



**IS IT POSSIBLE TO BUILD TRUST IN WAR THORN COMMUNITIES
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MITROVICA AND MOSTAR**



January - February 2005

PROJECT „FEASIBILITY STUDY OF MULTIETHNIC COEXISTENCE“

Mitrovica-Mostar

January-February, 2005

Implementing agency:

NGO “Jelena Anžujska“, Mitrovica

Participants in the project implementation:

“Misija ljudi dobre volje“, Zvečan Implementing partner for Mitrovica North

“Mitrovica“, South Mitrovica Implementing partner for Mitrovica South

“Sunčana strana“, Mostar - Implementing partner for Mostar

11 NGO activists from Mitrovica North / NGO Board of
Northern Kosovo and Southern Serbian enclaves

11 NGO activists from Mitrovica South / NGO Board of Mitrovica South



Project founded by:



British Office
Pristina

**IS IT POSSIBLE TO BUILD TRUST IN
WAR THORN COMMUNITIES:**

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MITROVICA AND MOSTAR

CONTENTS

General information about the Project.....	page 5
Results of the Survey.....	page 7
...And the reality is.....	page 18
Portrait of Mitrovica.....	page 20
Portrait of Mostar.....	page 22
Resume of meetings in Mostar.....	page 23
Annex 1 – Questionnaire.....	page 28
Annex 2 – Survey Sample	page 30

PROJECT „FEASIBILITY STUDY OF MULTIETHNIC COEXISTENCE“

Project “Feasibility Study of Multiethnic Coexistence“ has had, for its primary objective, to examine and compare experiences of Mitrovica and Mostar. These two cities were aimed, for they were or still are divided cities in the Balkans. Since Mitrovica is de facto divided city today, the idea of this project was to identify similarities and differences in comparison to Mostar. In addition, through the Survey the objective of the project was to determine positions of Serbian and Albanian communities in regard to possible and eventual rapprochement of the two communities.

One of the objectives of the project was introduction of Mostar realities, which certainly include political, economic and social dimension. With such objectives, visit to Mostar was also foreseen that would be based not only on field research but also on meetings with key actors in Mostar society such as representatives of local self-government, non-governmental organizations and media. Comparative methodological approach has been chosen as the most adequate for Mitrovica requirements in order to qualitatively compare situations in the two cities, establish similarities and differences and conclude on possible and similar solutions.

Nonetheless, team of the NGO activists from Mitrovica, was from the very beginning aware that there are no universal solutions that could be implemented in all individual cases. It is necessary to stress this due to the fact that the objective of this project was on no account to equalize the situations and prejudge the solutions in the two cities. This is supported by the Survey results that undoubtedly pointed out the significant differences between Mitrovica and Mostar, which makes it practically impossible to utilize the same concept. However, after introducing ourselves to the situation in Mostar, it is clear that some steps, though different, are already taken in Mitrovica. Certainly, anyone who is nearly familiar with the situation in Mitrovica, is well aware of the level of the distance between Serbian and Albanian communities, thus it is clear that the Mostar’s ‘good concept’ is inapplicable in the long run.

The basic structure of the Project was the Survey aimed to examine the opinion poll in Mitrovica and Mostar with regard to the situation in the two cities and possibility of coexistence. The Survey, designed by the team of NGO activists from Mitrovica, was compiled of 18 questions. The sample was composed of 400 interviewees, i.e. 100 interviewees on each side of the two cities.¹ Furthermore, we were careful when tackling population structure including age, education, gender and other relevant criteria.² **The Survey was conducted in Mitrovica first, between January 26 – 28, 2005 and in Mostar February 07 – 09, 2005.** The results of the Survey were processed in Mostar, thus the team from Mitrovica had a chance, along with the colleagues from Mostar, to discuss and analyse the results even during their visit to Mostar.

The group from Mitrovica that visited Mostar contained eleven NGO representatives from each side of the city. The implementing partner in Mostar was the NGO called “Sunčana strana”, i.e. the President Husein Oručević and same NGO volunteers who were involved in all activities of the Project, and without their ardent and generous help the Project would not have been successfully implemented.

¹ Mitrovica is divided into North, Serb and South, Albanian part, while in Mostar Bosnian population mostly lives in the East and Croatian in the West part of the city.

² Criteria for the Survey sample is in the Annex at the end of the Brochure.

Another important note regarding the Survey is that there were no mixed teams in Mitrovica, but each team worked on its own side of the city. The reason for this was impossibility to freely and without hindrance cross the bridge and by doing so not to seriously endanger the security of the team. However, the Survey in Mostar was conducted in mixed teams that were moving from the East side to the West side of the city. All the set criteria were fully met; thus the results of the Survey are to be taken as relevant.

The second part of the visit to Mostar was scheduled for meeting the key actors on social and political scene, in order to introduce participants from Kosovo with situation in Mostar and give them necessary information useful for their future work. Having in mind the set objectives, the series of meetings were held in Mostar, with actors as follows:

- Media representatives;
- NGO representatives;
- Trust Building Measures Committee representatives;
- City Council representatives;
- Representatives of Research team for analyses of NGO sector in Mostar;
- City Archive representatives.

Upon visiting Mostar and analyzing the results of the Survey, the team of NGO activists in Mitrovica started to work on the brochure that you are reading now. Based on our experiences and information gathered in the field, we believe that the Project "Feasibility Study of Multiethnic Coexistence" achieved the set objectives and responded to the research challenges.



RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

1. How often do you cross to the north/south, i.e. the east/west part of the city?	Mitrovica		Mostar	
	North	South	East	West
a) have not crossed it after the war	49	40	3	10
b) every day	4	5	40	16
c) often	12	12	39	40
d) rarely	35	43	18	34
	100	100	100	100

The first question of the Survey was aimed to establish how often the citizens of Mitrovica and Mostar cross to the other side of the city, by which the 'crossing' was to a certain extent seen as symbolizing the eventual indicator of life normalization. Baring in mind all the changes and administrative unification of Mostar that formally started in 2004, the results from this city are not surprising. Namely, only 13 out of 200 interviewees in Mostar have not crossed to the other side of the city, which supports the thesis that the trust and conditions for undisturbed coexistence in Mostar have been established to a great extent.

Results from Mitrovica, even though not as negative at the first site, still have to be viewed in a wider context and require additional explanation. Based on the gathered data, a bit less than half of the interviewees on both sides have never crossed to the other side of the city and this group is undisputable. However, more than half of the interviewees from South and North part of Mitrovica stated that they crossed to the other side, which would lead to the conclusion that the situation in Mitrovica is relatively positive, if not very similar to the one in Mostar. Nevertheless, this picture is absolutely unsustainable in reality.

Speaking of Mitrovica, it is essential to mention that crossings from one side to another most often end in security zone or, so called, Confidence Zone. In the South side, there are offices of international institutions, local and international NGOs and a Bank. In the North side, there are three Albanian enclaves – "Bošnjačka mahala", "Tri solitera" and "Mikro naselje" that additionally tell that people do not cross to the other side unless there is urgent need and with mandatory escort of international security forces.

Bearing in mind these results, the figure of more than half interviewees crossing the bridge sounds almost unreal. However, what seems to sound as nonsense has logical explanation. The vast number of those who cross the bridge stated that they do it rarely, and this group contains people who crossed to the other side of the city only once. For Serbian population, crossing to the South part of Mitrovica means only and exclusively, going to the church or cemetery and is usually organized a few times a year. It is about organized visits, not spontaneous decisions and always with strong escort of international security forces. For Albanian community, crossing to the other side of the city, also does not mean mixing with Serbian population. Crossing of Albanians to the North of Mitrovica is most often due to visiting their relatives or friends who live in the said enclaves. Just like Serbs, Albanians show their need for crossing to the other side of the city, through visits to graveyard, located in the North part of Mitrovica and also with strong escort of international security forces. Based on the stated facts that are to be considered when thinking of Mitrovica, it is clear that the Serbian and Albanian communities are not in contact, not even when they cross to the opposite side. In case of Mitrovica, it is clear that numbers and statistics are not

enough for properly understanding the situation. This thesis is supported by the fact that only 4 interviewees from the North, and 5 from the South cross every day to the other side. Actually, this is the small numbered group that has regular jobs on the other side of the city. In case of Serbian population crossing to the South, they are employed in international institutions, international and local NGOs and at the Bank. Albanians, working in the North side, are mostly employed in Detention Center, Courthouse, international NGOs and North Police Station.

	Mitrovica	Mostar		
2. What are the most often reasons for crossing to the other side of the city?	North	South	East	West
a) regular employment/regular job	12	14	10	10
b) the need	29	32	39	37
c) visit to friends/family	3	8	15	11
d) curiosity/stroll	5	2	17	23
e) other	2	4	16	9
	51	60	97	90

The most given reply to this question, what are the reasons for crossing to the other side of the city, both in Mitrovica and Mostar was the same, and summed up in short was the need. However, the differences between Mitrovica and Mostar have to be considered, for in Mostar the need is any normal thing as going to the market, shopping, or school, etc. In Mitrovica, this type of answers is not to be expected; thus, the interviewees, when deciding what to answer, often thought of the most urgent things that can be done only on the other side of the city. In analysis of the previous question the most often reasons for crossing to the other side were elaborated, and the needs of citizens of North and South side of Mitrovica are to be understood in the same context. Furthermore, the number of interviewees employed on the opposite sides of the two cities is not high, thus the percentage of the interviewees is low. Another obvious difference between Mitrovica and Mostar is seen by comparing the small number of people in Mitrovica who cross in order to visit their family and friends or simply take a stroll, with the number of those who gave the same answer in Mostar.³

	Mitrovica	Mostar		
3. If you do not cross to the other side of the city, what are the reasons?	North	South	East	West
a) fear/security	31	10	1	1
b) no need	9	27	0	6
c) do not want to go	9	1	0	3
d) other	0	2	2	0
	49	40	4	10

Based on the Survey results and the conversations conducted, the impression gotten was that the element of fear and security were eliminated in Mostar partially as a consequence of administrative unification of the city and partially as a consequence of time distance, no language barrier, similar cultural matrices and mutual history of the

³ Questions two, three, five and six do not count 100 in total, for they relate only to interviewees who cross, i.e. not cross to the other side of the city.

city, which all explain just a small number of those who still do not want to cross to the other side of the city. Only 2 interviewees expressed the fear for their security, while those who do not cross to the other side stated that there is no need for them to cross or 'other'.

When speaking of results from Mitrovica, the picture is significantly different. No less than 31 interviewees from the North part of Mitrovica explicitly stated their fear for their security and life, and that these were the reasons for not crossing to the South side of the city. This result and existing fear have to be viewed through the prism of grievous events and incidents that were happening after the war, especially March events in 2004. Albanians also feel fear, but the dominant reason is non-existence of need to go to the North part of the city, which also indicates the lack of will to build any relations between the two communities. Repulsion is also present with Serbs, and 9 interviewees responded that they do not want to cross, thus expressing their clear position.

	Mitrovica		Mostar	
4. Have you always lived in the part of the city you live in now?	North	South	East	West
a) yes	49	76	73	79
b) no	51	24	27	21
	100	100	100	100

The aim of this question was to give view on number of internally displaced people in the two cities. However, it is essential to stress that the methodological omission was made, for the additional question was not asked regarding those who did not always live in the part of the city they now live in, whether they are displaced from the opposite side of the same city or some other city or village from Kosovo or BiH. Nonetheless, the vast majority of displaced persons, i.e. those who did not always live in the examined cities, are in Mitrovica North, where even 51 interviewees are displaced persons. This information is important in terms of understanding the reasons why the interviewees from the North do not cross to the other side of the city – simply, they have no family or friends in the South. Speaking of Mitrovica South and both parts of Mostar, it is instantly visible that there were no major migrations of population, at least when the interviewees of this Survey are considered.

	Mitrovica		Mostar	
5. When in the other side of the city, you felt:	North	South	East	West
a) safe	0	3	55	33
b) unsafe	36	18	2	7
c) pleasant	1	8	11	21
d) unpleasant	6	13	6	6
e) confused	5	6	4	4
f) no opinion	2	10	16	14
g) other	1	2	3	5
	51	60	97	90

Answers to this question, also show the differences between Mitrovica and Mostar. The vast majority of interviewees in Mostar stated that they have positive feelings when crossing to the other side of the city – regardless of security or pleasant feeling.

In Mitrovica, mostly in the North, the interviewees deciding to cross to the other side generally felt unsafe, and than unpleasant. Only 3 interviewees from the South side stated that they feel safe on the other side of the city, thus it is made clear that feelings of citizens on both, South and North of Mitrovica are dominantly negative when crossing the bridge.

	Mitrovica		Mostar	
6. When crossing to the other part of the city, people treated you:	North	South	East	West
a) cordially	0	4	22	16
b) friendly	1	6	45	39
c) unkind	9	5	5	1
d) hostile	10	0	1	21
e) did not communicate, so do not know	22	36	11	8
f) no opinion	5	6	6	5
g) other	4	3	7	0
	51	60	97	90

Speaking of Mitrovica, it is obvious that the vast majority of those who crossed (22 in the North and 36 in the South) did not communicate with population of the other part of the city. This information supports the assumption that people cross when there is a strong reason and great need for that, and that they return to their parts of the city as soon as they meet their needs. Clearly, we have to bear in mind the language barrier that additionally aggravates communication. Majority of population that does not speak the language of the community, when crossing to the opposite side of the city fears that their own language will 'disclose' them and endanger their security. Due to this objective barrier, people are reluctant to communicate with the population on the other side of the city. Besides, it is indicative that 10 Serbs stated that the population of South Mitrovica treated them in a hostile manner.

The vast number of interviewees in Mostar answered that mostly people treated them friendly and cordially, i.e. had positive attitude. However, it is obvious that 21 interviewees from the West part of Mostar stated that people in the other part of the city treated them in hostile manner, which points out the fact that the process of unification and overcoming the consequences of war is still ongoing. In addition, it is interesting that in Mostar where the language barrier is incomparably lower, part of people when crossing to the other side still avoid to communicate with the population indicating that these interviewees cross only when they have some business there, not showing the interest or wish to start any deeper relations with the population on the other side of the city.

	Mitrovica		Mostar	
7. You personally experience people in the other side of the city as:	North	South	East	West
a) close	0	5	23	18
b) strange	23	29	9	12
c) friendly	2	8	30	34
d) hostile	67	11	10	7
e) no opinion	6	33	23	23
f) other	2	14	5	6
	100	100	100	100

Having in mind the context of Mitrovica and Mostar, the answers to this question were no surprise. In the North Mitrovica, the vast number of the interviewed stated that their personal experience of people in the South side is either strange (23) or hostile (67). Even though Serbian and Albanian community were hostile and intolerable towards each other before the March events, these events even more enhanced the polarization. Now, the March events strengthened the feeling of insecurity of Serbian community that through this Survey, also, expressed the doubt in good intentions of Albanian part of Mitrovica citizens. This low level of trust is also projected through the fact that, practically, in both parts of Mitrovica, there is no communication between Serbian and Albanian communities for already five years; thus, it is expected that the longer the time distance, the lower the level of trust will be. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the number of interviewees in the South also said that people in the North are strangers to them (29), or that they have no opinion (33), which indicates certain ambivalence, i.e. lack of any position towards the other community.

In Mostar, more than half of interviewees expressed positive attitude towards people from the other side of the city, though it is surprising that the number of those who do not have opinion on this is high. This result most probably indicates that not even in Mostar, the process of establishing trust has not finished yet, thus, there is a number of people who still keep the distance towards other community/ies.

	Mitrovica		Mostar	
8. Did you experience your city before the war as:	North	South	East	West
a) ethnically divided	44	34	2	1
b) ethnically undivided	28	9	77	75
c) tolerable	24	40	13	17
d) no opinion	4	11	6	5
e) other	0	6	2	2
	100	100	100	100

The answers to this question probably accentuate in the best way the differences and specific characteristics of Mitrovica in comparison to Mostar. The citizens of Mostar in vast majority stated that their city before the war was ethnically undivided (77 in the East and 75 in the West) or tolerable (13 in the East and 17 in the West), which further indicates that the communities lived not one next to another, but truly interconnected (every third marriage was mixed), and which further stands as a solid ground for building trust that already existed in the past.

In Mitrovica, the results are various. The majority of Serbs stated that the city was ethnically divided (44), and the same answer was given by a number of Albanians as

well (34). However, the majority of Albanians believe that the situation regarding ethnicities was tolerable (40). Only a few Albanians experienced Mitrovica before the war as ethnically undivided city (9), while this number in the North of Mitrovica is significant (28).

Several things have to be thought of when considering Mitrovica. Firstly, Serbian and Albanian side do not have the same time determinants of war, which is additional problem when analyzing answers to this question. Secondly, prevailing position is that the certain division existed ever since – it was common knowledge which side of the promenade was for Serbs and which one for Albanians, in which parts of the city predominantly lived Serbian community and in which Albanian community, and the best indicator is insignificant number of mixed marriages.

	Mitrovica	Mostar		
	North	South	East	West
9. Would you like to live like you used to before the war?				
a) yes	29	32	89	79
b) no	58	49	10	12
c) no opinion	13	19	1	9
	100	100	100	100

In Mostar, in spite of war that lasted three years, majority of interviewees on both sides of the city (89 in the East and 79 in the West) stated that they would gladly live as they used to before the war, which again indicates the fact that people were satisfied with their way of life.

In Mitrovica, the position is significantly different – the majority of both Serbs and

Albanians stated that they do not want to live as they used to before the conflict breakout. Nevertheless, the number of those who opted the answer 'other' is significant and they were stressing that going back to the old way of life is unacceptable and that it is not possible to live as before the conflict.

	Mitrovica	Mostar		
	North	South	East	West
10. Do you believe that coexistence is possible:				
a) yes	8	77	75	62
b) no	81	5	15	21
c) no opinion	9	15	5	12
d) other	2	3	5	5
	100	100	100	100

The answers to this question at a first glance seem clear and do not need additional explanation. In regard to Mostar, it is almost certain that this is the case, for more than half of the interviewees believe that coexistence is possible (75 in the East and 62 in the West). Even though the majority of interviewees in the East side expressed positive attitude, there are no major deviations in Mostar. In addition, this is supported by the fact that in Mostar the statements in favour of coexistence are not only declarative, but the effects of partially realised communalities are visible in the city itself, primarily in the administrative unification of the city.

In regard to Mitrovica, the results reached are shockingly different and give us the picture of one community (Serbian) completely closed and inexorable and another

(Albanian) open and ready for coexistence. However, the reality in Mitrovica refutes the results. In the North part of the city live Albanians which is contradictory to the position expressed by the majority of Serbian interviewees, while in the South part, there are no Serbian residents which is more than controversial in comparison to not less than 77 interviewees that believe in coexistence.

The imposed conclusion is that the interviewees, answering this question, were sending political messages. From the Albanian side it is a message about their readiness to multiethnic life that is forced on them as an obligation and often mentioned standard by the international community, while from the Serbian side it is expressed fear of possible Kosovo independence. More precisely, North Mitrovica is the last urban 'refuge' for Serbian population in Kosovo and majority of the residents believe that the coexistence would endanger their survival.

There is, also, undivided opinion that the number of Serbian interviewees answering positively on the possibility of coexistence would have been higher, had the Survey been conducted prior to March events that staggered the concept of multiethnicity.

	Mitrovica		Mostar	
11. Freedom of movement, security, normal way of life in the city depends on:	North	South	East	West
a) residents	20	11	31	34
b) local authorities	2	0	8	4
c) government authorities	3	0	3	4
d) international community	23	6	0	8
e) economic development	6	5	6	9
f) all actors together	43	73	48	35
g) other	3	4	1	5
h) no opinion	0	1	3	1
	100	100	100	100

The question that was aimed to focus on the key factors that the freedom of movement, security and normal way of life in the city mostly depend on, generated from the majority of interviewees the most neutral option, accentuating that for this process equally important are residents, local authorities, government authorities, international community and economic development. It is indicative that the number of interviewees opting for this answer is rather equal and does not go over 50%, while in South Mitrovica reaches not less than 73 interviewees. According to the Survey results, the awareness level of citizens' role in these processes is rather high in Mostar, meaning that more than 30 interviewees from both parts of the city believe that residents play the key role in providing normal way of life. Less, but still significant is the number of interviewees in the North Mitrovica (20) who chose this answer expressing a high level of awareness about citizens' role in normalization of life.

However, the most interesting are results explaining the impact of international community especially when considering North Mitrovica. Not less than 23 interviewees stressed that international community affects their security the most. This is the consequence of Serbian community depending on international community even when it is about effectuating their basic human rights – freedom of movement and right to live. It is also interesting that there were some significant changes in attitudes of both Albanians and Serbs towards the international community. Precisely, after the air raids in 1999, the Albanians had dominantly positive stand towards the international

community for they thought of them as saviors, while Serbs thought of international community as occupiers. Several years later, the Albanian community longs for independence and believes that the international presence in Kosovo is unnecessary, thus not thinking of them as allies anymore. On the other side, Serbs, in the presence of international community, see the only possibility for their existence in Kosovo province.

	Mitrovica		Mostar	
	North	South	East	West
12. Local authorities affect the situation in the city:				
a) stabilizing	23	84	18	25
b) destabilizing	36	2	41	46
c) no opinion	37	12	33	27
d) other	4	2	8	2
	100	100	100	100

The responses given when questioning the role of local authorities in Mitrovica and Mostar are diverse. For vast majority of interviewees from Mitrovica South the effect is stabilizing, while the citizens of Mitrovica North mostly expressed negative opinion about this level of authority. It is important to stress here that in the South side, local authority representatives were elected in Kosovo election, while in the North side they were appointed by the international community, which explains the responses of interviewees considering the fact that this was imposed solution.

At the same time, in Mostar, the biggest number of interviewees who conveyed their negative impressions regarding local authorities are partly consequence of recently established joint institutions. To be precise, local elections were held in autumn 2004 and local authorities were only recently formed or are still in process of establishing.

	Mitrovica		Mostar	
	North	South	East	West
13. PISG/BiH Government affect the situation in the city:				
a) stabilizing	3	77	17	19
b) destabilizing	78	4	36	48
c) no opinion	17	15	42	25
d) other	2	4	5	8
	100	100	100	100

Asking about the affect of PISG and Government of BiH, the interviewees gave similar answers as to previous question. In both parts of Mostar and in North Mitrovica, great number of interviewees expressed negative position or answered with 'no opinion' option. Only those interviewed in the South part of Mitrovica, in great percentage (77) stated that, in this case, PISG affect the situation in the city in a stabilizing way. This result can also be read in political sub-context – for Albanian community it is of high importance to show that PISG are capable to take responsibility for leading the society, while for Serbs, the key issue is to show that PISG are not capable to self-govern in the interest of all the communities.

	Mitrovica		Mostar	
14. International community affects the situation in the city:	North	South	East	West
a) stabilizing	18	37	37	27
b) destabilizing	61	11	16	31
c) no opinion	21	43	33	28
d) other	0	9	14	14
	100	100	100	100

Even though depending on the international community regarding many issues, the majority of interviewees from the North part of Mitrovica expressed the negative position regarding this actor. According to the opinion of majority of Serb interviewees (61), this position is consequence of, above all, insufficiently defined international community mission in Kosovo, lack of clear strategy and failure of the international community to protect basic human rights such as security and freedom of movement. At the same time, majority of South Mitrovica residents stated that the affect of international community is positive (37) or that they do not have opinion (43), which further explains that the Albanian community is still relatively in favour of international community, though certain changes in their position are visible.

The interviewees from the East part of Mostar in highest percentage (37) stated that the international community affects the situation in the city in stabilizing way, which, most probably, is the consequence of international community stopping the war and sufferings in BiH. The interviewees in the West part of Mostar were more skeptical regarding the international community, thus majority of them (31) expressed their negative impressions regarding this actor. There were a lot of those who believe that the position cannot be positive or negative, for sometimes international community is a stabilizing factor but sometimes also destabilizing factor.

	Mitrovica		Mostar	
15. Mutual economic interests would:	North	South	East	West
a) be factor of community rapprochement	32	63	82	63
b) not significantly affect the situation	35	4	8	17
c) communities would not support it	24	5	5	9
d) no opinion	9	17	4	10
e) other	0	11	1	1
	100	100	100	100

Mutual economic interests obviously are a precondition factor for community rapprochement and relation normalization for the residents of Mostar and South Mitrovica. This response was especially given in the East side of Mostar, where not less than 82 interviewees opted for this answer. In the North of Mitrovica, the most often answer was that the communities would not support this option (24) or that the mutual economic interests would not significantly affect the situation (35), which can be explained by the position that the security issue is above all other issues and that after the conditions for normal and safe life are met, only then the discussion about economy could commence. Provided that the first steps in Mostar have already been taken, it is clear that all the communities will turn towards rational solutions, placing the economic interests at the first place. That is, only where there is no thinking about the survival, it is possible to go to the phase of 'market match' and 'money language'.

	Mitrovica		Mostar	
	North	South	East	West
16. How NGOs and their projects affect the community rapprochement and normalization of life:				
a) do not meet the community needs	17	10	7	17
b) partially meet the community needs	49	51	57	50
c) fully meet the community needs	5	12	9	7
d) no opinion	29	24	22	22
e) other	0	3	5	4
	100	100	100	100

The highest number of interviewees in both Mostar and Mitrovica assessed the results of NGOs in bringing the communities together as partially positive. The number of those who gave this reply is almost equal, thus it is possible to conclude that NGOs have significant role in the society. Considering the short tradition of NGO sector in BiH, and especially in Kosovo, it is clear that the Survey results are encouraging.

However, it is essential for NGOs to be more visible to local population, as much open as possible and at the same time they should not incline to elitism at all. In that sense, it is important to work with the part of population that has no opinion, for they are uninformed about the possibilities, capacities and projects implemented by the NGO sector.

	Mitrovica		Mostar	
	North	South	East	West
17. Are you for the community rapprochement:				
a) yes	12	91	87	72
b) no	64	1	6	5
c) no opinion	22	7	6	23
d) other	2	1	1	0
	100	100	100	100

As in many other questions, in this one at a first glance we see the difference between Mostar and Mitrovica. In Mostar, both communities in high percentage expressed positive attitude when asked about community rapprochement, which positively testifies about the existing consensus in society and readiness of all communities to take this step and at the same time confirms that there are no hidden political messages.

On the contrary, in Mitrovica, the results show completely different positions of Serbian and Albanian communities. While the Serbian community mostly stated that they are against the rapprochement, the later has almost unanimously supported this idea. It is unbelievable that the interviewees from the South side of Mitrovica are even more ready for community rapprochement than the interviewees from Mostar where this process has de facto began several years ago.

It is obvious that the residents of Mitrovica when answering this question, were expressing their political stand – Serbs that they would loose the last urban refuge; Albanians were sending political message expected by the international community with regard to the possibility of normal life for all Mitrovica citizens, which, according to them, would create the conditions for city unification.

	Mitrovica		Mostar	
	North	South	East	
	West			
18. Which projects would contribute to the community rapprochement:				
a) economic	51	38	49	51
b) culture – sports	18	3	21	16
c) political	15	7	8	10
d) other	16	52	22	23
	100	100	100	100

In this case, from the methodological aspect, the adequate answers were not offered, thus the interviewees when answering this question, used the method of 'eliminating the worst case scenario'. Even though the Serb interviewees in all previous questions regarding different levels of authorities gave negative assessment, still 15 of them gave priority to political projects in process of community rapprochement, sending with no doubt a political message.

The highest number of Albanian interviewees opted for 'other', where most often they explained that for community rapprochement all the said projects are equally important.

The highest number of interviewees in all four communities, except in Mitrovica South, gave priority to economic projects as community rapprochement factor.



AND THE REALITY IS....

The results of the Survey conducted in Mitrovica are often contradictory with reality, and have to be additionally explained and supported by the empirical evidences. Namely, general observation of those who participated in the brochure preparation is that the answers of the interviewees in Mitrovica were mostly motivated by the dominant political stand of one or the other community. For Serbian community, it is possible to put that stand into one sentence – fear of losing the last urban refuge, i.e. urge to preserve Serb national identity in the North of Kosovo. However, Albanian community, sent politically correct messages, mostly regarding the international community, showing in this way that the coexistence in Kosovo is possible today; that the PISG is capable of guaranteeing rights to all Kosovo residents, prejudging in this way, the final status of Kosovo, i.e. independence. The answers of Albanian interviewees are, actually, in line with often mentioned standards that international community set as the key precondition for talks on Kosovo final status. This should serve as a means for understanding the responses of Albanian interviewees, for they picture requirements set by the international community in Kosovo rather than their personal opinion.

In addition, it is necessary to further explain the meaning of certain terminology used in the Survey, above all the term 'rapprochement', which, according to the opinion of the group that participated in the brochure writing, has different connotations in Serbian and Albanian community. Dominant opinion is that for Albanian community, rapprochement is equivalent to their crossing to the North side of Mitrovica and unification of the city. On the other side, Serbs fear rapprochement for they see in it the danger of assimilation that would jeopardize Serb national identity.

In order to grasp the real picture of Mitrovica before and after the war, it is not enough to consider Survey results only. To be precise, Mitrovica has always been divided city in which communities tolerated and lived next to each other, never truly connected. Empirical data support this thesis, and by far the fact that mixed marriages were exceptions and that none of the communities were in favour of those. Even when existing, mixed marriage couples were facing great difficulties and condemnation of both communities. Certainly this is one of the main differences between Mitrovica and Mostar but also one of the important obstacles for possible community rapprochement. Another difference, mentioned earlier, but the key one, is language barrier, different cultural matrices and only a few mutual points between Serbian and Albanian communities both before and especially after the war.

The next important point of the analysis is the structure of authorities in Mitrovica. Formally, Mitrovica since 1999 is one municipality even though practically functions as two municipalities. UNMIK had jurisdiction over the whole territory of Mitrovica municipality until 2002 and after the local elections in 2002 transferred the most responsibilities, including the one over budget, to local self-government. However, it has to be considered that speaking of self-government means only and exclusively Albanian municipality. On the other side, five years later, UNMIK has not found adequate solution for establishing municipality in the North that would suffice to all the requirements of Serbian population. Instead, as provisional solution, UNMIK administration was established as the only link between Serbian population and municipality in the South. Advisory Board in the North of Mitrovica has also been established which was supposed to be analogue to the elected Albanian municipality. This solution was a consequence of Serbs not voting at the Kosovo elections in 2002 and even though it was foreseen as provisional, it still lasts.

When analyzing local self-government it is necessary to compare Mitrovica and Mostar. What is different is accelerated transfer of responsibilities to local self-government bodies, but also to the PISG. That is, in Mostar, the process of transferring responsibilities from the international institutions to local government has not finished yet, even though ten years from the conflict had past. One of the most impressive examples is the decision of the international community in Mostar to keep the exclusive right to alter or veto any decision brought by the city government, which undoubtedly indicates high level of control. On the other side, the international community in Kosovo utilized different principal. Even though only five years past since the conflict ended, international community decreased its role to monitoring the work of local self-government, at least when the South municipality is in question.

Thus, in order to understand the reality of Mitrovica it was necessary to offer additional explanations along with the Survey results in which all the above stated observations are to be analysed.

PORTRAIT OF MITROVICA

Mitrovica area was populated since long time ago due to its exceptional natural resources, located on rivers of Sitnica and Ibar. It is well known that in Roman era Mitrovica was important mining and traffic center, composed of many settlements. In the time of medieval Serbian state, this area, after several centuries, had become important and at the time Trepca had developed as important mining and trading center. In the 15th century, small rural settlement Dmitrovica, for the first time was mentioned in written documents as Mitrovica. During the Ottoman reign, Mitrovica becomes town with developed crafts and trade. After the Balkan Wars, defeat of Turkey, Mitrovica area became part of Serbian Kingdom.

Mitrovica is located in grid reference 42,53° North and grid reference 20,50° East, 510 meters above sea level and under the influence of moderate continental climate.

When speaking about ethnic structure of Mitrovica, at least during the period after the World War II, the data gathered in censuses are in the table below.⁴ Censuses as of 1948, 1961, 1971, 1981 and 1991 were conducted by Federal Institute for Statistics⁵:

Year	Albanian	Serbs	Montegrin	Turks	Muslims	Roma	Croats	Slovenians	Others
1948.	7.500	4.689	851	-	-	95	135	66	901
1961.	35.015	28.923	2.708	1.674	716	-	-	-	1.589
1971.	52.285	30.128	2.509	871	2.607	1.305	-	-	1.263
1981.	66.528	25.929	2.000	789	4.519	4.330	-	-	1.227
1991.	82.837	10.698	-	431	5.205	4.851	-	-	-

The results of all the censuses in percentages are the following:

Year	Albanian	Serbs	Montegrin	Turks	Muslims	Croats	Slovenians	Roma	Others
1948.	53, 9%	30%	5, 9%	-	-	0, 9%	0, 5%	0, 8%	8%
1961.	49, 6%	41, 0%	3, 8%	2, 4%	1%	-	-	-	2, 1%
1971.	57, 5%	33, 1%	2, 8%	0, 9%	2, 8%	-	-	1, 1%	1, 3%
1981.	63, 2%	24, 6%	1, 9%	0, 7%	4, 3%	-	-	4, 1%	1, 2%
1991.	78%	10, 2%	-	0, 4%	4, 96%	-	-	4, 63%	-

After 1991, no official census has been conducted, thus it is impossible to give accurate data on numbers and size of different ethnic communities in Mitrovica. However, it has been estimated that during 1998 in Mitrovica municipality 95.231 Albanians, 10.447 Serbs, 2.000 Muslims of Slav origin, 545 Roma and 600 Turks⁶ resided.

The relevant data of Serbian population in Mitrovica practically do not exist, for as of conflict in 1999, there was a major migration of population, therefore significant number of Serbs, from other parts of Kosovo, was displaced to North Mitrovica.

According to unofficial estimates, and data of Coordination Center, Serb population in North Mitrovica is up to 23.000. It should be accentuated that the population in Mitrovica significantly raised when Pristina University, temporarily dislocated in Serbia, has been returned to Mitrovica this time. To the increase of

⁴ The first census in 1948 counted only urban population, while later included suburban and rural area.

⁵ 1991 census was boycotted by Albanian population in Kosovo.

⁶ OSCE Municipal profile, July, 2004.

Mitrovica population was contributed by March 2004 events, when high number of Serbs was displaced from several enclaves in Kosovo.

It is not possible to accurately establish Albanian population in Mitrovica South as well, for during the years of conflict and post-conflict period, part of Albanians from the North were displaced to the South part of Mitrovica. There is also a number of Albanians who came to the South part of Mitrovica from other parts of Kosovo, above all, migrating from rural to urban areas.

In order to better understand the present situation in the city, the following information is to be taken seriously. The Ibar River divides the city of Mitrovica into North, Serbian and South, Albanian side. In the South side, the population is nearly totally Albanian, apart from a small number of Bosnians and Ashkalia, while there are no Serbs in the South Mitrovica. In the North side, the majority population is Serbian, but there are also Bosnians, Roma, Ashkalia, Turks and approximately 2.000 Albanians, mainly in Bosniak Mahala, Three Towers and Mikronaselje. The North and South part of the city live practically separate since after the conflict with the minimum population mixing. KFOR checkpoint on the Main Bridge controls those who cross from one to the other side of the bridge. The city is divided administratively as well, thus there are practically two municipalities working on each side of the city.

In regard to the economy, there is no industry in Mitrovica today, which used to be a pillar of the economic development. In the last several years, in spite of natural potentials, Mitrovica Region is in the phase of stagnation.

PORTRAIT OF MOSTAR

The city of Mostar, political, financial and cultural center of Herzegovina, is located in one of the foothills of Velež, Huma i Čabulje Mountains, in the valley of the River Neretva, 60-80 meters above sea level. Mostar has almost ideal location, for it is only 60 kilometers away from the Adriatic Sea, and has excellent connections with all the main cities in BiH and in the region. In the city and its vicinity, there are important locations of immense cultural-historical heritage and they testify about life in this area.

Mostar, through the centuries, was on the crossroad of different civilisations, and their impact is visible every step of the way. Furthermore, very acceptable Mediterranean climate and number of sunny days, make this area suitable for growing vineyards and developing tourism, which were the most significant economic sectors in Mostar.

Mostar was, during the Ottoman reign, one of the most significant administrative and commercial centers of Herzegovina in the 16th century. In 1878, Mostar is part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and after the World War I becomes part of Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians.

Mostar was named after its famous Old Bridge (Mostars - the Old Bridge keepers), the main City symbol built by Suleiman the Magnificent during the 16th century. This Bridge was destroyed in 1993, during the war in the city, and rebuilt in 2004.

After World War II, Mostar developed its main economic production of tobacco, bauxite, wine and aluminum products. Especially developed economic sector before break up of Yugoslavia, was aircraft industry, 'Soko' factory.

After several attempts to find census data on Mostar before 1991, we failed, for only data about Bosnia and Herzegovina as a whole were available. According to 1991 census, the number and structure of Mostar population was as follows:

Year	Bosniacs	Croats	Serbs	Other
1991.	43.931 (34,8%)	42.648 (33,8%)	23.909 (19%)	15.579 (12,4%)

According to the unofficial estimates as of 2004 received in Mostar, the present situation in the city is as follows:

Year	Bosniacs	Croats	Serbs	Other
2004.	50.022	50.935	3.644	856

The City of Mostar has, after the war, been divided into East, Bosnian and West, Croatian part. The division line, in spite of erroneous beliefs, was not along the Neretva River. During the post-war years, Mostar was under direct control of international community, i.e. European Union, which only in 2004 started to transfer majority of responsibilities to the city that again contributes to the accelerated process of city unification.

Decision on administrative unification of the city was made in 2004 and six municipalities by the time (three with Croatian national majority and three with Bosnian national majority) in both parts of the city were unified in one municipality. The first independent elections were held, with no direct involvement of the international community. The process of rebuilding unified city is still on going thus the establishing of unified institutions and bodies is to be expected. Certainly, the whole process is by far created by the international community, which is at the same time the main supervisor of all activities taken in this regard.

SUMMARY OF MEETINGS HELD IN MOSTAR

Meeting with media representatives

In Mostar, most of the TV stations are commercial, which is the consequence of market requirements. In the past several years, especially after the formal unification of the city, there is a trend of elimination of national prefixes in media.

Speaking of ownership structure, primarily of radio stations, most of them are private with only three socially owned radio stations.

Paper media, daily newspapers, news weeks, mostly are from all over BiH, even though there is great influx of Croatian papers (Slobodna Dalmacija, Večernji list, etc.) which tells much about specific 'interest zone'. The only Mostar daily 'Dnevni list' is distributed all over BiH, but is not one of the most published. There are also several important news agencies in Mostar.

The key position in Mostar, but all over BiH as well, is taken by the Central Regulatory Agency (CRA) that promulgates conditions and criteria for all media. This Commission censored all programmes considered as provocative, discriminating or propagandist for 'language of hatred'. The impact of the CRA is certainly higher towards electronic media. On the other side, paper media are not controlled as much, thus the 'language of hatred' still can be found.

Radio 088, local Mostar radio is the first that started with programmes aiming at community rapprochement, on the initiative of the international community. For years ago, this radio had a concept of multiethnicity, i.e. all ethnic groups were employed, and they all provided information from both parts of the city.

The process of media unification started five, six years ago, in BiH proper, and it has been ongoing at the same time in Mostar as well. Although, significant progress has been made, there is still no space to talk about unified media sector.

The basic obstacle that Bosnian media face today, is market 'game' that imposes its own rules. The media are in critical phase in which the educational role has got lost as well as pointing to real values and key social problems.



Meeting with NGO representatives

NGOs in Mostar have started to work immediately after the war, mostly on the initiative of international community and donors' who recognized the need in encompassing part of population that cannot be covered by the work of government (state) institutions. Although, there are no precise data on number of registered NGOs in Mostar, there is series of NGOs who have successfully worked for years.

Today, same as at the time of establishing, Mostar NGOs work in parts of society where the problems are acute. They initiate the projects for local community, for they are in close contact with grassroots level and can clearly recognize their needs.

One of the good examples certainly is NGO 'Mladi Most', established in 1994, when volunteers from Holland and Germany arrived to Mostar, to convey their experiences and help establishing organization that would gather youth. The main idea was to create a safe area where the youngsters could hold meetings with no trouble at all, and where they could exchange ideas and prepare projects. Most of the implemented projects were of socio-cultural type, at least when youth was considered. Number of meetings with youth participation were organized, with the main objective to establish communication and trust.

The problems NGOs were facing several years ago are not the same as problems they face today. Four years ago, the biggest obstacle was to win over the population break down the mistrust, and today it is a problem of lack of financial resources. The donors are withdrawing lately, focusing funds on other 'hot' societies, and even if they do not withdraw, they have difficulties in understanding local needs.

The second example is organization of the Center of Civil Initiatives that was also established with the international community support. Most of the activists gained experience working for NDI and then started independent activities. NDI helped them to gather, to present ideas and to build network of offices in Mostar, Sarajevo, Banja Luka and Tuzla. Today, the Centers of Civil Initiatives have expanded and have offices in ten cities BiH wide. Even though the working concept is multiethnic, 'national keys' that would decide on numbers of employed Bosnians, Croats and Serbs have never existed. The basic criteria were the will to implement the projects of importance to local community and for the whole BiH population. Thus, multiethnicity was the ultimate result rather than self-set objective.

The experience of all NGOs in Mostar, indicates that it is better to work on less painful issues first, and then move to more sensitive problems. In these terms, economic processes should be resolved prior to social issues.

Insisting on multiethnicity is not fruitful. If these projects have the required form rather than contents, they cannot significantly affect the position of local community. Thus, the NGOs need to be consistent in their contact with donors and to insist on most rational approaches after they examine the community needs. The citizens' initiatives have showed as most efficient, but the positive political environment is a precondition for project implementation.

Meeting with Trust Building Measures Board

Seeing that the divided city is not effective and not wanting for Mostar to be remembered as such, one year ago the international community in cooperation with the local authorities decided to unify the city first through administration and then in terms of political and institutional unification. The key motive for this idea was to overcome the divisions for divided city are paradigm of tensions, hatred and are always on the 'black lists' (Belfast, Jerusalem, Mostar, Mitrovica, etc.). The divided cities are

centers to be avoided and cannot be economically developed. After the war ended, when Mostar officially was divided into East and West part, the division had an impact on culture, politics and finally the whole image of the city (1993 - 2004).

The first step in unification of Mostar was offering City Statute that would abolish municipalities with national prefix. It is important to stress that there were six municipalities – three in the East, Bosnian side and three in the West, Croatian side. The Commission that created the Statute, formed in 2003, managed to agree on the Statute only on January 15, 2004. Eventually, due to mutual disagreements and inability to find adequate solution, the international community and High Representative for BiH, Lord Paddy Ashdown, imposed the Statute on the Commission. The purpose of the Statute was to change institutional and administrative framework, to establish one budget, one urban plan and joint services. However, the legal instruments are not sufficient unless they are followed by increasing trust in the city. Thus, the Trust Building Measures Committee has been established with its task to follow administrative unification of the city. Ashdown also appointed members of the Committee but in accordance to the consultations with Mostar Mayer, Deputy Mayer and wide consultations with all the relevant actors in the community. The Committee members are eminent and famous, stand for the united city, and want to show by their personal examples that coexistence is possible. Certainly, ethnic balance was thought of, as well as age and gender.

The guiding principle of the Committee is to be vox populi, and to express the most important needs of the citizens. After idea gathering is completed, the Committee submits to the city government project proposals aimed at improving the way of life in Mostar.

The Committee should be seen as voice of citizens' initiatives joint in one place, rather than shadow government of alternative authority. What the Committee is famous for in Mostar are recommendations for city government and this year it will insist on these.

Undivided stand of the Committee members is that the decision for unification was not imposed, but brought as the necessity of the city. Today, only a few question these 'imposed' decisions. It was of key importance to bring such decision, for it was the only way for city to progress. Now, the situation is drastically changed – the international community is withdrawing and the process is more and more becoming local. The international community in Mostar enjoys the trust of local population, which is significantly different in comparison to Mitrovica. Furthermore, in Mostar, the unification process is on going since 1996, and the responsibilities are gradually transferred to local authorities and this process has not finished yet. The opinion of the Board members is that the process of transferring responsibilities must not be forced, as is the case in Kosovo, until the essential conditions in the communities are not met and the level of awareness and capabilities is not raised. This assumption is correct and supported by the fact that the first fully independent elections, with no involvement of the international community whatsoever, were held in autumn in 2004.

However, the most important result in Mostar was acknowledgement of the situation that existed before the war. When the city unification started, the only valid census considered was the one of 1991, that registered 34% of Bosnians, 33% of Croats, 19 % Serbs, thus the authority structure was designed in accordance to these percentage values. This is a positive solution that gives the possibility to all communities to return to Mostar.

Meeting with city government representatives

As mentioned earlier in the analysis, the first independent local elections in Mostar were held in autumn 2004, after the administrative unification of the city. Today, city operates with City Council President and his two deputies (representatives of all ethnic communities are in these positions). In addition, the city government is divided in five departments covering the main sectors, and those to services.

Until 1999, the law on return was in power, and it declaratively stated that everyone has the right to return to their homes and that the property must be returned to legal owners. The law provides services that were to deal with these issues, but no one knew how to implement this. The process started in 1999, in Mostar and has not completed yet. Nearly 98% of property has been returned to their legal owners. The procedures and deadlines for return of property were established, but primarily the political will to successfully conduct this process was established. The key idea of the process was legal process, the law regulations that were to be strictly met. The first step was the revision of returnees' ownership documentation. The city, also built several thousands of apartments for those whose houses were destroyed or illegally occupied. Significant funds were allocated for apartment renting in order to evict illegal occupants. All these issues were necessary to solve in order to minimize tensions and possible conflicts. The role of the international community was also crucial. High level of control of local officers was established and two heads of departments were dismissed due to their obstruction of the process.

When speaking about returnees, the conclusion is that the returns process in Mostar is successful and that the number of returnees from other cities is much lower. The key reason is certainly economical – the lack of adequate employment, due to which people reluctantly decide to change the environment. Regarding jobs, only state institutions are safe to work with, for they are obliged to employ people in accordance to the 1991 census, i.e. following the ethnical representation.

The city government representatives, also, stressed that the role of OSCE was decisive in the returns process in Mostar.

Financial moment is of key importance for city unification, thus joint budget and money allocation was insisted on. After the war, it was essential to have more than one municipality, but during the time, they become an obstacle for economic prosperity of the city. Joint budget was endorsed in mid 2004 and survived only due to the efforts of international community. The budget of Mostar is partially loaded by local fees. However, without donations for the international community, it would not be possible to cover all the activities that are supposed to be covered from the budget. As one of the instruments for enhancing the economic situation in the city, the Regional Development Agency has been established in order to develop strategic plans. Mostar has number of opportunities for development – existing industrial zone, airport, roads, wine production, excellent location and climate, thus all preconditions for tourism.

Analysis of NGOs in Mostar

Conducted analysis has mostly encompassed NGOs working on the trust building and good government and lasted since June last year. Active NGOs in Mostar have the following characteristics:

- Qualified staff;
- Methodologically developed approach;
- Good connections with local community;
- Projects based on local community needs;

Based on the preliminary results, the impact of NGOs, at least when we speak about trust building and good government is not high. Thus, local NGOs have to get closer to local community and have to rely on expert analysis of their needs. Furthermore, based on the gathered data regarding the needs of local community, NGOs have to learn how to 'pack in' the projects and make them acceptable to donors.

Activities of Mostar NGOs are as follows:

- Organizing seminars and workshops, mostly of educational character;
- Lobbying;
- Humanitarian aid;

Meeting with Center for Peace and Multiethnic Cooperation representatives

The main objective of this organization is to gather all the material about pre-war, war and post-war events in Mostar (1990-2000) at one place. The Center was established in February 16, 2001. The material gathered includes video material of different Bosnian and international media, newspaper articles 1990 – 2000, photographs of war times, etc.

Some of the implemented projects are:

- Documentary film 'Peace from Mostar';
- Documentary film 'Old Bridge', from destroying to rebuilding it;
- Monograph of Mostar;
- Exhibition 'Old Bridge – Monument of Peace' that traveled around the world and returned to Mostar when the rebuilt Old Bridge was reopened.

Also, the Reward for Peace was found, and this reward is to be awarded every year on the day of opening the Bridge, July 23. Vaclav Havel was the first to receive this award.



QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How often do you cross to the North/South, i.e. East/West part of the city?
a) Have not crossed it after the war 1
b) Every day 2
c) Often 3
d) Rarely 4
2. What are the most often reasons for crossing to the other side of the bridge?
a) Regular employment – regular job 1
b) The need 2
c) Visit to friends / family 3
d) Curiosity / Stroll 4
e) Other 5
3. If you do not cross to the other side of the city, what are the reasons?
a) Fear / Security 1
b) No need 2
c) Do not want to go 3
d) Other 4
4. Have you always lived in the part of the city you live in now?
a) Yes 1
b) No 2
5. When in the other side of the city, you felt:
a) Safe 1
b) Unsafe 2
c) Pleasant 3
d) Unpleasant 4
e) Confused 5
f) No opinion 6
g) Other 7
6. When crossing to the other part of the city, people treated you:
a) Cordially 1
b) Friendly 2
c) Unkind 3
d) Hostile 4
e) Did not communicate, so do not know 5
f) No opinion 6
g) Other 7
7. You personally experience people in the other side of the city as:
a) Close 1
b) Strange 2
c) Friendly 3
d) Hostile 4
e) No opinion 5
f) Other 6
8. Did you experience your city before the war as:
a) Ethnically divided 1
b) Ethnically undivided 2
c) Tolerable 3
d) No opinion 4
e) Other 5
9. Would you like to live like you used to before the war?
a) Yes 1
b) No 2
c) No opinion 3
10. Do you believe that coexistence is possible?
a) Yes 1
b) No 2
c) No opinion 3
d) Other 4

11. Freedom of movement, security, normal life in the city depends on:

a) Residents	1
b) Local authorities	2
c) Government authorities	3
d) International community.....	4
e) Economic development	5
f) All actors together	6
g) No opinion	7
h) Other	8

12. Local authorities affect the situation in the city:

a) Stabilizing	1
b) Destabilizing	2
c) No opinion	3
d) Other	4

13. PISG / BiH Government affect the situation in the city:

a) Stabilizing	1
b) Destabilizing	2
c) No opinion	3
d) Other	4

14. International community affects the situation in the city:

a) Stabilizing	1
b) Destabilizing	2
c) No opinion	3
d) Other	4

15. Mutual economic interests would:

a) Be a factor of community rapprochement.....	1
b) Not significantly affect the situation	2
c) Community would not support it	3
d) No opinion	4
e) Other	5

16. How NGOs and their projects affect the community rapprochement and normalization of life:

a) Do not meet community needs.....	1
b) Partially meet community needs	2
c) Fully meet community needs.....	3
d) No opinion	4
e) Other	5

17. Are you for the community rapprochement:

a) Yes	1
b) No.....	2
c) No opinion	3
d) Other	4

18. Which projects would contribute to the community rapprochement:

a) Economic	1
b) Cultural-sports.....	2
c) Political	3
d) Other	4

Gender:	Female		Male			
Age:			Scale:	I	II	III
Education			Level:	I	II	III
Working status			Status:	I	II	III
Are you religious?	Yes	No	Religion			

Interviewer:

Name and surname	Group No.
City part	
No of questionnaire:	

Interviewee:

Criteria for the Survey Sample

1. Survey Group No: _____ Name and surname _____

Name and surname _____

2. City part _____ Time: AM PM

3. No. of Questionnaires signed in for: 10 + 2 spare

4. No. of questionnaires signed out after the 1st phase _____ Unfilled _____

5. Gender structure 50: 50

Female		Male		
--------	--	------	--	--

6. Age structure:

18 - 25 years of age	30% or 3 per interviewer	Scale I			
25 - 40 years of age	30% or 3 per interviewer	Scale II			
40 - 60 years of age	30% or 3 per interviewer	Scale III			
60 years of age ▲	10% or 1 per interviewer	Scale IV			

7. Educational structure:

Primary school	10% or 1 per interviewer	Level I				
High school	60% or 6 per interviewer	Level II				
Higher education	30% or 3 per interviewer	Level III				

8. Working status:

Employed	30% or 3 per interviewer	Status I				
Unemployed	40% or 4 per interviewer	Status II				
Retired	10% or 1 per interviewer	Status III				
Private business	20% or 2 per interviewer	Status IV				

Publisher: NGO "Jelena Anzudska" Mitrovica
Editor in Chief: Nevenka Medic
Translated into English by: Biljana Todorovic
Circulation: 300 copies



Starting Project activities in Mostar



Meeting with Civil Issues Council



Meeting with Mostar NGOs



Interviewing in the field
Famous jumper from Mostar Old Bridge



Meeting with City Government representatives

PARTNERS

NGO „Mission of People of Good Will", Zvečan
Tel: +381 63 8 164 796
E-mail: pepelnica02@yahoo.com

NGO „Mitrovica", Mitrovica South
Tel: +377 44 146 233
E-mail: s-sadiku@yahoo.com

NGO „Sunčana strana", Mostar
Tel: +387 61 216 449
E-mail: sunnyside@atalantbh.com

Implementing Agency:
NGO „Jelena Anžujska", Mitrovica North
E-mail: nmedic2001@yahoo.com
Tel: +381 63 8 310 318

Funded by:
British Office Priština
Tel: 038 249 559
Fax: 038 249 779



British Office
Pristina