabloidization. The same could be said for working conditions in other countries, and a direct consequence is self-censorship which seems to be the main media approach in these five countries.

Editors in private media are often people closer to business than journalism and are led by corporate goals, while the public interest – if that is even a known term in private media in the region anymore – is forsaken. New employees are, as a former editor of a commercial TV-channel testifies, came with the idea to work for a corporation rather than the media:

“To work from nine to five, as if they are working in a factory, to screw bolts. No brain, the job is mechanically performed, no creativity, initiative, nothing special about them. They came to be a part of the system.”

## **ADVERTISERS’ INTEREST BEFORE PUBLIC INTEREST**

Journalists who are not obedient are in danger of losing their jobs. A drastic example is from Serbia, but it must be easy to find more in other countries, too. Bojan Bednar, a journalist who has worked as an editor for years, at one point got the position of “journalist assistant”, a position that doesn’t exist in redactions. However, there was nothing he could do about it.

“They simply tell you that from the next day on, you are a journalist’s or a photographer’s assistant, cut down your salary and that’s it. It lasted for a month, the contracts are designed so nicely that after that period they bring you a paper to sign that the need for your position has ceased to exist, because, for God’s sake, who needs an assistant journalist and so you are fired. I was explained that, after seven years of work there, I didn’t fit in,” says Bednar.

Journalists in Kosovo speak about cases when commercial media publish false information, or some topics are hidden, all in the advertisers’ interest.

But what is drastic, and what journalists in all the countries we researched in pointed to, is that there is no solidarity among colleagues and that they are missing a syndical organisation or associations that actually fulfil their roles.

In Montenegro, this problem of economic pressure, coming from the editors

onto the journalists and shows in editorial policy is described in Media Syndicate's analysis "Indicators for the level of media freedom and journalists' safety". It points to the problems of inability to separate marketing office and redaction. In case of Bosnia and Herzegovina that is shown in the fact that in some media editor in chief is simultaneously the director, which are positions that mustn't be merged.

What is noticeable in all the countries is that the journalists in private media have the least protection, and are often targets of mobbing, and cases of wrongful dismissals are not rare either. In these cases, there is no one to protect them, and, which is worse, their co-workers remain silent to that injustice, fearing of the same fate. During our research in Kosovo, we were told that journalists are trying to do their jobs, to serve public interest, which often leads to losing their jobs. "If not immediately after the critical interview, then later, because then the institution or the politician start to boycott the journalist in order to "avenge" or damage their carrier. The journalists thus become useless to their employers and then they get rid of them," she concludes.



**(IN)DEPENDENCE OF  
NON-PROFIT MEDIA**

By Milica Bogdanović

“

*The advantages of this kind of media outlet are absolute freedom of expression, vision and way of acting, but the disadvantage is that for now, we cannot provide employment in editorial team independently of profits.”*

*“There was censorship in both commercial and non-profit media outlets. The differences between them regarded specific subjects that were in focus in one media outlet and covered-up in the other.”*

*“Some of our projects were successful, but that’s not even close to enough for a decent life. That’s why we are forced to take jobs unrelated to journalism. For example, during the day I do administrative work for a company and then when I come home in the evening – I write. It’s questionable how long this can be viable.”*

*“I’m afraid that, in some cases, non-profit media are doing their journalists a disservice because they don’t prepare them for the reality of working in Bosnian media.”*

*“There was censorship in both commercial and non-profit media outlets. The differences between them regarded specific subjects that were in focus in one media outlet and covered-up in the other.”*

*“The advantages of this type of financing are that you still have the independence from direct pressure from the government and the pressure from the tycoon octopus close to the government. Naturally, you are under the pressure of some other, usually foreign institutions which are seemingly objective and progressive while actually pushing their own ideological agenda. For example, it is very hard to write critically about neoliberal transition in the Balkans and the influence of foreign financial and political factors on Serbian legislation, and it’s almost impossible to write about workers’ rights in that same context.”*

*“The problem with financing through donations is that your topics are restricted, i.e. you are limited to the topics about the project you are doing. It is hard to break that circle of topics in order to cover all the imposing topics. There is always the issue of getting funded for all the topics of importance to the media, since not many donors fund article production.*

”

\*Quotes from interviews with journalists gathered during the survey



*The dogma about the journalist as a guard dog protecting public interest is being tirelessly exploited in order to exploit the journalist themselves. Even though the working conditions are clear and relatively fairly defined in contracts, in practice it always comes to having to do more and to stay a bit longer.”*

*- Journalist who worked in a few nonprofit media outlets in Serbia*

Even though non-profit media are free from government influence and business and are leaders of pluralism in today's societies, they still haven't managed to completely achieve sustainability and be a true alternative to public and commercial media.

In post-Yugoslav countries civil society media model isn't too widespread, nor is there a system that would enable stable financing and journalists' undisturbed work. That model is somewhat present only in Croatia, because during several years a budget was set for the work of non-profit media, first through a program of National Foundation for Civil Society, and then through jurisdiction of Ministry of Culture. However, with the change of government and arrival of HDZ came serious difficulties, so now financing of non-profit media has been brought to a halt in this country, too. Due to lack of funds, the media were forced to perform crowdfunding campaigns or stop working.

The importance of existing of this kind of media in countries facing polarized media scene, increase of fake news, editorial pressures on media and bad economical situation is described in Dinko Gruhonjić's book "Civil Society Media – Instructions for Use" published by Independent Journalists' Association of Vojvodina.

"They are very significant for minority, multi-lingual, regional and local media, but they are also the only media model that can efficiently fill in the gaps in informing on a local or regional level, after shutting down of many media following sloppy privatization. Therefore, it is necessary to constantly work on encouraging the journalists, who are either lost their jobs during controversial privatizations or don't want to be pressured by censorship, to found civil society media and to learn about ways to provide sustainability of such media. (...) Such media, unlike commercial and political party driven media, have an agenda dedicated to public interest in the sphere of public informing, which is one of key things for the process democratization of the



country but also for preserving of basic values of journalism as a profession, although with limited reach.”

The limited reach is exactly where a part of the problem is.

Their survival in Serbia, Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia but also in Montenegro, is largely based on project financing that enables them to survive for a while. That’s why in case of civil society media, it can hardly be spoken about traditional, daily journalism, but also about a safe job with all working rights of journalists provided.

## **FEW EMPOLYEEES, A LOT OF WORK**

Journalists working in non-profit media often have part-time contracts with no social security provided, yet they work even more than eight hours a day. Along with journalism work, they write projects and do all other administrative duties typical for NGOs.

Civil society media in Serbia usually have a few employees and are focused on certain topics. Some of the journalists who were either forced to or willingly decided to leave public sector and commercial media, decided to try and continue to do their job through non-profit media. More often than not, they are based on founder’s passion and enthusiasm.

“For us, the killing of local media was an incentive to start our own thing. At first it worked, but we meanwhile realised that we also need to make a living. The media outlet is still working, the crew has been changing, but there are always a couple of people who are doing the main work. However, it’s impossible to make a living this way. Some of our projects were successful, but that’s not even close to enough for a decent life. That’s why we are forced to take jobs unrelated to journalism. For example, during the day I do administrative work for a company and then when I come home in the evening – I write. It’s questionable how long this can be viable,” says a non-profit media journalist who preferred to stay anonymous.

The situation in Macedonia isn’t any better. Only a part of the portals has a professional approach to journalists: workers’ rights are completely respected, they have decent salaries, regulated service and other operative expenses guaranteed by law, but working conditions are semi-professional, considering many of those portals’ practice of working in rented apartments.

“According to the syndicates and professional associations, workers’ rights in internet media are at the lowest level in media industry. Regarding organ-

ising syndicates in internet media, things here are worse, so much so that it's hard to compare them to mainstream media" syndicates from Macedonia say.

In online media in this country, there are certain specificities that differ from classic journalism, because people who work there aren't necessarily physically present in redactions, they work mostly based on copyright agreement, and are usually in precarious position.

"They don't have security and can't fight for their rights because some of them don't actually have a job, but a temporary engagement which, as the syndicate was informed, ends via text message," says Tamara Čausidis, the President of Macedonian Union of Journalists and Media Workers.

A young journalist who has worked for several influential portals during the course of six years, talks about the experiencing exploitative behaviour of the owners who are renowned journalist with years of experience.

"Ever since I'm a journalist, I haven't been compensated for overtime, weekends or holidays. If you are on site, you're on call all day long. I spend 18 hours at the computer. Workers' rights are not respected, and we don't even know them. We feel we are being exploited,"

## **UNCLEAR MANAGER – EDITOR BORDER LINE**

Similar problems are faced by non-profit media journalists in Bosnia and Herzegovina, who point to the lack of clear separation between the roles of managers and editors, which can largely influence journalists' independence.

"In the meetings meant for exchanging ideas and opinions between journalists, non-profit media managers show up, so it's hard to define their position in such moments," says one of the journalists from Bosnia and Herzegovina.

That problem is also recognised by the journalists in Serbia. They think there is no inner understanding of those who work in civic sector for journalists and their profession.

NGO management often meddles in redaction work, or the journalists are expected to do other jobs completely unrelated to their profession. According to the people we spoke to, even when media outlets are managed by respected, independent journalists, redaction decisions come from the top.

"Most of our media outlets, at least the ones labelled as "independent" are

extremely hierarchy-oriented and the topics you would cover often wait a decision from the “top” – of course, not political, but of editors/owners,” says one of the journalists who used to work for several non-profit media.

In case of problems with management and editorial board, non-profit media journalists have no one to turn to for protection.

“In non-profit media it is very important that in high positions, such as director or editor, are people adequate for such positions,” says a journalist who left a non-profit media outlet after being a victim of mobbing, just like her numerous colleagues.

The people we talked to, however, think that non-profit media can often afford complete independence from domestic political elite and hence are protected from economic pressures coming from the advertisers.

“In private media the owners are acting as if they were Gods – I had the luck to stay in private sector only for a very short time, so I wasn’t exposed to those who call all the shots for too long... Non-profit media are maybe in the best position because they attract quality professionals, so there’s both the money and the opportunity to specialize the media for what’s missing in public or private media – from investigative journalism to factchecking,” says Aleksandar Brezar, who, in his two-decades-long career, had the opportunity to work for private, public and non-profit media.

## **JOB INSECURITY**

Unlike Bosnia and Herzegovina, where there are donations for civic sector media and where non-profit media journalists often earn more money than employees in public or commercial media, Montenegro rarely has donations for this field. Furthermore, the law doesn’t even recognize these media. Institutions in that country are still following old regulations that this segment of media recognizes as electronic publications, and no special funds are being appointed for their work.

Besides this issue, non-profit media journalists we spoke to, who are very rare in this country, say that they face the same problems as their colleagues from public or profit sector.

“Both have low income (with few exceptions), both are struggling to get to information guarded by Cerberuses of particular interests, both have insecure and unappreciated jobs,” says Duško Vuković, founder of PCNEN (Prve crnogorske nezavisne elektronske novine – First Montenegrin Independent Electronic Newspaper).

However, freelance journalists or the journalists working in non-profit media in Kosovo have a status of “the only real journalists in the country” and such position led them to not being able to develop or expand their work.

They mostly manage to achieve good and efficient coverage of some topics, and nothing or very little about other important issues, thus not providing regular and complete reporting about events and political activities in the country.

Furthermore, in this country, as well as in other ex-Yugoslav countries, non-profit media are condemned for being too much like think tanks or other civic society organizations. The reason for this is that, like most NGOs, they are often involved in projects focusing on monitoring, research and analysis, failing to turn it into “journalistic content”.

“I was hired as a journalist in a media outlet. Because of my good command of English – even though my media outlet doesn’t publish in English – I was in charge of covering a trial conducted during European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo. At first, I found it very interesting. Then I realised that I was in fact there to watch, and not as a journalist. I wasn’t given much space to do interviews, but they wanted me to write reports about trials. I even sometimes had to write reports for donators,” said an employee of a non-profit NGO media outlet from Kosovo.

## **HOW TO STRENGTHEN THE MEDIA**

Despite shortcomings of non-profit media in all EX-Yugoslav countries, most people we talked to while doing this research say that they wouldn’t want to work in commercial or public media. As much as the situation may not be great, still the salaries, working conditions, dedication and quality can hardly compare to traditional media.

Besides, every society that cares about larger space for every person’s freedom, should encourage media pluralism, provide environment where media scene can be developed and where civic society media will ensure stable financing and thus perform its role.



Projekat "Nevidljivo nasilje: Priče iz redakcije" finansira Evropska unija i deo je programa "Zaštita slobode medija i slobode izražavanja", koji realizuje Hrvatsko novinarsko društvo kao deo projekta "Regionalna platforma za zagovaranje slobode medija i sigurnost novinara Zapadnog Balkana". Projekat je realizovan kroz partnerstvo šest regionalnih novinarskih udruženja: Nezavisnog udruženja novinara Srbije, Udruženja BH novinari, Hrvatskog novinarskog društva, Udruženja novinara Kosova, Udruženja novinara Makedonije i Sindikata medija Crne Gore.

This project is funded by the European Union through the small grants programme "Protecting Media Freedom and Freedom of Expression in the Western Balkans" implemented by the Croatian Journalists' Association as part of the regional project *Western Balkan's Regional Platform for Advocating Media Freedom and Journalists' Safety*, carried out through partnership of six regional journalists' associations – Independent Journalists' Association of Serbia (IJAS), Association of BH Journalists (BHJ), Croatian Journalists' Association all public communications, the Grantee is obliged to comply with the European Commission's visibility requirements (CJA), Association of Journalists of Kosovo (AJK), Association of Journalists of Macedonia (AJM) and the Trade Union of Media of Montenegro (TUMM).

**Za izdavača:**

Centar za inovacije NIIT NIŠ

**Novinarke i istraživačice:**

Nidžara Ahmetašević  
Una Hajdari  
Milica Bogdanović  
Biljana Sekulovska  
Žarka Radoja

**Prevod na engleski:**

Tijana Veljković i Marija Šerban

**Prelom i grafički dizajn:**

Johana Bogjčević

**Štampa:**

DiaArt, Beograd 2018.





Western Balkan's  
Regional Platform for  
Advocating Media Freedom  
and Journalists' Safety



This project is funded by  
The European Union



CENTAR ZA  
DEMOKRATSKU  
TRANZICIJU



Centar za društvene inovacije

