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INTRODUCTION

The NGO Info-centre, in cooperation with the Macedonian Centre for European Training (MCET), implement a programme for monitoring of media coverage and treatment of European integration processes in Macedonia, under the auspices of the "It Is Time for EU" project, supported by the Institute for Sustainable Communities (ISC) and the Foundation Open Society Institute Macedonia.

This report covers the period from February 1 to April 14, 2009 (the monitoring covers the Mondays’ and Thursdays’ programmes of television broadcasters; and Tuesdays’ and Fridays’ reporting in the daily newspapers).

The analyses includes the coverage in seven daily newspapers (Utrinski vesnik; Dnevnik; Vest; Večer; Vreme; Nova Makedonija and Špic) and the central news programmes aired on seven TV stations that broadcast nationally and over the satellite (A1 TV; Kanal 5 TV; Sitel TV; Telma TV; MTV 1; Alfa TV; and Alsat TV).1

The monitoring doesn't include the media in the languages of non-majority communities because of the limited financial and human resources.

The methodology shows the quality of the published information from the aspect of journalistic standards, whether the media/journalists used named sources, whether they consulted all stakeholders, the genres they used, the dominating genres, the treatment of facts and arguments.

The methodology also allows conducting analysis of the contents of the information on the European integrations presented not just by the media, but also by the Government, the political parties and the expert community. This monitoring programme analyzed the levels of understanding of the European Union and European integration processes, the use of terminology and language.

---

1 Central news programmes: A1 – 19:00 hours; Kanal 5 – 19:30; Sitel – 18:00; Telma – 18:30; MTV 1- 20:00; Alpha – 22:00; and Alsat TV – 22:30h.
1. QUANTITATIVE OVERVIEW

Total number of published and aired articles - 498;

Број на анализирани прилози во печатените медиуми: 250 (50%)
- Utrinski vesnik – 51 (10%)
- Vreme – 40 (8%)
- Špic – 39 (8%)
- Dnevnik – 37 (7%)
- Večer – 36 (7%)
- Nova Makedonija – 35 (7%)
- Vest – 12 (2%)

Number of articles in broadcast media: 248 (50%)
- Sitel TV – 50 (10%)
- MTV1 – 39 (8%)
- Alsat TV – 38 (7%)
- Kanal 5 TV – 37 (7%)
- A1 TV – 35 (7%)
- Alpha TV – 27 (5%)
- Telma TV – 22 (4%)

In terms of the used genres, the break-down is as follows:
- Reports – 399 (80%)
- Commentary/Reports – 20 (4%)
- News – 1 (0.2%)
- Statements – 39 (8%)
- Commentaries – 16 (3%)
- Analyses – 3 (0.4%)
- Interviews - 18 (4%)
- Portrait – 2 (0.4%)

2. QUALITY ANALYSIS

The coverage of the European integration processes was dominated by five topics: the Presidential and Local Elections; the dispute with Greece over the name of the country; liberalisation of visa regimes; the instrument for pre-accession assistance – IPA; and EU enlargement in general. This Quarterly Report refers to all five topics individually.

2.1. PRESIDENTIAL AND LOCAL ELECTIONS

For Macedonia to conduct fair and democratic elections, in accordance with the Election Law, was possibly the most important criteria for European integrations and likely the last opportunity for the state to prove that it has the capacity to conduct immaculate elections. This report shall focus exclusively in the media coverage of the elections, without comments on the elections themselves. The media coverage of the Presidential and Local Elections 2009 was correct and balanced, providing the public with sufficient information to ensure the voters would make an informed decision whether to vote and for whom.
2.1.1. LOCAL EXPERTS OVERSHADOWED BY MEMBERS OF THE DIPLOMATIC CORPS

Even before the election campaign started, the media presented messages of the international community about the importance of the elections for Macedonia. The media also carried the first warnings by the local experts (Shasivari, Suleimani, Dauti, Karakamiševa, Ismail, Maleski, Kartalov, Mirčev, Tonovski, Stojanovski, Mehmeti, Kekenovski, Taseva, Acevski, Arsovski, Osmanli, Budžakovski, Bilali, Daskalovski, Petrovski, Georgiev, etc.)\(^2\), including the representatives of the civil sector (Aleksov, Deral, Milčin, etc.).\(^3\) The local experts, albeit offering a variety of opinions, all called for fair and democratic elections. Their views were much more present in the media before the elections – especially in the print media – then after the elections. After the elections, the local experts were more interested in analyzing the issue of concentration of power than the electoral process itself (Maksuti, Shasivari, Andov, Ružin, Karakamiševa)\(^4\).

There was also abundance of information about the activities of the members of the diplomatic corps stationed in Macedonia, who were actively involved in the campaign, from the beginning to the end of elections, in order to help Macedonia meet the EU’s benchmark and hold fair and democratic elections. The first warnings that fair and democratic elections were needed came from the Enlargement Commissioner Olie Rehn\(^5\), to be followed by statements by the other ambassadors stationed in Macedonia. French ambassador Valero\(^6\) said: “We back only one candidate – the democracy” clearly noting that their involvement in the campaign aimed to assist the development of democracy. The Campaign Mission of the Council of Europe\(^7\) was also covered by the media.

The media also reported the positions of the institutions involved in the electoral process – the State Elections Commission and the Broadcasting Council regularly informed the public about the latest developments and decisions, earning the praise of the international community.

The media also carries reports on Elections in Macedonia printed and aired by the foreign media, after the two rounds of elections. Most commonly quoted were reports by BBC, Deutsche Welle, Reuters, Kommersant, Elefteros Typos, EPT, the Irish Times, Al Jazeera and the Economist\(^8\).

2.1.2. WARNINGS NEVER CEASED

The media carried the statements by international representatives both when they praised the participants in the elections and when they issued warnings. Jose Luis Herero, the Head of the OSCE Spillover Mission, regularly promoted the importance of the democratic processes, noting that: “The responsibility for any incidents doesn’t lie solely with the state institutions. They just provide the rules and it is the political entities and the citizens that play the game”\(^9\). Thomas Navratil, Deputy Chief of Mission at the US Embassy, on the occasion of the International Day of Elections pointed out how important it was for the Elections “to improve the impression made by the 2008 Elections”\(^10\). Brussels was the first to greet the leaders’ meetings, but didn’t miss the opportunity to note that “The concerns regarding the start of election campaign were far more important”\(^11\).

---

\(^2\) Vreme, February 2; A1 TV, February 5; Sitel TV, February 5; Nova Makedonija, February 6; Vreme, February 6; Dnevnik, February 20; Špic, February 20; Nova Makedonija, February 27; Nova Makedonija, March 10; Dnevnik, March 17; Vreme, March 17; Špic, March 31, 2009

\(^3\) Sitel TV, Alpha TV, Alsat TV, February 5, 2009

\(^4\) Špic, April 7, 2009

\(^5\) Kanal 5 TV, February 9, 2009

\(^6\) Sitel TV, February 12, 2009

\(^7\) Dnevnik, February 24, 2009

\(^8\) Špic, March 24; Nova Makedonija, March 7, 2009

\(^9\) Nova Makedonija, February 2009

\(^10\) Alsat TV, February 5, 2009

\(^11\) Kristina Nagy, Kanal 5 TV, February 23, 2009
There was an evident intensification of diplomatic visits to Macedonia before the elections, in support to the EU integration processes in the country. The media covered the visit by Mirek Topolanek in his office as the President of the Czech Presidency, Eric Meyer and other representatives of European countries. Some of the warnings issued by EU officials referred to the fair access to the candidates in the Presidential and Local Elections for all media. German Minisiter of State Gernot Erler didn't miss the opportunity to comment, in his meeting with the state leadership, that "We know that the candidates don't always have fair access to the media, especially the electronic media. It would be good to resolve that matter, too."

Before the official start of the election campaign, the media reported the numerous attempts to pressure and blackmail the voters, and carried the statements by opposition representatives: "VMRO-DPMNE holds them (the citizens) hostages, blackmailing them to bring at least 20 persons, family members and friends to vote in the March Elections. Similar pressure is evident in healthcare and education systems" (Mende Dinevski, SDSM). Information and reactions about pressure on the electorate and civil servants were reported during the whole election process. Before the second round of elections, the government received warnings from EU Ambassador Fouere regarding the "intimidation and threats against the voters, which have been substantiated with solid body of evidence". Fouere also noted that "efforts need to be invested, on national and local level, to make the citizens understand that they are voting for a person, not for a party... Lamentably, in a number of municipalities, confusion between the person and the party is in evidence, which is not good for the local democracy". Gruevski reacted quickly: "If any form of intimidation and pressure are noted, regardless of the institution or level of government of their origin and the party affiliation of the perpetrators, we will take all legally available measures to prevent and sanction such actions."

The media covered the consequences of Prime Minister's belated reaction in the reporting on the findings of ODIHR, quoting Peter Eicher: "Almost all claims and allegations referred to actions by civil servants and activities of the ruling party."

2.1.3. ABSENCE OF DEBATE

With the exception of the first debate of the presidential candidates on Telma TV and the failed attempt (Gjorge Ivanov's absence) to organize a debate by Alsat TV in the first round, and the debate between candidates Frčkoski and Ivanov on MTV 1 in the second round, there were no debates between the candidates in the media. The media tried to fill the void with detailed presentations of presidential candidates and their election platforms. On the other hand, the citizens were denied information on the local leaders they were expected to vote for in the elections. With that in mind, Ambassador Fouere said: "The campaign did not offer much excitement, and a number of debate were little more than a forum for exchange of insults... The debate between the two candidates last Friday was a disappointment. That is not what the citizens expect from a leader. The last debate didn't offer any explanation or elaboration of candidate's plans of action once they take the helm of the country."

Some media tried to provoke a debate in their coverage of events related to the Elections, like the violently interrupted debate of the Citizens for European Macedonia movement in Struga by a group of thugs and even tried to connect the Freedom Square protests in Skopje with the Elections, quoting Fouere: "The violent participants in the protests that we saw on TV have to be punished. If it is proven that they are activist of any political party, they need to be expelled immediately."

---

12 A1, MTV, Sitel, Alpha, Alsat, March 12; Dnevnik, Špic, Utrinski vesnik, Večer, Vreme, March 13, 2009
13 Dnevnik, February 2009
14 Interview with Fouere, Nova Makedonija, April 3, 2009
15 A1, April 2, 2009
16 Nova Makedonija, April 7, 2009
17 Intervju with Fouere, Nova Makedonija, April 3, 2009
18 A1, February 19, 2009
19 Špic, Utrinski vesnik, March 31, 2009
During the period covered by this analysis, “Nova Makedonija” daily went step further and amended the report on the distribution of funds from the Budget for the nongovernmental sector with reactions from representatives of civic associations that disproved of Government’s actions commenting that “it is not ethical to announce funding competition on the eve of election campaign” (“NGOs will Compete for Budget Funding During Elections”).

Having in mind the absence of any debate during the campaign, the statements by almost all opposition leaders that elections were peaceful but not fair didn’t surprise anyone. Menduh Thaçi, the leader of DPA, explained that: “The fact that the ballot stations in which his party traditional won were flooded by the Police”, while Jovan Manasievski, the leader of LDP, put emphasis on the “strong pressure by both the central and local governments”.

2.1.4. (AB)USES OF EU IN ELECTION CAMPAIGN

In this campaign, the European Union was again in the focus of attention, starting with Imer Selmani’s “candidacy for Europeisation of Macedonia” to the “small diplomatic victory” of Ivica Bocevski, Deputy Prime Minister charged with EU Integrations.

After the release from the Office of the Speaker of the Assembly, Trajko Veljanovski stated that “free and fair democratic elections will mean that the visa regime will be abolished and we will get start of negotiations date in October”, unnamed “sources in the Government” denied that information and didn’t miss the opportunity to add that “barring any obstacles of subjective nature, i.e. if the preparedness of Macedonia is judged on basis of real criteria, the country will be prepared for full integration in EU sometimes in 2012”.

The statements by members of expert community carried by the media supported the thesis that Macedonia is prepared for EU membership and that “if Elections are peaceful..., there should be no reason why we shouldn’t get the visa regime abolished and a date to start negotiations with EU by the end of the year”.

Another topic regularly brought up and abused by candidates and other political entities in the context of EU was the visa liberalisation (see in more details in the section on Visa Liberalisation - 2.3).

As in previous elections, again it was the matter of access to European funds that was abused the most. Messages that the access to financial support and the IPA funds to municipalities may be guaranteed only if they were lead by mayors supported by the Government are pure misinformation and the European Union duly reacted to deny them. “That is not right. It bends the truth, having in mind the fact that the way in which European funds go to a given municipality doesn’t depend on who will win, but what kind of projects it will offer.”

2.2. THE NAME DISPUTE

2.2.1. VIEWS PRESENTED BY REPRESENTATIVES OF EU, GREECE AND THE GOVERNMENT

The dispute over the name of the Republic of Macedonia dominated the media coverage in the period covered by this report. The media presented Commissioner Rehn's messages to the Macedonian Government, before and after the Presidential and Local Elections, repeating EC’s position that the solution of the name dispute, together with the other reforms, is essential for Macedonia to start the negotiations for EU membership: “Olli Rehn said yesterday in Brussels that, in addition to the basic European demands, Macedonia will have to solve the name dispute...”
if it wanted to start membership negotiations".26 "...The good neighbourly relations, including the solution for the name dispute, remain crucial. For that reason, I believe that the new mandate for leadership of the country will lead to renewed efforts to make good progress in that area, too".27 One of the key recommendations in the last Report by the European Parliament also refers to the need to urgently solve the dispute between Macedonia and Greece, with the EP expecting from the two countries to remain dedicated to the negotiations, in spite of the application with the International Court of Justice in the Hague: “The European Parliament called the Macedonian Government to demonstrate solidarity with the neighbours on cultural and historical matters and to prevent the emergence of hate-speech".28

In that context, the media carried numerous statements by Macedonian and Greek government officials. The two sides presented quite opposed views and used heated rhetoric.

The media carried the statement by Greek foreign minister Dora Bakoiani: "Our common European future demands that we leave our Balkans’ past behind. The Government in Skopje has to share that wish. You can’t find a single person in the Greek Parliament that would change his or her position on the Greek national policies. I believe that solution can be found that would allow Skopje to proceed towards its Euro-Atlantic prospects".29 The media also published the contents of the letter that Bakoiani sent to the Macedonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in response to Minister Milošoski’s initiative to improve the relations between the two countries: “…Regarding the name issue, that is the essence of the problems in the relations of our countries, Greece has made an important step forward through the acceptance of the single 'erga omnes' compound name that could include the term "Macedonia", with a modifier that will make the distinction between your country and people and Greek Macedonia and its population…".30

PM Gruevski said in the interview for Sitel TV (also carried by „Večer” daily): “Their (the Greek) position is to change the identity, the name of the language, the nation, the Constitution, passports and to expand the use of FYROM everywhere, bilaterally, multilaterally, abroad and inside the country”.31 Some media reported Milošoski’s view that "...Macedonia doesn't depend on Euro-Atlantic integrations and produces stability itself...".32 and that “...the postponed accession into NATO and EU will not reflect negatively on interethnic relations in the country...”. The media quoted Milošoski’s statement: “Macedonia passed its test in 1993. It is now a country that contributes to peace and stability in the region".33 Macedonian Government officials commented on the proposals made by mediator Nimetz. For example, Deputy Foreign Minister Zoran Petrov said: „The negotiations on the name are frozen, but not because of the elections in Macedonia and Greece, but because of the last several absurd proposals made by mediator Nimetz".34

Having in mind the sensitive nature of the name-dispute and the secrecy that surrounds the package offered by the UN Facilitator, the media de facto lack proper access to official information. Therefore, the conclusion is that the public opinion on this matter of utmost importance is created almost exclusively under the influence of statements given by Macedonian and Greek government representatives. The content analysis of the articles covered by the monitoring during this period shows that there are no consultations or debate on the name-dispute in Macedonia. An exception from the conclusion were the statements of a number of intellectuals who hold positions quite opposite to those of the Government: “We must make effort to find a compromise. Otherwise, not only the country will remain outside EU and

26 Utrinski vesnik, February 6, 2009
27 Kanal 5, April 5, 6; Utrinski vesnik, April 7; Telma TV, April 6; Alpha, April 6
28 Telma, March 12, 2009
29 A1, February 2, 2009
30 Alpha, March 30, 2009
31 Večer, February 17, 2009
32 Vest, February 3, 2009
33 MTV 1, February 2, 2009
34 A1, March 5, 2009
NATO, but it will face demands for federalisation or cantonisation, in view of the fact that European integrations were the point of cohesion that connected Albanians and Macedonians”. (Branko Gerovski)35

2.2.2. THE NAME IN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS CAMPAIGN

The name dispute dominated the campaign. Journalists insisted that all presidential candidates should present their own views of the problem. VMRO-DPMNE’s candidate Gjorge Ivanov emphasized that “…both in NATO and EU we want to remain Macedonian, not some other or nameless nation…”36 And “…since ‘former Yugoslav’ denotes a situation, not a name, our only conclusion is that we are the Republic of Macedonia and we have to stick to that… The name dispute is not Macedonian problem anymore, it is not problem for America itself…”37 Ivanov claimed that: “…Macedonia’s strategy is based on strong non-partisan unity in the country”38 and that he would “…make efforts to improve the relations with the neighbouring countries and to get Macedonia into NATO and EU, in a dignified manner and not at any cost…”39

SDSM’s candidate Frčkoski said that he will get Macedonia into EU and NATO because he had a solution for the name that would preserve the Macedonian identity: “That is a guarantee for our national identity, the Macedonian name and Macedonian state. The Republic of Macedonia remains the Constitutional name, it will not change, while the name for international use that will replace the FYROM will be better than what VMRO-DPMNE accepted before Bucharest – Republic of Macedonia (Skopje)”40. LDP’s candidate Nano Ružin said “if the country wants to progress towards NATO and EU, the name dispute with Greece has to be solved”41.

The candidates of the Albanian parties Agron Buxhaku (DUI), Imer Selmani (New Democracy) and Mirushe Hoxha (DPA) openly advocated a solution of the dispute and Macedonia’s integration into NATO and EU. Buxhaku said: “I will appeal to find a solution for the problem as soon as possible, with EU’s mediation following the example of Croatia and Slovenia”42; Selmani said: “Macedonian needs to know how to build excellent relations with Kosovo, Albania, Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia, since we could hardly convince Europe that we are good if we are not good with our nearest neighbours”43, and Hoxha said: “A solution for the problem of the name is needed if we want to see ourselves in NATO and EU”44.

2.2.3. ANTIQUITY CAMPAIGN VS. GOOD RELATIONS WITH GREECE

The Communication of the European Commission to the EU Council and the European Parliament in March 2008, as well as the 2008 Progress Report for Macedonia, states precisely that Macedonia, in order to be able to build good relations with Greece, needs to restrain itself from provoking statements and activities. Some of the media included in this report also noted the contents of EC’s recommendation: “Macedonia should restrain itself from statements and activities that could provoke our neighbour to the South - that is the definition of good neighbourly relations as defined by EU’s communication to the other European institutions”45.

35 A1, March 5, 2009
36 Utrinski vesnik, March 6, 2009
37 Utrinski vesnik, February 17, 2009
38 Utrinski vesnik, March 3, 2009
39 Vreme, March 6, 2009
40 Večer, March 6, 2009
41 Telma TV, March 5, 2009
42 Večer, March 3, 2009
43 Večer, March 6, 2009
44 Sitel TV, March 5, 2009
45 MTV 1, February 23, 2009
Deputy Prime Minister Bocevski, asked in the interview he gave to Alpha TV “Why didn’t you follow the recommendation in the last report to avoid provoking Greece and did exactly the opposite before the New Year’s Holidays?”, Bocevski avoided a direct answer and said: “Since Macedonian independence, there have been various documents coming from Brussels that contain various provocations and negations.”

The Financial Times, in an article carried by the Macedonian media, doesn’t put all the blame for the dispute on Greece alone: “One example is the moment when Macedonian leaders renamed the main trans-European highway North-South after Alexander the Great. It is a manner of encroachment of the legendary Macedonian leader as a hero in the context of the contemporary state populated by majority Slavic Macedonians. When the news arrived in Brussels, EU’s representatives dispaired. The Greeks used it to harden their positions further.” In that context, we have the statements by high officials of the Greek Government, who harden their rhetoric towards Macedonia and strengthen their positions in the EU: “There are issues that remain an obstacle on FYROM’s progress towards NATO and EU, like the problem of the name, the provocations by the state leadership and the nationalism” (Greek PM Karamanlis for Naftembonik daily), i.e. “lamentably, the provocative positions adopted by FYROM prevents the creation of a climate of mutual trust”, (Bakoiani).

During the period covered by this report, the media intensified the debate about the material damages Macedonian suffers due to the intensive Antiquity campaign in the Country, with Greek Government announcing that Athens intends to suspend a part of the Greek grant assistance for infrastructural projects (transport Corridor 10). Only the representatives of the opposition, a part of the civil sector and the expert community expressed their concerns: “Absolutely, those are Greek funds that we will lose because we put our national pride over our real capacities”, said university professor Hristo Kartalov, while Filip Stojanovski wrote in his internet blog “Will I and the other two million citizens feel any benefit from the fact that the highway will bear the name of Alexander of Macedonia? Will it improve the quality of driving on the highway...?”

Government representatives commented that such claims were not correct and that they haven’t received any information in that regard: “We would have been the first to know if Greece announced officially that it won’t give the money, said Ms. Valkanovska, Director of the National Road Fund,” and the media just presented such statements: “Skopje Government claims Greece will finance the construction of the Demir Kapija-Smokvica section of the highway, in spite of the Government decision to name the highway ‘Aleksandar Makedonski’”. Only the Deputy Prime Minister Bocevski admitted, in his statement “Corridor 10 is a European priority and we will seek solution in cooperation with EU” that Macedonia has problems in the relations with the neighbours and EU caused by the change of the name of the Tabanovce-Gevgelija highway. A number of journalistic comments pointed out that Macedonian provocation start to worry Brussels, too: “Brussels is worried by mutual provocations and desires a smoother negotiations.”

The opposition’s views that the Government should stop provoking Greece were seen by the ruling VMRO-DPMNE as pro-Greek: „The sad thing is that SDSM’s statements over time get
more and more alike to the statements of Dora Bakoiani (VMRO-DPMNE spokesman Bičikliski). The media didn't comment or analyze this subject, and the citizens were informed only through the statements by Government representatives, the opposition, civil sector and the expert community.

2.3. VISA LIBERALISATION

"This will be the year of the visa liberalisation and the whole process will be completed by the end of 2009" was the statement by Government representatives that the media repeated frequently during the period covered by this monitoring, and it dominated the statements of Government representatives during the Election campaign. Contrary to the Government representatives, two candidates running for opposition parties put a question mark on the abolition of the visa regime by EU in 2009: "...the visa regime itself is questioned, Ruzin said. They (the Government) were informed by Brussels that the new information on the progress of the visa liberalisation will come in December 2009. There it is! - Frčkoski said."

Some representatives of the Government, MPs and members of expert community insisted on making a direct connection between visa liberalisation and the regularity of the Presidential and Local Elections in March: "...the visa liberalisation will depend solely on the elections...". Contrary to those claims, some media presented the views of other high-ranking Government officials that "there is no direct relation between the elections and visa liberalisation, but the elections do have a political context that is tied to the visa liberalisation" , a reaction to the statement by the Speaker of the Parliament that the liberalisation is tied directly to the regularity of elections. Ambassador Fouere said on the matter: "I believe we should avoid crossing the bridges before they a built. Naturally, the elections are a test of vital importance but there are other reforms that need to be implemented".

In the absence of detailed analysis of the contents of the document listing the steps Macedonia has to implement to ensure liberalisation of the visa regime, the public was left without clear, precise and relevant information on the whole process.

2.3.1. SPECULATING ON DATES

There were dissonant tones in the attempts of Government Representatives to speculate with the actual month when Macedonia could hope to have the visa regime abolished. The media presented the following statements: "Ivica Bocevski said that realistically, we shouldn't expect the abolishment of the visa regime before November of this year, presenting a view different from the belief of Parliament Speaker Veljanovski, who said that the visas will be abolished in early July if Elections pass without any incidents". In that context, too, there was evident lack of journalistic analysis and comments on the necessary dynamic that events have to follow to round up the process of liberalisation of the visa regime.

In the attempt to report on the process and dynamics of the liberalisation process, the media focused exclusively on statements given by Government representatives, while reporting in some media on the subject was incomplete and incorrect. The Elections for the European Parliament in June and the constitution of the new European Commission will postpone the visa

---

57 Kanal 5 TV, February 16, 2009
58 Telma, March 5, 2009
59 Kanal 5 TV, February 12; MTV 1 TV, February 12; Alsat TV, February 12, 2009
60 Kanal 5 TV, February 5, 2009
61 Vreme, February 6, 2009
62 Utrinski vesnik, February 6, 2009
63 Vest, February 6, 2009
64 Dnevnik, February 6, 2009
It is often difficult to determine the source of information, which makes it impossible to conclude if the lack of precise information results from wrong information presented by the Government officials consulted by the media, or was it, in fact, a case of wrong interpretation by the journalists themselves. In any case, we have to say that, in the best interest of good reporting, reporters need to consult and confirm the veracity of their information with other sources. Incomplete and vague information about the decision making processes in EU on matters of crucial interest for Macedonian EU integrations in effect create a wrong perception of the process and the citizens are unable to make informed positions.

2.3.2 WHAT IS THE PROCEDURE?

Regarding the visa liberalisation, none of the media informed on the actual voting procedure in the EU Council in the adoption of the decision for visa liberalisation.

The liberalisation procedure implies that, in the first stage, the EC will have to prepare a Report that will evaluate Macedonia’s progress in the achievement of liberalisation benchmarks, listed in the Roadmap for Visa Liberalisation. If the evaluation is positive, EC will recommend to the EU Council and the European Parliament to abolish the visa regime. The decision making process for the visa liberalisation is called the consultation procedure. The consultation procedure means that the EU Council will adopt the final decision upon prior consultations with the European Parliament, which should give a green light to the initiative and adopt EC’s recommendation. The EU Council adopts the decision for visa liberalisation with two-thirds majority of the 27 EU member states.

Some of the media covered by this monitoring published mistakes in the effort to explain the process of harmonisation of Schengen legislation: "...the plan for harmonisation of the Schengen legislation needs to be prepared in March or April, and the whole harmonisation process should take a year to complete"#68 Having in mind the fact that the whole process is long and hard and will last until the moment Macedonia joins EU as full member.

2.4. EU ENLARGEMENT

Elections in Macedonia fell during the Czech Presidency of the European Union. To prevent a lull in EU enlargement and to secure it will remain a priority during the next, Swedish Presidency, EU strengthened its presence in the Western Balkans, especially in Macedonia, the only candidate country that has not started membership negotiations in the Western Balkans. The European Union effectively sent a message that the Western Balkans has not been forgotten.

2.4.1. DIPLOMATIC ACTION

From mid-February till the end of March, the media reported the intensive diplomatic action undertaken by the Government of Macedonia in the context of EU enlargement, but also by the EU member states and the European Commission. In addition to the regular statements by Enlargement Commissioner Rehn and the High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy Javier Solana on the importance of the Elections for the future of the country, the

---
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media published statements by members of the diplomatic corps stationed in Macedonia - Valero, Filippini, Bergant, Key, Fouere, etc.).

To prevent the stop of enlargement in the current economic crisis, there was an active diplomatic action from abroad. The media covered the visits by foreign officials – Slovenian President Danilo Tirk\textsuperscript{69}, Gernot Erler\textsuperscript{70}, Szech Foreign Minister Karel Schwarzenberg\textsuperscript{71}, Angelika Beer\textsuperscript{72}, Czech Prime Minister Mirek Topolánek\textsuperscript{73} and his Deputy Alexander Vondra, Jose Manuel Barroso, Hungarian PM Ferenc Gyurcsany\textsuperscript{74}, etc.

After a long period of passive diplomacy, Deputy PM Ivica Bocevski and foreign minister Milošoski engaged in lobbying efforts in EU and NATO member states. Bocevski visited Berlin\textsuperscript{75}, Paris\textsuperscript{76} and the Hague\textsuperscript{77}, and Milošoski travelled on official visit to Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania\textsuperscript{78}. One characteristic of the coverage of the visits was that it was difficult to identify the sources of information, and some articles were not signed by the authors. Sitel TV, MTV1, Kanal 5 TV and Večer daily were the most diligent in reporting Government's diplomatic activities.

2.4.2. LOBBYING CONTINUES

The media regularly reported messages coming from Brussels and the initiatives of known lobbyists for Macedonia. Italian foreign minister Franco Frattini, in the “8-Point Balkans Road Map”, expressed his conviction that “the time has come for Europe to think seriously about its responsibility towards the Balkans, where we created huge expectations that remain unfulfilled. The sixth point of the roadmap calls for quick solution for the dispute between Skopje and Athens, and the first point is the visa liberalisation\textsuperscript{79}”.

Right after that, the media reported on the letter written by the foreign ministers of eight EU members states – Italy, Poland, Slovenia, Hungary, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania – demanding from the European Commission to adopt the decision to remove the “Schengen wall” immediately after Macedonia meets the benchmarks listed in the Council’s regulations, without waiting for the European Elections to pass.

The conference organized on the 5th anniversary of the latest EU expansion in Pragva also voiced its support for the Western Balkans. Mirek Topolánek, from the position of holder of the EU presidency, noted that “the Copenhagen criteria are not personal. They are a strict and fair test how serious the aspiring countries are about their integration into EU and how prepared they are”\textsuperscript{80}. Bocevski followed with the statement that “the time is ripe for a comprehensive plan that will project not just the next stage, but the whole process until full integration of each country in the Western Balkans, with clear plans and timeframe for each individual state\textsuperscript{81}”. It is worth noting that what Bocevski proposed is already in place. The EC Communication of March 2008 is a clear and comprehensive plan for the countries of the Western Balkans to move to the next stage of integrations, and Macedonia received eight benchmarks that it still has to meet. EC officials point out that “it often happens that the EC would initiate or recommend something that wasn't agreed in advance with the member-states, in spite of the fact that it would be better
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82 to ensure that such recommendation would get the go from the member-states. Having in mind that the March 2008 Communication was agreed in advance, Macedonian politicians assessed wrongly and decided to go for early elections and missed the chance.

The media presented additional information on the importance of lobbying in the enlargement process. They presented the expert views of Jove Kekenovski, Vasko Naumovski, Simon Hicks, Michael Marsh, Angela Merkel, Aleksandar Spasenovski, Ilija Tanev, Igor Janev, but also Fouere’s explanation of the enlargement process.

2.4.3. EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT REPORT

In 2009, the European Parliament again asked, in its report on Macedonia, to start the negotiations for membership as soon as possible, which is consistent with the EP’s policies. The media carried the statements given by MEPs and Macedonian politicians and offered a more detailed and in-depth overview of the contents of the Report. Some media presented the EP’s view on the “pressure on the media by the Government, especially during the election campaign,” and the appeal by MEPs for “greater freedom of the press” and their concerns over the “great financial dependence of newspapers and broadcasters on Government’s campaigns, which can dilute the critical journalistic approach,” and the “spectacular televised arrests”.

The media presented balanced coverage on the interpretations of the Report, giving sufficient space to both the Government and the opposition, which competed in self-praise and accusations of how much was done, or not done, to get the positive Report. For the Government, the Report was “a small diplomatic victory, having in mind that the final text of the resolution is clear that the bilateral issues in the Balkans should not present obstacle to the EU integration processes,” while the opposition noted it was already seen before and didn’t feel there was much room for satisfaction. It is worth noting that the media reported the non-binding nature of the Report, adding that “it could still influence Brussels’ policies on Macedonia.”

The most exploited issue for the media was the matter of the use of EU’s official terminology towards Macedonia, initiated by Erik Meijer, the Rapporteur on Macedonia in the European Parliament. Although the majority of the media made effort to report impartially on the matter, the reporting moved between two extremes, from "Brussels knows no limits in its favours to Greece... adopting scandalous decision," to "there are no consequences and that is the main outcome.

It is interesting that the media never raised the question of the work of Macedonian Mission and Embassy to Brussels and how would they explain the overnight change, without their knowledge.

2.4.4. BILATERAL DISPUTES AND EU

The EP Report raised the question of solution to bilateral disputed in the European Union. There is the clear message that EP "expects from Macedonia and Greece to remain dedicated to the negotiations, in spite of the application to the International Court of Justice". The Parliament didn’t fail to mention its support for mediator Nimetz. This is of particular
importance, having in mind the recent efforts by a number of Macedonian politicians to get the European Commission and EU member states involved in the name dispute. One such effort was made during the visits of Czech PM Topolanek and German Minister of State Erler. Erler responded to such initiatives: “I would advise relaxation of the atmosphere and to think about a compromise.” Some media tied Erler’s statement that “Germany believes that it is time for EU to find a remedy for the bilateral disputes that present obstacles to the enlargement in the Western Balkans” with Canadian proposal to introduce a new “consensus minus one” voting instrument in NATO. Other media quoted the statement by NATO Spokesperson who said that “there were initiatives and considerations of possible changes in NATO’s decision making processes, but never on the issue of expansion” tying NATO expansion with EU enlargement, for which “the consensus rule remained in force in the Lisbon Treaty”.

The manner of resolution of disputes in the EU is well elaborated in the media and the overall impression is that the media play their role of informers of the citizens and opinion makers on this matter quite well, through a number of reports, analyses and comments – “If Macedonia demonstrates its democratic maturity in the elections and completed the required reforms, there is nothing to prevent the European Commission from giving its recommendation to start accession negotiations.” Media analyses are written by local authors, also based on foreign sources. For example, “Utrinski vesnik” daily presented, immediately after the elections, a list of four key issues for Macedonia - democracy, name, economic crisis and ethnic relations - and raised the question if Gruevski possessed “the democratic capacity to grow from party leader into statesman”.

The opinions in the foreign press (BBC, the Telegraph, Reuters, the Financial Times, Deutsche Welle) on the newly-elected President of Macedonia and his role in the process of finding solution to the name dispute, were again presented – “His (Ivanov’s) main task would be to first clear up the name dispute Macedonia has with Greece, creating the conditions for membership into EU and NATO. That is the decisive problem, and the President will be judged on that account”, Jurgen Kliemke emphasized for Deutsche Welle.

2.5. THE MYSTERY OF IPA

The European Union admits it is a complex machinery that is difficult to get closer to the citizens. Over the past several years, EU is increasingly aware that it has to find a better way to carry its messages to the citizens, especially after the failure of the Constitutional Treaty and the negative vote that the Lisbon Treaty got in Ireland. It seems that even the principles of the so-called “European governance” didn’t make that communication easier. In spite of the fact that EU is transparent and open to the maximum, the citizens have difficult time to find their way in the sea of information posted on EU’s website.

The situation in Macedonia is worse, having in mind the total lack of access to the documents of national importance that the Government needs to provide. Therefore, the media quite often make mistakes, sometimes technical, but also conceptual and politically motivated. It
makes the journalists more vulnerable and prone to political influence, sometimes even without realizing they have been played.

2.5.1 VAGUE INFORMATION

On February 23, 2009, Macedonia signed three financial agreements with the EU: a) on the National IPA programme for 2008 for Component 1, worth 37.12 million Euro; b) on the Cross-Border cooperation with Greece, worth 3.6 million Euro; and c) on multilateral cooperation in Southeast Europe, worth 1 million Euro. The total worth of the three agreements is 41.72 million Euro. The Secretariat of European Affairs organized a press-conference on the occasion. All the media reporting on the signing published different reports, even offering different figures on the funds that Macedonia will get from EU, from 37 to 44 million Euro102.

On the other hand, all media quoted Bocevski, who said to the ambassadors of EU member states: “Macedonia has the knowhow, the experience and capacity to manage European funds independently... The road to the signing of these agreements wasn’t simple or easy, but Macedonia passed the test” adding that the Government will add 10 million Euro from the Budget to the 40 million Euro in European funds. Bocevski’s statement is problematic for three reasons: Macedonia doesn't yet mange the European funds; he made his statement in front of ambassadors of EU member states who know well who manages the funds; and the Budget line is not 10 million, but 6.3 million Euro, plus 0.6 million loan from a World Bank project.

“Utrinski vesnik” daily published an article with the headline “Management of European Funds is a Test for the Country”, with the author commenting that “European assistance for Macedonia managed by Macedonian institutions is a long-term wish of the country and several Governments in a row”103. That is incorrect, knowing that the first activities to build the decentralized system of management with the assistance were financed by the CARDS 2005 programme, and the implementation started in 2006-2007, so it was impossible to get the credentials from the European Commission before 2008, not to mention being a long-standing desire of several governments. Further in the text, it is written that “IPA implementation started on January 1, 2009”, which is also incorrect.

3. LEARNING THROUGH MISTAKES!

Similar mistakes were noted in the other media. Following are some of the common mistakes the media made in the period covered by this quarterly report. The aim or our analysis of the mistakes is not to criticise the reporters and their editors, but to assist them to identify their weaknesses and correct them. Mistakes can be “institutional” (lack of knowledge of the institutions and their functioning) and essential (misunderstanding and misinterpretation of policies, processes and procedures) which leaves space for manipulation and absence of proper journalistic reaction.

Following is the list of mistakes, ranked by frequency of occurrence, not how serious they were:

1) “The Hague will continue to lobby for Macedonia to get access to European funds”104 (anchor’s announcement) This is a wrong conclusion, having in mind that Netherlands, or any member-state for that matter, has no competence over the European funds, which are totally in the hands of the European Commission and should not be a subject to bilateral talks. We find a similar mistake in Bocevski’s statement after the meeting with Gernot Erler: “We talked primarily about the preparations for the Elections as a key
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notion standing between Macedonia and the start of negotiations date, the preparations for visa liberalisation and the third priority, the credentials to use the IPA funds.¹⁰⁵

2) “According to him (Erik Meijer), the fear of a Greek veto results in a certain inertia towards Macedonia by the European Commission and the Council of Europe”¹⁰⁶ – no distinction is made between the EU Council and the Council of Europe. Other media don't make the distinction between the EU Council and the European Council.¹⁰⁷

3) “At the meeting, Montenegro and Serbia noted their aspirations to get the candidate status by the end of the year, while Bosnia and Herzegovina should sign the Stabilisation and Association Agreement”¹⁰⁸ – the Stabilisation and Association Agreement was signed on June 16, 2008, and the Interim Agreement entered into force on July 1, 2008.

4) “Skopje authorities expect that the European Commission will accept the recommendations of the European Parliament and will set the start of negotiations date by the end of the year”¹⁰⁹ – the date is not decided by the European Commission, but by the EU Council, on recommendation by the Commission.

5) The Report by the European Parliament “praised the progress in the achievement of the directives on the visa liberalisation”¹¹⁰ – the liberalisation process follows the Roadmap with benchmarks, not directives.

6) “Macedonia is criticised for its agreement with the U.S. on the exemption of American citizens from the jurisdiction of the International Court in the Hague, which is contrary to EU’s norms”¹¹¹ – there are three international courts in the Hague, the International Court of Justice, the International Criminal Court and the International Court for War-Crimes in Former Yugoslavia, also known as the Hague Tribunal. In this case, the report refers to the International Criminal Court.

7) “The European Parliament recommended that Macedonia gets the date last year, too, but the European Commission, the executive body of the Union, said that the country is not yet prepared for negotiations. Next month, the EC will come forward with a report on Macedonia and the decision of the Council of Ministers, as the highest bodz of the EU, will depend on the Report's findings”¹¹² – The May 2009 EC report referred to the visa liberalisation and doesn't contain a recommendation of start of negotiations date.

8) “EU enlargement started with the fall of the Iron Curtain and I believe it will not stop until the countries of the Balkans are part of the European family (Gjorge Ivanov)”¹¹³ – The enlargement started in 1973 when the United Kingdom, Denmark and Ireland were accepted as full members.

9) The letter of the eight member-states "Estonia, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia"¹¹⁴ – the name of the state is Latvia. Letonia is the Russian name for the country.

10) “Macedonia, although the first country of the Western Balkans to get a candidate-status, still awaits the date to start the negotiations with Brussels”¹¹⁵ - Macedonia was the first

¹⁰⁵ Alsat TV and A1 TV, March 12, 2009
¹⁰⁶ Vreme, February 20, 2009
¹⁰⁷ Dnevnik, Večer, April 10, 2009
¹⁰⁸ Vreme, February 24, 2009
¹⁰⁹ A1 TV, March 12, 2009
¹¹⁰ Sitel TV, March 12, 2009
¹¹¹ Vreme, March 13, 2009
¹¹² Večer, March 13, 2009
¹¹³ Vreme, March 13, 2009
¹¹⁴ Večer, March 13, 2009
¹¹⁵ A1 TV, April 13, 2009
country to sign the Stabilisation and Association Agreement, while Croatia is the first to get the candidate status.

4. CONCLUSIONS

- The general conclusion is that the media coverage of the Presidential and Local Elections 2009 was correct and balanced, providing the public with sufficient information to ensure the voters would make an informed decision whether to vote and for whom. The media offered sufficient body of commentary and analysis claiming that the elections, in spite of proceeding without incidents and corresponded fully to international standards, were not totally fair and democratic - the actual Ninth Benchmark set by EU.

- This monitoring shows, once again, that journalism in Macedonia continues to suffer from apparent lack of investigation, research and analyses. Commonly, the journalists simply present information on reported events and processes, as well as statements by political and public personalities. In this monitoring, for instance, reports, commentary/reports, statements and news account for 92.2% of the total number of articles covered, while commentaries and analyses account for 3% and 0.4%, respectively.

- At the same time, the monitoring shows that, for a number of different reasons, the media still make some common mistakes: Their knowledge and understanding of European integration processes is limited; they often rely on irrelevant sources of information of dubious merit; lack of access to sources of information; lack of time and capacity for proper research and analysis; editorial policies that demands from journalists to cover several different topics simultaneously, which prevents them from acquiring competence and specialise on the given subject matter.

- In a campaign that lacked debates between candidates, the media were pro-active and attempted to provoke discussion on several essential issues. For example, the election campaign was dominated by the issue of the name-dispute, and the journalists insisted that all presidential candidates should present their own views on the problem.

- Having in mind the sensitive nature of the name-dispute and the secrecy that surrounds the package offered by the UN Facilitator, the media de facto lack proper access to official information. Therefore, the conclusion is that the public opinion on this matter of utmost importance is created almost exclusively under the influence of statements given by Macedonian and Greek government representatives. The content analysis of the articles covered by the monitoring during this period shows that there are no consultations or debate on the name-dispute in Macedonia.

- In the absence of detailed analysis of the contents of the document listing the steps Macedonia has to implement to ensure liberalisation of the visa regime, the public was left without clear, precise and relevant information on the whole process. In that context, too, there was evident lack of journalistic analysis and comments on the necessary dynamic that events have to follow to round up the process of liberalisation of the visa regime.

- In the attempt to report on the process and dynamics of the liberalisation process, the media focused exclusively on statements given by Government representatives, while reporting in some media on the subject was incomplete and incorrect. It is often difficult to determine the source of information, which makes it impossible to discern if the lack of precise information results from wrong information presented by the Government officials consulted by the media, or was it, in fact, a case of wrong interpretation by the journalists themselves. In any case, we have to say that, in the best interest of good reporting, reporters need to consult and confirm the veracity of their information with
other sources. Incomplete and vague information about the decision making processes in EU on matters of crucial interest for Macedonian EU integrations in effect create a wrong perception of the process and the citizens are unable to make informed positions.

- As in previous elections, again it was the matter of access to European funds that was abused the most. Messages that the access to financial support and the IPA funds to municipalities may be guaranteed only if they were lead by mayors supported by the Government are pure misinformation and the European Union duly reacted to deny them.

- The media reporting on the Report prepared by European Parliament was professionally done. However, the fact that it was presented outside the EU enlargement policies towards the Western Balkans (the same, by the way, applies to the IPA instrument) points out at the fact that journalists lack sufficient understanding of the process Macedonian has to complete on its progress to EU membership. Such a conclusion is further supported by the numerous mistakes in the reporting on the European Union in general.
5. Recommendations

1. Training for the journalists on EU related issues
   This monitoring again raises the need for training for the journalists on EU related matters. The training needs to be sustainable, therefore, it needs proper institutional framework and stable financial construction.

2. Better Access to Information
   The Government has to improve the access to information and documentation relevant to European integrations, at least on the most burning issues. For example, the Government could translate the "Roadmap for Visa Liberalisation" and to present it to the journalists and all interested expert. At the same time, the Government should organize regular briefings (both its own and in cooperation with the European Commission) on current policies, processes and activities, in which it will openly discuss the matters and inform the press.

3. Promotion of Debate
   In the absence of quality relevant debate on key social and political issues, there was notable pro-active action by the media. The monitoring found that some media and journalists try to provoke a debate on a number of issues of key importance for the future of the state. Having in mind the fact that the media are a part of civic society, they need to continue to promote and initiate public debate, together with civic association, experts and intellectuals in general. We should not forget the crucial role of the Government which should itself initiate and participate constructively in a public debate.

4. Need for Investigative and Analytical Journalism
   To improve the quality of information, the editorial offices need to promote investigative and analytical approach with their reporters. If necessary, they should secure additional education and professional training for their reporters.