

CENTER FOR  ANTIWAR ACTION

* Milesevska 51, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia and Montenegro

* Tel/fax +381 11 308 9979, * E-mail caa@caa.org.yu

* Web site: www.caa.org.yu

PEACE BY PIECE

**PEACEBUILDING EXPERIENCE
FROM THE LOCAL NGO'S PERSPECTIVE
(THE REGIONS OF FORMER YUGOSLAVIA)**

**Ruzica Rosandic
Natasa Milenkovic
Mirjana Kovacevic**

**Translated by
Nina Djurdjevic Filipovic**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	SUMMARY	6
1.	OUR INTENTIONS	8
2.	PROCEDURE	11
	2.1. Response to the questionnaire	13
3.	FINDINGS	15
	3.1. Funding organizations / Donors	15
	3.2. Types of peace activities	17
	3.3. Effectiveness of accomplished actions/projects	26
	• Influence on direct beneficiaries/groups in focus	29
	• Who were the beneficiaries/groups in focus?	32
	• Benefit for local organizations/activists	34
	3.4. Problems in cooperation with foreign partners	36
	• Could it have been different?	47
	3.5. Compromises	48
	3.6. The sense of responsibility	49
	3.7. Opportunities missed or: What would have been beneficial to do, but was not done?	50
	3.8. What do local activists see as their greatest contribution to peace?	54
4.	LESSONS LEARNT	61
	ATTACHMENTS	63

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1:	Initial list of local peace activists and organizations by location	13
Table 2.2:	Response to the questionnaire by location	14
Table 3.1:	Geographic distribution of the types of peace activism (in %)	19
ATTACHMENT No. 2:	ORIGINAL LIST OF LOCAL PEACE ACTIVISTS AND ORGANIZATIONS IN THE REGION	65
ATTACHMENT No. 3:	LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS WHO FILLED OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE	71
ATTACHMENT No. 4:	PARTICIPANTS OF THE JAHORINA MEETING	74
ATTACHMENT No. 6:	YEARS OF ESTABLISHMENT OF PEACE ORGANIZATIONS WHICH RESPONDED TO OUR QUESTIONNAIRE	85

***“If you don’t know where you are going,
any road will get you there!”***

Lewis Carrol

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the response of numerous peace organizations and activists willing to answer our very demanding questionnaires. We highly appreciate their readiness to participate in this endeavor.

Equally merited praise goes to the participants of our meeting at Jahorina. Their comments, suggestions and supplements made this analysis of peace activism in the regions of former Yugoslavia more profound and correct.

We are especially thankful to all persons who provided additional time and described their successful peace practices.

We would not have been able to work on this project without the help of translators, and minute-takers at the meeting on Jahorina, drivers and accountants.

Last, but not least, we would like to thank the funding agency of this project, United States Institute of Peace, on their trust and the resources which made it possible to successfully work.

SUMMARY

Since the beginnings of the recent violent conflicts in former Yugoslavia (1990s) local peace-minded groups have actively tried to prevent and overhaul the consequences of this exhaustive social crisis. Whether they were formed spontaneously or as local branches of international peace agencies, local peace organizations were (and still are) greatly dependant on support from international partners. So, even though various foreign donors place much importance on local peace groups' contribution to building peace, their assessments are mostly derived from the perspective of someone who is giving support. The experience of those receiving support is greatly neglected. Our intention was to fill in that void.

Using a questionnaire and the meeting where in direct interaction important issues related to the experience of local peace workers were reconsidered, we attempted to gain deeper insight into the forms of peace activism in the regions of former Yugoslavia, focusing on the following questions: *What is the scope of peacebuilding activities in which the local non governmental organizations (hereinafter NGOs) from the region have been involved? How long they function and with what kinds of support? How they perceive the efficiency of their actions? What contributed to the success of their projects? "Whose" peace was being built? From the perspective of local NGOs, how far do the regional/international funding agencies respect their local partners and believe local people to be capable of building peace? How much they understand the specificities of the local context? In what ways international donors aid the work of local NGOs? To whom are local NGOs truly accountable?*

We base our analysis on 61 (36%) answers to the questionnaire (out of the initial list of 169 addresses - local peace activists and organizations from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Kosovo) and on contributions of 43 participants of the conference dedicated to these issues.

Even though this analysis, mostly based on qualitative data, cannot guarantee far-reaching generalizations about the nature and effectiveness of peace activism in this region, it offers some insightful answers to the questions that inspired our research.

First, our data clearly indicate a very wide, all reaching spectrum of peacebuilding activities undertaken from the very start of the armed conflicts. Aside from the fact of the existence of a truly grand number of funding agencies which sumptuously supported their actions, the data gathered point to the fact that the role of local peace activists was and is far more than just a mere transmission of foreign ideas and projects.

Second, it is quite clear that local peace activism depended greatly on foreign help; not only could most of the peace projects not be accomplished without the financial and logistic support of foreign donors, but also the local activists and peace organizations could not have made it through in such numbers, nor could they have worked with the same quality that they achieved. This help is highly appreciated. It is also quite obvious that local peace activists did as much as was in their power to accommodate the forms and ways of work to local needs, norms, culture, values, knowledge and skills of the local populace. If nothing else, the validity of this statement is proven by the fact that the local peace activists feel first of all responsible toward their communities.

From the perspective of local activists, the relations with foreign partners were also burdened by numerous, but not unsolvable, problems. In the approach of some foreign donors local activists recognized a lack of knowledge of the local context, over-insistence on form and procedure, a bureaucratic stance toward local activists, and even a lack of readiness to support independence and survival of local peace initiatives. Along with the lack of proper support to sustainability of local peace organizations, the resources were short for broader cooperation and regional networking of local peace groups, and for all other activities beyond the scope of the very action projects, which could have helped the empowerment of the networks themselves as well as creation of a richer base of collective knowledge. Although beset by such pressures, in most cases local peace activists did not agree on bad compromises, but opted for constructive, creative solutions.

1. OUR INTENTIONS

The tragic disintegration of former Yugoslavia also resulted in the mobilization of peace activists who, even though it may seem modest and inadequately visible¹, tried to react to the beginnings as well as the consequences of this painstaking social crisis.

Whether they were established spontaneously or as local branches of international peace agencies, local peace organizations were (and still are) greatly dependant on support from international partners. So, even though various foreign donors² place much importance on local peace groups' contribution to building peace, their assessments³ are mostly based from the perspective of someone who is giving support. The experience of those receiving support is greatly neglected.

Our intention is to fill in that void. Using a questionnaire and the meeting where in direct interaction important issues related to the experience of local peace activists were reconsidered, we strove do gain deeper insight into the forms of peace activism in the regions of former Yugoslavia. All the time the focus of our attention was on the following questions:

- What is the scope of peacebuilding activities in which the local NGOs from the region have been involved? How long have they functioned and with what kinds of support? How they perceive the effectiveness of their actions? What contributed to the success of their projects?
- “Whose” peace was being built? Facilitating human security, demilitarization, justice, good governance, accountability, reconciliation and human development should not

¹ For example see one of the rare analytical studies of civil activism in Serbia, done by Pavlovic, Vukasin (Ed.). *Potisnuto civilno drustvo*. Beograd: EKO Centar, 1995. Here the work of peace organizations, as part of the civil movement, is not recognized at all.

² We will use this term to describe all those from foreign institutions who give help: international non-governmental peace organizations, foreign state and private foundations, and supranational institutions of that type.

³ Several issues of the Committee for Conflict Transformation Support Newsletter were dedicated to the question of relationships between local and international players in the peace process. See, for example, the Discussion of Large, Judith. *“The Interplay of Domestic, Regional and International Forces in Peacebuilding.”* Committee for Conflict Transformation Support Newsletter, No. 13. 2001. Also, see: Anderson, Mary B, and Lara Olson. *Confronting War: Critical Lessons for Peace Practitioners*. Cambridge, MA: The Collaborative for Development Action, Inc, 2003.

be driven by the quest for an imposed normative order. From the perspective of the local NGOs, how far do the regional/international agencies believe local people to be capable of building peace? How much they rely on local NGOs?

- What are the procedures that international NGOs and funders use and require local NGOs to use in their management? How they aid the work of local NGOs? Are these procedures contributing to accountability of the local NGOs? How far the perspectives of international NGOs and funders are adapted to the suggestions coming from local NGOs? Are there such local initiatives? How much do the local NGOs have to compromise their perceptions of the local situation and necessary actions? From the perspective of the local NGOs, have there been cases where a common ground understanding with international NGOs/funders has been achieved? Have there been cases (projects) with full recognition of local norms, culture, values and skills?
- How do the local NGOs evidence (prove) their potentials to contribute to the peacebuilding? What are the indices of their effectiveness?
- Accountability to local people is a difficult issue. To what extent can local NGOs gain or claim legitimacy for their actions? What is making local NGOs legitimate in peacebuilding? To whom are local NGOs truly accountable? Who should they be accountable to?

With this analysis we choose to encompass the work of peace organizations in Serbia, Kosovo, Croatia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia. This choice was evident to us because of the fact that the problems with which those organizations were dealing with came out of the process of disintegration of then mutual state – former Yugoslavia – and thus the formation of new states. In addition, most of the problems they were dealing with, as well as the problems that follow their work, were the product of many decades of mutual history. Some of the differences in the process of social transformation

within the communities where they operate can only add to a deeper and fuller understanding of their social status and the breadth and development of their activities.

2. PROCEDURE

We worked on finding the answers to these questions in two ways.

First, by applying the questionnaire intended for all peace organizations and peace activists in the region⁴. The questionnaire had two linguistic versions: Serbian and English (for not Serbo-Croat speakers).

By doing various searches we compiled an initial list of 169 addresses (127 organizations and 42 persons).

Second, on the basis of the analysis of answers in the questionnaire we made a report which was used as working material for a three day meeting where local peace activists from the region were given an opportunity to interact and comment the offered material from manifold points of view, correct or accommodate our interpretations, and thus contribute to even deeper observations regarding some of the key issues about the basic subject of this project.

The initial list (169 addresses) contained all of those whom we knew dealt with projects/activities that can be included in a much arrayed specter of peace activities. We constructed the following classification of the forms of peace activities by following the example of the system of classification given by Diane Francis⁵:

- Sanitizing the direct consequences of violence (treatment of Post-Trauma Syndrome, working with rape victims and the like).
- Taking care of refugees and displaced/evicted persons
- Gathering/distributing humanitarian aid
- Gathering/disseminating information about war criminals and their victims/perpetrators
- Reestablishing violently terminated communication links

⁴ To the original list of peace organizations we added a list of individuals who in their work were not necessarily tied to one organization and/or who momentarily were not in the NGO sector but who have a rich previous peace-building experience.

⁵ Francis, Diana. *"Conflict transformation from Violence to Politics."* Committee for Conflict Transformation Support Newsletter, No. 9, 2000.

- Education of non-violence
- Education for constructive conflict resolution
- Building trust/Reconciliation
- Mediation/Negotiation
- Public advocacy of political solutions to conflict (rallies, public protests, public announcements, publications and the like)
- Protection of human/minority rights
- Analysis (of reasons of/consequences of violence, culture of violence and the like)

Considering that our focus was on the experiences of peace activists the questionnaire was mostly made up of open-ended questions. Such a form of questioning directed us toward a qualitative analysis of a phenomenological type. Such type of analysis enabled us to extract the wide spectrum of the key themes characteristic for answers to all questions posed. Where it was possible the data gathered was also quantified and, for reasons that will be explained latter on, was presented in terms of elementary descriptive statistics.

It is necessary to point out that the findings offered in this analysis are not representative for peace activism in the region since neither is the initial list of addressees necessarily complete (some organizations and individuals from the region may have not been covered because we did not find adequate data), nor is the sample constructed out of the respondents to our call representative for the population of peace activists in the region.

On the basis of our analysis and the discussion we had at a meeting of peace activists we made this final report. The text of this report will be widely distributed: to all local addressees from the initial list of peace activists, to the web site of the Center for Anti-War Action (www.caa.org.yu), to all local offices of foreign donors and to foreign embassies with which cooperation was established in the regional states and, of course, the agency which financed this project – the US Institute of Peace, from Washington.

2.1. Response to the questionnaire

The initial list of peace activists had 169 addresses: 127 organizations and 42 individuals (**Attachment No. 2**). We sent out our call for cooperation during July and August 2004, while we waited for the responses till the beginning of October.

The locations of peace activists and organizations to which we sent out the call are shown in Table 2.1.

Aside from e-mail contact, some organizations and individuals were addressed during July and August by phone, while everyone who sent us a filled out questionnaire got a message confirming that we received the said form.

Table 2.1 Initial list of local peace activists and organizations by location

Location	Organizations		Individuals		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Croatia	16	53.3	14	46.7	30	100.0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	19	73.1	7	22.9	26	100.0
Macedonia	15	68.2	7	31.8	22	100.0
Montenegro	7	70.0	3	30.0	10	100.0
Kosovo	25	83.3	5	16.7	30	100.0
Serbia	45	88.2	6	11.8	51	100.0
Total	127	75.1	42	24.9	169	100.0

In total we had 61 (36%) of addressees send back filled out questionnaires, as shown in Table 2.2 which follows. (**Attachment No. 3** contains a list of these organizations and individuals with their contacts).

One possible reason for this relatively low response rested on “bad connections”. Namely, our channels of virtual communication are obviously not as good as in the rest of the world and as much as we would want them to be, so we doubt with good reason that some of the sent packages never managed to reach destination. Also, we are aware that the questionnaire itself was very demanding in regards to the time needed to fill it out, which could discourage some who otherwise might have wanted to answer our call. Perhaps the low response was a consequence of poor documentation we keep on accomplished projects: namely, only few among us have the internal resources adequate for keeping documentation

on the activities. Also, a possible deterrent could be such a demanding questionnaire in languages that are not the first language for everyone, as was the case with Macedonia and Kosovo. If there were some other reasons we did not mention, we can do nothing but express our regret.

Table 2.2 Response to the questionnaire by location

Location	Organizations		Individuals		Total	
	Called	Received	Called	Received	Called	Received
Croatia	16	9 (56.3%)	14	6 (42.9%)	30	15 (50.0%)
Bosnia and Herzegovina	19	10 (52.6%)	7	-	26	10 (38.5%)
Macedonia	15	2 (13.3%)	7	2 (28.8%)	22	4 (18.2%)
Montenegro	7	4 (57.1%)	3	-	10	4 (40.0%)
Kosovo	25	4 (16.0%)	5	1 (20.0%)	30	5 (16.7%)
Serbia	45	18 (40.0%)	6	5 (83.3%)	51	23 (45.1%)
Total	127	47 (37.0%)	42	14 (33.3%)	169	61 (36.1%)

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Funding organizations / Donors

If there was any foreign help to peace initiatives at the beginning of peace work (1991 – 1992), it consisted of support and solidarity in form of practical help to the spontaneously gathered groups of anti-war-minded citizens who at that time were not necessarily registered as non-governmental organizations. If that help was of financial nature, it was given in the form of smaller donations rather than as grants for formally designed projects:

...One thing was the cooperation with peace organizations, groups and individuals who were not necessarily funding agencies even though they did bring smaller amounts of money. The value of our cooperation with them was in feeling connected on a global scale and in our understanding of the wider context to which our actions belong. The nature of our cooperation with the funding agencies was completely different, since they required detailed project proposals and complicated reports.

For instance, the funds necessary for the visits to Ljubljana, Zagreb and Belgrade where together with women's peace groups from Italy, were secured by the Italian women themselves: they might have had some contacts with the Greens. I think we got the space in Gliptoteka, where we held a round table discussion in Zagreb, for free...

I remember Herbert Froelich, a German protestant priest, who gave us 500 German Marks in the fall of 1991 as a donation for the preparation of *ARKzin – magazine of Antiwar Campaign*. Aida Bagic, Zagreb, Croatia

I remember that in the midst of our attempts translate the knowledge gained at trainings for conflict resolution into our school program (specific for our culture), a man came to the offices of Center for Antiwar Action (he introduced himself as Ted Herman, a Quaker) and offered us a hundred dollars to "do something for the youth". Those were the initial resources that we used for the "Goodwill Classroom" project. *Ruzica Rosandic, Center for Antiwar Action, Belgrade, Serbia*

Solidarity help of this type was received from Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Switzerland and, a little less, from United States of America.

Some time later funding agencies, in the full sense of that word, appeared on the scene, and they had offered financial aid for specific types of activities. In order to receive such an aid we had to apply with properly designed projects and specified budgets. At first this type of help was offered together with specific training in project proposal writing, fundraising, and NGO management and so on.

On the basis of the questionnaires received, we found 197⁶ various donors from 17 various states. The biggest number of funding agencies was from Germany (32) and the United States of America (32), and somewhat smaller from Netherlands (14), Great Britain (10), Norway (9), Sweden (7), Switzerland (6), Canada (6), Italy (6), Austria (5), Denmark (3), Belgium (2) and Lichtenstein, France, Finland, Australia and Spain with 1. A complete list of countries and funding agencies is in **Attachment No. 5**.

Aside from foreign national funding agencies there were supranational funding agencies and organizations (international or regional), and as of recent, local state sources of funding. It is interesting that some local NGOs were also listed as funding agencies, and in two ways at that: as mediator between a foreign funding agency and local groups, in the function of administrator of finances, or as direct sources of funding who with their own means and resources support an action or an activity.

Our attempt to classify foreign donors according to the sources from which the money is coming from – from state (money of tax payers), private (philanthropy, lottery, corporations) or religious sources (donations of believers) – did not bear fruit since many funding agencies gather their money from various sources. So, even when their status in their own state is clear, in the “field” i.e. in our states, that same organizations handles money from either private and/or state sources.

We did not even attempt, out of understandable reasons, to get data on specific amounts given to peace initiatives in this region. We presumed, above all, that our organizations do not have systematized documentation on the basis of which we could get a more or less true insight into the situation, and also we presumed that some of them would not be willing to give out this sort of data. (ZaMirNET from Zagreb, Croatia was the only organization that, without us asking for it, listed all donations they had received till that time

⁶ The acronymes used are mostly in the the language of the donor.

in the full amount). When making such an overview one should bear in mind that through the Internet⁷ it is possible to find amounts (in millions and billions of dollars) that developed countries give as foreign aid to developing countries worldwide, but without specifying the type of aid. Even if specified those, those amounts not even from afar fit the actual amounts received by local peace organizations.

3.2. Types of peace activities

We have made one possible classification of peace actions⁸ which, as all other similar attempts, is not ideal:

- A. Dealing with direct consequences of violence (treatment of Post-Trauma Syndrome, working with rape victims, veterans, etc.)
- B. Taking care of refugees, displaced and evicted
- C. Gathering/distributing humanitarian aid
- D. Establishing violently terminated communication links
- E. Gathering/disseminating information about war criminals, their victims and perpetrators
- F. Education of non-violence
- G. Education for constructive conflict resolution
- H. Trust building/Reconciliation
- I. Mediation/Negotiation
- J. Public advocacy of political solutions to conflict (rallies, public protests, public announcements, publications and the like)
- K. Protection of human/minority rights
- L. Analysis (of reasons of/consequences of violence, culture of violence and the like)
- M. Other

Even though our respondents had difficulty following it (leaving few items unclassified), we did not have much trouble later relocating these not so numerous examples of actions that were in the “other” category to 12 specified categories. After that, the “other”

⁷ OECD – Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development has great statistics and you can find this data at http://www.oecd.org/countrylist/0,2578,en_2649_34447_1783495_1_1_1_1,00.html

⁸ In great measure derived from the classification of Diane Francis

category had only 1.2% of examples. During this process we did not have an impression that we were damaging the data. Later, at the meeting, there were no complains except a suggestion that the items like the work on demilitarization that was done in Croatia, or gathering of information about the examples of positive practice and humane treatment during war, which was worked on in Bosnia and Herzegovina, should be treated as a separate category.

Here is the list of the projects from the category “Other”: Development of ecological agriculture. Alternative rural development and protection of environment. Seminar “Council of Europe – Rights and duties of the member countries”. Prayers for peace, held every Wednesday during war time in Bosnia. Establishing connections with influential people and peace organizations abroad (also, establishing the Group 485 in Berlin – 2000); helping the establishment of a consulting center in Vukovar, the mutual headquarters of OXFAM, Group 484 and the local association of refugees, in lawyers’ leadership. Registration of new organization, Center for Peace, Legal Advice and Psychosocial Assistance, Vukovar, Croatia. Reconstruction of the green market in Bujanovac. Project Water for Peace – the building of an aqueduct network in villages of Nesalce and Zbevac. Courses of English for former members of Liberating Army of Presevo, Medvedja and Bujanovac. Computer courses for former members of Liberating Army of Presevo, Medvedja and Bujanovac. Re-education in order to gain new qualifications for members of Liberating Army of Presevo, Medvedja and Bujanovac. Park building in village Crnotice as a form of support to Youth Forum in that village. Reconstruction of village collection of instruments in the village of Crnotice. Acquiring of equipment for the Youth Forum with chessboards. Project Rural Youth Network 2003 and 2004. Collecting books for a library in Gračanica. Promotion of books of young poets from Kosovo. Organizing various meetings on the subject of culture in an enclave influenced by various factors.

There was one more barrier in attempting to classify all mentioned forms of peace activities. This barrier is related to an effort to quantify everything that was done, that is to show how much of what (types/forms of actions/projects), when and where (location) was done.

The impediment in accomplishing this task was in the fact that our respondents did not necessarily list absolutely every action/project that they realized. Hence, the calculations

we will offer are not exact, that is, they are not the complete truth of the reality we are dealing with.

The second obstacle were projects which lasted for several years, because we wanted to show a chronological view of peace activism and to follow how its shapes have changed over the years, from 1990 till 2004. Here again we opted for a choice that has a potential mistake. Namely, if for a certain project it is stated that it was accomplished in a certain time period we calculated it as a separate unit for each year in that time period. For example, if project C was stated to have been done from 1994 till 1998, we added it up five times for that category – once for each year, in the stated period, even though it is possible that for a year within that time frame the project was provisionally paused.

Regardless of those barriers we believed that we should not give up on our original intention. Hence, we offer this quantitative presentation of peace activism shown chronologically and by locations, while nothing that relative markers (percentages) indicate more adequately than absolutes (frequencies) relative proportions of certain types of peace activism in the region.

First of all, we will show a summarized view of the geographical distribution (locations) of the types of peace activism, and then we will analyze each of those types separately.

Table 3.1 Geographic distribution of the types of peace activism (in %)

Peace activists from:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	Total
Bosnia and Herzegovina	45.6	6.8	7.2	30.2	22.2	8.6	22.6	32.4	0	6.0	29.2	11.5	0	19.3
Montenegro	1.6	2.6	0.7	0	5.6	2.9	3.9	0.8	0	14.1	5.7	0.6	0	3.8
Croatia	35.1	30.2	7.8	46.6	34.4	34.9	21.1	20.6	55.6	25.0	30.3	32.3	12.1	27.7
Kosovo	0	1.6	1.0	3.9	0	9.2	5.7	2.9	13.3	2.0	3.6	0.6	3.0	3.5
Macedonia	2.6	0	5.8	0.9	1.1	8.2	12.2	7.5	4.4	3.2	4.6	5.0	0	5.3
Serbia	14.9	58.8	74.1	18.5	37.4	36.2	34.4	35.7	26.7	50.0	26.5	50.0	84.8	40.4
Total	4.2	7.0	10.7	8.5	3.3	11.1	10.2	13.7	1.6	9.1	13.4	5.9	1.2	100.0
	114	192	293	233	91	304	279	373	45	250	366	162	33	2735

How to read this table?

First of all, one can notice that certain types of peace activism are not equally distributed. Following the horizontal summary view in the second last row. Even though there was no category of peace activism missing, some types of activities were rather rare. For example, negotiation or mediation between parties in conflict (1.6%), gathering and disseminating information about war criminals and their victims and perpetrators (3.3%), and those dealing with direct consequences of violence (4.2%).

The most frequent (21.3%) were various forms of education. With good reasons we compounded two types of education – for non-violence (F, 11.1 %) and for constructive conflict resolution (G, 10.2%). Projects that deal with trust building and reconciliation (H, 13.7%) and protection of human/minority rights (K, 13.4%) are also present in high frequencies.

Is this sort of distribution adequate for the real needs of communities where the local peace organizations were active? We hope that this overview of the geographical distribution of peace activities would somewhat bring us closer to a better informed answer to that question. The geographical distribution of the total number (2735) of peace actions / projects (last column in the table) would not be of much help, while the distribution of certain types of peace activities in each country separately can, at least to some extent, offer some relevant data.

From Table 3.1 we can see that out of the total number of projects from the category of:

- A. Dealing with direct consequences of violence – most were in Bosnia and Herzegovina (45.6%) and Croatia (35.1%), while the least were in Kosovo (0.0%)
- B. Taking care of refugees, displaced and evicted people – most were in Serbia (58.8%) and Croatia (30.2%), while the least were in Macedonia (0.0%)
- C. Gathering and distributing humanitarian aid – most were in Serbia (74.1%) and the least were in Montenegro (0.7%)
- D. Establishing violently terminated communication links – most were in Croatia (46.6%) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (30.2%)
- E. Gathering/disseminating information about war criminals – most were in Serbia (37.4%) and Croatia (34.4%), while the least were in Kosovo (0.0%)

- F. Education in tolerance – most were in Serbia (36.2%) and Croatia (34.9%), while the least were in Montenegro (2.9%)
- G. Education for conflict resolution – most were in Serbia (34.4%), Bosnia and Herzegovina (22.2%) and Croatia (21.1%), while the least were in Kosovo (5.7%)
- H. Trust building/Reconciliation – most were in Serbia (35.7%) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (32.4%)
- I. Mediation/Negotiation – most were in Croatia (55.6%), while the least were in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro (0.0%)
- J. Public advocacy of political solutions to conflict – most were in Serbia (50.0%) and Croatia (25.0%), while the least were in Kosovo (2.0%) and Macedonia (3.2%)
- K. Protection of human/minority rights – most were in Croatia (30.3%), Bosnia and Herzegovina (29.2%) and Serbia (26.5%), while the least were in Kosovo (3.6%)
- L. Analysis of the causes of violence, stereotypes, culture of violence – most were in Serbia (50.0%) and Croatia (32.3%), while the least were in Montenegro (0.6%)

This analysis can be further complicated, or brought closer to the wanted outcome, by bringing in one more dimension, that is, by looking chronologically at every category of peace activities, following the years when they were realized. However, that chronology cannot be adequately followed unless we take into account the fact that local peace activists came onto the scene at different times, so we will take a look at data regarding the establishment of non-governmental peace organizations (**Attachment No. 6**). We stress that until 1995 only 20% of organizations were officially registered; that, for example, organizations from Kosovo who answered our call, were registered only at the beginning of 2001 and that there was a similar situation regarding organizations from Montenegro. Also, we must not forget that in certain localities there were individual activists or organizations even before non-governmental peace organizations appeared (or they might have been active within organizations that did not answer our call).

A. Dealing with direct consequences of violence (treatment of Post-Trauma Syndrome, working with victims of rape, etc.)

We said that actions of this type were more prevalent in Bosnia and Herzegovina (45.6%) and in Croatia (35.1%), while there were none in Kosovo (0.0%).

In Croatia work on such projects began in 1992, while in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1995, and in both communities the work has been carried on continuously till nowadays – more or less with equal intensity.

Relatively speaking, in Serbia there were fewer of those projects (14.9% out of the total number of such actions), but they also were realized in continuity since 1993 to nowadays.

In Macedonia activities of this sort were present since 1998 till 2000 when they stopped, while in Montenegro there was only one project from 1993 till 1994, and in Kosovo, in regards to the data we have, there were none.

B. Taking care of refugees and displaced/evicted people

Projects of this sort were most present in Serbia and Croatia and this work has been continuous.

In Croatia they began in 1991 (two projects), and then by 1993 that number climbed to 4 to 6 projects a year.

In Serbia the work began in 1992 and by 1994 there were two such projects per year. In 1995 the number of projects drastically climbs to 12, and this has continued with similar intensity to nowadays.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina there has been one to two such projects per year since 1996, and in Montenegro since 2000.

In Kosovo there has been one project per year in 1995, 1996 and 2004, while in Macedonia there were none.

C. Gathering/distributing humanitarian aid

Both in Serbia and in Croatia actions of this type began in 1992. In Serbia these actions were continuously done (from 10 to 20 per year), while in Croatia there was a pause from 2000 till 2004 (number of action ranged from 1 to 5 per year).

In Bosnia and Herzegovina local peace activists have done work on this continuously since 1994 (from one to 3 projects per year).

In Macedonia this work has been done since 1998 (two-three projects per year).

In Montenegro there were three actions of this type per year since 2001 to 2004.

In Kosovo we found one such action in 1995, a one per year in 2003 and 2004.

D. Establishing violently terminated communication links

In Croatia and Serbia such actions began in 1991 and, interestingly enough, have lasted in continuity till 2004. In both countries the number of such actions increased from 1995 till 1999.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina these actions start in 1995 and in Kosovo in 1999 and are continuously implanted till 2004.

In Macedonia we registered two such actions – in 1999 and in 2000.

There were no such actions in Montenegro.

E. Gathering/dissemination of information on war criminals, their victims/ perpetrators

Even though there were fewer of these, activists from Croatia and Serbia have been working continuously on these projects from the start of war – in Croatia since 1991 and in Serbia since 1992. The number of these projects starts increasing in 2003 and 2004.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina these projects began in 2000, while in Montenegro in 2002, and they are still actively worked on.

In Kosovo and Macedonia we have not registered any such projects.

F. And G. Education in tolerance and constructive conflict resolution (cumulative)

This is the most numerous categories of actions. They were present in each region, the only difference being the years when they began – in Croatia in 1991, Serbia 1992, Macedonia 1995, Bosnia and Herzegovina 1996, Montenegro 1997 and Kosovo 2000. Even though the distribution was numerically different (in Croatia and Serbia there were more than 20 a year), work on these projects continues till nowadays.

H. Trust building/Reconciliation

In this case the situation is similar to the previous one, except that these types of projects were less prevalent: they start in 1992 (Croatia and Serbia⁹), 1993 (Bosnia and Herzegovina), 1997 (Macedonia), 2000 (Montenegro), 2001 (Kosovo), are continuous till 2004, and increase in numbers from 2000.

I. Mediation/Negotiation

While being the least prevalent, this type of peace action began in 1996 (Croatia), that is, in 1997 (in Serbia).

Since 2002 we have registered six such projects in Kosovo (for one there is no data regarding what year it began).

They were not implemented in other countries.

J. Public advocacy of political solutions of conflict (rallies, public protests, announcement, public publications, etc.)

This type of action is present in all countries, with the only difference being the number and time of their beginnings. It should be mentioned that in this category there are many (12) actions that were not specified in regards to when they began (most from questionnaires from Croatia – eight).

⁹ A complete overview of this sort of peace activity in Serbia and Montenegro can be found in: Blagojevic, Marina, and Natasa Milenkovic. *Suocavanje s prosloscu: Izvestaj za Srbiju i Crnu Goru*. Beograd: Quaker Peace and Social Witness, 2004.

In Serbia the public protests began in 1990, while most of them were in 1992 (13) and between 1996 and 2000 (from 7 to 14 a year), and in smaller numbers all the way through 2004.

In Croatia they started in 1991 and continue till today (with an increase in intensity in 2003 and 2004).

In Montenegro we register one such action in 1992, a then a pause till 1996 when they start up again and continuously last all the way through 2004 (with an increase in 2002).

In Macedonia there were four such actions per year in 2001 and 2002, while in Kosovo there were two per year in 2003 and 2004.

K. Protection of human/minority rights

This type of project is very prevalent and has continuously been realized in all countries, while the years they began in are different. From 1990, that is 1991 they began in Croatia and Serbia, from 1993 in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia, 1999 in Kosovo and 2001 in Montenegro.

An increase in number of projects is noted in all countries.

It should also be noted that in this category as well there are fifteen projects that did not state the year they were implemented in, and most of them from Serbia - eight such projects.

L. Analysis of causes of violence, culture of violence

Even though many peace activists indicate a lack of adequate resources for analytical work, we managed to register 160 such projects. Most of them were in Serbia (81) and Croatia (52), but there were some in Bosnia and Herzegovina (19) and Macedonia (8). In Montenegro we noticed only one (in 2003), while on Kosovo none.

Also, we can notice a larger increase of analysis projects in 2003 and 2004.

3.3. Effectiveness of accomplished actions/projects

It is always hard to talk about the effectiveness of peace projects. Often they have as a goal complex social change (for example, “improving relations between conflicting parties”), and it is uncertain whether the registered change can be attributed to the work of some specific initiative. It is always too difficult to claim that the peace activity of A brought about the outcome B, since that outcome is most often the result of a cumulative effort of several factors.

The evaluation of the effects of peace projects is rather distorted due to the fact that it is mostly based on the subjective (arbitrary) estimate of external evaluators, internal evaluators and/or focus groups (project participants). Even when more credible measures are taken on the basis of which it is possible to claim that a certain effect was gotten due to a certain peace action, on the basis of what than will we claim that the said effect is relevant for peace?¹⁰

Especially in the beginning, local peace initiatives in this region were being established spontaneously, on impulse, without a systematic program of action (that is, without a proper research project, where the evaluation is an integral part of planning) and most often with no foreign help. An example of the beginnings of one of the oldest peace organizations in the region, Center for Antiwar Action from Belgrade, Serbia, show this clearly:

Our first action was calling soldiers to desert the civil war (the call was made during a press conference at the International Press Center in Belgrade). We offered legal protection to individuals who refuse the military draft. Also, we started a petition for civil serving in the army (on the basis of conscientious objection) and to annul the measure of mobilization. The petition was sent to our government – then president of state, Cosic, and it was signed by international organizations as well, as a special type of support...

At the beginning we worked on propagating peace, that is, anti-war actions that were public, held in streets and parks (for instance, “*Peace Picnic*”, held in Pionirski Park, or the reception for peace activists from Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia who came to Belgrade to ask Milosevic to sign an anti-war petition (*Peace Charter*). Or, we organized a big rock

¹⁰ More on this in: Anderson, Mary B, and Lara Olson. *Confronting War: Critical Lessons for Peace Practitioners*. Cambridge, MA: The Collaborative for Development Action, Inc, 2003.

concert against the war in Bosnia, titled “*Do not Count on us*”, where we distributed much of our propaganda material (we didn’t save any!). Around 50,000 people visited this event. Mirjana Karanovic and Rade Serbedzija (celebrities) took part in this manifestation. We organized mega actions like “*Black Ribbon for Sarajevo*”, “*Yellow Ribbon*” (peace protest against ethnic cleansing), and so on.

Then in 1992 we engaged ourselves in forming an ad hoc tribunal for war crimes committed on the territories of former Yugoslavia, and in December, in San Remo, we held the first international meeting regarding the tribunal. At the same time a study about this¹¹ was published in English. Then, next year we organized a similar meeting in Brussels, with the help of National Endowment for Democracy, and that is how the Center for Antiwar Action became the initiator of the Tribunal, while it was established by the United Nations.

We also wrote anti-war public announcements that were published in the daily newspapers. The weekly *Republika* always published everything we wrote, and what women’s groups wrote, and texts on the topic of nationalism and against the war. We initiated peace campaigns, especially intensive one being in 1993, for the Vens-Owen peace plan for Bosnia and Herzegovina. However, that plan was torpedoed by the United States and Warren Christopher, even though it was much better than the one from the contact group from 1994, and which practically meant the division of Bosnia, according to which the Dayton Peace Agreement was made. Regretfully, no peace organization was consulted for all that. *Vesna Pesic, Center for Antiwar Action, Belgrade, Serbia*

Donations for properly designed projects came much later and were given mostly to those groups of enthusiasts gathered around the need to in some way prevent or change the turn of events that were taking Yugoslavian society straight into a catastrophe.

From the questionnaires that were returned filled out it is obvious that our respondents are aware of the complexities of the question of effectiveness, generally speaking, and are especially aware of the difficulties of comparing specific peace actions and singling out one that could be considered the most effective. Because, as one of our respondents said, “this is about pioneer work or otherwise unique activities” that were all happening “in public”, where it’s hard to say who gained from it and how. Hence, it was not easy to give one straight answer to the question of the effectiveness of peace actions and projects.

¹¹ Biserko, Sonja (Ed.). *Yugoslavia Collapse, War, Crimes*. Belgrade: Centre for Anti-War Action and Belgrade Circle, 2003.

Well, it is very hard to talk about effects. Our peace actions were not successful in a practical manner, to end the war, but they were effective in the sense that everyone knew that there were peace groups in Serbia that they are against the war, against nationalism; we maintained some dignity by staying active... Our actions taken for the cessation of the bombing of Sarajevo from Pale were effective, not right away, and maybe not because we were lobbying, but it happened, and we were the initiators of that consciousness, at least that's what I think. So, that raising of someone's consciousness about something¹² (war crimes, bombing of Sarajevo, ethnic cleansing, discrimination, etc.) was effective. One should keep in mind that today, for instance, it is normal that the Law has a provision for civil serving of the army, and at the time we were initiating it that question was very sacrilegious. At the end, success came. That takes into account a great advance in the field of respect for human rights, but that is in regards to the entire non-governmental sector; that is something many have worked on. *Vesna Pesic, Center for Antiwar Action, Belgrade, Serbia*

Our projects are somewhat specific since they are not regarding a concrete group of beneficiaries, and hence, it is much more complex and delicate to estimate the "needs of the beneficiaries". The analysis of requirements that we made before designing these projects shows that women are invisible in local history in basically all areas, in official history, in existing historiography books, in the endeavors of previous generations (exhibitions), but also that they are erased from public memory and have been pushed out of public space (names of streets and city spaces). In that sense, our projects have most certainly helped to raise consciousness and articulate the need for more knowledge of this sort, much more than what has been given in response to the existing need... *Women's Peace Group, Pancevo, Serbia*

Even though it was done cautiously our respondents, none the less, stress the effects of peace actions that have been accomplished on several levels – (a) with the direct "beneficiaries"/focus groups, (b) with those working on the project itself/who realize the program, but also (c) with the larger community. We will illustrate this with one concrete example of complex effects of working with minority groups in the Vukovar-Srijem County.

This project began the first partnership of one NGO and the County, followed by cooperation between two counties regarding the question of national minorities. A working group of representatives of national minorities was formed, and later it grew into a coordinating body (Minority Council). Representatives of the national minorities who took part in this project became presidents of the Council. The cooperation that was thus established among the minorities and between them became permanent and exists autonomously, while

¹² The cursive and underline are ours

also becoming an example to the whole community and the region as a whole. Later, the Istra County has asked that their minorities be permanently involved in all Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education – VIMIO education projects, including projects aimed at Kindergartens. Also, a mutual statement of national minorities and political parties was signed. It was titled “Vukovar Together” (**Attachment No. 7**). A project for the reconstruction of cultural and religious facilities was written in the name of all national minorities. Also, support was given to the project Kindergarten “Vukovar Together”. The various minorities wrote a mutual letter to nominate Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education – VIMIO for the municipality award for their involvement in establishing cooperation between national minorities, and Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education – VIMIO received this award.

To conclude, it seems that what most thought was impossible was accomplished: cooperation between national minorities amongst themselves and then cooperation between national minorities and the County... *Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education – VIMIO, Vukovar, Croatia*

▪ **Influence on direct beneficiaries/groups in focus**

Many peace actions were of educational nature and hence it is relatively easier to recognize, and add up the direct effect (number of participants, their evaluation of the purposefulness of the knowledge/skills gained). This is why, maybe, this type of activity is noted to be the most effective, especially when young people have been educated this way.

However, our respondents acknowledge even more complex, indirect effects of peace education, which guarantee the transfer and sustainability of changes that were brought about. Often, for example, it is noted that through work with certain groups in society there was an increase in the number of peace activists (Center for Peace Studies - CMS, Zagreb, Croatia, Kosovo Initiative for Democratic Society – KONI, Prizren, Kosovo, Peace Studies, Belgrade, Serbia, Open University, Subotica, Serbia, Small Step – Center for Peace and Non-Violence, Zagreb, Croatia, Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education – VIMIO, Vukovar, Croatia) who are ready to use the skills gained during the trainings.

A similar example is with education for non-violent conflict resolution. This education has for years been done out of institutions, since school authorities at that time were not willing to have such programs in schools. This way a great number of school workers were educated who, later on, after changes in the school authorities and reforms in the education

system, were already able to apply this program. What is more, society became aware of the need for such programs and hence it was legalized. During the last years these education programs have been incorporated in the official school programs in Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro. At the time when this was beginning, legalization of this sort of activity was a far of goal whose realization had to be waited on for years...

Education in non-violence has in the mean time reached into various areas; there are even programs on a state level approved by the Ministries that regulate such matters. Even if this is not what we have always talked about and what we worked on in little groups at the beginning of the nineties, it is a fact that today there is literature in Croatian as well university courses on non-violent conflict resolution at certain Faculties. *Aida Bagic, Zagreb, Croatia*

...non-violent communication was brought into the curriculum in elementary schools. *Helsinki Citizen's Assembly, Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

...we opened up the road for the philosophy of peace and tolerance in schools, connected pupils and teachers from two different national systems. *Youth Center Gornji Vakuf – Uskoplje, Gornji Vakuf – Uskoplje, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

For example, the program of “Goodwill Classroom” brought something new to a large number of both teachers and students, and later on the program was implemented in Civic education for 1st grade in high school. *Dragan Popadic, Group “MOST” – Association for Cooperation and Mediation, Belgrade, Serbia*

Many organizations can testify about the effectiveness of working with young people. An example can be the effects of the program Young MIRamiDA (Center for Peace Studies, Zagreb, Croatia) which worked on getting young people more active. At the end the young people were actively involved in the creation of the National Youth Policy in Croatia¹³.

The Young MIRamiDA program was the first in Croatia to start working on strengthening young activists and questioning the state's stance on youth issues. This program reached its crown success cooperating and later overseeing the signing of the National Youth Policy in Croatia. *Center for Peace Studies, Zagreb, Croatia*

Aside from educational programs, the efficiency can be seen in many other forms of peace activities, some of which were focused on direct beneficiaries:

¹³ More on this case study in **Attachment No. 7**

- Providing legal aid (Documentation and Information Center “VERITAS”, Belgrade, Serbia)
- Protecting the rights of those especially endangered (civilian victims of war, minorities, and families of those who were killed or are missing...) ¹⁴
- Protection and promotion of human rights
- Work on bettering the efficiency of the court system and giving help in municipal court cases in war stricken regions, and achieving equality before the law for all citizens of Croatia (Coalition for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, Osijek, Croatia)
- Work with war veterans (Association for Mental Health Protection of War Veterans and War Victims 1991 – 1999, Novi Sad, Serbia)
- Elimination of communication blocks (Forum of Tuzla Citizens, Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina)
- Establishing communication between antagonized ethnic groups (Open University, Subotica, Serbia)
- Project Respecting the Differences (Violeta Petroska Beska, Skopje, Macedonia)
- Exchange Program for Tolerance in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina. It helped us a lot to create a partner organization from Sarajevo in order to develop different activities for peace building in Kosovo as well as in Bosnia and Herzegovina. (Network of Peace Movement – Kamenicë, Kamenica, Kosovo).

While some are focused on starting broader social change:

¹⁴ Information from the Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Serbia in the research “*Between Integration and Sustainable Return*”, 2001, speaks about how refugees in Serbia see foreign organizations: “Foreign humanitarian organizations seem to fare a little worse than the Red Cross according to refugees. However, this picture can be misleading since none of those questioned had bad experiences with them, and even 30% of them had no direct contact with these types of organizations. 48 percent of them have a positive opinion and good experiences, while 18% noted that they got no help from foreign humanitarian organizations. The responses vary from: “I have not used their services”, “there was no contact”, “we received nothing from foreign organizations”, “we have not been helped by foreign humanitarian organizations”, “I do not know anything about foreign humanitarian organizations”, “I have no information”, “we had no contact with them, they mostly visited collective centers”, to answers such as: “it was satisfying”, “they helped before but not now”, “good overall”, “we received nothing from them directly, but rather through the Red Cross”, “once from a Maltese church”, “I received assistance once from Caritas”, “they were good, help with food”, “help with food and clothes”, “help with food and rarely clothes”, “Norway, CARE, help with food”, etc. The respondents obviously do not differentiate between the assistance distributed by the Red Cross and the assistance handed out directly by foreign humanitarian organizations. It is very interesting how after ten years of the refugee agony and the truly great efforts by certain foreign organizations, they remain unacknowledged by the respondents or are experienced in extremely unusual ways (for instance “a Maltese church”), whereby assistance is ascribed to the Red Cross.

- Documenting war victims (Documentation and Information Center “VERITAS”, Belgrade, Serbia)
- Establishing a citizens forum (Open University, Subotica, Serbia)
- Education for civil society (Open University, Subotica, Serbia)
- Work with minorities (Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education – VIMIO, Vukovar, Croatia)
- Publishing a magazine (ARKzin, Zagreb, Croatia, VOICE/Center for Antiwar Action, Belgrade, Serbia) and other publications.

This list obviously does not include all effective actions since many respondents said that all actions that they listed as examples of their work they consider to be adequate for the real and current needs of their beneficiaries, and that their accomplishment helped the self-sustainability of the projects themselves.

▪ **Who were the beneficiaries/groups in focus?**

Both all who were filling out the questionnaires, and we, while we were processing them, had difficulties to precisely articulate the beneficiaries of peace actions. We guess that this is why in many cases (64 %!) the category “beneficiaries” remained unfilled.

However, it seems that we should not completely give up on this endeavor to systematize the beneficiaries of peace actions. So, here is one (maybe a clumsy one) attempt to classify the beneficiaries for the cases where we had relevant information:

- NGO sector (for instance¹⁵, activists of the women’s peace network; activists of non-governmental organizations; activists of peace, defenders and organizations for human rights; civil society activists; activists from former Yugoslavia; activists from Europe; activists from United States of America, and so on).
- Professional groups (for instance, teachers; journalists; independent journalists; media; professional associations; sport associations; social workers; day care workers; lawyers; public workers; legal experts; judges; school psychologists and pedagogues; writers; publicists; researches for the Hague War Crimes Tribunal;

¹⁵ Formulations of all these categories are listed as they were named in the questionnaires.

health care staff; researchers of violence; intellectuals Serbs and Albanians and so on).

- Public (for instance, schools; broader (local) public; those who had access to publications; beneficiaries of data; public opinion; visitors and the broader public through media; interested citizens; citizens of Kotor; citizens of Belgrade; citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina; citizens of the municipalities of Priboj, Prijepolje and Nova Varos and so on).
- Victims of war (for instance, refugee and displaced children; refugee and displaced women; refugees and displaced people living in private accommodation and in collective centers; refugees who are Roma or Bosniaks from Kosovo; Serbian refugees from Croatia, Bosnia and Kosovo; refugee population living in collective centers and so on).
- State/political institutions and organizations (for instance, members of democratic political parties; activists of political parties; members of municipal councils; people who are on public functions; representatives of authority institutions; local government representatives and so on).
- Minorities/marginalized groups (for instance, Roma; Bosniaks; Albanian; Roma displaced from Kosovo; Roma who were in Nazi camps during World War II; Roma women and children; Roma population; Roma children; Roma neighborhood in Cetinje and Podgorica, Montenegro; associations and informal groups of national minorities; various ethnic groups; representatives of organizations of national minorities; organizations and institutions of national minorities; representatives of minorities from Central and Eastern Europe; members of the Montenegro-Serb and Roma-Egyptian communities in the municipality of Niksic; members of minority communities; minorities; handicapped; those retired; members of religious communities; other endangered groups; HIV/AIDS; children between 6 to 14 years of age; local populace – Serbs, Roma, Hungarians, Slovaks, Jews, Croats; students in ethnically diverse high schools; students from the second to fourth grade in elementary schools that are ethnically diverse; young of all nationalities; women from North Kosovo and enclaves and so on).
- Others (for instance, members of unions; members of religious communities; the faithful; atheists; everyone who wants to learn techniques of positive communication and peaceful conflict resolution and so on).

Considering that educational projects are a very prevalent form of local peace activities, and that they are often praised for being especially effective, and especially sustainable, we looked out for the projects where just children and youth are the beneficiaries. In that way we found out that children and youth make up one fifth (21.3%) of the total number of beneficiaries/focus groups.

More and more local as well as international organizations started working with youth so the team the program for Young *MIRamiDA* made a decision to lessen activities and with time completely cease those activities since we thought that youth associations and youth as a grouping strengthened enough to start working with us as partners and not just as beneficiaries. By doing this we clearly state that so called beneficiaries should at one moment begin to be treated as associates and partners, considering that for years they have been strengthened and in a subordinate position with less knowledge, resources and information.
Center for Peace Studies, Zagreb, Croatia

- **Benefit for local organizations/activists**

Whether it was mediated or, less frequently, direct, the local peace organizations and peace activists themselves saw positive effects of the donations. Working on projects for these organizations was an opportunity that they themselves learn new needed skills. That is especially the case with organizations that were formed earlier on and had enough opportunities to gain, through experience, knowledge and to sharpen personal measures of responsibility for the activities they are realizing, and with that establish an adequate reputation.

In any case, help to the local activists came in the form of specific trainings for certain areas of peace work (conflict resolution, mediation, negotiation and the like), after which they were able to transfer this knowledge and build on it through various education projects. However, many also received systematic training regarding necessary technical-procedural knowledge on how to organize and manage an organization, how to conceptualize and implement a project.

Similar to these there are other professional benefits about which our respondents talked about: professional literature given¹⁶, taking part in the work of international

¹⁶ Especially important for organizations in Serbia which was for several years in complete isolation, including informative.

professional conferences, articles published in foreign magazines, various awards. This has helped build self-confidence but also a reputation – not only with funding organizations but also in the communities where they worked, or at least with the beneficiaries with whom they worked:

The procedures I learned through project cycle management were really beneficial for me. They are defined and if you stick to them there can be no confusion or wrong interpretation. Everything is clearly defined. The feeling of independence within the project; I never had the feeling that someone “above” was controlling the realization, but that the money we were given was spent in the most rational manner and for what is was planned ahead. *Svetlana Kijevcanin, Belgrade, Serbia*

The most valuable thing was the trust that we gained from the international organizations that financed us. Of course, we always tried to do our best, and in return organizations like National Endowment for Democracy, for instance, still finance our work even today, since local NGO’s still are not in a position to be partner with the authorities, or at least we could not accomplish that as eternal opposition to the authorities who still flagrantly violate human rights. We are still in the situation that we can only survive through the help of foreign organizations. *Forum of Tuzla Citizens, Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

“A fertile exchange of ideas with experts and intellectuals from Europe and America” (Belgrade Circle), possibilities of making contacts, good relations with “people who work in the right places” (Andrej Nosov, Belgrade, Serbia, Committee for Civic Initiative, Nis), the wish and willingness to continue with the activities started (Kosovo Organization for New Initiatives – KONI, Prizren, Kosovo, Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education – VIMIO, Vukovar, Croatia), a sense of being a part of the broader context in which we work and that is built by connecting internationally, sense of togetherness, exchange of activists, learning about the experiences of other communities – all were frequently stated as additional dimensions to this sort of benefits.

During the war years and later on, this cooperation was an important link with the normal world, a possibility to fix some of our beliefs which seemed “objective” and were in reality pretty distorted. *Dragan Popadic, Group “MOST” – Association for Cooperation and Mediation, Belgrade, Serbia*

Like the cited Dragan Popadic, other respondents stress that the benefits of foreign help was also the understanding of the context in which we were working (better

understanding of the needs of the local community, readiness to listen to the needs in the way the group in focus is articulating them), and even “building the feeling that it is possible to influence change” (Mladen Majetic, Zagreb, Croatia, Association of Citizens “Truth and Reconciliation”, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina).

We knew nothing about civil society in the practical sense of that word, except theoretically, since that was discussed and written about in magazines in the eighties (first organizations of that sort began in Slovenia and were declared to be against the state), and here in Serbia ten of us tried to register an organization against the death penalty, but we did not succeed in that since our association was declared unconstitutional... So, if it were not for the cooperation with foreign funding organizations we would not have these NGO groups, since they basically began that activity and today it covers all important social problems.
Vesna Pesic, Center for Antiwar Action, Belgrade, Serbia

Quantified, the dominant (most mentioned) are the following aspects of foreign help:

Financial support	69%
Logistics support	13%
Consultative support	6%
Training/education	5%
Other	7%

In cooperation with funding agencies some local activists who replied to our questionnaire additionally value flexibility, mutual effort to visible resistance to patterns of structural violence, similar value system, solidarity, transparency, continued support, timely/fast reacting, mutual problems solving, good communication, and possibility to use data gathered in project.

3.4. Problems in cooperation with foreign partners

However helpful and appreciated this help was, there were also problems in cooperation with foreign partners. Local activists may not have had all needed procedural knowledge, but they had strong positive motivation, various relevant expertise and good knowledge of the context in which they were working. This gap created problems that local activists tried solving in various ways.

First of all it should be mentioned that one fourth of respondents did not have (or mention) any problems in cooperation with foreign partners. Among them are the Center for Peace, Legal Advice and Psychosocial Assistance, Vukovar, Croatia, DAJA - Roma Women's Organization, Kumanovo, Macedonia, Ecumenical Humanitarian Organization, Novi Sad, Serbia, Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Nansen Dialogue Center, Prishtina, Kosovo, Network of Peace Movement - Kamenicë, Kamenica, Kosovo, Committee for Human Rights and Freedom, Kursumlija, Serbia, Committee for Human Rights, Leskovac, Responsibility for the Future/Neighbors for Peace, Beograd-Bujanovac, Documentation and Information Center "VERITAS", Beograd, Women's Center, Debar, Macedonia, Belgrade Center for Human Rights – office in Priboj, Priboj, Serbia, Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Republika Srpska, Bijeljina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education – VIMIO, Vukovar, Croatia, Association of Citizens "Truth and Reconciliation", Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The rest (three fourths of respondents) point to various sorts of problems that can be summarized in five basic groups: (1) problems resulting from not knowing, not understanding the local context, (2) bureaucratic relation to local partners and procedural difficulties resulting from them, (3) problems that result from a neocolonial stance of some representatives of funding agencies expressed towards the local populace, (4) intermediaries between funding agencies and local groups and (5) problems that can be noticed in the unwillingness of foreign partners to support organizational survival and sustainable development of local activists.

(1) Lack of understanding, insufficient knowledge of local context

Problems that arise from the donor's insufficient understanding of the local context is evident when foreign partners offer ideas, concepts, and even solutions to problems that are not adequate for the reality they need to be realized in. Or, when they finance only projects of a certain type even though local activists consider that different activities are needed in the moment.

The funding agency from the start is directing the project, so basically from the moment the call for proposals is made or when they offer the possibility of financing. We are there for them and not the funding agency for us. In the past 12 years it has practically never happened that I thought differently. The funding agency "knows best" what we need and what we should do and they are especially keen on dictating the conditions and methods of

realization without having a clue about the situation in the field. They are interested in form, and not content. The effectiveness of such projects that are dictated and determined in advance is basically low, that is, they do not create a critical mass that is ready to make changes. *Marija Molnar, Vukovar, Croatia*

Generally, it is problematic when we have to behave in accordance with funding trends, instead of following the needs and consulting local experts about what was a priority in what moment and the best means of support for beneficiaries. *Humanitarian Association "Prijateljice", Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

The most problematic thing was that funding agencies often had their ideas about what we should be doing, and that was imposed on us, and maybe something else that was more important was not covered because funding agencies had no interest for those problems. There was too much routine, practically false spending of money, empty actions, because that's what "the project said". *Vesna Pesic, Center for Antiwar Action, Belgrade, Serbia*

Periodical attempts to misuse power and attempts to dictate what and how it should be done, most of all by funding agencies in the United States of America. In those cases there basically was not any cooperation or it was abolished. With those that we have been cooperating in the long-term the problems came in the form of periodical bureaucratic mishandlings that do not take into account the reality we live in here... *The Center for Non-Violent Action, Belgrade, Serbia/Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

It is one thing to cooperate with peace organizations, groups and individuals who are not necessarily funding us, even though they did bring smaller amounts of money. The nature of the cooperation is completely different with funding agencies who asked for worked out project proposals. Among the first group there were periodically misunderstandings about the context in which the peace work was taking place, for instance, some of them particularly like public actions and consider them the only way to do peace work, so if there are no peace demonstrations it is like there was nothing done... One problem with working with the second group was their lack of will to adjust their procedures, to develop some type of mutual international standards instead of everybody of them expecting a project proposal in accordance with their own application form. *Aida Bagic, Zagreb, Croatia*

I think that it bothered me most that we were receiving support to be "multi-ethnic" and not ethnic, to be peaceful and not war supporters, but when the peace plans were being created no one asked us one thing. So, we felt betrayed in the sense that we were more

multi-cultural and more for human rights, and were taking it all very seriously, than the states of our funding agencies, who were behaving as they pleased. That was the case in Bosnia and Herzegovina: we work hard for one peace plan, they reject it and adopt another one completely different because someone feels like hitting his hand on the table and being in charge. It was similar with Kosovo. American officials came to Belgrade thousands of times to talk to Milosevic, without ever consulting us or the democratic parties about Rambouillet. Finally, we were called to the American embassy in November 1998, and I was the only one criticizing and saying that the peace plan for Kosovo was not good and giving arguments for it, and everything ended in the bombing, as if we do not exist and like we never did anything, and then they asked that we say publicly that we are for the bombing. *Vesna Pesic, Center for Antiwar Action, Belgrade, Serbia*

Local peace activists see several solutions that could, if not fix, than lessen this sort of problem. On one side, they consider it important that they themselves have a clear long-term strategy that should be presented to potential funding agencies, who then could consider them as professional and serious partners. Another suggestion was to design the project proposals with as clear as possible the definition of the problem addressed and equally detailed specification of project activities. These were considered as the most effective forms of protection from possible misuse.

(2) *Bureaucratic stance and procedural problems*

Donors' bureaucratic stance is recognized by the local activists not just as rigid insistence on procedure, which is often totally inadequate in regards to the dynamics of the situation in which the work is being done (many circumstances in which the project is being realized change in relation to the situation when the project was being written), but are also renowned for the slowness of communication and decision making, and even as donors' lack of concern for the accomplished effects of the project. Although there is an understanding that applications must go through complex process of decision, it is hard to allow the duration of that process, which hinders the timeliness of reacting to problems for which we all believe need to be solved.

Such rigid insistence on previously written out procedures results in:

- Formal accomplishment of project demands (so that "some activities are done even when they do not have much impact", Center for Peace Studies, Zagreb, Croatia, ZaMirNET, Zagreb, Croatia)

Intervening in a project with “useful” ideas that would lead us into problems, doubting our capacities or expertise, insufficient competence of people in funding agencies who were in charge of following our work, burdening us with endless questions and sub-questions (even some non-stop series of questions) after each interim report, shifting the blame for the mistakes of the intermediary organization onto us as implementing partners, demands that are impossible to meet and so on (for example, how to make people who know nothing about computers and do not speak English into computer technicians who can fix hardware and software in two weeks).

Another type of problem is donors’ request for detailed monthly plans of all activities with exact dates, hours and places where something will be taking place. That would not be hard to accomplish if it wasn’t regarding a consortium, that is, a partnership that contains several bigger organizations that have numerous activities; in such cases it takes a lot of time just to construct a detailed compilation of all plans. Considering the procedure that has to be respected in communicating with funding agencies, until the plan arrives (considering procedure) to the funding office, you can already be sending in a new one since the local circumstances have already changed. For example, the starting time of a round table has changed. Namely, frequent changes of time-tables, even two weeks before commencement, are a reality when it’s regarding the local self-government, politicians, etc. who have very busy schedules and activities that relay on them have to be open to adjustment. So, donors’ micromanagement officers generate additional stress for those in charge of project implementation.

In parallel, so as to lessen their share of work, the employees of one funding agency ask the consortium to purchase all the equipment needed for the project at once. That means that specific needs for equipment of every partner organization are not respected, nor the timing when that equipment is needed. For instance, the equipment for offices of project partners should be bought at the beginning of the project, and the equipment for beneficiaries much later. If we would buy everything at the beginning we have to find space to storage everything and who would pay for that storage because storage expenses are not calculated in the budget. Aside from that, the guarantee time for the equipment starts when you pay for it – and it is not being used because it is in storage!

Problems with understanding the project happened in regards to certain employees of some funding agencies who were in charge of following up the project with which they were not familiar because they have no previous professional or life experiences. It is just hard to cooperate with unqualified person who has the power to expect from you to be cooperative and ready to answer numerous and frequently absurd questions and at the same time the power to reject any advice and suggestion.

It also happened that some employees of funding agencies ask us not to change anything in the approved budgets, not to spare our expenses and not to ask for changes in

expenditures, since this creates additional work for them. On the other side, other employees of the same funding agency ask us to save money and even suggest changes in parts of the project so as to achieve those savings. Thus persistently they disregard the fact that the project has been approved by an independent professional commission and that we may not change anything without the approval of the headquarters of that same funding agency.
ZaMirNET, Zagreb, Croatia

- Discrepancies between deadlines for reporting and logics and dynamics of activities in the field (Helsinki Citizens' Assembly, Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina)
- Irrational spending of resources

It would have been better if we could have used our resources with several more ambitious or more time consuming options, then choosing one option that we thought would pass most easily. *D. Popadic, Group "MOST" – Association for Cooperation and Mediation, Belgrade, Serbia*

Funding agencies mostly do not respect our need to work out some activities in lower pace. Hence, we have cases where NGO's has too short budget to sensitize the public and when they start to do it and stop since there is no more money in the budget, everything goes in vain... Some additional not funded actions the activists are tempted to take over just show that they are still alive and still striving for the same goals but are powerless to achieve them...

Funding agencies like to think that they have done all that was in their power if they left behind them an NGO (established it), or maybe a network (each funding agency likes to have its own network, a network of what????), equipment and if the local government doesn't drastically repress its people. They see their mission accomplished. But, the evaluation of their work (especially how much money/working hours they invested) in regards to real changes made in peoples mind would, too often, be defeating.

On the other hand, women's funding agencies frequently listen to our suggestions and give support to activities that are important to women. *Center for Civic Initiatives, Porec, Croatia*

- Inadequate timing of activities that, as a consequence, had inadequate effect (ASK, Podgorica, Montenegro)

If we are speaking about funding agencies... then we could mention that they are not set to react promptly and not willing to support the long-term projects ... For example, in the case of one project, Initiatives for the third sector, the Open Society Institute in Zagreb approved a grant only after we were already campaigning heavily for 6 months, while all the time we were counting on them to begin the whole thing. Anyway... we worked it without somehow, but spent the money that came late on something else. *Mladen Majetic, Zagreb, Croatia*

Most often it happens that the funding agencies pay out the money in several installments, only after interim narrative and financial report. The gap left between two payments is something you have to bridge in whatever way you can manage. Most funding agencies are slow in regards to their financial responsibilities, while also being very upset if, during the gap, you cease the activities. *Marija Molnar, Vukovar, Croatia*

Not once have representatives of the funding agency come to visit us, just to see how a project is realized or to attend the concluding manifestations that were always promotional – performances, calendar promotions, etc. I missed having some sense of togetherness, as if both parties are not committed to the same goals. *Women's Peace Group, Pancevo, Serbia*

(That was) present in all phases (of project realization) - from how the project was conceived, how it was implemented, evaluated, and how it was reported on. More detailed things, like how to inform the local community about our activities – they checked where we placed our posters, how many posters, what size and color, if we were on the radio, how long the posters were up, if we visited all houses, etc. Then it goes on to how we chose beneficiaries, that is, whether they had enough time to read the posters, or if they got the leaflet, from whom and when, whether they could have gotten more information by phone, etc. Whether we secured that there was enough of these and those and so on and so on. All of that was not that bad, just that sometimes it went too far.

And then there are the procedures for purchasing equipment in regards to which the funding agency does not accept the fact that we are competent enough to know the configuration of the computer in relation to the needs of our beneficiaries or activities that will be realized on those computers; who we choose to purchase the equipment from – they might request that the equipment be 100% American or European, which means that in case its American there are problems in the software in the English language and not in Croatian – and with all that there is the problem of transport of such equipment to our region that would take at least 2 months. If a donor is European Commission, there simply is not any equipment we can buy that would meet all requirements of European Commission. What we need simply

is not made in Europe. Not to mention that we have proved that we made a public call for that equipment, which no one can answer! *ZaMirNET*, Zagreb, Croatia

During the conference numerous similar cases have been discussed. A strong belief prevailed among participants that the consequences of this bureaucratic stance can be fixed by constant communication with potential and current funding agency partners, and by pointing out some of our successful actions that were accomplished precisely because local partners had a different approach.

Among funding agencies that were ready for a real partnership with local activists and organizations the following were mentioned: CARE International (though not always in a positive light, since there were some problems in cooperation with the CARE International offices in Croatia), Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, Olof Palme International Center, Die Schwelle, Kvinna Till Kvinna, Global Fund for Women, Mama Cash, European Commission.

However, there are cases where a partner relationship only appears that way. In eleven questionnaires there are answers indicating that *funding agencies do not really listen to the suggestions of local partners*, since later on they do not act in accordance to what was suggested. This represents a very painful moment in the cooperation between foreign and local partners.

They always listen and take notes (that is called "to meet the culture"). Then they go to their country with a notebook full of notes and become "experts" for the Balkans (a trendy term is "South-East Europe") and they make careers. They appear to be full of consideration, political correctness, empathy, and so on, since civilized norms dictate so. Of course, they smile constantly. They listen, but they do not respect and acknowledge, and that is the most evident moment of the hypocrisy of the funding society. *Marija Molnar*, Vukovar, Croatia

Sometimes, to some extent, but they mostly have their own "hidden agenda". *Vesna Kesic*, Zagreb, Croatia

At the meeting the examples have been discussed of funding agencies who offer so called copy/paste projects that have already been implemented in other countries. If one local NGO rejects such an offer, the funding agency looks for some another one (or forms a new one) willing to accomplish this offer. However, the complains were not addressed only

to the funding agencies; it was also pointed out that some local organizations were incapable to negotiate or lack local initiative.

Local peace activists see a solution of this problem in doing whatever is in the domain of their competence: developing personal Public Relation capabilities, making web sites, by widely disseminating their yearly reports to all, and not just their current, funding agencies, by calling funding agencies to seminars and other events that are an integral part of project realization, and so on.

(3) Neocolonial stance toward local partners and/or populace

Respondents notice a certain arrogance of funding agencies toward local NGO's and/or local populace. Some have defined this more radically as an imperialistic or racist attitude ("syndrome of our servility and their supremacy"). Such attitude has been recognized in stereotyping toward certain groups in the local populace, in ignoring the competence, responsibility and/or ethics of local partners, in social distance, and even spatial segregation insisted upon by some employees of the local offices of foreign agencies.

At the meeting examples have been discussed where members of foreign funding agencies come here out of interests that do not really fit the mission of their organization: lucrative, tourist, or interests regarding their career. A whole series of restrictions imposed on local partners were pointed out, such as requests that grants from other funding agency not be used, imposing a list of books or merchandise that may not be bought with money from that specific funding agency, threats that local partners may not, under any circumstance, be involved in protests against the war in Iraq or the funding will cease, and so on.

(4) Intermediaries

The role of international organizations that are not themselves funding agencies but are in charge of budget management is often seen by local NGO's as problematic in many ways. It turns out that those organizations sometimes spend more than 70% of the money given for the project implementation itself (covering various cost such as the purchase of jeeps from the United States of America for example), that frequently they are not well informed about the project even though they are given regular reports, that there are cases when these officers hired only for a short while... Also, there are examples of corruption and nepotism of some locals employed by international organizations... The use of

intermediaries is sometimes guided by donors' pure mistrust in local NGOs. Those are just some of the problems mentioned in regards to cooperation with intermediary international organizations.

Their bureaucracy is phenomenal; for 10 thousand dollars which they give you for a project, they need an additional 25 thousand to pay the many employees who will oversee your work, follow your work, call you, bother you with monitoring, all in all, getting involved in your project in the worse possible way. A great example for this is Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. *Marija Molnar*, Vukovar, Croatia

The consequences of working through intermediaries can be many:

- Because of frequent changes of personnel who are in charge of project realization, and who do not have enough time to get acquainted with the state of things, there is a loss of energy and time and project effectiveness suffers.
- Mistrust towards local organizations results in intermediaries registering as local organizations, which then result in decreasing the chances of already existing local organizations to receive the needed grants.
- Because of the practice of retuning money to the country where the funding agency is, the funding itself for project activities is lessened.
- Intermediaries frequently credit themselves for the results achieved.
- The division of resources is not transparent.

Recommend solutions were: good Public Relation, protection of own ideas by contracts, relaying directly on funding agencies instead of intermediaries, insisting on a partner relation in regards to intermediaries, dumping the inferior position by gaining more assertiveness and improving negotiation skills.

There is however one problem that cannot be fixed systematically with any tactics, but is solved a piece at a time, in various ingenious ways. This problem is lack of support for the survival of organizations and development of local activists and organizations.

(5) Lack of support for organizational development of local activists and organizations

This is a major problem faced by local NGO's. Foreign funding agencies are willing to finance project activities, but never or rarely the expenses of the organizations work. So,

local organizations survive from project to project. Sometimes they do all sorts of stuff due to lack of adequate projects. What is most important, they have no possibility to develop a somewhat long-term strategy that would lead to self-sustainability.

In general, in donors' funding policies toward local organizations there are very small chances for long-term projects, so that local activists have poor chances to develop their own long-term programs. It was especially so immediately after the wars in these regions. Later on trust was built again and it was easier to work and plan. But still, donors insist on self-sustainability while having no, or very little, understanding for the preconditions of self-sustainability. For instance, most funds are oriented towards activities, and not organizational development. It is hard to raise funds for organization management. During the ten years that most organizations have been working since, it would have been possible to buy the offices with the money they have used to pay rent for them, and hence secure their own sustainability, but the grants given were strictly against the purchase of real-estate and new vehicles. *Helsinki Citizens' Assembly*, Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina

The biggest problem with funding agencies is that they do not understand that for the realization of good projects organizational development is necessary as well as investing in that development. Most would only like to invest in project activities and keep the organization "virtual". *Group 484*, Belgrade, Serbia

I think it should have been made possible for us to craft an Institute of Peace, i.e. an institutional structure that would allow work on long-term projects aiming at systemic social changes. If Sweden has such an institute, than Serbia should have it as well. We submitted such proposals more than once, but did not succeed. *Vesna Pesic*, *Center for Antiwar Action*, Belgrade, Serbia

Not one organization worked on self-sustainability and no funding agency taught us how to do it. As funding agencies are now withdrawing from Bosnia and Herzegovina, it remains to be seen how many NGOs will survive. *Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

What can be the components of our self-sustainability? When foreigners talk about it, I become furious; not all the countries are able (or willing) to fund local NGOs. I cannot rely on the money of the local self-government in Novi Pazar. And the local industry? In Serbia, I see no source of income since our industry is close to non-existent. *UrbanIN*, Novi Pazar, Serbia

This problem was discussed at length at the meeting. No one, of course, likes the state of total dependency on foreign aid and support. Many still do not see a way out of that situation. The only exception were participants from Croatia where, thanks to the future joining of the European Union, the government formed an office for cooperation with non-governmental organizations, thus securing the NGO sectors participation in social change. This is best illustrated with two examples of successful cooperation with Croatian authorities – in the example of Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education – VIMIO from Vukovar, Croatia and in the example of the National Youth Policy, Young MIRamiDA, Zagreb, Croatia.

▪ **Could it have been different?**

Had there been no problems and had you had the opportunity, would you have realized your projects and activities differently? This was the next question in the questionnaire. It could be said that, regardless of the problems, a good third of respondents (more than those who noted that they did not have problems!) was completely satisfied with the end results, since they said they would not change anything because the projects that were approved were carefully planned and adequately realized.

It depends what kind of opportunities are implied. Greater financial means would of course make for a more ambitious realization. But most projects come close to the maximum of our organizational capacities and our readiness to work on the project. What I mean is that we were not prepared for more ambitious projects and the limitations were not imposed by funding agencies. *Dragan Popadic, Group "MOST" – Association for Cooperation and Mediation, Belgrade, Serbia*

If there was something that they would have done differently, with increased budgets and without many of the mentioned problems, than they would have done more of what they were already doing (increasing the numbers of participants in project activities or broadening the range of various beneficiaries), or they would have planned the implementation more flexibly, secured more time during the project cycle for breaks, reflection, new ideas. However,

Part of the project activities financed from American sources we would have definitely done differently, meaning that we would have kept the project in accordance to how it was

approved. Unfortunately, during the realization itself some donor's officers decided to stop parts of the project or redefine the indicators of success. They redefined it in accordance to the "one size fits all" credo, applying the same pattern to different organizations that were doing different activities and had completely different approaches. In any case, we successfully implemented the same activities in another project that was financed by European sources, except this time no one interfered in the realization of the already approved project. *ZaMirNET, Zagreb, Croatia*

Of course, it should not be forgotten that even without foreign financial support local peace activists have accomplished some projects just how they wanted them.

3.5. Compromises

Many respondents (34) state that there were none, unless by compromise one considers the initial acceptance of the criteria funding agencies have when applying to them. As examples of the before mentioned situation we note the following:

Mostly not. The good practice of Center for Peace Studies is that it chooses funding agencies it applies to and with those chosen we already have a certain reputation. We plan for funding agencies and activities at the same time; I can not remember such an example. *Center for Peace Studies, Zagreb, Croatia*

Only once – but during the phase of project proposal. We could not accept the funding agency's requests. We decided against further cooperation with that agency forever! *Center for Civic Initiatives, Porec, Croatia*

On the other hand, not accepting compromise had as a consequence giving up some areas of work (Ecumenical Humanitarian Organization - EHO, Novi Sad, Serbia) or ending the project if it turns out that the funding agency puts pressure in an inadequate manner. (Association of Women Citizens "Women to Women", Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina)

When it is agreed upon, a compromise is made by "cutting" the budget, accomplishing activities that were not in the contract, stretching the budget so to cover a high percentage that some funding agencies (Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe was mentioned as an example) pay only after the final report has been put in, giving up on some option of a better approach to a problem, that becomes obvious only during project

realization, accepting the funding agency's insistence on number of beneficiaries, types of activities or choice of locality where the work will be done.

3.6. The sense of responsibility

This strongly expressed uncompromising stance is, most likely, based on a great sense of responsibility of local peace organizations and activists toward the community in which they work – toward the ones they focused their activities on (“beneficiaries”) and the broader community (local populace) – or towards their own organization, associates, that is, toward themselves, only then they feel responsible toward the funding organizations. Expressed it in percentages, the distribution of answers to the question to which they feel most responsible for all they do, the distribution of answers looks like this:

Toward the beneficiaries/groups in focus, community, populace	55.9%
Toward their organization, associates, themselves	30.1%
Toward the funding agency	14.0%

I feel the greatest responsibility towards the citizens. I have always thought even when they were against us, that we work for them and that we were valuable to those citizens who felt just as we did, or who were of other nationality and in a very difficult position in Serbia. *Vesna Pesic, Center for Antiwar Action, Belgrade, Serbia*

I do not know if I understood this question right. Regarding my work in the NGO I feel the greatest responsibility toward the community in which I live in and for which I conceive projects for which I feel and think that it needs. I do not know how if I have a right to offer to my community much of what I feel and think. That is why the doubts and sense of responsibility are strongest in that segment. For some things that I did ten or so years ago, being young and foolish, today I think I should have done differently. In meantime, as an activist I have become older, more sophisticate and aware of the consequences. *Marija Molnar, Vukovar, Croatia*

Toward the group in focus – those for which all of this is done and those that help these projects. *Open University, Subotica, Serbia*

Toward the people for whom and with whom we work. We do not like calling them beneficiaries. They are definitely in first place. I feel responsible for the process itself, that is, in the long-term perspective, for adequacy of our actions and the tempo of their realization in different circumstances and different communities. *Iva Zenzerovic, Zagreb, Croatia*

If we relate responsibility to what we have done and do, I feel responsible on various levels and in various ways. Of course, I feel responsible toward the funding agency in the sense of spending money in a proper, transparent, and previously planned manner. In some way I feel personally responsible for the continuity of our group's function in the anti-war movement in our city. Nonetheless, I feel the greatest responsibility that through our work I manage to keep the balance between the work ethics, the values that drive us, and the impact we make that is frequently reached through compromise. *Women's Peace Group, Pancevo, Serbia*

3.7. Opportunities missed or: What would have been beneficial to do, but was not done?

This question from the arsenal of "everyone knows better in retrospect" is not as ceremonial as it could seem on first glance, since we all learned on personal mistakes and in practice. That is why we posed it as: "Is there something you think was necessary to do, but you had no possibility to do?"

A relatively low number of respondents (11) are completely satisfied with what was done, that is, they think that there were no missed opportunities.

We always tried to develop our projects taking into account the current situation in Kosovo/a, such as: political, economical and social circumstances. Being as realistic as possible, we did not set up high expectations and were very flexible in adjusting activities, when necessary. Therefore, we think that we did everything that was necessary at certain times under certain conditions. *Kosovo Organization for New Initiatives - KONI, Prizren, Kosovo*

Our projects are long-term and what we have not accomplished we will most certainly accomplish, if we have continued financial support from funding agencies. *Documentation and Information Center "VERITAS", Belgrade, Serbia*

Among those answers that confirmed that something could have been done in a different way, there are some unspecified answers (“yes”, “a lot” would have been done differently), while those that are specific point to missed opportunities (that is, existing needs) to do the following:

- More thorough expansion of existing projects (to continue with the activities already underway, to broaden evaluation criteria and plan more responsibly, to secure better monitoring, supervision, and follow-ups with beneficiaries). (Small Step – Center for Peace and Non-Violence, Zagreb, Croatia; Iva Zenzerovic, Zagreb, Croatia; Center for Peace, Legal Advice and Psychosocial Assistance, Vukovar, Croatia; Center for Civic Initiatives, Porec, Croatia).

For every project we should have a follow-up meeting with our beneficiaries, at least one at the end, where we could hear what they have accomplished and succeeded in doing, where they would share experiences, etc. *Small Step – Center for Peace and Non-Violence, Zagreb, Croatia*

To bring some cases to completeness and in a more refined way. We have lost some people from sight; we do not know what happened to them... That is something that we should/have to see through to the end. *Center for Civic Initiatives, Porec, Croatia*

To continue some projects that are necessary but for which we did not find a funding source. *Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education – VIMIO, Vukovar, Croatia*

- Strong peace network in the region (Women in Black, Belgrade, Serbia, Network of Peace Movement - Kamenicë, Kamenica, Kosovo, Women’s Group “Stella”, Cetinje, Montenegro, Democratic Initiative of Sarajevo Serbs (DISS), Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Committee for Human Rights and Freedom, Kursumlija, Serbia, Group “MOST” – Association for Cooperation and Mediation, Belgrade, Serbia). While during the survey that was just a wish, during the conference in Jahorina it became a reality: the agreement was reached to establish the network of peace activists (Drinka Gojkovic from Documentation Center Wars 1991 – 1999, Belgrade, Serbia, has accepted to moderate the communication within the network) and even to continue with yearly meetings (the next meeting was proposed and scheduled for 2005, in Vukovar, Croatia).

- More thorough (or more adequate) work with some specific groups in focus or communities such as: political parties, “common people” in the community, youth, minority groups, displaced people, veterans (DAJA - Roma Women’s Organization, Kumanovo, Macedonia; Group for Human Rights, Podgorica, Montenegro; Group “MOST” – Association for Cooperation and Mediation, Belgrade, Serbia; Youth Center Gornji Vakuf - Uskoplje, Bosnia and Herzegovina; Svetlana Kijevcanin, Belgrade, Serbia).

Building capacities of local self-government according to the ECRA - Economic and Community Revitalization Activity program and networking the municipalities that are at great distance from one another by wireless connection. One municipality has no telephone cables and phone central. *ZaMirNET*, Zagreb, Croatia

- Broadening the spectrum of peace activities: education in “culture of religions” for the school population, lobbying and advocating, implementing joint projects in several communities, disseminating the facts about the recent past, uncovering media lies (ABRAHAM – Association for Inter-religious Peace Work, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina; Humanitarian Association “Priateljice”, Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina; Network of Peace Movement - Kamenicë, Kamenica, Kosovo; Group “MOST” – Association for Cooperation and Mediation, Belgrade, Serbia).
- Advancing the work of local peace organizations and activists: establishing publishing activities, documentation or video documentation about projects implemented, creating greater visibility in the community, opening up possibilities for analytical-research activities, independence and freedom of work. (Andrej Nosov, Belgrade, Serbia; Center for Peace Studies, Zagreb, Croatia; Small Step – Centre for Peace and Non-Violence, Zagreb, Croatia; Center for Antiwar Action, Belgrade, Serbia; Open University, Subotica, Serbia; Goran Bozicevic, Groznan, Croatia).

More self-evaluation, broader evaluation of organizational work, more responsible planning taking into consideration personal capacities and the ones of associates and beneficiaries. Work in several communities that are not constrained by results and time, with the possibility of monitoring and support of local human resources. *Iva Zenzerovic*, Zagreb, Croatia

Each project should be more visible in the community, and for that we have neither time nor possibility. All media are interested in wars and scandals, but not for constructive, normal actions of NGO's.

We should have documentation on projects accomplished, neatly tied up instruments which we worked with, indicators that we measured, and not be in a situation to make forms, questionnaires, written materials every time a new... that is something we neither have the time nor the staff which we could pay. *Small Step – Centre for Peace and Non-Violence, Zagreb, Croatia*

As reasons for opportunities missed the following were given:

- Lack of resources or limited capacities of the organizations themselves.
- Bad communication among peace activists in the region.
- Strong tendencies toward ethnic and religious isolationism (in certain communities), but also
- Lack of listening and understanding by funding agencies for what local peace activists consider needs to be done in a given moment:

There is much misunderstanding by funding agencies for the real needs of people in the region. People who cannot satisfy even their basic existential needs, cannot sense needs of a higher order (for instance, need for democratization of society, for culture of dialogue, for multiculturalism and other). On the other hand, foreign funding agencies see only this other, for the local populace abstract, needs.

In Vukovar it is above all necessary to overcome the ever-present war trauma, and then fulfill the basic existential needs of people (unemployment is above 80%), and only then work on needs of a higher order can follow. However, for work on sanitizing war trauma and its deadly consequences on peoples' health there is not enough human (skilled) or financial resources, and sadly, not enough understanding among funding agencies. *European House, Vukovar, Croatia*

We do not question the results we have accomplished, but it has happened that funding agencies did not have understanding for certain activities, since according to their criteria some other activities had priority. For instance, at the beginning all kinds of peace activities were in focus, but not research. Today, research and conferences are in focus, but trainings and educations do not get enough support. For publications and newsletters funding is hard to find, so that most of the time we have to "pin" them to a larger project, even though in a country like Bosnia and Herzegovina there are still towns that do not get the daily

newspapers, that do not have electronic media and every piece of news is read. *Helsinki Citizens' Assembly*, Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina

3.8. What do local activists see as their greatest contribution to peace?

In answers given to the question “What do you consider your biggest contribution to peace?” it is hard to find even traces of doubt in whether there was such a contribution. In only two instances respondents declined to answer (“do not know”, symbol ☺), and only one had a hint of doubt regarding everything that was done:

March 17th 2004 showed me that the NGO sector does not exist in Kosovo. And that everything I believed in crashed, so now I do not rush since I believe everything depends on the majority, and the majority is not ready and does not want peace. *Radmila Kapetanovic*, Zubin Potok, Kosovo

One gets the impression that answers to this question are largely alike those about the effectiveness of peace actions, even though our intention was to get deeper insight into examples of “good peace practices.” Obviously, our question was not phrased well.

Looking at the answers we did get, most examples of good peacebuilding practice were related to the work with youth, and to the projects dealing with various means of dealing with the past and reconciliation. Some examples of good practice were related to the protection of human rights and minority rights, to work on war trauma and conscious-raising actions in smaller local communities.

Thanks to the conference, we are now able to offer 16 examples of good peace practice in the region, in **Attachment No. 7**¹⁷. We present here a short overview of small groups' discussions at the Jahorina conference:

WORK WITH YOUTH

A great number of organizations consider this field of work very successful: Serbian Democratic Youth, Kosovo; Natasa Dokovska, Skopje, Macedonia; Helsinki Citizens'

¹⁷ Some additional examples of good peace practice can be found in a research of Marina Skrabalo: “*Documenting Impact of Community Peacebuilding in the Post-Yugoslav Region as a Basis for Policy-Framework Development*”, <http://www.policy.hu/skrabalo/>

Assembly, Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina; Belgrade Circle, Belgrade, Serbia; Aida Bagic, Zagreb, Croatia; Small Step – Centre for Peace and Non-Violence, Zagreb, Croatia; Group “MOST” – Association for Cooperation and Mediation, Belgrade, Serbia...

Aside from general peace education, respondents especially noted successes in working with youth from different ethnic groups: Women’s Center, Debar, Macedonia; Violeta Petroska Beska, Skopje, Macedonia; Humanitarian Association “Prijateljice”, Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina; Iva Zenzerovic, Zagreb, Croatia; Network of Peace Movement - Kamenicë, Kamenica, Kosovo; Kosovo Organization for New Initiatives – KONI, Prizren, Kosovo; Nansen Dialogue Centre, Prishtina, Kosovo; ZaMirNET, Zagreb, Croatia; UrbanIN, Novi Pazar, Serbia; Responsibility for the Future/Neighbors for Peace, Belgrade/Bujanovac, Serbia...

The following projects and examples of good practice were thoroughly presented and analyzed:

- YOUNG MIRamiDA, Center for Peace Studies, Zagreb, Croatia;
- The Program of Support to Children Integration into the School System in Two Entities, Humanitarian Association “Prijateljice”, Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Velika Kladusa, Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- Association of Women Citizens’ “Women to Women”, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- Ministry for Youth, Culture and Sport, Pristina, Kosovo;
- Nansen Dialogue Centre, Pristina, Kosovo;
- Helsinki Citizens’ Assembly, Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- UrbanIN, Novi Pazar, Serbia;
- Youth Center, Gornji Vakuf - Uskoplje, Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- Group 484, Belgrade, Serbia;
- Committee for Civic Initiative, Nis, Serbia.

During a live discussion numerous questions were considered: How national strategies on work with youth are implemented in local communities? How to secure a legal background that would guarantee the accomplishment of educational programs? What should be the nature of cooperation with the authorities regarding peace education of youth?

Especially useful was the comparative analysis of the circumstances that surround the work with youth. For more details see examples 1 through 6 in **Attachment No. 7**.

DEALING WITH THE PAST

From the questionnaires we find out that work on dealing with the past is accomplished through gathering relevant data (Documentation and Information Centre “VERITAS”, Belgrade, Serbia; The Council for Protection of Human Rights and Humanitarian Activity, Priboj, Serbia; ABRAHAM – Association for Inter-religious Peace Work, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina...) or through direct work on inter-ethnic dialogue (Group 484, Belgrade, Serbia; Goran Bozicevic, Groznan, Croatia; Forum of Tuzla Citizens, Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina; DAJA - Roma Women’s Organization, Kumonovo, Macedonia; Center for Peace, Legal Advice and Psychosocial Assistance, Vukovar, Croatia...).

Considering that respondents gave only few examples of their work on this issue, the Jahorina conference was of great help in fulfilling that gap. For even more thorough information, one can consult the analysis of projects and programs dealing with the past in Serbia and Montenegro.¹⁸ That analysis not only covered the work of NGO’s (53) but also the media, cultural institutions, university professors, and hence in the results there is much more broader spectrum of registered activities – from theater and street performances and music festivals, and also public debates, TV programs and other media shows, documentary projects, research, publications and education, all the way through to direct legal (court appearances) and psychosocial support.

At the meeting on Jahorina, as part of the discussion of the issues of dealing with the past and reconciliation, we have thoroughly analyzed several projects:

- Documentation Center Wars 1991 - 1999, Belgrade, Serbia;
- Women’s Peace Group, Pancevo, Serbia¹⁹;
- Forum of Tuzla Citizens, Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- Center for Peace Studies, Zagreb, Croatia;
- Women in Black, Belgrade, Serbia;

¹⁸ M. Blagojevic and N. Milenkovic (2004). Ibid.

¹⁹ See more about these examples in the already mentioned research on dealing with the past.

- The Centre for Non-Violent Action, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Belgrade, Serbia²⁰.

During the very fruitful discussion that followed the presentation of these projects, we analyzed the differences in approaches. While the Documentation Center Wars 1991 - 1999 collects and disseminates individual histories of direct participants in war events (soldiers and local citizens) and secondary witnesses who were coming to the site from outside (journalists, politicians, members of United Nation troops), counting on empathy and understanding of the readers, other projects use the strategy of direct confrontation with (objective) facts/data related to war events. For example, Women's Peace Group from Pancevo, Serbia uses street installment of the labyrinth to present to the passers by with the facts related to Srebrenica and the Storm. Similar approach use the Women in Black from Belgrade, Serbia, who in various Serbian towns organize street events in which they present various facts related to the wars 1991-99. The approach of the Forum of Tuzla Citizens differs from both mentioned up to now. They strive to reach the "unique truth" through direct confrontation of and dialogue among the members of three ethnic communities. Unlike all was an effort of the Center for Peace Studies from Zagreb to react to and correct the acts of the inhabitants of some towns in Croatia who wanted to pay the respect to some characters from the Second World War, who belonged to the Ustasa forces. Quite unique is the approach of the The Center for Non-Violent Action from Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Belgrade, Serbia. They are getting together the soldiers (regular or paramilitary) from different conflicted armies in order to make them exchange their personal war experiences and then present their stories to the public who can not only listen to them, but see them sitting at the same table and talk instead of targeting each other with the guns.

The participants in this discussion have also considered the possibilities of coordinated actions in this field, cooperation of peace activists from different localities and exchange of experience through which some new, more fruitful, approaches could be developed. In **Attachment No. 7**, you will find a detailed description of the project of the Documentation Center Wars 1991 - 1999.

²⁰ More on round table discussions "Four Views", can be found on the web site of Center for Non-Violent Action: www.nenasilje.org

PROTECTION OF HUMAN AND MINORITY RIGHTS

Examples of successful work on various human and minority rights issues were listed in questionnaires by several respondents. For example The Association for Peace and Human Rights "Baranja", Bilje, Croatia; Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina; Coalition for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, Osijek, Croatia; Group for Human Rights, Podgorica, Montenegro; Center for Civic Initiatives, Porec, Croatia.

Information about these projects was fruitfully discussed at the meeting:

- Coalition for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, Osijek, Croatia;
- ASK, Podgorica, Montenegro;
- Altruist, Split, Croatia;
- Center for Peace, Legal Advice and Psychosocial Assistance, Vukovar, Croatia;
- Association of Women Citizens "Women to Women", Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- Macedonian Helsinki Committee for Human Rights, Skopje, Macedonia;
- Helsinki Citizens' Assembly, Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- Ecumenical Humanitarian Organization, Novi Sad, Serbia;
- Antiwar Campaign, Zagreb, Croatia.

During the discussion a lot of attention was focused on factors influencing success of certain actions and problems which follow this type of actions. Especially inspirational were the suggestions to work on issues of minority rights not only with the minority groups themselves but also with the majority populace, by means of campaigns and education.

Alongside to the success on protecting minority rights, the examples of successful projects on consciousness objection, protection of women's rights, protection of the rights of sexual minorities, protection from police torture, protection of displaced people (from Kosovo, who do not have the same status as refugees) were also presented and analyzed. Very interesting were the projects of media protection of minority human rights and the project of protection of members of the police in Bosnia and Herzegovina (who are legally completely unprotected since they have not right to complain to the local authorities or to Strasbourg).

RAISING CONSCIOUSNESS OF CITIZENS IN LOCAL COMMUNITIES

This type of work covers campaigns, “peace relies”, citizens’ forums, working with the police so as to prevent police violence. Groups and individuals who informed us about their actions at the conference are:

- Open University, Subotica, Serbia;
- Ecumenical Humanitarian Organization, Novi Sad, Serbia;
- Women’s Peace Organization, Pancevo, Serbia;
- Women’s Group “Stella”, Cetinje, Montenegro;
- Women in Black, Belgrade, Serbia;
- ASK, Podgorica, Montenegro;
- The Council for Protection of Human Rights and Humanitarian Activity, Priboj, Serbia;
- Committee for Human Rights – Bujanovac, Bujanovac, Serbia;
- Danica Stefanovic, Novi Sad, Serbia;
- Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Republika Srpska, Bijeljina, Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- Committee for Civic Initiative, Nis, Serbia;
- Center for Culture of Peace and Non-Violence “Anima”, Kotor, Montenegro;
- Democratic Initiative of Sarajevo Serbs (DISS), Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- Goran Bozicevic, Grožnjan, Istra, Croatia;
- Committee for Human Rights, Leskovac, Serbia;
- Serbian Democratic Youth, Kosovo;
- Youth Center, Gornji Vakuf - Uskoplje, Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- UrbanIN, Novi Pazar, Serbia;
- Group 484, Belgrade, Serbia.

Those involved in such projects think that their success mostly depends on good preparation that consists of work on focus groups, needs assessment, careful selection of participants. For the realization itself it is very important to have concrete, modest, achievable goals. Considering that in communities that are divided mistrust is one of the issues first to be addressed, success of such projects greatly depends on consideration, tactfulness and commitment in regards to the goals set. In order to be successful, such projects have to be long-term. Sustainability is achieved through strengthening the partners (through friendly and political support and solidarity), cooperation with authorities, and

defining the mission statement so fit a wide specter of activities; projects that are broadly grounded have greater chances of success, especially if they consist of a combination of different activities (one goal <-> more operations <-> more activities <-> more beneficiaries). See examples in **Attachment No. 7**.

DEALING WITH WAR TRAUMA

Successfulness of these types of actions can be seen in work with refugees and war veterans that were done by organizations such as:

- Open University, Subotica, Serbia;
- Committee for Human Rights and Freedom, Kursumlija, Serbia;
- European House, Vukovar, Croatia;
- Association for Mental Health Protection of War Veterans and War Victims 1991 – 1999, Novi Sad, Serbia;
- Andrej Nosov, Belgrade, Serbia;
- Center for Peace, Legal Advice and Psychosocial Assistance, Vukovar, Croatia.

At the meeting we heard that after the educational, communicational and ecumenical activities there was too much fulfillment and that in the divided community of Vukovar, Croatia the only solution was connecting peace and economical activities. NGOs connect municipalities and business owners with the west European market and that seemed smart and productive at the given time.

4. LESSONS LEARNT

Even though this analysis, mostly based on qualitative data, cannot guarantee far-reaching generalizations or thorough conclusions about the nature and effectiveness of peace activism in this region, it still gives insight into various peace activities and hence accomplishes several important goals. Aside from the fact that it stops us from forgetting some aspects of the events that marked the 1990-is in this region and reminds us of the times for which we would rather believe is far behind us, it helps us to follow and better understand the changes which we affected and/or experienced ourselves. Also, it is our honest belief that this document will be an inspiration for further questioning, analysis and exchange of experience of local peace activists and their relationships with international funding agencies.

Even though it is not thoroughly far-reaching, this analysis offers some answers to the questions that started our research.

To answer the first group of questions – *What types of activities were undertaken by local peace activists? How long have they done this and with which funding agencies do they cooperate? How do they see the effectiveness of their actions? What do they see as their contribution to the projects accomplished?* – we offer data that clearly implies a very wide, far reaching spectrum of activities undertaken from the very beginnings of armed conflict on the territories of former Yugoslavia. Aside from the presence of a truly grand number of donors who supported their actions, the data gathered point to the fact that the role of local peace activists was and still is far from being just a mere transmission of foreign ideas and projects.

The other group of questions – *How much did the concept of peace projects rely on foreign funding agencies' perception of the problems which they wish to solve, and how much on the ideas of local activists/organization? How adequate are certain forms and ways of peace activism for the communities in which they are implemented? In what measure did the implemented projects acknowledge local norms, culture, values, knowledge and skills of the local populace? How much do foreign donors rely on the opinions of local partners? Do they truly listen to local initiative?* – explore the nature of the relationship between foreign

donors and local peace organizations and activists. The data gathered offer a very complex insight into these relations.

The answers to this group of questions have neither one meaning nor are they simple. It is quite clear that local peace activism depended greatly on foreign help; not only could most of the peace projects not be accomplished without the financial and logistic support of foreign donors, but also the local activists and peace organizations could not have made it through in such numbers, nor could they have worked with the same quality that they achieved. This help is highly appreciated. However, it is also quite obvious that local peace activists and organizations tried as much as was in their power to accommodate the forms and ways of work to local needs, norms, culture, values, knowledge and skills of the local populace. If nothing else, the truth of this statement is proven by the fact that the local peace activists feel mostly responsible toward their communities.

From the perspective of local activists the relations with foreign partners were also burdened by numerous, but not unsolvable, problems. In the approach of some foreign donors local activists recognized a lack of knowledge of the local context, over-insistence on form and procedure (which frequently leads to just formally accomplishing the projects activities, not achieving everything at the set time or irrational spending of finances), a bureaucratic stance toward local activists/organizations, and even a lack of readiness to support independence and survival of local peace initiatives. Although beset by such pressures, in most cases local peace activists did not agree on bad compromises, but opted for constructive, creative solutions. That, of course, was not always possible, and hence there is a clear consciousness among peace activists regarding what else could have been accomplished, but was not, because of the lack of adequate or timely support.

Due to the problems which could not be adequately resolved, it sometimes happened that projects had to be terminated before achieving the set goals, some groups in focus did not receive proper attention, there was not proper monitoring and follow-ups. Along with the lack of support to sustainability of local peace organizations, the resources were short for broader cooperation and regional networking of local peace groups, and for all other activities beyond the scope of the very project that could have helped the empowerment of the networks themselves as well as create a richer base of collective knowledge. This very research, and the survey and meeting organized for it, may be the first step towards achieving such a goal.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Literature	64
2. Original list of local peace activists and organizations in the region	65
3. List of organizations and individuals who filled out the questionnaire	71
4. Participants at the Jahorina meeting	74
5. List of funding agencies	76
6. Years when polled peace organizations were established	85
7. Examples of successful peace practices in the region	86
8. Short CVs of the authors of the analysis	122

Attachment No. 1

LITERATURE

"Aid Statistics, Donor Aid Charts." Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2 December 2004. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. September 2004.

<http://www.oecd.org/countrylist/0,2578,en_2649_34447_1783495_1_1_1_1,00.html>

Anderson, Mary B, and Lara Olson. *Confronting War: Critical Lessons for Peace Practitioners*. Cambridge, MA: The Collaborative for Development Action, Inc, 2003.

Biserko, Sonja (Ed.). *Yugoslavia Collapse, War, Crimes*. Belgrade: Centre for Anti-War Action and Belgrade Circle, 2003.

Blagojevic, Marina, i Natasa Milenkovic. *Suocavanje s prosloscu: Izvestaj za Srbiju i Crnu Goru*. Beograd: Quaker Peace and Social Witness, 2004.

Creswell, John W. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*. California: SAGE Publications, Inc, 1998.

"Cetiri pogleda: Od proslosti: Otkud ja u ratu? Ka buducnosti: Kako ka trajnom miru?" Centar za nenasilnu akciju. 2004. Centar za nenasilnu akciju. Januar 2005.

<<http://www.nenasilje.org/cna.htm>>

Francis, Diana. *"Conflict transformation from Violence to Politics."* Committee for Conflict Transformation Support Newsletter, No. 9. 2000.

Ilic, Vladimir. *Izmedju integracije i odrzivog povratka*. Beograd: Helsinski odbor za ljudska prava u Srbiji, 2001.

Large, Judith. *"The Interplay of Domestic, Regional and International Forces in Peacebuilding."* Committee for Conflict Transformation Support Newsletter, No. 13. 2001.

Pavlovic, Vukasin (Ed.). *Potisnuto civilno drustvo*. Beograd: EKO Centar, 1995.

Skrabalo, Marina. *"Documenting Impact of Community Peacebuilding in the Post-Yugoslav Region as a Basis for Policy-Framework Development."* International Policy Fellowships. 2003. The Open Society Institute. June 2004 <<http://www.policy.hu/skrabalo>>

"The Role of NGOs, Local and International, in Post-war Peacebuilding." Committee for Conflict Transformation Support Newsletter, No. 15. 2001.

Wedel, Janine R. *Collision and Collusion: The Strange Case of Western Aid to Eastern Europe*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Attachment No. 2

ORIGINAL LIST OF LOCAL PEACE ACTIVISTS
AND ORGANIZATIONS IN THE REGION

No.	Name	City, country	e-mail
1.	Association of Women Citizens "Women to Women"	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	zene2000@megatel.ba
2.	The Center for Non-Violent Action	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	cna.sarajevo@nenasilje.org
3.	Democratic Initiative of Sarajevo Serbs (DISS)	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	uq_diss@BiH.net.ba
4.	International Multi-religious and Intercultural Center	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	zajedno@BiH.net.ba
5.	Association of Independent Intellectuals CIRCLE 99	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	valid@krug99.ba
6.	Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	office@bh-hchr.org
7.	Association of Citizens "Truth and Reconciliation"	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	kip@BiH.net.ba
8.	ABRAHAM – Association for Inter-religious Peace Work	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	jelena@abraham.ba
9.	The Center for Religious Dialogue	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	sajecrd@BiH.net.ba
10.	Selma Hadzihalilovic	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	selma.h@zonta-star.worldlearning.ba
11.	Memnuna Zvizdic	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	zene2000@megatel.ba
12.	Jovan Divjak	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	ogbh@open.net.ba
13.	Radmila Zarkovic	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	rada2129@hotmail.com
14.	Sevima Sali Terzic	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	sevimast@open.net.ba
15.	Mostar Youth Theater	Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina	mtm@cob.net.ba
16.	Human Rights Office	Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina	biroy@BiH.net.ba
17.	Forum of Tuzla Citizens	Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina	forum-tz@BiH.net.ba
18.	Humanitarian Association "Priateljice"	Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina	hdprituz@BiH.net.ba
19.	Helsinki Citizens' Assembly	Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina	hcabl@blic.net
20.	Youth Communication Center	Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina	okc@inecco.net

21.	Aleksandra Petric	<i>Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>	alexp@blic.net
22.	Youth Center Gornji Vakuf – Uskoplje	<i>Gornji Vakuf - Uskoplje, Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>	ocgv@gmx.net
23.	Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Republika Srpska	<i>Bijeljina, Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>	helodbor@teol.net
24.	Medica Infoteka	<i>Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>	infodoc@medica.org.ba
25.	Meliha Hubic	<i>Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>	meliha@medica.org.ba
26.	Association of Citizens “Family”	<i>Prijedor, Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>	anel@prijedor.com
27.	Humanitarian Law Center	<i>Podgorica, Montenegro</i>	hlc-asz@cg.yu
28.	Montenegrin Women’s Lobby	<i>Podgorica, Montenegro</i>	mnzenskilobi@hotmail.com
29.	Nansen Dialogue Center – Montenegro	<i>Podgorica, Montenegro</i>	info@ndcmn.org
30.	Center for Democracy and Human Rights	<i>Podgorica, Montenegro</i>	cedem@cg.yu
31.	ASK	<i>Podgorica, Montenegro</i>	askngo@cg.yu
32.	Misko Vujosevic	<i>Podgorica, Montenegro</i>	ljudimir@cg.yu
33.	Kerim Medjedovic	<i>Podgorica, Montenegro</i>	kesha@cg.yu
34.	Andja Backovic	<i>Podgorica, Montenegro</i>	backovic@cg.yu
35.	Civic House – NGO Club of the City of Cetinje	<i>Cetinje, Montenegro</i>	skc@cg.yu
36.	Center for Culture of Peace and Non-Violence “Anima”	<i>Kotor, Montenegro</i>	anima@cg.yu
37.	Antiwar Campaign	<i>Zagreb, Croatia</i>	ark@zamir.net
38.	Center for Peace Studies	<i>Zagreb, Croatia</i>	cms@zamir.net
39.	Small Step – Center for Peace and Non-Violence	<i>Zagreb, Croatia</i>	mkorak@zamir.net
40.	Croatian Helsinki Committee for Human Rights – CHC	<i>Zagreb, Croatia</i>	hho@hho.hr
41.	ZaMirNET	<i>Zagreb, Croatia</i>	zamir@zamir.net
42.	Civic Committee for Human Rights	<i>Zagreb, Croatia</i>	zpusic@zamir.net
43.	Marina Skrabalo	<i>Zagreb, Croatia</i>	mkrab@zamir.net
44.	Paul Stubbs	<i>Zagreb, Croatia</i>	pstubbs@zamir.net
45.	Aida Bagic	<i>Zagreb, Croatia</i>	aidab@zamir.net
46.	Vesna Kesic	<i>Zagreb, Croatia</i>	vesnaka@zamir.net
47.	Mladen Majetic	<i>Zagreb, Croatia</i>	mladenm@zamir.net
48.	Ognjen Tus	<i>Zagreb, Croatia</i>	ognjen@makromikro.hr
49.	Vesna Tersalic	<i>Zagreb, Croatia</i>	vesnat@zamir.net
50.	Biljana Kasic	<i>Zagreb, Croatia</i>	biljana@zamir.net

51.	Mirjana Radakovic	Zagreb, Croatia	mirjanar@zamir.net
52.	Ana Raffai	Zagreb, Croatia	anaraf@zamir.net
53.	Iva Zenzerovic	Zagreb, Croatia	zeniva@zamir.net
54.	Marija Molnar	Vukovar, Croatia	marija.molnar@vk.htnet.hr
55.	Center for Peace, Legal Advice and Psychosocial Assistance	Vukovar, Croatia	centar-za-mir@vk.htnet.hr
56.	European House Vukovar	Vukovar, Croatia	europski.dom.vukovar@vk.hinet.hr
57.	Youth Peace Group Danube	Vukovar, Croatia	youth.peace.group.danube@vk.t-com.hr
58.	Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education – VIMIO	Vukovar, Croatia	vimio@hi.hinet.hr
59.	The Association for Peace and Human Rights “Baranja”	Bilje, Croatia	baranja@inet.hr
60.	Center for Peace, Non-Violence and Human Rights	Osijek, Croatia	czmos@zamir.net
61.	Center for Civic Initiatives	Porec, Croatia	cgiporec@zamir.net
62.	Homo - Association for Protection of Human Rights and Citizen's Freedom	Pula, Croatia	homo@pu.tel.hr
63.	Altruist	Split, Croatia	altruist@zamir.net
64.	MIRamiDA Center	Groznjan, Croatia	miramida@zamir.net
65.	Goran Bozicevic	Groznjan, Croatia	goranb@zamir.net
66.	Vanja Nikolic	Zagreb, Croatia	vanja.nikolic@wl.htnet.hr
67.	Nansen Dialogue Center	Prishtina, Kosovo	mihanesalihu@hotmail.com
68.	Kosovo Initiative for Democratic Society – KIDS	Prishtina, Kosovo	kids_pri@hotmail.com
69.	Kosova Action Network – KAN	Prishtina, Kosovo	kan@alb-net.com
70.	Mother Theresa	Prishtina, Kosovo	ntereze@yahoo.com
71.	Committee for Human Rights	Prishtina, Kosovo	office@cdhrf.org
72.	Association for the Free Thought, Creation and Acting – Dardania	Prishtina, Kosovo	behxhetshala@cdhrf.org
73.	Don Bosko – Social and Education Centre of Prishtina	Prishtina, Kosovo	dragashyc2002@yahoo.com
74.	Futura	Prishtina, Kosovo	futuram03@hotmail.com
75.	Institute of Kosova for Strategic Studies and International Relations	Prishtina, Kosovo	nspahiu@yahoo.com
76.	Inter – Religious Youth Association	Prishtina, Kosovo	wcrp_kosovo@yahoo.com
77.	Kosova Action for Civic Initiatives	Prishtina, Kosovo	yhysa-KACI@kohaditore.com
78.	Kosova Foundation for Open Society	Prishtina, Kosovo	info@kfos.org
79.	Kosovar Networked NGO Youth for Peace and Future	Prishtina, Kosovo	netypf@yahoo.com
80.	Religious Without Borders	Prishtina, Kosovo	Ldenesenko@yahoo.com
81.	Kosova Women’s Network	Prishtina, Kosovo	info@womensnetwork.org
82.	Serbian Democratic Youth	Prishtina, Kosovo	ktorvi@yahoo.com

83.	Petrit Tahiri	Prishtina, Kosovo	petrit@kndialouge.org
84.	Bujar Madjoni	Prishtina, Kosovo	bujar.maxhuni@omik.org
85.	Igballe Rogova	Prishtina, Kosovo	igorogova@yahoo.com
86.	Kosovo Organization for New Initiatives – KONI	Prizren, Kosovo	ngo_koni@hotmail.com
87.	OJQ Sfida	Prizren, Kosovo	sfida_kosovo@yahoo.com
88.	Network of Peace Movement - Kamenicë	Kosovska Kamenica, Kosovo	nopm_org@hotmail.com
89.	Radmila Kapetanovic	Kosovska Mitrovica, Kosovo	radakap@yahoo.com
90.	Community Building Mitrovica	Kosovo	CBMitrovica@hotmail.com
91.	Forum for Democratic Initiatives	Kosovo	jet@ipko.org
92.	Kosovo Youth Network – KYN	Kosovo	labinot1975@yahoo.co.uk
93.	Rrjeti i të Rinjëve të Pejës	Kosovo	pejayouthnet@hotmail.com
94.	Center for Drama and Creative Activities of Children and the Youth – Qeshu-Smile	Kosovo	qeshu_smile@yahoo.com
95.	Qendra për Progres dhe Iniciativa të Reja	Kosovo	lama_alma@hotmail.com
96.	Pal Bala	Kosovo	palbala@hotmail.com
97.	Peace Action	Skopje, Macedonia	odbij@hotmail.com
98.	Macedonian Helsinki Committee for Human Rights	Skopje, Macedonia	helkom@mhc.org.mk
99.	Center for Democracy and Security	Skopje, Macedonia	ebalkan@soros.org.mk
100.	Civil Society Resource Center	Skopje, Macedonia	csrc@csrc.org.mk
101.	CIVIL	Skopje, Macedonia	contact@civil.org.mk
102.	International Center for Preventive Activities and Conflict Resolution (ICPCR)	Skopje, Macedonia	icpcr@mol.com.mk
103.	Center for Multicultural Understanding and Cooperation	Skopje, Macedonia	kim@unet.com.mk
104.	Ethnic Conflict Resolution Project (ECRP)	Skopje, Macedonia	skaric@pf.ukim.edu.mk
105.	Azbija Memedova	Skopje, Macedonia	centar@mt.net.mk
106.	Violeta Petroska Beska	Skopje, Macedonia	v.p.beska@ukim.edu.mk
107.	Ana Bitoljanu	Skopje, Macedonia	anabb@mol.com.mk
108.	Natasa Dokovska	Skopje, Macedonia	detstvo@detstvo.org.mk
109.	ANTIKO – Women’s Multiethnic Network in Macedonia	Gostivar, Macedonia	anticogv@mail.com
110.	Women’s Center – Debar	Debar, Macedonia	womenscentredebar@yahoo.com
111.	Youth Information Center	Tetovo, Macedonia	mic_sreten@yahoo.com
112.	Association for education,	Tetovo,	ortel@freemail.org.mk

	democracy and multiculturalism	Macedonia	
113.	DAJA - Roma Women's Organization	<i>Kumanovo, Macedonia</i>	daja@mol.com.mk
114.	Jagoda Gligorovska	<i>Kumanovo, Macedonia</i>	femina_org@hotmail.com
115.	Center for Multicultural Cooperative Collaboration and Multinational Promotion of Young People - AURORA	<i>Prilep, Macedonia</i>	avrora@avrora.org.mk
116.	Interethnic Integration and Development Association "Mir"	<i>Kicevo, Macedonia</i>	mir_kicevo_mkd@yahoo.com
117.	Ljubica Angelkovska – Magoska	<i>Bitola, Macedonia</i>	+ 389 70 207 070
118.	Anifa Demirovska	<i>Delcevo, Macedonia</i>	+ 389 33 412 142
119.	Center for Antiwar Action	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	caa@caa.org.yu
120.	The Center for Non-Violent Action	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	cna.beograd@nenasilje.org
121.	Group "Let's..."	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	hajdeda@eunet.yu
122.	Group "MOST" - Association for Cooperation and Mediation	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	most@most.org.yu
123.	Psihokod	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	psihokod@eunet.yu
124.	Group 484	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	office@grupa484.org.yu
125.	Documentation and Information Center "VERITAS"	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	veritas@yubc.net
126.	Women in Black	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	stasazen@eunet.yu
127.	Center for Interactive Pedagogy	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	ciip@sezampro.yu
128.	Center for Non-Violent Communication "Smile Guardians"	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	icke@eunet.yu
129.	Hi Neighbor	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	zdravo@eunet.yu
130.	International Aid Network (IAN)	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	office@ian.org.yu
131.	Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Serbia	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	biserkos@eunet.yu
132.	Lawyers' Committee for Human Rights	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	yulaw@eunet.yu
133.	Belgrade Circle	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	beokrug@eunet.yu
134.	Center for Cultural Decontamination	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	info@czkd.org.yu
135.	Documentation Center Wars 1991 – 1999	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	office@dcr.org.yu
136.	Responsibility for the Future/ Neighbors for Peace	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	futurity@eunet.yu
137.	Humanitarian Law Center	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	office@hlc.org.yu
138.	Belgrade Center for Human Rights	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	bgcentar@bgcentar.org.yu
139.	Andrej Nosov	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	andrejnosov@hotmail.com
140.	Miljenko Dereta	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	dereta@eunet.yu
141.	Svetlana Kijevcanin	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	ckijev@eunet.yu
142.	Nebojsa Popov	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	redakcija@republika.co.yu
143.	Women's Peace Group	<i>Pancevo, Serbia</i>	ildikoe@panet.co.yu

144.	Peace Movement Pancevo	<i>Pancevo</i> , Serbia	weisnera@panet.co.yu
145.	Ecumenical Humanitarian Organization – EHO	<i>Novi Sad</i> , Serbia	ehs@eunet.yu
146.	Association for Mental Health Protection of War Veterans and War Victims 1991 – 1999	<i>Novi Sad</i> , Serbia	beareze@neobee.net
147.	Center for Multiculturality	<i>Novi Sad</i> , Serbia	corna@eunet.yu
148.	Danica Stefanovic	<i>Novi Sad</i> , Serbia	pancivic@eunet.yu
149.	Center for Civil Society Development “Protecta”	<i>Nis</i> , Serbia	protecta@bankerinter.net
150.	Committee for Civic Initiative	<i>Nis</i> , Serbia	ogi@ogi.org.yu
151.	Committee for Human Rights	<i>Nis</i> , Serbia	gralter@bankerinter.net
152.	NGO “Peace School”	<i>Kragujevac</i> , Serbia	skolamira@ptt.yu
153.	Society for Tolerance	<i>Celarevo</i> , Serbia	mzdravko@eunet.yu
154.	Sombor Peace Group	<i>Sombor</i> , Serbia	prising@eunet.yu
155.	UrbanIN	<i>Novi Pazar</i> , Serbia	urbanin@ptt.yu
156.	ABC – Center for Peace, Security and Tolerance	<i>Vranje</i> , Serbia	centarvr@ptt.yu
157.	Committee for Human Rights – Leskovac	<i>Leskovac</i> , Serbia	nesic@eunet.yu
158.	Committee for Human Rights – Bujanovac	<i>Bujanovac</i> , Serbia	shaipk@yahoo.com
159.	Open University Subotica	<i>Subotica</i> , Serbia	oksu@openunsubotica.co.yu
160.	German People’s Unity	<i>Subotica</i> , Serbia	de.weiss@tippnet.co.yu
161.	The Council for Protection of Human Rights and Humanitarian Activity	<i>Priboj</i> , Serbia	officepb@hotmail.com
162.	Belgrade Center for Human Rights – office in Priboj	<i>Priboj</i> , Serbia	gipnvo@yahoo.com
163.	Committee for Human Rights	<i>Bor</i> , Serbia	ljpb@ptt.yu
164.	Committee for Human Rights	<i>Negotin</i> , Serbia	pravang@ptt.yu
165.	Belgrade Center for Human Rights	<i>Kraljevo</i> , Serbia	forumnvo@ptt.yu
166.	Committee for Human Rights	<i>Valjevo</i> , Serbia	odbor@ptt.yu
167.	Committee for Human Rights	<i>Zajecar</i> , Serbia	mogili@ptt.yu
168.	Committee for Human Rights and Freedom	<i>Kursumlija</i> , Serbia	tmaks@ptt.yu
169.	Branka Jeremic	<i>Uzice</i> , Serbia	pro.ue@ptt.yu

Attachment No. 3

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS WHO FILLED OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE

No.	Name	City, country	e-mail
1.	Association of Women Citizens "Women to Women"	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	zene2000@megatel.ba
2.	Democratic Initiative of Sarajevo Serbs (DISS)	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	uq_diss@BiH.net.ba
3.	Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	office@bh-hchr.org
4.	Association of Citizens "Truth and Reconciliation"	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	kip@BiH.net.ba
5.	ABRAHAM – Association for Inter-religious Peace Work	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	jelena@abraham.ba
6.	Forum of Tuzla Citizens	Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina	forum-tz@BiH.net.ba
7.	Humanitarian Association "Priateljice"	Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina	hdprituz@BiH.net.ba
8.	Helsinki Citizens' Assembly	Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina	hcabl@blic.net
9.	Youth Center Gornji Vakuf – Uskoplje	Gornji Vakuf - Uskoplje, Bosnia and Herzegovina	ocgv@gmx.net
10.	Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Republika Srpska	Bijeljina, Bosnia and Herzegovina	helodbor@teol.net
11.	Group for Human Rights	Podgorica, Montenegro	hlc-asz@cg.yu
12.	ASK	Podgorica, Montenegro	askngo@cg.yu
13.	Women's Group «Stella»	Cetinje, Montenegro	skc@cg.yu
14.	Center for Culture of Peace and Non-Violence "Anima"	Kotor, Montenegro	anima@cg.yu
15.	Center for Peace Studies	Zagreb, Croatia	cms@zamir.net
16.	Small Step – Center for Peace and Non-Violence	Zagreb, Croatia	mkorak@zamir.net
17.	ZaMirNET	Zagreb, Croatia	zamir@zamir.net
18.	Aida Bagic	Zagreb, Croatia	aidab@zamir.net
19.	Vesna Kesic	Zagreb, Croatia	vesnaka@zamir.net
20.	Mladen Majetic	Zagreb, Croatia	mladenm@zamir.net
21.	Iva Zenzerovic	Zagreb, Croatia	zeniva@zamir.net
22.	Marija Molnar	Vukovar, Croatia	marija.molnar@vk.htnet.hr
23.	Center for Peace, Legal Advice and Psychosocial Assistance	Vukovar, Croatia	centar-za-mir@vk.htnet.hr
24.	European House Vukovar	Vukovar, Croatia	europski.dom.vukovar@vk.hinet.hr

25.	Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education – VIMIO	Vukovar, Croatia	vimio@hi.hinet.hr
26.	The Association for Peace and Human Rights “Baranja”	Bilje, Croatia	baranja@inet.hr
27.	Coalition for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights	Osijek, Croatia	lsc@os.htnet.hr
28.	Center for Civic Initiatives	Porec, Croatia	cgiporec@zamir.net
29.	Goran Bozicevic	Groznjan, Croatia	goranb@zamir.net
30.	Nansen Dialogue Center	Prishtina, Kosovo	mihanesalihu@hotmail.com
31.	Serbian Democratic Youth	Prishtina, Kosovo	ktorvi@yahoo.com
32.	Kosovo Organization for New Initiatives – KONI	Prishtina, Kosovo	ngo_koni@hotmail.com
33.	Network of Peace Movement – Kamenicë	Kosovska Kamenica, Kosovo	nopm_org@hotmail.com
34.	Radmila Kapetanovic	Kosovska Mitrovica, Kosovo	radakap@yahoo.com
35.	Violeta Petroska Beska	Skopje, Macedonia	v.p.beska@ukim.edu.mk
36.	Natasa Dokovska	Skopje, Macedonia	detstvo@detstvo.org.mk
37.	Women’s Center – Debar	Debar, Macedonia	womenscentredebar@yahoo.com
38.	DAJA - Roma Women’s Organization	Kumanovo, Macedonia	daja@mol.com.mk
39.	Center for Antiwar Action	Belgrade, Serbia	caa@caa.org.yu
40.	The Center for Non-Violent Action	Belgrade, Serbia	cna.beograd@nenasilje.org
41.	Group 484	Belgrade, Serbia	office@grupa484.org.yu
42.	Documentation and Information Center “VERITAS”	Belgrade, Serbia	veritas@yubc.net
43.	Women in Black	Belgrade, Serbia	stasazen@eunet.yu
44.	Belgrade Circle	Belgrade, Serbia	beokrug@eunet.yu
45.	Drinka Gojkovic	Belgrade, Serbia	office@dcr.org.yu
46.	Responsibility for the Future/ Neighbors for Peace	Belgrade, Serbia	futurity@eunet.yu
47.	Andrej Nosov	Belgrade, Serbia	andrejnosov@hotmail.com
48.	Svetlana Kijevcanin	Belgrade, Serbia	ckijev@eunet.yu
49.	Dragan Popadic	Belgrade, Serbia	dpopadic@eunet.yu
50.	Women’s Peace Group	Pancevo, Serbia	ildikoe@panet.co.yu
51.	Ecumenical Humanitarian Organization – EHO	Novi Sad, Serbia	ehs@eunet.yu
52.	Association for Mental Health Protection of War Veterans and War Victims 1991 – 1999	Novi Sad, Serbia	beareze@neobee.net
53.	Danica Stefanovic	Novi Sad, Serbia	pancivic@eunet.yu
54.	Committee for Civic Initiative	Nis, Serbia	ogi@ogi.org.yu
55.	UrbanIN	Novi Pazar, Serbia	urbanin@ptt.yu
56.	Committee for Human Rights – Leskovac	Leskovac, Serbia	nesic@eunet.yu
57.	Committee for Human Rights – Bujanovac	Bujanovac, Serbia	shaipk@yahoo.com

58.	Open University Subotica	<i>Subotica</i> , Serbia	oksu@openunsubotica.co.yu
59.	The Council for Protection of Human Rights and Humanitarian Activity	<i>Priboj</i> , Serbia	officepb@hotmail.com
60.	Belgrade Center for Human Rights – office in Priboj	<i>Priboj</i> , Serbia	gipnvo@yahoo.com
61.	Committee for Human Rights and Freedom	<i>Kursumlija</i> , Serbia	tmaks@ptt.yu

Attachment No. 4

PARTICIPANTS OF THE JAHORINA MEETING

No.	Name	City, country	e-mail
1.	Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina	Democratic Initiative of Sarajevo Serbs (DISS)	Dusan Sehovac
2.		ABRAHAM – Association for Inter-religious Peace Work	Ernest Jovic
3.		Association of Women Citizens “Women to Women”	Tanja Jovanovic
4.	Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina	Forum of Tuzla Citizens	Ermin Mustacevic
5.		Humanitarian Association “Prijateljice”	Sehaveta Srabovic
6.			Emir Hasanbasic
7.	Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina	Helsinki Citizens’ Assembly	Aleksandar Zivanovic
8.	Bijeljina, Bosnia and Herzegovina	Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Republika Srpska	Danijela Jovanovic
9.	Gornji Vakuf – Uskoplje, Bosnia and Herzegovina	Youth Center Gornji Vakuf – Uskoplje	Mirjana Gvozdenovic
10.			Anita Grabner
11.	Velika Kladusa, Bosnia and Herzegovina	Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina	Kenan Keserovic
12.	Podgorica, Montenegro	ASK	Nedeljka Sindik
13.	Cetinje, Montenegro	Women Group «Stella»	Zorica Jovetic
14.	Podgorica, Montenegro	Group for Human Rights/Humanitarian Law Center	Nikola Borozan
15.	Zagreb, Croatia	Center for Peace Studies	Andrijana Paric
16.		Antiwar Campaign	Gordan Bosanac
17.	Vukovar, Croatia	Journalist from Vukovar	Marija Molnar
18.		Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education – VIMIO	Anica Birac
19.		Youth Peace Group Danube	Dragomir Obrencevic
20.		Center for Peace, Legal Advice and Psychosocial Assistance	Ankica Mikic
21.	Osijek, Croatia	Coalition for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights	Gordana Stojanovic
22.	Porec, Croatia	Center for Civic Initiatives	Ranka Sepic
23.	Split, Croatia	Altruist	Marko Martinic
24.	Prizren, Kosovo	Kosovo Organization for New Initiatives – KONI	Nehari Sharri

25.		Kosovo Organization for New Initiatives – KONI	Burim Leci
26.	<i>Kosovska Mitrovica, Kosovo</i>	Nansen Dialogue Center	Ivan Radic
27.	<i>Skopje, Macedonia</i>	Macedonian Helsinki Committee for Human Rights	Daut Dauti
28.		Journalist from Skopje	Maja Dankovic
29.	<i>Priboj, Serbia</i>	The Council for Protection of Human Rights and Humanitarian Activity	Aida Polimac
30.	<i>Novi Pazar, Serbia</i>	UrbanIN	Aida Corovic
31.	<i>Novi Sad, Serbia</i>	Ecumenical Humanitarian Organization – EHO	Orsolja Vidac
32.	<i>Nis, Serbia</i>	Committee for Civic Initiative	Miodrag Milenkovic
33.	<i>Leskovac, Serbia</i>	Committee for Human Rights - Leskovac	Mirjana Nestic
34.	<i>Kursumlija, Serbia</i>	Committee for Human Rights and Freedom	Tomislav Maksimovic
35.	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	Women in Black	Ljiljana Radovanovic
36.		Documentation Center Wars 1991 - 1999	Drinka Gojkovic
37.		Group 484	Branka Antanasijevic
38.	<i>Pancevo, Serbia</i>	Women's Peace Group	Ildiko Erdei
39.	<i>Belgrade, Serbia</i>	Center for Antiwar Action	Ruzica Rosandic
40.			Natasa Milenkovic
41.			Jelena Mihailovic
42.			Mirjana Kovacevic
43.	The Netherlands		Ana Miskovska Kajevska

Attachment No. 5

LIST OF FUNDING AGENCIES (BY STATE)

GERMANY (32)

1. The Government
2. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany
3. German Embassies
4. Goethe Institute
5. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung
6. Heinrich Boell Stiftung
7. Friedrich Naumann Stiftung
8. Konrad Adenauer Stiftung
9. FrauenAnStiftung
10. Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung
11. GTZ - Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
12. The German Committee for Human Rights and Democracy
13. Stiftung Die Schwelle
14. Berghof Forschungszentrum für konstruktive Konfliktbearbeitung
15. Guernika Institute
16. IIZ/DVV - Institute for International Cooperation of the German Adult Education Association
17. ZFD – Forum Ziviler Friedensdienst
18. French-German Youth Office (the finances are supplied by the German and the French governments) or OFAJ (Office franco-allemand pour la Jeunesse) / DFJW (Deutsch – Französisches Jugendwerk)
19. Bosnian Initiative
20. Amica E.V. Freiburg
21. Klaus Vack
22. Rodelheim Initiative
23. OSSI PINK Freiburg
24. Private donation of Kosnik – Heinrichs
25. Grasswuerzel
26. Gemeinde Gemeinsam
27. Komitee für Grundrechte und Demokratie

28. German peace groups
29. I remember Herbert Froelich, a German protestant priest, who gave us 500 German Marks in the fall of 1991 as a donation.
30. The Ecumenical Society of Germany
31. Evangelical Society for Development
32. Friedenskreis Halle

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (32)

1. Government of United States of America
2. USAID – United States Agency for International Development
3. American embassies
4. NED - National Endowment for Democracy
5. ADF - American Development Fund
6. AED – Academy for Educational Development
7. Star Project of Delphi International/ Star Network of World Learning
8. IOM - International Organization for Migrations
9. ABA CEELI – American Bar Association
10. USIP – United States Institute of Peace
11. The Johns Hopkins University
12. IRC - International Rescue Committee
13. Freedom House
14. Mercy Corps
15. OSI - Open Society Institute
16. Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
17. Rockefeller Brothers Fund
18. Winston Foundation for World Peace
19. Urgent Action Fund
20. Friends of Bosnia
21. Global Fund for Women
22. TCDS – Trans-regional Centre for Democratic Studies
23. AJ Muste Memorial Institute
24. UMCOR – The United Methodist Committee on Relief
25. GBGM – General Board of Global Ministries, The United Methodist Church
26. CRS – Catholic Relief Services
27. IOCC - International Orthodox Christian Charities

28. CBIInternational
29. AFSC - American Friends Service Committee
30. Madre – Demanding Human Rights for Women and Families around the World
31. Balkan Trust Fund for Democracy
32. KCSF – Kosovo Civil Society Foundation

THE NETHERLANDS (14)

1. Government of the Netherlands (MATRA program)
2. Royal Netherlands Embassies
3. HIVOS - The Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries
4. NOVIB – Oxfam Netherlands
5. HOM – Humanist Committee on Human Rights
6. Mama Cash
7. Stichting Vluchteling
8. IKV - Interchurch Peace Council
9. Pax Christi Netherlands
10. DRA - Dutch Relief Agency
11. Vereniging Dienstweigeraar
12. CNF – Cooperating Netherlands Foundations for Central and Eastern Europe
13. CORDAID - Catholic Organizations for Relief and Development
14. Press Now

GREAT BRITAIN (10)

1. DFID – Department for International Development (Know How Fund)
2. British Embassies
3. British Council
4. WFD - Westminster Foundation for Democracy
5. OXFAM GB
6. CAFOD – Catholic Agency for Overseas Development
7. Christian Aid
8. QPSW - Quaker Peace and Social Witness
9. WATFY – Women's Aid to Former Yugoslavia
10. BCS - Civil Society Initiatives Fund

NORWAY (9)

1. Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2. Norwegian Embassies
3. Norwegian Helsinki Committee
4. Save the children
5. Nansen Academy
6. BIP – Business Innovation Programs
7. NPA - Norwegian People's Aid
8. NCA - Norwegian Church Aid
9. NRC – Norwegian Refugee Council

SWEDEN (7)

1. SIDA - Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
2. Olof Palme International Center
3. Swedish Helsinki Committee for Human Rights
4. ABF Goteborg
5. KtK - Kvinna till Kvinna
6. Ship to Bosnia, Swedish NGOs
7. Lakarmissionen - Swedish Medical Mission Foundation, member organization of the Christian Network EU-CORD (Christian Organizations in Relief and Development)

SWITZERLAND (6)

1. Government of Switzerland
2. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland
3. SDC - Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation or DEZA – Direktion für Entwicklung und Zusammenarbeit
4. Swiss Embassies
5. Pestalozzi Children's Village Foundation
6. HEKS – Hilfswerk der Evangelischen Kirchen Schweiz

CANADA (6)

1. CIDA - Canadian International Development Agency
2. Canadian Embassies
3. Canadian Institute for Conflict Resolution
4. Human Security Canada – Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade

5. KLIP Canada
6. Canada Cooperation Fund

ITALY (6)

1. Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2. KTK – La rete di iniziative Contro la Guerra Padova
3. La Donne Verde
4. Informest - Service and Documentation Centre for International Economic Cooperation
5. G.V.C. - Gruppo Volontariato Civile
6. ARCHI

AUSTRIA (5)

1. Austrian Government
2. Diaconia
3. ASPR - Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution
4. Kultur Kontakt
5. Karl Popper Foundation

DENMARK (3)

1. Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2. FRESTA – Peace and Stability Program for South-East Europe
3. DRC - Danish Refugee Council

BELGIUM (2)

1. King Baudouin Foundation
2. Pax Christi Flanders

FRANCE (1)

1. CCFD – French Catholic Committee against Hunger and for Development

FINLAND (1)

1. Finish Embassy

LIECHTENSTEIN (1)

1. Liechtenstein Government

AUSTRALIA (1)

1. Australian Embassy in Vienna

SPAIN (1)

1. Embassy of the local Barcelona Democracy – Sarajevo (now they call themselves the Local Democracy Foundation)

INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS (22):

1. UNHCR - United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
2. UNHCHR - United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
3. UNDP – United Nations Development Program
4. UNICEF - United Nations Children's Fund
5. OHR - Office of the High Representative
6. UNOPS - United Nations Office for Project Service
7. UNESCO - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
8. UNIFEM - United Nations Development Fund for Women
9. ICTY - International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
10. United Nations – Millennium Program
11. ACT – Action of Churches Together (humanitarian organization of the World Church Council)
12. ICMP - International Commission on Missing Persons
13. ICRC - International Committee of the Red Cross
14. CARE International
15. Coalition For Stop Use Child Soldiers
16. WRI – War Resisters International
17. MRG International – Minority Rights Group International
18. WLUML – Women Living Under Muslim Laws
19. International Organization For Peace Journalism
20. Helsinki Citizen International
21. International Peacebuilders
22. BCYF - Balkan Children and Youth Foundation

REGIONAL AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS (9):

1. European Commission (micro and macro projects)
 - PHARE program
 - SSO program
 - ECHO – European Commission's Humanitarian Office
2. European Agency for Reconstruction
3. European Roma Rights Centre, Budapest
4. OSCE – Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
5. Council of Europe
6. Regional Environmental Centre Budapest
7. Stability Pact for South East Europe
8. Agency of Local Democracy Brtonigla
9. Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe

Local state funds (11), local NGOs (17) and local private funds (1):

CROATIA

State Funds (4)

1. Croatian government, Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs
2. State Institute for the Protection of Family, Maternity and Youth
3. The Office for Human Rights of the Government of Croatia
4. Croatian Ministry of Education

Local NGOs (2)

1. Antiwar Campaign of Croatia
2. Sunflower

Local private funds (1)

1. Iskon Internet

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Local NGOs (4)

1. IBHI - Independent Bureau for Humanitarian Issues
2. Bosnian Women's Initiative

3. NDC - Nansen Dialogue Center in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
4. La Benevolencia, the Jewish Humanitarian Aid Organization of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

SERBIA

State funds (3)

1. The Executive Council of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina
2. Information Department of the Pancevo Municipal Assembly
3. Secretariat for Education of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina

Local NGOs (3)

1. Victimology Society of Serbia
2. European Movement in Serbia
3. Ecumenical Humanitarian Organization from Novi Sad, Serbia

MONTENEGRO

State funds (2)

1. The National Assembly of Montenegro
2. Government of Montenegro

KOSOVO

State funds (1)

1. Ministry of Youth, Culture and Sports - Department of Youth

Local NGOs (3)

1. NOPM – Network of Peace Movement
2. KWI - Kosovo Women's Initiative
3. ATRC – Advocacy Training Resource Center

MACEDONIA

State funds (1)

1. Macedonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Local NGOs: (5)

1. A ESE - Association for Equality, Solidarity and Emancipation
2. MCMS– Macedonian Center for International Cooperation
3. BUL-MAK COALITION
4. JCWE - Journalists for Children's, Women's Rights and the Environment in Macedonia
5. Representatives of NGOs in Macedonia

Attachment No. 6

YEARS OF ESTABLISHMENT OF PEACE ORGANIZATIONS WHICH RESPONDED TO OUR QUESTIONNAIRE²¹

Year of establishment	Serbia	Montenegro	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Croatia	Kosovo	Macedonia	Total
1991	2						2
1992	2						2
1993	2		1			1	4
1994				1			1
1995	1		1	1			3
1996	1	1	5	1			8
1997	1		1	2			4
1998	1		1				2
1999	1			2			3
2000	1	1	1	2			5
2001	5	1			1	1	8
2002	1	1			2		4
2003					1		1
Total	18	4	10	9	4	2	47

²¹ We would like to emphasize that the year of founding was required and filled out by organizations, not individuals who completed the questionnaire. Therefore, a difference appears in the peace activism, especially in Croatia where organizations were founded in 1991.

Attachment No. 7

EXAMPLES OF SUCCESSFUL PEACE PRACTICES IN THE REGION

I. WORK WITH YOUTH1. **"SAME, SIMILAR, DIFFERENT": Bilingual program for ethnically mixed groups of primary school pupils**

Donor: **United Nations Children's Fund Office - Skopje, Macedonia**

Project time frame: **2000-2003**

Accomplished by: **Centre for Human Rights and Conflict Resolution, Institute for Sociological, Political, and Juridical Research, St. Cyril and Methodius University**

Year the organization was established: **1996**

Location: **Skopje, Republic of Macedonia**

Background information

The Macedonian educational system has been for many years now one of the key segregation factors of the country. In both the primary and secondary schools, the Albanian, Turkish and the Macedonia students attend separate classes in their mother tongue, whereas the Roma students attend classes in Macedonian language. This structure impedes the creation of ethnically mixed "classrooms". Caution measures aiming at "prevention" of inter-ethnic conflicts have been undertaken even in the so-called "mixed schools". In those schools, the Macedonian and the Albanian students attend classes in two different shifts without having any possibility to meet each other and have inter-ethnic contact on the premises. In addition to the lack of organized school activities aiming at stimulation of inter-ethnic contacts, there is hardly any positive climate or encouragement for implementing extracurricular activities with ethnically mixed groups of students or teachers. As a consequence, the children are overwhelmed with ethnic stereotypes and prejudices about the "other" which on their part further support the climate of inter-ethnic distrust and tensions. During the armed conflict in Macedonia in 2001, this separation tendency became even stronger given that in some places, the students from different ethnic groups stopped attending classes in the joint school and separated themselves in other buildings. In spite of its "nominal" commitment to inter-ethnic communication, coming together and building of inter-ethnic trust, the Macedonian - inter-ethnic - government didn't undertake any activities to impede these developments and what's more gave the impression of "silently" allowing them.

This was the climate when the project "Same, Similar, Different" started in 2002 in five (of the originally planned six) ethnically mixed schools in two towns in Macedonia (Skopje and Tetovo). It began by introducing and initiating joint (inter-ethnic) activities which took place during the whole academic year

as a supplement to the already existing curriculum. In two schools the groups consisted mainly of Macedonian and Albanian children, in two other schools the groups consisted of Roma and Albanian children and in one school the groups consisted mainly of Bosniak and Albanian children.

More precisely, by developing and implementing extracurricular activities which promote harmonious inter-ethnic relations in a multicultural society, the project intended to be complementary to the already existing formal educational system of the Republic of Macedonia. The main goal was to have the children - through an array of structured activities - get to know each other, develop mutual trust and respect and take part in cooperative activities. All this was supposed to serve as a basis for weakening the ethnic stereotypes and prejudices and to allow a relocation of the communication from an inter-ethnic to an inter-personal level.

The program was intended for fourth-grade pupils (age 10-11) who attend separate Macedonian and Albanian classes within ethnically mixed schools. In each school, one Macedonian language class and one Albanian language class were chosen and working groups were formed by combining each half of each monolingual class into one bilingual balanced group. In this way, there were two bilingual groups in each school.

In each group the program was carried out bilingually by two implementers. Each of them spoke and gave instructions in their mother tongue, Macedonian or Albanian.

Within the framework of the program a *training of teachers* was organized which provided teachers with the knowledge and the skills necessary for their further participation in the program as implementers.

The program activities were carried out in the form of an-hour-and-a-half workshops which took place as additional encounters once per week on the school premises.

The program consisted of three separate group activities:

1) Creative psychological workshops - activities which by using the method of games, allowed children to get in contact with their inner self. Sharing this inner content with the other children in the group gave the possibility to get to know and understand each other better.

2) Workshops on peace education and children's rights - activities which encouraged positive group interactions and offered knowledge and skills for development of tolerance, cooperation, emotional expression and conflict resolution. The education on children's rights was primarily focused on raising one's own awareness about these rights by learning about some of the children's rights.

3) Social activities - organized forms of socialization, such as attending cultural events, performing sport and entertaining activities etc. In this extracurricular context, the children got to know each other, became closer, made friends and relaxed.

The realization of the program began by organizing meetings with the school headmasters and the teachers involved. They were asked to give their permission. In the next stage meetings with parents were organized in order to present the project activities to them and ask for their permission for having their children participate in the program. After that, a pretest was conducted in order to measure the ethnic stereotypes the children had. This was directly followed by realization of the activities.

In the beginning the children were interested to participate in the activities only driven by their curiosity and interest to hear and experience something new. In the course of the program though, their

interest was turning into a deeper motivation to participate in joint activities with children from the "other" ethnic group and to gather new knowledge. Their creativity, spontaneity and the positive communication were gradually increasing. The frequency of the inter-ethnic contacts both during the workshops and during the other (extra) curriculum activities was also increasing. Children considered the social activities as particularly important. Those activities allowed many children to visit some locations in town for the first time (the Amusement Park in Skopje, the Children's Creative Centre in Skopje, Macedonia etc.). At the end of the pilot program, a posttest was conducted again in order to measure the ethnic stereotypes the children had. The teachers and the parents filled in questionnaires regarding their estimation of whether and how the children changed in relation to the aims of the program.

The analysis of the gathered data and the qualitative analysis of the changes in the group dynamics unambiguously showed a decrease of negative ethnic stereotypes the children had about each other. The interest to participate in ethnically mixed children activities, the children's self-confidence, their knowledge of children's rights, as well as their sensibility regarding constructive ways of approaching and reacting in conflict situations, were all increased.

Several factors which contributed to the success of this program can be pointed out:

The creators and the implementers of the program were well-trained in constructive communication with children, non-violent conflict resolution; work on stereotypes and prejudices and management of bilingual activities. Their knowledge is due to the matching training and practice they had in the course of many years, which on its behalf had effect on the planning and the implementation of those children activities.

The main aim during the implementation of the planned activities was to create a positive atmosphere of mutual acceptance and respect in all existing relations: child-child, child-implementer and implementer-implementer.

The topics were discussed on a personal level without stressing the ethnic background of the participants which helped to a great extent in finding common ground for inter-ethnic communication.

The relatively frequent encounters made it possible to maintain and deepen the starting process of inter-ethnic communication.

Already during the program design, the accent was put on activities which would give this program a longer "expiry date". The teachers who mentored the classes which participated in the program were encouraged to observe the practical implementation of each workshop, to attend a basic Albanian language course (only those who didn't master Albanian; contrary to this, all teachers had a solid knowledge of Macedonian) and to participate in a seminar where the basic skills in running inter-ethnic children activities were presented. As a result of this, a corps of trained teachers was created. In future, these teachers can directly implement the program with the supervision of a team from the Centre. The latter was proven very efficient when additional program was carried out in one of the originally participating schools by a bilingual team of teachers.

The feedback received from both the participating pupils and their teachers after the end of the program activities showed that there was an increase in the extent of mutual interactions and participation in joint inter-ethnic activities within the school.

The schools which participated in the pilot program were schools in Skopje and Tetovo which satisfied the initially set criterion for having a relatively balanced number of children from different ethnic groups. The same criterion was applied for Kumanovo as well, but in spite of the existence of schools which satisfied this criterion, some of the parents were not open for having their children participate in the program. This is due to the fact that the area in question was the one which was most affected by the war conflict in 2001. In this area more time and other types of activities are needed in order to create a climate of trust for accepting any kind of ethnically mixed activities.

The management and the teachers in the schools where the pilot program was conducted gave their maximal support to it and expressed their readiness to participate in such programs in future.

One can point out the following - more serious - problems the team in charge of the realization of the project "Same, Similar, Different" had to deal with:

- The initial distrusts from the side of the parents of the participating children. Only after several months, this distrust was turned into unconditional trust and support.
- The impossibility to start the program in Kumanovo due to the atmosphere not ripe for acceptance of such programs by some of the parents.
- The participation of Roma children in the program demands to include in future a Roma assistant in the implementing team. This assistant would contribute to a better adaptation of the contents to the specific Roma culture and lifestyle.
- The impossibility to continue the program due to the changes of the donor's financial policy.
- The impossibility to cover all classes in all schools in Macedonia which satisfy the criterion for participation in this project (ethnically mixed schools with a more or less balanced number of pupils in monolingual classes), due to the limited financial means provided by the donor.
- The number of participating schools in the pilot year was decided in accordance with the project budget. The financial means allowed for the inclusion of four primary schools in Skopje, one in Tetovo and one in Kumanovo. Given the impossibility to conduct the program in Kumanovo, the means allocated for the working groups in this town, were reallocated for a follow-up program in one school in Skopje in the successive academic year.

Filipina Negrievska and Renata Dedova
(Translation from Macedonian: Ana Miskovska Kajevska)

2. “DO NOT GET ANGRY: THE RICHNESS OF DIVERSITY” – ABC OF DEMOCRACY

Donor: **Novib, OXFAM Netherlands**

Project time frame: **2000-2003**

Accomplished by: **Group 484**

Year of organization's establishment: **1996**

Location: **Belgrade, Serbia**

This project began in response to the need that in a situation of material, moral and spiritual poverty which was ruling in Serbia, as a support for youth so that they may in their, as well as our, lives change the pattern of one Serbian dictum – “Let the neighbor's cow die” and follow the rules of the popular game children's game, “Do not get angry”. Keeping in mind that the young are the most vulnerable segment of population and at the same time the most receptive for positive change and ready to resist the conditions they live in, we opted for a program that counts on these their needs. The focus was on youth in ethnically mixed communities. We wanted to teach them how to be tolerant and accept ethnic differences as a possibility for mutual work on bettering their community.

The training program instructed them in knowledge and skills needed for planning and undertaking some social action, organizing a campaign, advocacy and the like. The camps have been organized so as to facilitate exchange of experience of all participants and their work on joint projects of social change. After the training they have been encouraged to implement the gained knowledge and skills and undertake some activities in their own communities, first under supervision and then autonomously. The established network of the trained young activists was an additional form of support. With the support of adults who were mostly educated for working with youth, and later even parents, neighbors and representatives of various institutions and authorities in the local community, assured sustainability of the effects of this undertaking. Numerous materials that support the project goal were also printed.

The project was implemented in 42 towns in Serbia.

Factors that helped the project success:

- External factors: In situation contaminated with war, violent conflicts, destructiveness of all kinds, isolation, kitsch and trash culture, the young were “hungry” for positive values and constructive contents.
- Good insight into the needs of beneficiaries: this project was conceptualized on the basis of previous youth projects
- Beneficiary's motivation
- Support to the beneficiaries to self-organize (strengthening them to act autonomously)
- Participation of beneficiaries in all phases of the project
- Good choice of coordinator and assistant in project: expert knowledge, democratic values, experience, good relations with youth, flexibility and cooperativeness
- Prolonged training of associates, monitoring and evaluation of activities

- Gradual development of the project: Steady strengthening of beneficiaries for autonomous activities and gradual expansion of the network
- Good relations with the funding agency and possibility of project adaptation in accordance to how the work in the field is developing.

Sustainability of achieved change:

About 3,500 young people participated in this program while its final results and effects reached 20,000 young people in all of Serbia: through presentations, campaigns, media and other public promotions, project productions (publications, movies, CDs...) that are all accessible to the general populace.

In each of the 42 cities these youths have brought about change in their communities through numerous local actions. Many of them have established their own NGOs, got engaged in other NGOs, engaged in our other projects (many of them are currently joining a group of volunteers in our organization), became active in their communities (schools, hospitals, social institutions, ecological actions, etc.)... School teachers began to implement interactive method of work in class, to organize workshops with pupils of various generations on the values of civil society, and they themselves have become active in solving problems of their local communities...

Another result of this project was a call from the Ministry of Education and Sport for the participation in a curriculum for civil society education for students of the third year of high school.

External evaluators (External Evaluation Report on Civil Society Program implemented by Group 484 from 2000 to 2003, Marina Prodanovic-Skuric and Dragan Markovic, April 2004), highly estimated the approach and the achieved results.

Problems in realization:

Problems were related to the difficult political, social and economic situation, which sometimes made entry into schools troublesome.

The funding agency was supportive. They followed with us the situation in the field and approved changes in implementation. They made it possible for our work to be flexible and they supported organizational development.

Tanja Pavlov

3. YOUTH NETWORK OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Donors: **Olof Palme International Centre, Sweden; Cordaid - Catholic Organizations for Relief and Development, The Netherlands; NED - National Endowment for Democracy, United States of America; OSI – Open Society Institute, United States of America; OSCE - Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe; Press Now, the Netherlands; Heinrich Boell, Germany.**

Project time frame: **1997 – 2004**

Project coordination: **Helsinki Citizens' Assembly (hCa), Banja Luka; Helsinki Citizens' Assembly, Tuzla**

Accomplished by: **Youth NGOs in Bosnia and Herzegovina**

Locations: **Banja Luka, Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

One of the basic program activities of our organizations at the end of the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina was the normalization of relations, bringing back trust and establishing communication across entity borders. Even though two years have passed since the signing of the Dayton Accord, our organizations were among the rare that dared to travel throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina and make contacts. The only opportunity that represented itself at that time to meet was youth schools and workshops abroad.

We began by visiting and making contacts with youth organizations. In 1997 we held the first youth meetings in Tuzla and Banja Luka, where the young decided to form the Helsinki Citizens' Assembly youth network (later on *Youth Network of Bosnia and Herzegovina*). A youth magazine, "TNT", was established as well where the organizations had the opportunity to publish information about their activities. The magazine was distributed across Bosnia and Herzegovina, even to the farthest parts, through youth organizations and with the help of their volunteers. An e-mail list was also formed, with information relevant to youth activism in Bosnia and Herzegovina and about the activities of network members, grants, stipends, seminars, workshops locally and abroad was exchanged.

In cooperation with Helsinki Citizens' Assembly Banja Luka and Helsinki Citizens' Assembly Tuzla youth organizations held a series of youth festivals, concerts, theater performances and exhibits. Before elections, the youths organized campaigns to motivate people to vote. Through all these activities trust was built and friendships were made among the young people. By means of the network many youth organizations got the funds necessary for registration or beginning of first small projects.

In 1999 and 2000 the youth network already numbered about 70 organizations and there is a rising need for more education, so we organized workshops: youth organization management, writing projects and fundraising, public advocacy and media presentation, strategic planning, youth work and volunteering, journalist schools, etc. Evaluation done after the seminars shows that beneficiaries feel more secure to begin new projects or appear in public, but what is most important is that through telephone interviews done in periods from half a year to several years after the training, we got concrete examples of successful project writing for many organizations, many have organized campaigns, and even in one case, to open a small business and plan the budget successfully.

Thus, the network became a resource center for youth organizations, and in their further work they organize various campaigns more often: motivating the young to vote, campaign for the ecological protection, celebrating the day for human rights, opening up youth centers and the like. One of the most successful campaigns was the campaign for returning pre-war youth centers to youth organizations, and including youth organizational funding into municipal budgets.

The campaign was started since many organizations were facing problems regarding lack of office space as well as the lack of understanding by local authorities for what non-governmental organizations

do. Network members conducted a research that gave solid argumentation regarding legal possibilities for the campaign, as well as potential facilities and allies in local communities. The network sent out announcements about the commencement of local campaigns to 1300 addresses. The letters resulted in more letters. The network received declarative support for the campaign from several associations and institutions.

This was followed by 11 strong local youth campaigns in the local municipalities. Around 30 youth organizations took part, that is, around 300 young people. They organized: street signing of petitions and appeals, radio shows and jingles, television debates, round table discussions with representatives of local authorities, ecological actions, video polls, press conferences, concerts, theater shows, letter writing actions to representatives of authorities and meetings with them...

During the campaign for returning the youth centers, in all 40,000 young people signed petitions for that cause.

In many places we found good responses and interest of municipal representatives who are in charge of youth issues, while in some municipalities there were obstructions by authority representatives, who tried to stop the campaign in numerous ways, also by discrediting the organizations. Government institutions as well as political parties had their own reactions to these campaigns. Especially positive examples were "Party for Bosnia and Herzegovina" and the minister of Trade and Foreign Relations in the Bosnia and Herzegovina Federation, who expressed willingness to help the campaign. In almost all activities the media seemed to be the best partners.

At the end, in some municipalities the youth got to use the former youth centers, while in some other municipalities this issue was resolved later or the municipality helped in other ways, such as, financing from the municipal budget. Numerous campaigns were started in other cities based on these results. Aside from that, youth organizations were networking and exchanging experiences and the potential they have. Most of these "coalitions" remains active.

During the previous years the network had 150 youth organizations. In 2004 financing stopped for *Youth Network of Bosnia and Herzegovina* as a project. Thus, the intensity of activities was lessened, but still the connected organizations remain and still write the Network Newsletter, maintain their web site, exchange information about their activities and can make ad hoc coalitions, if the need be, very quickly to solve a problem. They answer each others calls for help willingly, support campaigns and promote ideas. So, even though the network was never officially registered it can be said that it continued to exist in another way.

Aleksandar Zivanovic

4. TEEN GROUP IN YOUTH CENTER GORNJI VAKUF – USKOPLJE, BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Donor: **UMCOR - The United Methodist Committee on Relief**

Project time frame: **1998 – 2004**

Accomplished by: **Youth Center Gornji Vakuf - Uskoplje, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

Year of organization's establishment: **1996**

Location: **Gornji Vakuf - Uskoplje, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

The Teen group is made up of volunteers of high-school age. They find their place within the Youth Center educational programs, starting out as kid beneficiaries but later spontaneously changing into volunteers who work in groups on the activities in the Center and in the community. The Teen Group is given enough space to get additional education for civil and peace initiatives when they begin taking on responsibilities of leadership positions by working on projects or volunteering for Youth Center activities with those younger than themselves or their peers.

This practice has been in place in Youth Center since 1998 and has proven to be very fruitful, since in this way we have empowered more than 100 youths. These young people, upon leaving to summer schools, remain close to the Center and still volunteer.

A success factor is continuous work with teenagers, permanent peace workshops and empowerment workshops for civil initiatives, supporting their ideas, making it possible for them to participate in all activities and the decision making of the management team; they are also part of the evaluation and strategic planning process.

They bring in new members into the group, since their example was and still is a good motive for others to join. The Youth Center has capable educators who can always give this group training sessions and supervision.

They are a connection between two ethnic communities, they bridge the dividing lines, make contacts easier, and they motivate young people in mono-ethnic schools for mutual actions in schools and communities.

As leaders of certain activities they are more easily accepted by the young. In their example children see the importance of volunteer work and the importance of working on connecting two different ethnic communities.

The teenage group encompasses youth of different sexes, ethnic background, people from rural and urban places, of different talents and different volunteer needs (leadership, creative activities with children, public campaigns, ecological projects, translation, work with media, work in larger schools, trainings...).

The sustainability is visible in the continuity of this group work and independence of funding agencies money.

*Jasminka Drino Kirilic,
Mirjana Gvozdenovic and
Anita Grabner*

5. YOUNG MIRamiDA – Peace Building Training and Support Program for Young Activists in Their Communities – Center of Peace Studies

Donors: **European Commission, BCYF - Balkan Children and Youth Foundation, DFID - Department for International Development, Royal Netherlands Embassy, US AID**

(United States Agency for International Development) – OTI (Office of Transition Initiatives), Croatian Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs

Project time frame: **1999 – 2003**

Accomplished by: **Center for Peace Studies**

Year of organization's establishment: **1999**

Location: **Croatia**

The Center for Peace Studies (hereinafter CMS) grew from a volunteer project Pakrac, peacebuilding project in western Slavonia conducted by the NGO "Anti-War Campaign". CMS created its programs with the basic goal of connecting education, research and activism, and with the idea that the knowledge gathered on direct peace activism be transferred onto more people. Based on this, MIRamiDA's peacebuilding trainings for activists in Croatia as well as in the region were established.

If we consider the wider context of MIRamiDA's work, we can differentiate three periods in which MIRamiDA worked: war times, post-war period, and the period of development and transition. As could have been anticipated the political situation was reflected in our work. During the war beneficiaries of MIRamiDA were mostly peace activists who worked on direct help and psychosocial work with war victims. After the war MIRamiDA continued working with peace activists, but the beneficiaries were spread onto other activists, representatives of unions, journalists and politicians.

During the nineties there were few organizations that worked with youth, I dare to say that real direct work with youth did not exist. Different organizations mostly had as beneficiaries' children and refugees, but youth as a specific group in focus did not exist.

A gap was created in work with youth since direct activities ceased during the war, there was a transition from socialism and the young were left to themselves to self organize without any assistance from the local communities or the state. For a long time, in Croatia people thought that youth can only be active in extracurricular activities, in church, sports and the like.

After long discussions about this problem we decided, with the youths themselves, to start something so as to waken activism of youth in Croatia or at least to achieve acknowledgement of the efforts of youth, who have, even if invisibly, worked in their communities – at first just to satisfy their basic needs and interests, and later on for the needs of the larger community.

During 1998 and 1999, when we began talking about this issue, we thought we knew what the young need since we ourselves were young and at that moment we thought it was important to gather information about the situation and what sort of resources there are. We conducted different surveys, cooperated in information exchange with the Red Cross, boy-scouts and the like. In all, we found 120 organizations/youth initiatives.

We realized quickly that there were a great number of youths interested in empowerment programs for young activists, and we were right on the mark. We created the basic MIRamiDA training program and in a short period of time received more than 70 applications for the first training, even though

we only had 20 places. The trainings were for peace making and contained peace and activist subject matter, strengthening and consciousness-raising. We did not concentrate on knowledge transfer regarding technical skills of organizational development, but rather we focused on the value of activism.

After 2-3 trainings the project quickly grew into a program and gained new components of work on strengthening youth activists. New youth organizations were established slowly, while those that were inactive ceased working, networking began as well, sometimes through trainings, sometimes through different activities. We did more and more direct work with youth in the country so as to facilitate the process of learning how to critically consume – so that they do not become young “managers” but more so people who react to injustice and are proactive in building their community. The concept that was very important to us was understanding activism through a prism of a wider definition of social engagement where activism is defined as a positive act of an individual or group of people who as a goal have the greater (social) good, while influencing the wider process of social change.

We began to understand that the role of civil society, including youth activism, is important in developing tools and mechanisms for concrete actions within the process of social change, which in this case means that the young are empowered so as to better their own lives, educate themselves and change the systems of the society they live in.

Empowering the young means giving them access to knowledge, information, tools and skills so as that they may satisfy their own needs, but also build themselves up for the future.

Activism strengthens young people so that they may become citizens who are prepared, have the skills and are aware of their responsibility, power and strength to influence the society they live in.

Not long after, foreign funding agencies began coming here looking for contacts of youth organizations (CARE International, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the like). Little by little, work with youth began to reach a wider range of topics and in various ways. Quickly we began to work with organizations that work with the young and accomplished several mutual projects of empowerment and supporting youth initiatives. Then, alongside with CARE International we conducted the first survey about youth activism in Croatia, which was used as a tool for the further direction of our work.

At the beginning of 2001 we were acknowledged by some representatives in the Assembly as an organization that works with youth, and they told us that Croatia was given an “order” to make a National Youth Policy. There was doubt whether those who were in charge and (not) responsible would just rewrite the programs of several other countries and that it would not reflect the exact situation or be applicable here. At that time YOUNG MIRamiDA received as a program an informal call to mobilize, inform, and inspire young people to request their place in the creation of this program.

Quickly, we began to lobby the State Institute for Protection of Family, Maternity and Youth, an institution in charge of youth policy and began negotiating about the intensity and form of cooperation. We started to explain the problem to youth organizations in the country and then we began pressuring. The Institute created a working group that included several representatives of youth associations. After months of lobbying and mutual work of several organizations, out of which YOUNG MIRamiDA (CMS) was the

most active, in the process of creation of the “National Youth Policy” more than 70 young people from more than 30 youth associations were involved. The suggestion of National Youth Policy was made by the working group of the State Institute for Protection of Family, Maternity and Youth, consisting of more than 80 members (9 sub-groups made in accordance to the Programs locations), consisting of representatives of the state management body, experts and scientists, representatives of youth.

After the text of the first draft of the Program was made, the idea was that through a campaign “Get Involved” the youth of Croatia could add changes to it, give suggestions, or evaluate what was already written. The campaign was designed and created by activists of YOUNG MIRamiDA. Through the public campaign the State Institute for Protection of Family, Maternity and Youth wanted to involve around a 1000 youths in the creation of the final version of this document, before it was sent to the Assembly and the Government. However, the campaign began somewhat late. Because of the bad timing and lack of communication, the Assembly voted in the document before the campaign results were gathered and processed. The campaign proved to be a good idea since it inspired the young to get actively involved in the debate about the problems of youth and give suggestions to their possible solutions.

This was the first time that those regarding whom an official state document was about could directly create it, that is, the youth of Croatia. It is common for such state strategic documents to be made within the Ministry and at closed sessions of the Government, while its implementation is left to Ministry employees and those employed in other state bodies. “But, when we got the opportunity to participate in the creation of this program, we realized that it will remain “just words on a paper” unless we make it possible for the youth of Croatia to find out about it. Also, we wanted to check whether what we wrote and what we requested funds for from the state have a real basis with the needs of youth. That is how we decided to make a public campaign, through which we would make the document known to as great a number of youth as possible, as well as making it possible for them to change what they wish. We were very lucky that the whole process of making the National Program was lead by two wonderful women from the State Institute for Protection of Family, Maternity and Youth (Dejana Bouillet and Ivana Kanceljak), who managed to find the resources for this very “revolutionary” act.”²²

The campaign was implemented so that on many publicly accessible computers (in high schools, universities, bookstores, public schools, culture centers, associations and youth clubs) special computer programs were installed that contain information on the national program and a poll by which it is possible to chose priorities for new projects, comment the suggested measures and make suggestions for new projects for youth on a national and local scale. On the other hand, we also made TV and Radio jingles a web page for the campaign, so that the public may find out about these computers “info-stations” and call on young people to give feedback on the National Youth Policy. Info-stations were located in 115 towns in Croatia. The campaign lasted from 20 September to 20 November 2002, and we gathered 1,600 comments given by youth. The campaign results were used as success indicators for the document, and also showed that the National Youth Policy was written for the young and agrees with their needs.

²² Andrija Vranic, member of the first working group, the founder of the idea of the campaign and coordinator of info-stations (CMS)

Of course, the question of the implementation of the documents was now to be addressed. After each chapter there are recommendations and measures which different institutions, bodies and organizations should implement. It is necessary to make regular monitoring of the implementation and continue to advocate. A restraining factor for us was that with the change of the Government in 2004, the Department was terminated, while the section for youth got its place within the Ministry of Family, Veterans' and Inter-generational Solidarity. This was a clear sign that youth was being degraded and not only are not becoming a priority but are almost completely not focused on. The National Program for Youth Work was implemented too slowly, almost not at all. By the end of 2003 the United Nations Development Program approached the CMS and asked that we become an implementation partner for the making of the Human development report: Croatia 2004 - Youth. We agreed and quickly had an opportunity to, through work on direct research on the situation among youth during the first 6 months in 2004, do some monitoring of the implementation of National Youth Policy. The report was well accepted by the young themselves as well as by the institutions and organizations, and it did not take a long time for it to reach the Croatian Delegation for Negotiations with the European Union, who in turn, after reading the report, contacted the The National Foundation for Civil Society Development and requested that they begin negotiations on creating a more direct and institutionalized work with youth of Croatia. YOUNG MIRamiDA by working on this report concluded a major cycle of work. Considering that the old team is not so young anymore, we decided to go on to some other activities and give the younger activists control of new activities.

The situation in Croatia today is greatly different from the one six years ago and there are various programs and projects for youth work, as well as much more finances.

All the while of our work with youth we tried not to make those youth permanent "beneficiaries" of our programs but more so partners and associates.

Now we are in a position to be working with those youth on the implementation of mutual projects, such as the current project YOUNG DEVELOP ALTERNATIVES.

YOUNG MIRamiDA represents an example of good practice not just because the state national program is perfect (far from it since it has many failings, especially in implementation), but more so because for the first time in Croatia a strategy was written publicly with the participation of numerous individuals. We succeeded in motivating young people to become active. This was a direct influence on state policy and that is transformation.

Andrijana Paric

6. SUPPORT TO INTEGRATION OF CHILDREN FROM TWO ENTITIES INTO THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

Donors: ROZA LUXEMBURG STIFTUNG, Germany; SDC - Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation or DEZA - Direktion fur Entwicklung und Zusammenarbeit

Project time frame: **1997**

Accomplished by: **Humanitarian Association of “Prijateljice”, Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

Year of establishment: **1994, “Amica e.V.” Freiburg, Germany, while the local NGO “Prijateljice” was established in 1996**

Location: **Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

Summary of project activities

The project encompassed 360 students (45 in each school), while in 4 schools in the Federation Bosnia and Herzegovina and 4 schools in Republika Srpska. Out of those, there were 6 elementary schools and two high schools. During one school year students visit each other three times. The goal of these visits is, above all social contact between the pupils, even though educational programs are also implemented.

For students of all 8 schools we organized a mutual one-day social meeting.

Aside from the activities mentioned we also organize weekly activities, outside school activities, such as non-violent communication, tolerance, eradication of prejudice, identity, feelings, affirmation, and team work.

In each school Student Clubs were founded, leaders were chosen and through trainings they are educated so as to be the initiators of activities in their schools.

Aside from students who participated in the project we also involved one teacher, while a good part of parents and teachers volunteered during the social gatherings.

Description of one example of good practice

In the elementary school “Desanka Maksimovic” in Oraovac, municipality of Zvornik (Republika Srpska), there are a great number of pupils who came back after the war ended and started going to school there.

Before the war the national structure of the populace was around 50% Serb and 50% Bosniaks, and such was the national structure in the school.

Shortly after the war parents of the pupils came back from the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina to Republika Srpska and vice versa, while the children either remained in the place where they were living during the war or they traveled to schools and paid the steep transportation expenses while also losing time in traveling.

Reasons for this situation were usually a consequence of doubt that the pupils will be well accepted in schools by the other pupils, teachers and other staff.

The project realization in schools has entered its fourth year.

Through the above mentioned activities we achieved a high level of acceptance among pupils that come from other the other entities. Tolerance among pupils, teachers and management personnel is very

high. The curriculum has mutual themes and the pupils have religious teaching from the religion they belong to.

During their visits to schools from other entities pupils socialize and there are no incidents. During these social encounters parents and teachers volunteer very often, so social contact happens on that level as well.

Factors that helped the success of the project

We began cooperating with the Ministry of Education in Republika Srpska as well as in the Federation. They agreed that the project may be realized in schools for which we requested.

We also achieved cooperation with school management teams for project realization.

The greatest success was achieved through continued work with pupils on the subjects of: nonviolent conflict resolution, tolerance, prejudice, identity. In that way we taught children about the right attitude towards those who are different from them in regards to religion, nationality, culture, attitudes, and opinions.

The education reform taking place in Bosnia and Herzegovina also helped the achievement of these good results. Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe gave support in the realization of project activities.

Sustainability of accomplished change

Changes for the better are becoming more visible each day, and there are no regressive movements in almost any communities where the project has been accomplished.

Scope

The project has been limited to few schools. In the following period we plan to accommodate the project so that teachers in more schools are educated, and then they can work on these topics during homeroom classes.

Problems during project realization in regards to funding agencies

Except for the uncertainty about receiving funds for each year from foreign funding agencies, there are no other problems.

Sehaveta Srabovic

II. DEALING WITH THE PAST

7. ORAL HISTORY OF WARS BETWEEN 1991-1999

Donors: **Open Society Institute Belgrade, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, Embassy of Switzerland in Belgrade, Serbia**

Project time frame: **2002 till now**

Accomplished by: **Documentation Center Wars 1991 - 1999**

Year of organization's establishment: **2001.**

Location: **Serbia and Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia**

Documentation Center "Wars 1991 – 1999." is conducting the research contributing to describing, interpreting and understanding of the war decade in the region. Within this research, a significant place is given to the project Oral History of Wars 1991 – 1999.

Why do we consider this project as good example of positive peacebuilding practice?

The experience of common people. Project is focused on personal/individual experience of a huge number of so called 'common' people that were touched by the wars in many different ways.

We opted for such an approach because in many studies on war conducted in our region; 'common' people were objects of description rather than its subject. We considered it necessary to hear how they lived through the war and how they look on a decade of enormous destruction and tragedy, on its causes and consequences. Detailed research on war is impossible without taking into consideration their experiences and their comprehension.

The conception of the project is based on the fact that the oral history is a method that is used worldwide in many different social disciplines, just because it is shown that vivid human experience is a very important source of historical, sociological and anthropological knowledge.

Regional character of the project. Wide range of speakers. Many different truths. The project is accomplished regionally, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia. It includes interviews with those who were voluntarily involved in war and those who were forced participants of war, with civilians who were indirectly and directly seized by the war, with victims of torture, as well as with the secondary eyewitnesses (foreign representatives in the region, representatives of NGO's, etc). Their testimonies create a mosaic picture of war that crystallizes what is considered the "truth" about the prewar and wartime circumstances and events. The project was based on the standpoint that in this kind of clashes/conflicts everyone who has been through it has his/her own story, own truth, and that only through the whole spectrum of individual truths we can get the detailed insight into the development and maintenance of war. In the project, the stories of numerous speakers are parallel, and the project aims to point out the differences and similarities in their psychological experience and in presentations of war that they hold.

Understanding the war experience of "others". change of perspective. Oral histories reveal the abovementioned multi-perspective approach, as well as the similarities in different perspectives. They

contain many, often unknown, trivial and important facts about prewar period and wartime, and an abundance of details making the terrible war daily life vivid, convincing, striking and new (in terms of what we already know!)

When speaking of the beneficiaries in Serbia, they bring about and encourage important psychologically effects:

- emotional understanding of the experience of “others”, identification on the level of personal human experience (instead of separation and fear of “others” on the level of ideological narratives imposed by politics and state);
- provocative knowledge of terrible effect that war has had on numerous “others”, and not only on themselves.

Both things are an incentive for making individual perceptions of war complete, they expand and essentially change our knowledge, make us think about war through the eyes of “others” and thus override the fatality of limitations and closed mindedness that are based on old and prejudices, fears and ideological notions from the recent and distant past.

In this sense the results of the project contain a certain catharsis for a person who speaks about own experiences and, hence, objectifies them (especially if experiences are traumatic), as well as for those who hear those experiences and traumas of others, and learn from them; on the basis of such insights they form a world view that contains readiness and capability for change of destructive and negative social circumstances.

Public relations. A selection of gathered oral histories was published in the edition “People in War”. So far four volumes have been published, while the fifth is in production. The books are sent to all libraries in Serbia and some selected libraries abroad. They are distributed to individuals who wish to receive them, whether they are experts or just interested readers. Public debates are organized regarding the books, where the cathartic effect of these oral histories is expected and the importance of the implicit “training” of readers for social change stressed.

These oral histories have received very positive reviews from domestic and foreign experts.

Drinka Gojkovic

III. HUMAN RIGHTS AND MINORITY RIGHTS WORK

8. “COTENANTS NOT SUBTENANTS” – Project with ethnic minorities

Donor: **European Union**

Project time frame: **November 2003 – October 2004.**

Accomplished by: **Helsinki Citizens' Assembly (hCa), Banja Luka, Association of Czechs “Ceska Beseda” (“The Czech Word”), Banja Luka**

Year of organization's establishment: **1996**

Location: **Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

Problems and needs

The goal of the reforms conducted in Bosnia and Herzegovina by the international community and domestic institutions were to facilitate equal access and the right of participation in decision making for all citizens. Constitutional changes have been made so as to secure the constitutionality of three peoples (Serbs, Croats and Bosniaks) on the whole territories of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The nationality key was again instituted as a basic mechanism for decision-making on various levels. However, ethnic minorities remain marginalized in the Constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and with that also in everything that the Constitution influences. The Constitution defines some ethnicities (Czechs, Hungarians, etc.) as “others”, which may not have been a problem in other circumstances, but certain individuals from that “others” category started to declare themselves as Bosnians, Montenegrins or Yugoslavs in order to improve chances to get a job, work for government and so on. Hence, associations of ethnic minorities in Republika Srpska advocated for a more precise definition. In decision-making regarding ethnic minorities, these associations were not consulted or were consulted rarely in round table discussions, where the conclusions made did not have real effect on the betterment of the minorities' status. The media rarely reported on the activities of these associations of minorities, and even when they did it was regarding cultural programs. On the other hand, the associations themselves were not that strong, did not have enough finances, and there was no one single powerful organization of ethnic minorities which would stand up for their rights. These problems were discussed on meetings of the Helsinki Citizens' Assembly and representatives of ethnic minorities where project implementation was planned.

Goals

- Strengthen capacities of ethnic minority organizations in Republika Srpska.
- Establish a unique organization of ethnic minorities that would, aside from activities on protecting cultural heritage, also influence important decision-making on all levels and be a partner to the authorities in making laws on protection of ethnic minority rights.
- Establish long-term cooperation with the media – make problems visible.

Activities

- We decided to begin with the registration of Alliance of Ethnic Minorities in Republika Srpska, for which there were already good pre-requirements considering the three year mutual cooperation between associations of ethnic minorities. The registration made it possible for the Alliance to act as a legal entity and hence create the possibility for financial dealings.
- Training: 22 members of different associations of ethnic minorities were trained during a four day training session about basic advocacy skills (problem analysis, creating goals, planning actions, evaluation) and media presentation (writing public announcements, organizing press conferences, giving statements, how to behave in front of a camera, and so on). This training session was the basis for further activities. We decided that attracting media attention was to be the first goal we would accomplish. The first step was preparing the association for a public appearance.
- We organized a round table discussion “Ethnic Minorities and Media”, to which we invited the director of the Radio Television of Republika Srpska (a public service that is by law required to have programming for ethnic minorities), to open the discussion, and a young journalist a member of the Association of Czechs, who creates the program on languages of ethnic minorities on a private radio station in Banja Luka. The round table was visited by 50 media representatives, members of ethnic minority associations, political parties and government institutions. The choice for the persons opening the round table was helped accomplish the results set – right there we agreed on with media representatives to create a regular weekly programming in duration of fifteen minutes, for presenting activities of ethnic minority associations. Associations presented their activities as well as the problems they face to those present. To the journalists we distributed contacts and information on associations and the Alliance. All this resulted in an increase of media coverage. Also in the planning phase we have a one-hour weekly show about the activities of ethnic minorities on Radio Television of Republika Srpska.
- After getting the media’s attention we started an initiative for the participation of ethnic minorities in creating laws on the protection of the rights of members of ethnic minorities in Republika Srpska. At a round table discussion on this topic we gave the information we had about the plans of government and about the ideas of experts, but this was not enough to achieve stronger contacts. With constant communication, calling Government representatives to TV and Radio shows, the representatives of associations of ethnic minorities got the opportunity to address members of the National Assembly before their vote on the bill, and then give the Government their own amendments to be considered when later on this document reached discussion.
- Within the project we organized a strategic planning meeting for the Alliance of Ethnic Minorities, where we agreed on a draft for a strategic plan.

In parallel with project implementation the Alliance of National Minorities gave numerous suggestions and initiatives to relevant institutions (request for free offices in the town, request for finances from the towns budget for cultural activities of ethnic minorities, changes of voting law, school reform...), that were all promoted in all project activities. When the authorities gave us a positive response we called on them to present their work and plans within our activities, when they did not do this we reminded them

and criticized them. For the achievement of these goals we used the meetings with international officials, and especially with the monitoring team of the Council of Europe, which follows up on all requirements of Bosnia and Herzegovina after its acceptance into this organization. Thanks to the unity and initiatives of the Alliance, as well as all their mentioned activities, the Alliance got office space in the town of Banja Luka for use during one year, finances for registration and basic needs of the Alliance, finances for cultural activities from the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Government of Republika Srpska (Alliance was responsible in regards to this point for distribution of finances).

Aleksandar Zivanovic

9. COALITION FOR THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Donor: **Swedish Helsinki Committee for Human Rights**

Project time frame: **2004**

Accomplished by: **Coalition for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights**

Year of organization's establishment: **2001**

Location: **Osijek – main offices**

During the past 7-8 years we have worked on protecting the human rights of those people who have been returning to this region after the war, refugees and displaced people.

The general value of the **Coalition**, in regards to information flow and joint actions (considering how much territory we cover) is that something that began in Vukovar can end in Split. An example of people coming from Serbia who might have had only permits for stay in border regions shows that they could come to Vukovar and they did not need to go further to get the information they need in regards to their returnee rights, minority rights, rights to reconstruction, questions regarding property and so on.

The Coalition began a campaign regarding the Law on Free Legal Aid. The campaign was supported by the Swedish Helsinki Committee for Human Rights, while it is being implemented through mutual activities of all **Coalition** members.

Namely, we used the opportunity and existing information about everything Croatia must do to join the European Union.

Thanks to the data that 167,000 people asked for legal information from the **Coalition**, we insisted that representatives of the **Coalition** should be included in the working group of the Ministry of Justice for the creation of the bill on Free Legal Aid. The Law should make it possible for marginalized people (those who have no economic or political power) to have access to the courts.

Members of the **Coalition** give free advice and information, and when there is a need for court representation we hire registered lawyers since we ourselves were not allowed to do it. Regarding court representation the main problem is the dawdling of the Croatian judiciary system; many court cases depended on political will... Our lawyers did not have time to solve all cases. The influence of politics is a major factor.

The strength of the coalition is in its members who are respected for the work they have for more than ten years invested in promoting and protecting human rights in the Republic of Croatia.

Thanks to those references of our members, two years ago we got a draft of reforms in the judiciary system from the Ministry of Justice, and were asked to give suggestions to those reforms.

Coalition members:

- **Coalition office**; Gornjodravaska 81; 31000 Osijek; Republic of Croatia; Tel: +385 31 284 320; Fax: +385 31 284 321; Email: isc@os.htnet.hr;
- **Center for Civic Initiatives**; Partizanska 2d; 52 440 Porec; Republic of Croatia; Tel/fax: +385 52 452 746; +385 52 452 696; Email: cgiporec@zamir.net;
- **Center for Peace, Non-Violence, and Human Rights**; Zupanijska 7; 31 000 Osijek; Republic of Croatia; Tel/fax: +385 31 206 886; +385 31 206 889; +385 31 214 581; Email: czmos@zamir.net;
- **Office for Human Rights**; Gunduliceva 4; 31 000 Osijek; Republic of Croatia; Tel/fax: + 385 31 206 887; Email: ljprava@zamir.net;
- **Center for Peace, Legal Advice and Psycho-Social Assistance**; Antuna Tomasevica 32; 32 000 Vukovar; Republic of Croatia; Tel/fax: +385 32 413 319; +385 32 413 317; Email: centar-za-mir@vk.htnet.hr;
- **Dalmatian Solidarity Committee**; Setaliste Bacvice 10; p.p. 248; 21 000 Split; Republic of Croatia; Tel/fax: +385 21 488 944; +385 21 488 951; Email: dalmatinski-odbor-solidarnosti@st.htnet.hr;
- **Organization for Civic Initiative**; Kralja Petra Svacica 36; 31 000 Osijek; Republic of Croatia; Tel/fax: +385 31 582 290; +385 31 582 291; Email: ogi@os.htnet.hr;
- **Committee for Human Rights**; Ivana Banjavcica 7; 47 000 Karlovac; Republic of Croatia; Tel: +385 47 600 634; +385 47 600 635; Tel/fax: +385 47 616 365; Email: chr-ka@ka.htnet.hr;
- **Serbian Democratic Forum**; Gunduliceva 55; 10 000 Zagreb; Republic of Croatia; Tel: +385 1 4921862; Fax: + 385 1 4921827; Email: zagreb-sdf@sdf.hr;
- **Association for Peace and Human Rights, "Baranja"**; Petefi Sandora 78; 31 327 Bilje; Republic of Croatia; Tel/fax: +385 31 750 608; +385 31 750 892; Email: baranja@inet.hr;
- **Center for Direct Protection of Human Rights**; Filipoviceva 20; 10 000 Zagreb; Republic of Croatia; Tel/fax: +385 1 2422 801; Email: dphr@zamir.net;
- **HOMO: Association for Protection of Human Rights and Freedoms**; G. Martinuzzi 23; 52 100 Pula; Republic of Croatia; Tel/fax: +385 52 505 976; +385 52 506 012; Email: homo@pu.htnet.hr

Gordana Stojanovic

10. THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION and CIVIL SERVICE

Donor: **Heinrich Boell Stiftung, Germany; the Office for Human Rights of the Government of Croatia**

Project time frame: **1991 – 2003**

Accomplished by: **Antiwar Campaign of Croatia (ARK)**

Year of organization's establishment: **1991**

Location: **Zagreb, Croatia**

The campaign for the conscientious objection and civil service is one activity that has continually been implemented within the **Anti-War Campaign** (hereinafter ARK) since its establishment in 1991. What is more, even before the establishment of ARK, civil society was key to the incorporation of the Article that guarantees the right to conscientious objection in the Constitution of Croatia. That is how the Constitution of Croatia since 1991 in Article 47 guarantees the right to conscientious objection. Of course, the right to conscientious objection was directly marginalized and violated during the war years. The civil service itself was not clearly defined, that is, it was regulated by several Articles within the Law on Defense, so the Ministry of Defense had a monopoly on regulating civil service. The counseling service for civil service and conscientious objection gave during the war years constantly advice to all who resisted military service.

The first important "victory" of ARK was when we filled a Constitutional lawsuit requesting that an Article demanding that conscientious objection be given within 90 days of recruitment within the Defense Law be terminated. That Article made it difficult to ask for conscientious objection for the simple reason that young men who were recruited did not have information regarding conscientious objection, and were very often informed about their rights too late. The Constitutional Court voted in our request and since 1998 there is no time limit on conscientious objection. However, not even this decision of the Constitutional Court helped raise the number of conscientious objectors who, during the nineties, numbered about 200 to 300 a year. One of the reasons for this low number was that civil service lasted 15 months, while regular service lasted 10 months. Also, those requesting conscientious objection received no benefits, i.e. financial benefits.

An escalation in the promotion of conscientious objection happened after the change of government in Croatia in 2000. The new coalition government began numerous reforms in the goal of distancing themselves from Croatian Democratic Union politics. One of the reforms was a military reform, that is, talks began about decreasing the period recruits spend in the military in Croatia. Of course, no one from the Government mentioned civil service, but the media was heavily covering military reform. We used this opportunity to promote civil service. We worked in parallel with Amnesty International Croatia on creating a bill for Law on Civil Service. With the Croatian Helsinki Committee for Human Rights we organized a press conference for journalists to talk about the discrimination faced by those who request conscientious objection. We reacted publicly to every statement or act that was discriminatory toward conscientious objector and one of the key factors in getting the public's attention regarding discrimination

of conscientious objectors was organizing direct street actions in front of the Ministry of Defense in January 2000. The importance of this action is in the fact that it was the first demonstration in front of this Ministry since 1991. Our demands were clear: making civil service and regular service the same in length, and making a new Law on Civil Service that would not be regulated by the Defense Ministry. Just the fact that conscientious objection was made a topic of public debate (the media began writing more about it) helped increase the number of requests for conscientious objection, and in 2000 it jumped to 680 from 260 in 1999. ARK was recognized as an important figure in discussions regarding the length of military service and civil service. We were invited to a session of the Assemblies Department for National Security and Internal Politics when they were discussing military reform. At the beginning of 2001 the Assembly decreased military service to 6 months, and after a series of negotiating talks they also agreed to decrease the number of months for civil service from 15 to 8. What is more, on our initiative the Office for Civil Service (with a recommendation from the President of Croatia), announced that the 15th of May will be the national day of conscientious objection, a day off for all those doing civil service. All these events helped increase greatly the number of those requesting civil service, so that in 2001 it reached 4009. At that moment the campaign changed from being just an ARK activity to functioning in its own dynamics through conscientious objectors who became visible in schools, society, at parties and who by talking about their experiences promoted civil service. It was becoming *cool* to do civil service than doing regular military service. By the end of 2002 there were 8556 requests for conscientious objection that was a clear indicator that civil service has to be regulated with its own specific law. Finally, in February 2003 the Croatian Assembly adopted the Law on Civil Service that commanded that civil service be regulated by the Ministry for Social Welfare and not the Ministry of Defense, while also allowing that the service be conducted in non-governmental organizations. The number of requests for civil service jumped to 9711 in 2003. The rate of increase was like this: 260 (1999), 680 (2000), 4009 (2001), 8556 (2002), and 9711 (2003).

Gordan Bosanac

11. VUKOVAR TOGETHER – INTERETHNIC TOLERANCE

Donor: **Friedrich Naumann Stiftung and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany**

Project time frame: **2003**

Accomplished by: **Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education - VIMIO**

Year of organization's establishment: **1999**

Location: **Vukovar, Croatia**

The representatives of political parties – Democratic Centre, Croatian Bloc – Movement for Modern Croatia, Croatian Democratic Union, Croatian People's Party, Croatian Party of Rights, Croatian Peasant Party, Liberal Party, Social Democratic Party of Croatia, Independent Democratic Serbian Party and the Council of ethnic minorities (Hungarians, Roma, Rusinians, Slovaks, Serbs, Ukrainians) from Vukovar and the region, were participants in the project "Cooperation of Political Parties and Minority

Communities in the Development of the Community”, organized by the Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education.

The goal of this yearly project, “Overcoming and Preventing Conflict in Ethnically Diverse Regions of Croatia,” financed by Friedrich Naumann Stiftung and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany, was to bring closer key segments of the city and surroundings: representatives of political parties and ethnic minorities regarding mutual actions in the goal of the prosperity of the city of Vukovar.

During the seminars representatives of political parties and ethnic minorities talked about the strengths and weaknesses, threats and possibilities that face Vukovar: How to motivate citizens to cooperate on development of the community? What to suggest to the local self-government for a better future of the city? What do we want and need regarding economic development in this region?

Participants of the seminar defined some problems, but also possible ways of fixing them. On the basis of the analysis of weaknesses and strengths, threats and possibilities the seminar participants came to a common vision for the future of Vukovar that they defined in the following manner, and that they wish to share with the citizens of Vukovar as well as with the representatives of the local self-government and state administration:

VISION FOR THE CITY OF VUKOVAR

Vukovar has historically been a multi-national city, connected through routes in the European route network, while its economic development has been based on the agriculture industry, small and medium businesses, tourism, which is based on historical differences and accommodated to the needs of each citizen, while actively stimulating higher education and keeping the young in the town.

*In order to begin realizing this vision it is necessary to make the first step, and the first step for the seminar participants is creating a citizens initiative called **‘VUKOVAR TOGETHER – INTERETHNIC TOLERANCE’**, and a mutual statement that we are giving to you attached.*

At the press-conference held on December 12th, 2003 and organized by VIMIO, the Mutual Statement of all political parties and national minorities was presented to the public. The Statement asserts the following:

- Representatives of political parties – Democratic Centre, Croatian Bloc – Movement for Modern Croatia, Croatian Democratic Union, Croatian People’s Party, Croatian Party of Rights, Croatian Peasant Party, Liberal Party, Social Democratic Party of Croatia, Independent Democratic Serbian Party, the Council of Ethnic Minorities (Hungarians, Roma, Rusinians, Slovaks, Serbs, Ukrainians) from Vukovar and the region, members of the seminar “Cooperation of Political Parties and Minority Communities in Development of the Community”, organized by the Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education are establishing a citizens initiative called **“VUKOVAR TOGETHER – INTERETHNIC TOLERANCE”**.
- Our initiative aims to stress that Vukovar is historically a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural city in which no one has the right to forget what happened during the war in Vukovar, while the future of Vukovar needs to be built through the respect of differences, tolerance and directing out mutual efforts and developing the city and the region.

- We have come back, stayed or came to this town, and we wish for it to be, in spite of currently numerous problems in the economy, lack of participation of citizens in its development, a formal or informal division of citizens, lack of rights regarding the Law on Areas of Special State Concern which is important on the state level, we wish for Vukovar to advance and develop into a town for every citizen.
- We do not want to wait any longer for solutions that someone else will offer us. We ourselves, our families, want to be active participants in creating the future of Vukovar.
- But how can we do that? By talking, exchanging experiences and opinions, by looking at who lives in this city, who is living by us and next to us, by giving our children and our youth an opportunity to accomplish what they wish, not to limit them in what they can do, by stressing the positive examples of cohabitation and humanity while recognizing the negative and publicly condemning them.

Biljana Kondic

IV. WORK IN SMALL COMMUNITIES

12. PROGRAM FOR GAINING PUBLIC SUPPORT IN THE COMMUNITY

Donor: **UMCOR - The United Methodist Committee on Relief, United States of America**

Project time frame: **1996 – 2004**

Accomplished by: **Youth Center Gornji Vakuf - Uskoplje**

Year of organization's establishment: **1996**

Location: **Gornji Vakuf - Uskoplje, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

Today, when we are in a situation to analyze “good practices” we cannot afford not to see the “good practice” of the United Methodist Committee on Relief as a funding agency that from the very start – 1996, followed our needs and showed real care for us. They supported numerous training sessions for our staff, young volunteers, teachers for peace work; activities for children and youth that are based on building trust; project of organizational development. We were strengthened as a resource center for civic initiatives in the community; we developed project sustainability; the United Methodist Committee on Relief gave us full support in reconstructing our own office spaces. Representatives of the United Methodist Committee on Relief came to visit us often and always tried to understand as much as possible the situation in which we are working and the needs we have as well as the preparation we need to survive, which we know was not the case with many other funding agencies. The good practice of the funding agency in this case resulted in good practice of the local organization.

About the community

Gornji Vakuf - Uskoplje is a Bosniak and Croatian community in the Middle-Bosnian canton. There is a history of very violent multi-ethnic conflict that raged in this town in the period between 1992 to 1995. By the results of a research done by the international community, this was one of the most destroyed towns in Bosnia and Herzegovina. As a result of prolonged conflict the town was divided into two communities where the main street divides the Bosniak part from the Croatian part. National parties are still in power.

Even today, 10 years after the war ended all institutions for children and youth are divided. Children go to 2 different high schools and 4 elementary schools with different national programs in schools. Each program “forces” its own version of recent history, while each is not in accordance with the other and does not lead to trust building and a stable peace.

This is why there is a great need to work on resolving conflicts from the past so as to build stable peace and avoid armed conflict and bloodshed in the future.

About us

The Youth Center is the only place in Gornji Vakuf - Uskoplje where children and youth, their parents and teachers from both ethnic communities can meet and work together to reconnect the

connections torn by war. The Youth Center has been actively working since 1996. Trust building and stable peace is a constant challenge that motivates activists, in this organization, make every effort in spite of hard political times in which they work.

Mission

The Youth Center is a citizens association in which children, youth and adults cooperate in creating initiatives and educational, creative and social programs, learn and advance, while connecting two communities torn apart by the war.

Year 2003 – “Township government gave public support” - the Youth Center got its own offices in House of Culture.

For years, the Youth Center, as the only multiethnic institution in the community, has been ignored and denied by the local government. We were well aware that fastidious national political options will not accept a peacemaking organization in this community easily, but, we decisively continued to work in order to get their attention.

Persistent as we were, we were continually sending invitations to local government representatives on public presentations of our activities. We never neglected the community as our common place: we participated in reconstruction of public sites - fountains, parks, mountaineer homes, worked in partnership with public institutions (police, social services, schools, other NGOs, court of law, health care), while always presenting our work through media.

When the town was administratively united by the decree of the Office of High Representative in year 2002, we recognized the favorable political conditions and started fighting “aggressively” for our, until then just visions, goals. We knew that the local government will have respond to our demands because The Youth Center had credibility and support from parents and young people. Our basic aim in our approach toward local government was to get our own space in the House of Culture (a public institution/facility for cultural events), which at that moment was in use by one ethnic community for political parties and organizations established after the war. We wanted to open it for both communities and restore its pre-war function.

We knew whom to address with our demands; which individuals on high places, due to their responsibilities, could help and understand the goals of the Youth Center and share the concern for problems in community and help us establish the best way to solve problems.

Our goals were to get our own offices and establish collaboration with the local government because, without the dialogue, we were unable to work on some issues.

We realized both our goals at approximately same time. After years of lobbying we got unfinished space in the attic of the House of Culture and (with help from donations of the United Methodist Committee on Relief and private donations from parents) made it ready for further usage. This space has been quickly recognized as a space open for all advanced initiatives and activities in community.

Since that year a complete turn over occurred in our relations with local government and now we are cooperating and local government recognized our collaboration as mutually useful.

With the assistance of foreign volunteers we assessed the needs of local community - youth leisure activities, ecological problems, drug abuse, educational needs (not just of young people but also

their parents), need for artistic expression, need for psychosocial work, various forms of community violence... Since we addressed the needs of the whole community, local government recognized us as an organization that can help in the process of solving some common problems in our community. Local government actively participated in exploring and defining an expanded mission of our organization and strategic planning for the future.

All activities that the Youth Center directed towards local government were based on principles of peace, interethnic dialogue, and clearly emphasized concern for both ethnic groups and their equal development. Constant peacemaking education provided for children, young people, their parents and guardians helped through that process.

Sustainability of the project

Sustainability is secured through integration of knowledge gained through various training programs, own space, credibility of the Youth Center in the community. The township representatives value our reports and good practices; the Youth Center became a public place where people can come to consult or get an advice of personal nature. The community started to feel this place as its own.

Success factors

- Improved political conditions
- Commitment to the mission
- Continuous peace education of the staff, volunteers and people from the community
- Careful and tactical work under hard political conditions (taking care of sensitive issues of our neighbors or partners, celebrating diversity, possibility of choice, bilingualism, establishing offices close to both communities, paying attention to the ethnic structures of the employees, etc.).
- Activities attuned to the needs of the community
- Transparency and public work of the Youth Center

Problems with realization

The main problem was finding proper timing for our programs, especially when working with the partners from the community; it has frequently happened that we had to take over many responsibilities because our partners did not have the necessary skills.

*Jasminka Drino Kirlic,
Mirjana Gvozdenovic and
Anita Grabner*

13. WOMEN'S TRAVELING PEACEBUILDING WORKSHOPS: "POWER AND OTHERNESS"

Donor: **Heinrich Boell Stiftung, Germany**

Project time frame: **1998 – 2004**

Accomplished by: **Women in Black**

Year of organization's establishment: **1991**

Location: **Belgrade, Serbia**

The work of Women in Black can be followed through several significant periods. Concerning the types of activities that overruled in certain periods: 1991 to 1998, 1998 -2002, and from 2002 and on.

Women in Black were founded on the 9th of October 1991, and, during this period, the work of Women in Black was marked by street protests, by stand in public spaces, which occurred every Wednesday as a mark of disagreement with actual politics that created national intolerance, and as a protest against war politics of the regime. Besides street protests, at that period we worked in refugee camps, distributing humanitarian aid and offering help and support to refugee women. Every year, Women in Black of Belgrade organized international meetings of all Women in Black associations from various countries.

At the beginning of 1998, we felt the need to qualitatively change the way we work because the conditions in which we worked had changed. Supported by Heinrich Boell Stiftung, we designed a long-term educational project, "Women's' traveling peacebuilding workshops." The aim was to decentralize our activity and, through women's alternative peacebuilding education, stimulate consciousness raising and organization of women all over Serbia and Montenegro. Women's traveling peacebuilding workshops consisted of six series of workshops and six subjects: Women are Changing Women; Women's Rights are Human Rights, Interethnic and Intercultural solidarity, Women and Power, Women and Antimilitarism, Women's Peace Politics. These workshops were held in five towns in various regions in Serbia and Montenegro: Novi Sad, Kragujevac, Kraljevo, Novi Pazar, and Niksic. On these workshops, which were held from 1998 to 2002, more than 1000 women of different ethnic and social background, different age, professional and political orientation, had participated. Participants got various types of information and knowledge that helped them enhance their self-confidence and self-consciousness necessary for linking and organizing in the local community. After each workshop and evaluation women from different regions would meet; that enabled experience exchange and interregional linking. During this project many women became independent activists and/or founders of new groups. This is the greatest contribution of Women in Black - to empower and support women to self-organize themselves in constant fight for their human and civil rights and to mutually mediate for strengthening and development of civil society in their communities.

Project "Power and Otherness" started in March and ended in October 2001. This project included three border regions in Serbia: Sandzak, southern Serbia and Banat. The Project had three phases. The first phase consisted of workshops, all with the same contents: stereotypes and prejudices, co-existence in diversity. The second phase was attuned to the specific needs of activists from above mentioned regions (gender and nation, breaking the habits of patriarchy and understanding other cultures). The third phase had workshops which all women from all regions participated in and the subjects were: identities, dealing with the past and cultural consequences of September 11th.

Since 2002, when the project "Women's traveling peacebuilding workshops" ended, we continued working with individual groups all over Serbia, cooperating in order to articulate individual needs of groups

concerned and working together on solving problems in local communities. This support that comes from Women in Black to local women's groups is realized by: organizing round table discussions, guest activists from abroad, joint actions, organizing meetings all over Serbia - in short, decentralizing of activities and helping local groups. As a result of this continuous work and non-bureaucratic communication we got a strong and vibrant The Women in Black network which consists of many local groups, individuals; a network capable to cope with various situations and difficulties. When we speak about acting in local communities, Women in Black like to say that they are "spreading symbolic infection." We, Women in Black of Belgrade, do not want to be like some "umbrella organization" but to induce and to encourage local activists to recognize local problems that they have to solve.

Due to such an approach, many activists from local communities are grouping, linking and organizing regional seminars and other activities. One such successful seminar in Southern and Eastern Serbia was titled as the "Function of Female Activism in Development of Civil Society."

Ljiljana Radovanovic

14. "WOMEN CHA(LA)NGING HISTORY"

4. Donor: **The Executive Council of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina, Serbia and Montenegro; OSI - Open Society Institute, United States of America**

Project time frame: **2003**

Accomplished by: **Women's Peace Group, Pancevo, Serbia**

Year of organization's establishment: **2001**

Location: **Pancevo, Vojvodina, Serbia**

The Women's Peace Group can be defined as a "small local group with big discontents and activism potentials". What we see as our specific trait is that we are not professional in the sense that we do not have our own offices, no employees, no regular income, no permanent projects, but we have a big and constant need to work and we are very active in the local community. The Women's Peace Group was founded in the summer of 2000 (we were officially registered in January 2001) by experienced antiwar and feminist activists who have been active since the 1990-ties. Important fact for our activities profile and our self-consciousness is that we work in the town which has a tradition of peacebuilding groups and especially peacebuilding activism since 1991 (in summer of 1991, right after the Center for Anti-War Action, peace movement was founded in Pancevo). Thus, in all our activities (projects, actions, public displays etc.) we emphasize the importance of continuity with the activities that existed in Pancevo before the Women's Peace Group was formed (Peace movement, Peacebuilding group "M", individual peace activists).

Women's Peace Group is one of the groups that originated as consequence of empowering and support from Women in Black of Belgrade with which we have associated and cooperated for many years. For the first two years, our activities were adjusted to the model developed by Women in Black (street protests, celebrating important dates for the international feminist and peace movement, activities

concerning dealing with the past) and during that time we implemented one mutual project involving women from three multiethnic border regions in Serbia. Nevertheless we feel that our activities at that moment reached only a small, rather limited circle of women and men in our town. We think that the reason for that was a message that was “too universal”, which we suggested, so that citizens of Pancevo could not recognize it as relevant, as something that relates to their experience.

The problems we confronted were legitimacy and credibility: on whose behalf we, as local group, speak, which “local interest” we are articulating, in what way we help the citizens of Pancevo to really understand the problems we would like to address, do they trust us when we define some issue as problematic. After two and a half years of “floating”, we decided to address the problems we coped with from before: pacifism, feminism and responsibility, and to present them in an understandable way. Why was all that important to us? We have not been recognized in our community as a referent to which citizens could turn to for something they need; we have been somehow self-centered. In order to become recognizable within the local community it was important to initiate some concrete activities which would communicate special, local, and easy to acknowledge problems with the universal, global ones. That is how our project, “Women Cha(la)nging History”, started. Of course, our focus were local women changing local history, it was performed in March and April 2003. Three main activities have been organized: (1) Symbolic renaming of streets in central town areas, replacing names of male military leaders and warriors with the names of women symbolizing peace and non-violence, mostly from local history. (2) Exhibition, “Another World” (realized in cooperation with the History Archive, set in the Public Museum in Pancevo), which presented photographs and documents related to women whose names were used in the streets renaming. This exhibition was a kind of an introduction to the performance, “In/Out-Hidden Places.” (3) Round table discussion on the importance of writing women’s history named “Research of Women’s Local History as a Form of Civic Responsibility.”

This project activities have happened during two significant events: during March, in the women’s movement known as the month of women’s history, and in 2003, when Pancevo celebrates a significant town anniversary - 850 years since the town name has been mentioned for the first time in history. So, we “seized the moment” and “signed” our project by the town’s anniversary and, at the same time, articulated criticism of the dominant view on town’s history and constructively opened new aspects of perception and interpretation of the past.

In this project we used a complex set of activities (that we advanced in future) that includes a combination of: *street action* (which enables demonstration and regeneration of activists’ capacities and enables visibility for large number of citizens) and *research* (gathering different types of documents and creating a database for future activities). Town events suit the promotion of research results, while performance and artistic means enhance transmission of our message through various media. These elements comprise our “formula”: DIRECT ACTION → RESEARCH → REPRESENTATION → DOCUMENTATION → ARTISTIC TRANSFORMATION → RAMIFICATION.

The beneficiaries of this project varied: general public, cultural institutions (archive, museum) which participated and whose institutional limitations and politics we tried to “soften” through mutual preparation and realization of one untypical exhibition, elementary and high school pupils, who saw our exhibition with their teachers and discussed not only exhibition material but also, problems that this

exhibition opens; and last but not least artists/actors from “Spleen Theatre” who, while working on this project got used to cooperation with NGOs (they are now our regular associates on various projects and activities).

After this project Women’s Peace Group officially suggested to the Commission for Monuments and Street and Square Names to name still unnamed sites by significant women from Pancevo and to place commemorative plaques on 8 houses. The Commission welcomed our suggestion as interesting and promised to consider it, but we never got an official response. However, in order to show up as a properly functioning body, they invited us to participate in their work. We have accepted it, but already during the first meeting have realized that the Commission has no established work procedures and decision making criteria but rather functions in silent accordance with dominant and never endangered patriarchal and militaristic values. It was clear that we should not participate and collaborate with such a Commission and we informed the President of the Commission and the President of Pancevo Executive Council about our decision.

Nevertheless, the attention that was refocused from our projects to the repressed history of women in Pancevo. In consequence, the official monograph published for the town’s jubilee included life stories and contribution of significant women from Pancevo to town’s history. This is how, all material we gathered and presented on the “Other World” exhibition continued to exist. Also, parts of collected material for that exhibition - portraits of significant and professionally outstanding women of Pancevo (artists, scientists, writers) – were published as postcards (named “Female face of the town”). Postcard motives were printed on posters and distributed to elementary and high schools as Women’s Peace Group’s contribution to enlightening the alternative views on town’s history. Interest for local female history kept growing during summer, and a calendar for the year 2004 was published and dedicated to women’s local self-organizing from the second half of 19th century until the beginning of 21st century.

Ildiko Erdei

15. EMPOWERING INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS TO ADVOCATE THEIR RIGHTS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UN GUIDING PRINCIPLES ON INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT

Donor: NRC – Norwegian Refugee Council; FRESTA NGO TDP – FRESTA NGO Transition and Development Program, Serbia; UN OCHA IDP Unit - United Nations Office for Humanitarian Affairs, Internal Displaced People Unit, Geneva; UNHCHR - United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Project time frame: 2002 - 2004 (Project will continue in 2005)

Accomplished by: Group 484

Year of organization’s establishment: 1995 (formally 16.02.1996.)

Location: Belgrade, Serbia and Montenegro

The *internally displaced* persons are citizens of Serbia and Montenegro and they claim protection in their mother country. However, their claims are not included in the international system of protection like the protection of the refugees. The state of Serbia and Montenegro finds itself responsible to protect the rights not only of refugees but of internally displaced citizens as well. State's duties and rights towards refugees are declared in United Nations Refugee Status Convention from 1951 and in the attached protocol from 1967. State's duties towards its internally displaced citizens originate from international conventions and pacts which relate to all citizens - Pact for Civil and Human Rights, Pact for Economic, Social and Culture Rights, Convention for Children's Rights, Convention for the Elimination of Discrimination of Women, etc...

In order to alleviate states' protection of internally displaced persons and to remind them of their duties, the United Nations made a document, "Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement" in 1998. These principles do not have legal strength but they plead on legally binding international conventions and pacts.

These Guiding principles were presented in our country in 2002 for the first time in cooperation with three United Nations agencies: for human rights (United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights), for humanitarian issues (United Nation Office for Humanitarian Affairs) and refugees (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees).

Since June 1999, after the Kosovo peace treaty, approximately 230 000 persons, mostly Serbs, and among them app. 40 000 Roma and Askalis migrated from Kosovo to Serbia and Montenegro, where app. 450 000 refugees from Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia have already lived. Due to the unresolved status of Kosovo and social and economic problems in Serbia and Montenegro, the main problem is lack of political will and consensus to create a state strategy for permanent solutions for internally displaced people. State offers minimal protection during the process of displacement and it's only strategy for displaced people are their return to Kosovo. At the same time, the circumstances for their return to Kosovo are far from suitable because there are no guarantees for basic safety for returnees. Even United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees is not promoting return to Kosovo, but just supports those individuals who already consider and choose that option.

There are huge difficulties to find a proper and permanent solution for the problems burdening life of the displaced persons, extended from the administrative ones (getting their basic documents) to economic, social and political.

Our Approach

Group 484 works for change in society standards and political levels in order to permanently alleviate the position of internally displaced people. In working for those changes, Group 484 relies on internally displaced people, their capacities and solutions they give and includes them into public advocacy processes.

Pilot phase

United Nations agencies introduced the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement to government and civil organizations in our country in autumn 2002. After that, Group 484 formed a team

consisted of internally displaced people who live in collective centers near Belgrade, aiming to raise their consciousness and knowledge about their duties and rights, and their understanding the mandate and responsibility of various Serbian and international institutions and organizations. Also, they have been trained in public advocacy skills. Our intention was to check whether displaced people find these activities useful and to make them ready for the public advocacy process.

Evaluations showed that there is a great need among displaced people for better understanding of their own position and great interest for active participation in public advocacy for realization of their rights.

Based on this experience we prepared a project that started in 2003.

Activities and results

- Team of 20 trainers from all parts of Serbia took a training program in: the rights of displaced people, public advocacy techniques, coordinating workshops, participatory research techniques and activism in local community.
- We accomplished a participatory research in 10 municipalities in Serbia. Using focus groups and panel discussions we addressed the displaced people and those who work with them (from governmental institutions and foreign and domestic institutions), we have explored the real state of human rights of the displaced, how do they, and their helpers, perceive those rights and which solutions they have.
- We have organized action teams for public advocacy for rights of displaced people in 5 regions in Serbia, whose members were mostly people which participated in participatory research as respondents. These action teams got trained in the rights of displaced people and public advocacy. Using the results of participatory research, each team undertook one advocacy action in their region. Their advocacy actions were similar – all teams chose to advocate for the realization of one right which they marked as the most violated in their region, and organized one-day conferences whose key participants were persons responsible for the realization of that right.
- These Action teams for advocacy had full logistic and other support by the local NGOs, a member of FRESTA Transition and Development Network.
- Conclusions and recommendations from those conferences were the base for making the Policy Recommendations for the realization of rights of displaced people which had been made by Group 484, which Group 484 uses while performing public advocacy in this area.
- We encouraged the foundation of *Referent Group* for United Nations Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. In that group, besides Group 484 the representatives of United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, United Nation Office for Humanitarian Affairs, FRESTA NGO Transition and Development Network and Norwegian Refugee Council were also present. The *Referent Group* analyzed the realization of the project on regular basis and provided counseling, gave authority to the project in governmental institutions and secured financial support for the project.
- In 2004, based on previous phases of this project, we have established the *Local Coalition* for realization of rights for displaced people in 5 towns in Serbia. Members of these coalitions, which Group 484 facilitates, are representatives of local governments, local institutions, displaced people

and civil society organizations. These coalitions analyze concrete problem the displaced people are interested to resolve, and look for solutions for the most urgent ones which they can realize by mobilization of their capacities.

- Local coalition members were continually educated in terms of rights for displaced people and different advocacy techniques. Their work is being monitored by local media.
- In 2005, local coalitions will continue with their work and Group 484 will facilitate the foundation of these coalitions network that will advocate for the rights of the displaced on a national level.

Factors that contributed to the success and sustainability of the project

- Timely reactions, joining the broader context of United Nations strategies and the use of documents that the United Nations advocated to the domestic government.
- Testing the idea with beneficiaries through pilot phase and implementation of experiences from that exact phase on future phases.
- Inclusion of local government representatives and displaced people as activists who work on this project (some of them are trainers and partners and others are members of Local Coalitions).
- Inclusion of research respondents into further project phases - we used the motivation that already existed.
- By establishing the Reference Group for United Nations Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, we stirred the support for the advocacy process “from above” and mobilization of financial support through sense of mutual ownership and product.
- Reinforcement and foundation of Local coalitions secured the feeling of ownership over this project between people in the local community and we strengthened their mutual relations which, overall, contribute to the project sustainability.

Range

- Although we included just five municipalities, by engaging the capacities of Local Coalitions for advocacy for change in social standards and politics we will be able to secure the interest of the entire population of the displaced on national level.

Problems in realization

Our main problem is lack of clear governmental politics concerning the internally displaced people and discouragement of all kinds of integration of the internally displaced people which, also, discourages the funding agencies to plan their support strategies.

Establishment of the Referent Group for Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement helped us to turn the focus of the funding agencies from supporting the governmental strategy towards the promotion of the document which means so much to them and that secured their stable support.

The funding agencies are dedicated and flexible and they are participating on the project and also other kinds of support except financial, advising and personal advocacy on a national level.

Vesna Golic

V. DEALING WITH WAR TRAUMA

16. PROGRAM FOR ECONOMIC AND DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT THROUGH INTERSECTORAL COOPERATION IN EASTERN SLAVONIA

Donor: **Norwegian Embassy in Croatia**

Project time frame: **2002 - 2004**

Accomplished by: **Center for Peace, Legal Advice and Psychosocial Assistance, Vukovar**

Year of organization's establishment: **1996**

Location: **Croatia**

This project is carried out in cooperation with the Center for Enterprise from Osijek and Business Innovation Programs from Norway as a result of Center's research in cooperation with representatives from several rural townships near Vukovar. The aim of this project is to establish a long-lasting cooperation between civil sector and local self-government and to establish better communication between communities involved in this project in order to start mutual business projects. Long-term goals of this project are to contribute to revitalization and economic growth of rural communities, raise the living standards and create new employment possibilities, strengthen and consolidate inter-sector collaboration and contribute to development of democracy, tolerance and co-existence of local population through realization of common economic interests.

Concrete activities are based on business education (business planning and computer training), research of business possibilities in chosen area and linking potential local entrepreneurs with entrepreneurs from abroad.

Success factors

1. Established / continued extremely effective cooperation between chosen municipalities and civil sectors
2. Local self-government representatives' understanding of problems and needs of their communities and their attempt to overcome those problems through meeting common (economic) interests.
3. Extremely bad economic situation and underemployment made new climate in which people, because of mutual (economic) interests, from different (ethnic) communities are bonding and trying to get over this crisis together.

Sustainability of the accomplished change

Research has shown that, so far, that there are great capacities for business cooperation between local municipalities and potential foreign partners; if we carry on this project and achieve positive results in production and export we would definitely achieve improvement of living standards for the population in this region.

Problems in realization

So far, we had no problems or significant withdrawals.

Ankica Mikic

Attachment No. 8

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

RUZICA ROSANDIC, associate of the Center for Antiwar Action since its establishment. Associate and coordinator of the Group MOST. Co-author of the *Goodwill Classroom* training program in constructive conflict resolution and of the training program for children's rights, *Now I know – that is why I can* (Center for child's rights, Belgrade, Serbia). Also, co-author of the school textbooks' analysis, *Warfare, patriotism, patriarchy* (1994). She is professor of the University of Belgrade, Serbia (Developmental and Education Psychology). She sojourned as senior Fellow in United States Institute of Peace from 1997-98. Since 1998 - 2001 she has taught as a visiting professor at the Department of Conflict Analyses and Resolution, Nova Southeastern University, United States of America (courses: Theory and Practice of negotiation, Violence and Violence Prevention, Conflict Transformation and Reconciliation, Theory and Philosophy of Conflicts, Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Social Sciences). For the time being, Program Director at the Center for Antiwar Action.

NATASA MILENKOVIC, active in NGO since 1994; worked on educational projects aimed at activists of women's NGOs in the region (Feminist schools 1996 - 2000), and support for women's NGOs (STAR Delphi International 1997 – 1999, Republic of Macedonia and Serbia and Montenegro); she is worked on the theme of reconciliation for the last eight years: OASIS network (NGO from Serbia and Montenegro, 1999 - 2001), training (programs ALTERNATIVE=PEACE Helsinki Citizens' Assembly from Banja Luka /2001 - 02 / and *MIRamiDA* + Center for Peace Studies from Zagreb, Croatia /2001/), research (regional research *about dealing with the past* as Quaker Peace and Social Witness representative, 2002 - 2004); Also, she evaluates different local and international programs/organizations; she is one of the authors of evaluation manual (S evaluacijom na TI, 2002) and, she initiated the Regional Peace Directory (2003).

MIRJANA KOVACEVIC, activist and ex-politician, active since 1994, founder of the Student Union, Social Democratic Youth and Belgrade Youth Association, one of the founders of the Feminist Working Group of the Balkan Round Table. Activist and coordinator of the Antiwar campaign in 1998 against the war in Kosovo. Regional instructor in the Belgrade Department of the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs.