

Debata
**ČOV
EK
NA
PU
TU**

(u očima
i poimanju njegovih
nevoljnih domaćina)

Debate

MAN

ON THE ROAD

(Seen through the eyes of his reluctant hosts)

Tekstovi učesnika i učesnica debate
u Kulturnom centru REX 21. aprila 2013.

Essays by participants in the debate held in
Rex Cultural Centre on April 21, 2013

Sadržaj / Contents

Uvod / Introduction.....	4 / 5
Najava debate / Debate Announcement.....	6 / 11
Jovana Vuković	
Debata „Čovek na putu“.....	17
Debate “Man on the road”.....	20
Vladimir Petronijević	
Srbija kao podeljeno društvo – gde su tu migranti.....	23
Serbia as a Divided Society – Where are those Migrants.....	25
Marta Stojić Mitrović	
Čovek na putu: Srbija kao sigurna zemlja	28
Man on the Road: Serbia as a Safe Country.....	33
Ela Meh	39 / 44
Aleksandra Galonja	
Ima li politike izvan binarnih opozicija	50
Is there politics outside binary oppositions.....	55

Peđa Obradović

Migranti i društvo ŽIVOT „ISPOD RADARA“..... 59
Migrants and Society LIVING „UNDER THE RADAR“..... 62

Sara Preradović

Zakonski odobrena dehumanizacija –
Sukob poslušnog građanina i glasa istine u nama..... 66
Legally Approved Dehumanization –
Conflict between “Obedient” Citizen and the Voice of Truth inside Us..... 72

Eva Ottavy

Borders: similar causes, similar effects 78
Granice: slični uzroci, slični rezultati..... 80

Christophe Lалуque

Eight small pieces that testify..... 82
Osam kratkih odlomaka koji svedoče..... 85
KRATKE BIOGRAFIJE / SHORT CVs..... 89

Uvod

Čitaoci će u tekstovima ove publikacije naći detaljnu argumentaciju protiv aktuelnih opšteprihvaćenih i normalizovanih politika i praksi tretmana migranata u zemlji i regionu, koje su diktirane od strane Evropske unije. Imajući to u vidu, simptomatično je da jedan broj tekstova ima oblik apela na elementarnu ljudskost i racionalnost najšire publike. Ukoliko osetimo nelagodu zbog takvog otvorenog apelovanja, zbog repetativnog ukazivanja na nepravde koje se planski i sistematski čine migrantima, ukoliko osetimo zamor od insistiranja pojedinih aktivista i teoretičara na ovim temama – vreme je da se pre svega zapitamo kakav je to sistem koji nas je učinio ravnodušnim ili nezainteresovanim posmatračima dnevnih agonija ljudi na putu.

Urednik

Introduction

In the texts of this publication, the readers will find a detailed argumentation against at present generally accepted and normalized policies and practices of dealing with migrants, both nationally and regionally, which are dictated by the European Union. Bearing this in mind, it is rather symptomatic that a number of the texts are in the form of appeal to the wide public's elementary humanity and reason. In case we feel unease due to such direct pleas, or repetitive pointing out of injustice which is committed methodically and systematically against migrants, if we feel weariness because some activists and theoreticians repeatedly insist on these issues – it is time to primarily ask ourselves about the system which made us indifferent and unconcerned observers of the agony experienced daily by the people on the road.

Editor

Najava debate

Kulturni centar Rex
nedelja 21. april, 2013, 18h

debata

ČOVEK NA PUTU

(u očima i poimanju njegovih nevoljnih domaćina)

U okviru svojih Govornih programa i projekta Raskršća istok zapad, Kulturni centar Rex priređuje debatu posvećenu javnim stavovima i institucionalnom tretmanu migranata koji prolaze kroz Srbiju na svom putu ka Zapadnoj Evropi.

U Srbiji je, u poslednjih par godina, postao aktuelan odnos države i građana prema ljudima koji putuju kroz ovu zemlju na način koji im je jedino dostupan i moguć, a koji se rutinski i uobičajeno smatra ilegalnim. "Tražioci azila", "migranti", subjekti i objekti "human trafiking-a" pod nehumanim uslovima, izloženi nadzoru i progonima granične straže, policije, javnosti i medija, prepušteni milosti i nemilosti svojih tur-operatera i čitavog niza moćnika koji zarađuju na njihovoj nevolji, briga su tek nekolicine organizacija za zaštitu ljudskih prava i aktivističkih grupa. Ljudi za koje malo ko pretpostavlja da im pripada pravo da putovanjem upoznaju svet, usavrše svoja znanja i veštine, nađu povoljnije mesto za život i rad, tretiraju se uglavnom kao nepoželjni uljezi. Pri tom se tendenciozno ignoriše činjenica da oni vrlo često napuštaju svoje zemlje i dolaze u Evropu zbog neokolonijalnih ekonomskih i političkih odnosa, ratova, progona ili katastrofa uzrokovanih klimatskim promenama. U uslovima u kojima je sveprisutna dehumanizacija i stigmatizacija takvih putnika preduslov i posledica i njihovog izuzeća iz domena univerzalnih

ljudskih prava, pred svakog ko ne želi da se pomiri sa dnevnom poražavajućom situacijom u kojoj se ovi ljudi nalaze i snalaze, postavlja se pitanje kako ovu problematiku sagledati iz ugla koji otklanja stereotipe, prevazilazi logiku "legalnosti" i izbegava zamke stigmatizacije koje se kriju u vladajućem rečniku i terminologiji koja je u opštoj upotrebi u medijskoj i legislativnoj sferi.

Kao uvod u izlaganja i razgovor poslužiće dokumentarni film studentkinje Sare Preradović, snimljen radi istraživačkih potreba tokom prošle zime na staništu putnika migranata u okolini Subotice. Film prikazuje fragmente iz njihovog svakodnevnog života dok čekaju ispred vrata Evropske unije.



Vladimir Petronijević

Srbija kao podeljeno društvo-gde su tu migranti?

Paradoks je da države odnosno političke elite koje zagovaraju globalizam, kao neumitan process, često posežu za granicama, ograničenjima i zabranama kada je reč o kretanju ljudi-migracijama. Srbija, kao država nastala na razvalinama ratom razrušene Jugoslavije, i sama se našla zatečena sve većim brojem migranata na svojoj teritoriji. Posle više od 500.000 izbeglica, interno raseljenih lica, koje je zbrinula i pokušala da integriše, odjednom se suočava sa sve većim brojem Avganistanaca, Pakistanaca i drugih koji od nje očekuju pomoć. Srbija, koja ne uspeva da specifičnosti različitih etničkih zajednica koje u njoj žive oduvek integriše u jedan prihvatljiv društveni sistem, sada se suočava sa fenomenom novih novopridošlih. Kada nema takvog sistema, populizam političke elite, podstaknut medijima, preuzima primat i stvara uslove za nove konflikte i podele.

Vladimir Petronijević, izvršni direktor Grupe 484, diplomirao je na Pravnom fakultetu. Radio je kao pravni savetnik u Kabinetu potpredsednika Vlade zaduženog za evropske integracije Božidara Đelića, gde je bio zadužen za pravna pitanja u okviru procesa evropskih integracija i pitanja vizne liberalizacije. Član je Izvršnog komiteta Evropskog saveta za izbeglice i prognanike (ECRE). Pored toga, bio je član UNDP konsultantske grupe: ekspert za izveštaje o humanom razvoju (izbeglice i raseljena lica), konsultant za pitanja zapošljavanja interno raseljenih lica i konsultant za položaj dijasporu u srpskom pravnom sistemu. U Grupi 484 je od 2005. godine. Odgovoran je, pored ostalog, za razvoj organizacije, prikupljanje sredstava i upravljanje projektima.

Marta Stojić Mitrović

Dehumanizacija migranata

Dehumanizacija predstavlja odricanje ljudskosti drugome, onima koji nisu članovi grupe kojoj mi pripadamo. Nakon proučavanja systemske diskriminacije migranata kroz pravnu praksu, govorila bih o paradoksu univerzalnih ljudskih prava, koja bi trebalo da važe za sve ljude a koja se u praksi priznaju samo određenim kategorijama - migrantima se odriču samo zbog učinjenog prekršaja ilegalnog prelaska granice.

Marta Stojić Mitrović, etnolog - antropolog, radi u Etnografskom institutu SANU. U poslednje vreme istražuje fenomen migracija, a u okviru toga se fokusira na stigmatizaciju i institucionalizovanu diskriminaciju migranata.

Ela Meh

"Ilegalni", "tražioci azila" i "lažni tražioci azila" – koju realnost ove reči prikrivaju i opravdavaju?

Oslanjajući se na načela slobode kretanja, moj prilog će se fokusirati na posmatranje dominantnih tipova diskursa o tranzitnoj migraciji u Srbiji: sigurnosni diskurs, koji vidi "ilegalne" migrante kao "pretnju" sigurnosti i vladavini prava, i humanitarni diskurs, koji vidi neke migrante kao ranjive žrtve koje zahtevaju resurse kojih je ionako malo u Srbiji. Sugerisaću da bi ovi diskursi trebalo da budu kritički preispitivani i posmatrani kao sredstvo maskiranja ili izvrtanja realnosti sa kojom se migranti suočavaju i legitimisanja represivnih mera i potupaka koji takvu realnost prouzrokuju. Iz perspektive slobode kretanja, problem su granice i procesi koji ljude uljučuju u diskurs o migrantima.

Ela Meh, diplomirala filozofiju, bavila se aktivizmom koji povezuje borbu protiv klimatskih promena sa antikapitalističkom borbom, a od 2010. uglavnom se bavi *no borders* aktivizmom, za slobodu kretanja i protiv sistema granica. Živela i radila uz različite autonomne i *no borders* kolektive na francusko-engleskoj granici, u Kaleu. Tokom 2012. godine bila je volonterka Migreurop, živela u Beogradu i istraživala posledice eksternalizacije migracione politike EU i situaciju migranata u Srbiji.

Moderacija:

Jovana Vuković i Nebojša Milikić

Gosti i gošće na debati:

Kao gosti i gošće na debati pozvani su aktivisti/aktivistkinje i novinari/ke koji se aktuelno bave ovom tematikom, među njima i **Aleksandra Galonja** (Atina), **Peđa Obradović** (RTV B92), **Radoš Đurović** (Centar za zaštitu i pomoć tražilaca azila) i drugi.

Specijalni gosti i gošće iz inostranstva pokušaće da reflektuju iznesenu problematiku sa stanovišta svojih iskustava i prakse, to će biti:

Eva Otavi (Eva Ottavy),

pravnik, radi na pitanjima migranata već skoro 8 godina. Od pre četiri godine sukoordinira Migreurop (www.migreurop.org), evro-afričku mrežu baziranu u Parizu (Francuska). Glavne teme njenog rada su sporazumi o readmisiji, evropska agencija Frontex i internacionalna koalicija Brodovi za ljude (Boats 4 People www.boats4people.org)

Christophe Laluque,

glumac i reditelj, u kontekstu istraživanja svakome dostupnog teatra radi na delima B. Brehta, R.M. Rilkea, G. Štajn, A. Dodea, H. Milera itd. Režirao je dve predstave obrađujući temu migranata za mladu publiku: *The Manuscript dogs III: What Misery!* (2008) i *To the trash paper!* (2009). U saradnji sa CIMADE i RESF mrežama organizuje susrete, diskusije i čitanje o stranim kulturama, u okviru programa koji je i pokrenuo: Strani stranci (Strange strangers).

Ova debata je deo programske linije interkulturnih dijaloga Raskršća istok zapad (Crossroads East-West) u okviru trogodišnjeg projekta "Mašinsko odeljenje Evropa" (Engine Room Europe) koji Kulturni centar Rex/Fond B92 realizuje sa još jedanaest kulturnih centara Evrope. Projekat je fokusiran na nezavisne radnike u kulturi i njihovo polje delovanja, a njegov glavni je razvoj kapaciteta i održivosti nezavisne kulture u Evropi. Projekat Engine Room Europe je podržan od strane Evropske komisije, a programska linija interkulturnih dijaloga Raskršća istok zapad i od Ministarstva kulture Republike Srbije.

Debata ČOVEK NA PUTU se realizuje i u okviru Govornih programa Kulturnog centra Rex, čiji je opšti cilj podsticanje na javno promišljanje aktuelnih tema i moguće generisanje jezika kojim se neki akutni društveni problemi mogu bolje definisati i tretirati, a podržan je od strane Fondacije za otvoreno društvo.

Debate Announcement

MAN ON THE ROAD

(Seen through the eyes of his reluctant hosts)

Cultural Center REX

21. 04. 2013, 18:00

As part of its Talks Programmes and the Crossroads East-West project, Cultural Centre REX organizes a debate focusing on the public's attitude regarding the immigrants passing through Serbia on their way to Western Europe and the institutional treatment they receive.

The attitude of the state and the citizens towards transit migrants travelling through this country the only way they possibly can, which is routinely and commonly considered to be illegal has become a hot topic in Serbia, over the past few years. Asylum seekers, migrants are both subjects and objects of human trafficking, faced with inhuman conditions, subjected to scrutiny and persecution by border guards, the police, the public and the media and left to the mercy of those who smuggle them and numerous moguls making money from their misery. Few human rights organizations and activist groups show concern for the position of these people, who not many believe have the right to discover the world travelling, improve their knowledge and skills and find a better place where to live and work. They are mostly treated as unwelcome intruders, while tendentiously ignoring the fact that they very often leave their countries of origin and come to Europe because of the neo-colonial economic and political relations, wars, persecution or catastrophes caused by the climate change. In the circumstances where ubiquitous dehumanization and stigmatization of these travellers is the precondition and the consequence of their exclusion from the domain of universal

human rights, everyone who is not willing to resign themselves to this disastrous daily situation that these people are confronted and cope with, faces the question of how to view such issues from an angle which is free from stereotypes and rises above the logic of "legality", avoiding the traps of stigmatization lurking in the dominant language and terminology, widely used in the field of the media and the law.

Sara Preradović's documentary, shot last winter at a location occupied by immigrants, in the vicinity of Subotica will offer an introduction to the debate. The participants / speakers will include activists, theoreticians and journalists currently exploring said issues. The guests from abroad will try to throw additional light on the topic, based on their experiences and practice.

Speakers:

Vladimir Petronijević

Serbia as a Divided Society - What is the position of Migrants?

We are witnessing a paradox that the countries, namely, political elites, advocating globalization as a relentless process, often resort to borders, limitations and bans, when it comes to the mobility of people i.e. migrations. Serbia, a country that was built on the ruins of the war-torn Yugoslavia, found itself unprepared for an increasing number of migrants on its territory. After more than 500,000 refugees, internally-displaced persons it accommodated and tried to integrate in the society, Serbia is faced with an influx of Afghans, Pakistani and others looking for help. It has never been successful in integrating different ethnic groups with their diverse characteristics into an acceptable social system and yet, the country is now confronted with a phenomenon of the new new-comers. Where there is no such social system, the populism of political elites, whipped up by the media, comes to the fore and creates the conditions necessary for the emergence of new conflicts and divisions.

Vladimir Petronijević, executive director of Grupa 484 (Group 484) graduated from the Faculty of Law, University of Belgrade. He was a legal advisor in the Cabinet of the Deputy Prime Minister for EU Integration Bozidar Đelić, where he was in charge of the legal issues related to the process of integration into the EU and visa liberalization. He is a member of the Executive Committee of the European Council for Refugees and Exiles (ECRE). Moreover, he was on the list of UNCP consultants and is an expert on human development reports (refugees and IDPs), consultant on IDP employment issues and consultant on the position of the diaspora in the Serbian legal system. He joined Grupa 484 in 2005. He is responsible, among other things, for the development of the organisation, fund raising and project management.

human rights, everyone who is not willing to resign themselves to this disastrous daily situation that these people are confronted and cope with, faces the question of how to view such issues from an angle which is free from stereotypes and rises above the logic of "legality", avoiding the traps of stigmatization lurking in the dominant language and terminology, widely used in the field of the media and the law.

Sara Preradović's documentary, shot last winter at a location occupied by immigrants, in the vicinity of Subotica will offer an introduction to the debate. The participants / speakers will include activists, theoreticians and journalists currently exploring said issues. The guests from abroad will try to throw additional light on the topic, based on their experiences and practice.

Speakers:

Vladimir Petronijević

Serbia as a Divided Society - What is the position of Migrants?

We are witnessing a paradox that the countries, namely, political elites, advocating globalization as a relentless process, often resort to borders, limitations and bans, when it comes to the mobility of people i.e. migrations. Serbia, a country that was built on the ruins of the war-torn Yugoslavia, found itself unprepared for an increasing number of migrants on its territory. After more than 500,000 refugees, internally-displaced persons it accommodated and tried to integrate in the society, Serbia is faced with an influx of Afghans, Pakistani and others looking for help. It has never been successful in integrating different ethnic groups with their diverse characteristics into an acceptable social system and yet, the country is now confronted with a phenomenon of the new new-comers. Where there is no such social system, the populism of political elites, whipped up by the media, comes to the fore and creates the conditions necessary for the emergence of new conflicts and divisions.

Vladimir Petronijević, executive director of Grupa 484 (Group 484) graduated from the Faculty of Law, University of Belgrade. He was a legal advisor in the Cabinet of the Deputy Prime Minister for EU Integration Bozidar Đelić, where he was in charge of the legal issues related to the process of integration into the EU and visa liberalization. He is a member of the Executive Committee of the European Council for Refugees and Exiles (ECRE). Moreover, he was on the list of UNCP consultants and is an expert on human development reports (refugees and IDPs), consultant on IDP employment issues and consultant on the position of the diaspora in the Serbian legal system. He joined Grupa 484 in 2005. He is responsible, among other things, for the development of the organisation, fund raising and project management.

Marta Stojić Mitrović

Dehumanization of Migrants

Dehumanization describes the denial of "humanness" to others, those who are not members of a group that we belong to. Having researched the systemic discrimination of migrants through legal practices, I would like to talk about the universal human rights paradox, that is, the rights which should be applicable to all human beings, but in practice, are granted only to members of some categories, while being denied to migrants, because they committed the offense of crossing borders illegally.

Marta Stojić Mitrović, ethnologist-anthropologist working at the SASA Institute of Ethnography. She has recently begun researching the phenomenon of migrations, focusing more precisely on the stigmatization and institutional discrimination of migrants.

Ela Meh

"The Illegals", "Asylum Seekers" and "False Asylum Seekers" - Which Reality Do These Words Cover up or Attempt to Justify?

Based on the principles of the freedom of movement, my contribution will be focusing on the observation of the dominant types of transit migration discourse in Serbia: the safety-oriented discourse that views "illegal" migrants as a "threat" to safety and the rule of law and the humanitarian discourse that considers migrants to be vulnerable victims requiring resources that are scarce in Serbia anyway. I will suggest that these discourses should be critically examined and seen as a tool for masking and distorting the reality that migrants face, as well as for legitimizing the repressive measures that bring such a reality about. From the point of the freedom of movement, the problem lies in the borders and processes that turn people into migrants.

Ela Meh earned a degree in philosophy and became involved in a form of activism that links the fight against climate change to the fight against capitalism. Since 2010, she has focused on the no borders activism, advocating freedom of movement and opposing the border system. She has lived and worked alongside different autonomous and no borders collectives on the French-English border in Calais. In 2012, she was a Migreurop volunteer living in Belgrade and researched the consequences of the externalization of the EU migration policy and the position of migrants in Serbia.

Moderators:

Jovana Vuković and Nebojša Milikić

Guests at the debate:

Activists and journalists currently focusing on these issues, including **Aleksandra Galonja** (Athens), **Peđa Obradović** (RTV B92), **Radoš Đurović** (Asylum Protection Center) and others.

The following special guests from abroad will attempt to reflect on said issues from the point of view of their experiences and practice:

Eva Ottavy,

lawyer has been working on migrant issues for 8 years now. Four years ago, she became a coordinator at Migreurop (www.migreurop.org), an European-African network based in Paris (France). The main themes of her work are readmission agreements, the Frontex European agency and the international coalition Boats 4 People (www.boats4people.org).

Christophe Laluque

is an actor and theatre director who explores the work of B. Brecht, R.M. Rilke, G. Stein, A. Daudet, H. Miller, etc. in the context of his research into the theatre available to everybody. He directed two plays on the topic of migrants intended for young audiences: *The Manuscript dogs III: What Misery!* (2008) and *To the trash paper!* (2009). He organizes meetings, discussions and public readings about foreign cultures, in collaboration with the networks CIMADE and RESF, as part of the Strange Strangers programme that he launched.

The debate is part of the three-year intercultural dialogue programme Crossroads East West, implemented within the framework of the Engine Room Europe project by Cultural Centre REX/B92 Fund, together with eleven cultural centres from all over Europe. The project focuses on independent cultural workers and their field of activity. Its main aim is to enhance the capacity and sustainability of independent culture in Europe and it is carried out with the support of the European Commission, while the Crossroads East West intercultural dialogue programme received additional support from the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Serbia.

The debate MAN ON THE ROAD is one of the Cultural Centre REX Talks Programmes, held with the aim of fulfilling the general goal of stimulating public examination of the current issues and possibly generation of a language allowing formulation of a better definition and treatment of some topical social issues.

It is carried out with the support of the Foundation for an Open Society.

tek sto



texts

Jovana Vuković

DEBATA „ČOVEK NA PUTU“

U potrazi za boljim životom, neretko bežeći od rata i razaranja, ali i ekstremnog siromaštva, eksploatacije i ekonomskog nasilja, značajan broj ljudi sa osiromašenog Juga se odlučuje da krenu na put pun neizvesnosti i teškoća, prelazeći dobro čuvane granice, kako bi put okončali u zemljama u kojima veruju da ih čeka bolji život. Krajnja destinacija za najveći broj njih je Zapadna Evropa, čija sve restriktivnija migraciona politika, osujećuje njihov dolazak, ali i otežava sam put do željenih zemalja. Ova politika uključuje i eksternalizaciju kontrole šengenskih granica i nameće obavezu državama van Evropske unije da spreče dolazak migranta/kinja u Evropsku uniju. S obzirom na aspiracije Srbije da se pridruži ovoj Uniji, njena politička elita se saglasila da saučestvuje u evropskoj politici koji kriminalizuje migracije, a migrante svodi na ilegalne strance/kinje uskraćujući im osnovna ljudska prava. Sve rigoroznije kontrole granica i sve teže migriranje preko Mediterana aktuelizovalo je tzv. balkansku rutu koja migrante/kinje sa osiromašenog Juga preko Srbije i drugih balkanskih zemalja vodi u zemlje Evropske unije. Ova okolnost stavlja i organizacije za ljudska prava u Srbiji pred dilemu: šta zapravo znače univerzalna ljudska prava, pre svega sloboda kretanja, i da li ih je moguće ograničiti i kako opravdati to ograničavanje.

Uloga organizacija za ljudska prava pokazuje se kao naročito problematična u ovom procesu. Privrženost ljudskim pravima mnogi su istrgovali za sigurnu i izdašnu finansijsku pomoć Evropske unije koja finansira one projekte koji imaju ulogu da humanitarno zbrinu migrante/kinje i odvrate ih od daljeg puta (deportacijom ili „dobrovoljnim“ povratkom u zemlju porekla ili privremenim zadržavanjem u Srbiji). One, takođe, usvajaju jezik evropske migracione politike koja kriminalizuje migracije – ljudi postaju ilegalni, prinudne deportacije postaju dobrovoljni povraci, a novi instituti koji treba da posluže da se neželjene migracije zaustave kao „sigurna zemlja porekla“ se nekritički prihvataju i opravdavaju. S obzirom na nesigurno finansiranje, ali i nezasićenost pojedinih organizacija, one u zamenu za finansiranje pristaju da zagovaraju politiku koja od Srbije zahteva da pruži punu političku, institucionalnu i logističku podršku kontroli spoljnih granica Tvrdave Evrope ili pristaju da budu *outsourc*-ovani servis koji pruža humanitarne usluge migrantima/kinjama koji su se zatekli ovde. Činjenica da trenutna migraciona praksa EU ozbiljno erodira sve međunarodne pravne tekovine zaštite izbeglica, azilanata/kinja i migranata/kinja, nažalost ne izaziva

očekivanu pozornost, a pojedinačni slučajevi se predstavljaju kao dirljive i depolitizovane ljudske priče koje se srećno razrešavaju uz malo ogreva ili čebadi. Pri tome se uzroci migracija koji se nalaze u viševekovnoj kolonijalističkoj eksploataciji Juga i daljem pljačkanju i osiromašivanju, ratnom razaranju i uništavanju ekonomije, životne sredine i klime prećutkuju, a namere i želje migranata/kinja da se domognu željenog blagostanja u zemljama Evropske unije ne uvažavaju, već osujećuju.

S druge strane, kao direktan odgovor na kriminalizaciju migracija i stigmatizaciju samih migranata/kinja pojavljuju se *grass root* inicijative (*No border* ili slične inicijative) koje pomažu migrantima/kinjama da stignu do željene destinacije uvažavajući pravo svake osobe da se slobodno kreće i nastani tamo gde želi. Iako se usredsređuju, pre svega, na individualnu pomoć pojedincima/kama migrantima/kinjama i često ne razumeju politički kontekst u kome deluju, njihov angažman predstavlja autentičan i konsekventan zahtev za apsolutnom slobodom kretanja i oni u svakoj pojedinačnoj sudbini vide priliku da iskažu solidarnost sa migrantima/kinjama i konkretnim akcijama iskorače iz svojih privilegija. Iako najčešće deluju u okviru različitih subkulturnih niša, nema sumnje da jedini imaju neposredan i ljudski kontakt sa migrantima/kinjama i da su njihovi uvidi nezamenljiva svedočanstva teškog položaja u kome se migranti/kinje nalaze.

Ono što karakteriše i što će karakterisati svaki budući aktivizam je činjenica da migranti/kinje bez regulisanog statusa, dakle, ona najugroženija većina, ne mogu da se uključe u borbu za ostvarivanje svojih prava i da će svaki aktivizam imati paternalistički karakter. Takođe, s obzirom na odbijanje države da se i minimalno angažuje oko obezbeđivanja elementarnih uslova za život migranata/kinja, radikalne inicijative će završavati kao humanitarno saniranje njihovih egzistencijalnih problema.

Mediji u Srbiji se nedovoljno, a pre svega senzacionalistički, bave ovom temom svodeći problem migracija na egzotični prikaz Drugog i njegovog avanturističkog pohoda. Takav pristup umesto da utiče na bolje upoznavanje sa migrantima/kinjama, njihovim pravima i problemima, dodatno podstiče predrasude, a neretko doprinosi i pojavi nasilja nad migrantima/kinjama. Na sreću, s obzirom na njihovu nevidljivost, ti/kinje još uvek nisu postali primarna meta ultradesničarskih i ideološke neistomišljenike/ce susednih država koje su se zatekle na njenoj strani. Evropske unije da budu

stražari Tvrdave Evrope, pri čemu često ovu restriktivnu politiku sprovode i prema svojim građanima/kama (npr. Romi/kinje migrante/kinje iz Srbije žrtve su nezakonitog postupanja policije, rasnog profilisanja na granici itd). Organizacije za ljudska prava se nalaze na prekretnici na kojoj treba da izaberu da li će neselektivno braniti ljudska prava i sačuvati svoju autonomiju ili će to podrediti finansijskoj pomoći Evropske unije.

očekivanu pozornost, a pojedinačni slučajevi se predstavljaju kao dirljive i depolitizovane ljudske priče koje se srećno razrešavaju uz malo ogreva ili čebadi. Pri tome se uzroci migracija koji se nalaze u viševekovnoj kolonijalističkoj eksploataciji Juga i daljem pljačkanju i osiromašivanju, ratnom razaranju i uništavanju ekonomije, životne sredine i klime prećutkuju, a namere i želje migranata/kinja da se domognu željenog blagostanja u zemljama Evropske unije ne uvažavaju, već osujećuju.

S druge strane, kao direktan odgovor na kriminalizaciju migracija i stigmatizaciju samih migranata/kinja pojavljuju se *grass root* inicijative (*No border* ili slične inicijative) koje pomažu migrantima/kinjama da stignu do željene destinacije uvažavajući pravo svake osobe da se slobodno kreće i nastani tamo gde želi. Iako se usredsređuju, pre svega, na individualnu pomoć pojedincima/kama migrantima/kinjama i često ne razumeju politički kontekst u kome deluju, njihov angažman predstavlja autentičan i konsekventan zahtev za apsolutnom slobodom kretanja i oni u svakoj pojedinačnoj sudbini vide priliku da iskažu solidarnost sa migrantima/kinjama i konkretnim akcijama iskorače iz svojih privilegija. Iako najčešće deluju u okviru različitih subkulturnih niša, nema sumnje da jedini imaju neposredan i ljudski kontakt sa migrantima/kinjama i da su njihovi uvidi nezamenljiva svedočanstva teškog položaja u kome se migranti/kinje nalaze.

Ono što karakteriše i što će karakterisati svaki budući aktivizam je činjenica da migranti/kinje bez regulisanog statusa, dakle, ona najugroženija većina, ne mogu da se uključe u borbu za ostvarivanje svojih prava i da će svaki aktivizam imati paternalistički karakter. Takođe, s obzirom na odbijanje države da se i minimalno angažuje oko obezbeđivanja elementarnih uslova za život migranata/kinja, radikalne inicijative će završavati kao humanitarno saniranje njihovih egzistencijalnih problema.

Mediji u Srbiji se nedovoljno, a pre svega senzacionalistički, bave ovom temom svodeći problem migracija na egzotični prikaz Drugog i njegovog avanturističkog pohoda. Takav pristup umesto da utiče na bolje upoznavanje sa migrantima/kinjama, njihovim pravima i problemima, dodatno podstiče predrasude, a neretko doprinosi i pojavi nasilja nad migrantima/kinjama. Na sreću, s obzirom na njihovu nevidljivost, migranti/kinje još uvek nisu postali primarna meta ultradesničarskih organizacija koji još uvek kao arhineprijatelje vide pripadnike/ce susednih naroda, Roma, LGBT osobe i ideološke neistomišljenike/ce.

Srbija je obavezna da štiti prava svih osoba koje su se zatekle na njenoj teritoriji, a njene institucije da odole pritisku Evropske unije da budu

stražari Tvrđave Evrope, pri čemu često ovu restriktivnu politiku sprovode i prema svojim građanima/kama (npr. Romi/kinje migrante/kinje iz Srbije žrtve su nezakonitog postupanja policije, rasnog profilisanja na granici itd). Organizacije za ljudska prava se nalaze na prekretnici na kojoj treba da izaberu da li će neselektivno braniti ljudska prava i sačuvati svoju autonomiju ili će to podrediti finansijskoj pomoći Evropske unije.

DEBATE "MAN ON THE ROAD"

Searching for better life, while frequently also fleeing from war and war destruction, as well as from extreme poverty, exploitation and economic violence, a significant number of people from the impoverished South, decide to set on a journey full of uncertainties and difficulties, across well-guarded borders, in order to reach the countries in which they believe a better life to be waiting for them. The final destination for most of them is Western Europe, yet more restrictive migration policies there ward off their arrival and jeopardize the very journey they have undertaken to reach the desired countries. These policies also include external control of the Schengen borders and obligation of the countries which are not the members of the European Union to stop the influx of migrants to the EU. Considering the aspirations of Serbia to join this Union, its political elite agreed to participate in implementation of the European policies which criminalize migrations and reduce migrants to the status of illegal aliens whose fundamental human rights are being denied. More rigorous border controls in general, and especially harsher control of the Mediterranean, made the Balkan route popular once again, as it brings migrants from the impoverished South to the European Union via Serbia and other Balkan countries. These circumstances introduced a dilemma for the human rights organizations in Serbia: what is the real significance of universal human rights, primarily of the right to free movement; whether it is possible to restrict them and how to justify that restriction.

The role of human rights organizations becomes quite problematic in this process. Many have traded off their commitment to human rights in return for maintained and plentiful financial assistance from the EU, who supports the projects which offer humanitarian aid to migrants while discouraging them from further journey (by either deporting them and „voluntarily“ returning them to their countries of origin, or temporarily detaining them in Serbia). These organizations also acquire the language of European migration policies which criminalizes migrations – people are becoming illegal, forced deportations are presented as voluntary returns, while new legal institutes such as „safe country of origin“, created to stop unwanted migrations, are uncritically accepted and justified. Considering their unstable funding, yet insatiable appetites, it is no wonder that, in exchange for financial security, certain organizations have agreed to advocate for the policies which demand of Serbia to offers full political, institutional and logistic support to the control of the external

borders of Fortress Europe, or to be outsourced as service providers of humanitarian services to the migrants currently residing in Serbia. The fact that the current practices of the EU relating to migrants severely erode the international legal heritage which protects refugees, asylum seekers and migrants, unfortunately does not draw a lot of attention, while at the same time individual cases are presented as touching and de-politicized human stories which could be happily resolved by means of some firewood or blankets. At the same time, the causes of migrations, which are deeply rooted in the centuries' long colonial exploitation of the South, as well as its further plundering and impoverishment, war havoc and the destruction of economy, environment and climate, are bypassed while the migrants' intents and wishes to reach the prosperity they look for are not respected, but rather thwarted.

On the other hand, as a direct response to the criminalization of migrations and stigmatization of migrants, grass root initiatives (such as *No border* or similar) are emerging, to support migrants reaching their desired destinations, while respecting the right of each individual to move freely and reside wherever he/she may desire. Though their primary focus is on personal support to individual migrants, and they often lack full understanding of the political context in which they operate, their involvement represent an authentic and consequential demand for absolute freedom of movement, just as they see an opportunity, in each and every individual destiny, to express solidarity with migrants and step out from their privileges through concrete actions. Though they mostly operate in various subcultural niches, it is undeniable that they are the only ones to nurture direct and humane contact with migrants and that their insights are authentic testimonies of the harsh conditions of these people.

What presently characterizes every activism, and will continue to do so in the future, is the fact that the undocumented migrants, i.e. those constituting the most vulnerable and majority group among them, are unable to join the struggle for their own rights and therefore every activism must have paternalistic character. In addition, bearing in mind that state refuses to become even minimally involved in providing basic living conditions for migrants, radical initiatives will end up being a humanitarian mending of their existential problems.

Media in Serbia cover this topic scarcely and in a sensationalist manner, as they reduce the problem of migration to the exotic presentation of Others and their adventurous quest. Instead of familiarizing people with migrants, their rights and problems, this media approach additionally instigates prejudices and frequently contributes to the occurrence of

violence against migrants. Fortunately, since they still remain invisible in public life, migrants have not become a primary target for ultra-rightist organizations yet, since they still consider the citizens of neighbouring nations, Roma, LGBT persons and ideological adversaries to be their archenemies.

Serbia has an obligation to protect human rights of all people on its territory and its institutions should withstand the pressure from the European Union to become guardians of Fortress Europe and implement these restrictive policies, often against their own citizens (e.g. Roma migrants from Serbia are victims of illegal police actions, racial profiling, etc.). Human rights organizations confronted with the dilemma should decide whether they will non-selectively defend human rights and keep their autonomy, or will they sacrifice these principles for the financial support of the European Union.

Vladimir Petronijević

SRBIJA KAO PODELJENO DRUŠTVO- GDE SU TU MIGRANTI?

Živimo u svetu koji se suočava sa dva podjednako prisutna i suprotstavljena procesa. Jedan je proces globalizacije, koji briše granice, podstiče mobilnost, ali i koncentraciju kapitala i produbljuje jaz između bogatih i siromašnih. S druge strane je, podjednako prisutan, a na ovim našim prostorima i dominantan, proces partikularizacije, koji od Barselone do Prištine, intenzivno zagovara segmentaciju država, nove i čvrste granice. Paradoks je da države odnosno političke elite koje zagovaraju globalizam, kao neumitan proces, često posežu za granicama, ograničenjima i zabranama kada je reč o kretanju ljudi-migracijama.

Naravno, Srbija, kao država nastala na razvalinama ratom razrušene Jugoslavije, i sama se našla zatečena sve većim brojem migranata na svojoj teritoriji. Posle više od 500.000 izbeglica, interno raseljenih lica, koje je zbrinula i pokušala da integriše, odjednom se suočava sa sve većim brojem Avganistanaca, Pakistanaca i drugih koji od nje očekuju pomoć. Srbija, koja ne uspeva da specifičnosti različitih etničkih zajednica koje u njoj žive oduvek integriše u jedan prihvatljiv društveni sistem, sada se suočava sa fenomenom novih *novopridošlih*.

Kada nema takvog sistema, populizam lažne političke elite, podstaknut medijima, preuzima primat i stvara uslove za nove konflikte i podele.

Da bismo mogli da odgovorimo na pitanje zbog čega *novopridošli* nailaze na nerazumevanje lokalne sredine, moramo sagledati kako se naše društvo generalno odnosi prema različitostima... recimo, nacionalnim. Srpsko društvo izgubilo je svoje repere raspadom bivše države. Titovoj Jugoslaviji može se mnogo toga prigovoriti, ali niko ne može negirati postojanje jednog društvenog sistema u čijem središtu je bila ideološka potka bratstva i jedinstva. Sa svim svojim manama, to je ipak bila jedna ozbiljna država. U toj državi govorio se srpsko-hrvatski odnosno hrvatsko-srpski jezik, a pripadam generaciji koja je jedan dan pisala ćirilicom, a drugi dan latinicom, porastao sam družeći se i sa Romima i sa Srbima i sa Makedoncima, nikada nisam imao problem da se sa njim sporazumem na jeziku koji smo svi govorili.

A šta nam je doneo rat? Pored velikog broja žrtava stradalih u najsvirepijim zločinima, bespovratno nam je doneo podeljenost društva

po kriterijumu etničke, verske odnosno nacionalne pripadnosti. Danas u Srbiji Mađari imaju ne samo nastavu jezika i književnosti na svom jeziku, već i fiziku, matematiku... danas se i kultura želi staviti u uske manjinske i većinske okvire, kako se ne bi mešala, što nas dovodi do apsurdna-kultura koja se želi sputati, uokviriti, prestaje to da bude, već postaje sredstvo za otvaranje novih podela i sukoba. No, to je nama naša borba dala u vidu tzv. kolektivnih prava.

Pa kako onda jedno takvo društvo može prihvatiti *novopridošle*, uz to one sa kojima se stvarno ne možemo sporazumeti, čiju kulturu jako slobodno poznajemo ili ne poznajemo uopšte, koji su druge boje kože, a koji su toliko očajni da su spremni da prevale i hiljade kilometara samo da bi pobešli od rata, bede, beznađa u kojem su se našli.

Ukoliko se bude sledio primer naše nacionalne i lokalne političke elite onda vrlo teško... toliko odsustvo političke zrelosti i osećaja za društveni trenutak i situaciju u kojoj se nalazimo naši političari su još jednom pokazali na primeru azilanata i to samo tokom prošle godine. Jedan važni opozicioni političar izjavio je da Centar za azil u Mladenovcu jeste primer kažnjavanja jedne opštine u kojoj je njegova stranka na vlasti... lokalni, bolje reći, mesni političari, pitanje borbe protiv azilanata postavili su visoko na listi prioriteta izbora za mesnu zajednicu. Stereotipi, da nećemo da nam otimaju decu, siluju žene, krađu po okolini, zdušno su preuzeti i od mnogih medija, koji umesto da objasne razloge dolaska tih ljudi, dodatno potpiruju palanačku atmosferu lažnog straha.

Pa šta nam je onda činiti? Mišljenja sam da se još jednom moramo zagledati u sebe i zapitati: kuda to kao društvo želimo da idemo? Postoje li u našem društvu bar one minimalne snage koje će sebi i drugima pokušati da objasne šta znači biti deo savremenog i modernog sveta? Ukoliko želite... i šta znači biti deo Evrope... mantra po kojoj bismo u EU, a da se ne menjamo, samo će nas odvesti u još jedno bolno razočaranje. Na žalost ni današnja Evropa ne može se pohvaliti svojom otvorenosću prema migrantima, naprotiv... ali ko kod je imao priliku da poseti bilo koji veći evropski grad, nije mogao a da ne primeti svu tu različitost u ljudima koji žive u tim metropolama... da li mi to možemo i hoćemo da prihvatimo... to je pravo pitanje... a sistem azila i efikasna zaštita... daleko smo još od toga...

Vladimir Petronijević

SERBIA AS A DIVIDED SOCIETY – WHERE ARE THOSE MIGRANTS?

We live in the world which faces two equally represented, yet clashing processes. First is the process of globalization which erases borders and stimulates mobility, but also induces accumulation of capital and widens the gap between the rich and the poor. The other, equally present and in this region of ours even dominant process, is the one of particularization, operating from Barcelona all the way to Pristina, which advocates for segmentation of states, as well as new, firmer borders. Paradoxically, the states i.e. political elites which advocate for globalism as an inevitable process, often resort to borders, limitations and prohibitions when it comes to the people's movement – migrations.

Naturally, as a state founded on the ruins of the war-torn Yugoslavia, Serbia found itself confounded by the ever increasing number of migrants on its territory. After half a million refugees and internally displaced persons it has taken care of and tried to integrate, Serbia is now suddenly faced with more and more Afghans, Pakistanis and citizens of other countries, which demand its help. Serbia, which has never managed to entirely integrate the specific traits of the different ethnic communities that have lived on its territory since times immemorial into a single acceptable social system, is now faced with the phenomenon of new *newcomers*.

When such system does not exist, the populism of false political elite, encouraged by the media, takes primacy and creates environment of new conflicts and divisions.

In order to be able to answer the question of why the *newcomers* encounter the lack of understanding in the local environment, we must understand the way in which our society generally responds to diversity of any kind... national one, for example. Serbian society lost its referential benchmarks in the process of dissolution of the former state. Tito's Yugoslavia may have been accused of many things but the one thing undisputed was the existence of a social system with the ideology of fraternity and unity at its core. Regardless of its many flaws, this was indeed a serious state. In that country the spoken language was Serbo-Croatian, or Croat-Serbian, and I belong to a generation which would write in Cyrillic letters one day, and in Latin alphabet the next; I grew

up having Romany, Serbian and Macedonian friends and we never had problems to communicate in the language that we all knew and spoke.

And what did the war bring us? Apart from a great number of victims killed in the most brutal of crimes, it gave us a society which is eternally divided according to ethnicity, religion and nationality. In today's Serbia, Hungarians are taught in Hungarian, not only their mother tongue and literature, but also mathematics, physics... Today, even culture tends to be narrow-mindedly compartmentalized into majority and minority cultures, so as not to mix, which results in absurdity – when constrained and framed, culture ceases to be culture, but rather becomes an instrument for the creation of further divisions and conflicts. Be that as it may, this is what we gained from the war...

So how could a society such as this one accept the *newcomers*, especially providing that we really cannot communicate with them, we have limited or no knowledge of their culture, they have different skin colour, and are desperate enough to travel thousands of kilometres only to escape war, poverty and hopelessness that befell them?

If we would follow the suit of our national and local political elite, then it would be quite hard... The absence of political maturity or the grasp of the present social moment and situation was once again demonstrated by our politicians on the example of asylum seekers, and not only during last year's incidents. An important opposition politician said that the asylum centre in Mladenovac was the punishment imposed on the municipality for the offence of being ruled by his party... Local, or rather say parochial politicians have placed the issue of combating asylum seekers high on the list of priorities in the local election campaign agenda. The stereotypes that we do not want them kidnapping our children, raping our women, or thieving in our communities, are enthusiastically adopted by a large number of media who additionally fuel this provincial atmosphere of pseudo-fear, rather than explaining the reasons that brought those people to our country.

So what are we to do then? I believe that we need to once again look inside ourselves and ask: where do we want to go as society? Do the forces exist in our society, if only minimal, who would try to explain to themselves and to others what it means to be a part of the modern world? In case we want that. And what does it mean to be a part of Europe? Since the mantra of us wanting to be in the EU, yet not wanting to change would only result in yet another bitter disappointment. Unfortunately, not even today's Europe can take pride in being open to migrants, on the contrary... Yet, anyone who had the opportunity to visit any large European city could

not but notice all the diversity inherent to the people living in those metropolises... Are we willing and able to accept this? This is the true question. And as for the asylum system and efficient protection? For us, this might still be in the distant future...

ČOVEK NA PUTU: SRBIJA KAO SIGURNA ZEMLJA

„Rođen sam na istoku Nigerije u dobroj hrišćanskoj porodici. Otac mi je umro dok sam bio dete. Majka me je sama odgajala. Njena familija je se odrekla jer se udala po svojoj volji, za čoveka koga nisu odobrivali. Jedino nam je s vremena na vreme pomagao jedan ujak. U našem mestu svako dete prođe inicijaciju. Hteli su da me iniciraju kad sam bio mali ali moja majka to nije prihvatila. Mi smo hrišćani. Dobri hrišćani. Nekoliko godina kasnije, „kralj“ (upravnik geografsko-administrativne oblasti, prim. aut.) je zahtevao od moje majke da me dovede kod njega. To je bilo 2009. godine. Imao sam dvadesetak godina tada. Moja majka je rekla da neće dozvoliti da mi se išta desi. Majka je plakala. Nisam razumeo šta se dešava. Majka mi nije pričala o tome šta se ranije desilo. Posle nekoliko dana „kralj“ je poslao svoje ljude da me uhvate i dovedu u njegovu palatu. Bio sam u svojoj sobi. Moja majka nije bila tu. Uхватili su me i odveli. Jedan od članova „kraljevog“ obezbeđenja je moj dobar drugar. On je bio zbunjen. Nije znao šta da radi. On je znao šta me čeka. Moja majka je čula šta se događa. Dovedli su je i čuo sam kako plače u sobi iza. Posle su me odveli do mesta ispred zgrade, tamo gde se obavlja inicijacija. Vezali su me naopačke. Tokom noći je moj prijatelj posetio moju majku. Pitao je da li može nešto da uradi. Rekla je da uradi šta god može. Došli su i on me oslobodio. Pošto me je odvezao, otrčali smo odatle. Moja majka mu je dala novac da me odvede što dalje može. Krenuli smo na sever. Zaustavljeni smo negde...”

Ovako započinje priču o početku svog izgnanstva jedan mladi čovek iz Nigerije. U poslednje vreme, a naročito od tzv. Arapskog proleća i pooštavanja kontrole maritimnih migracijskih ruta od strane raznih evropskih i drugih službi, sve je više ljudi koji preko Turske i Grčke stižu u Srbiju iz smera Makedonije, Bugarske, Crne Gore ili sa Kosova. Traženje azila u Srbiji ne znači istovremeno i odricanje od mogućnosti da se azil zatraži i u nekoj drugoj zemlji, budući da Srbija još uvek nije potpisnica međunarodnih ugovora koji zahtevaju razmenu podataka o neregularnim migrantima i licima koja traže azil, poput ozloglašene tzv. Dablinske regulacije, koja je 2013. doživela svoju treću verziju, niti je član Frontex-a, sve brojnije i jače organizacije kojoj je jedan od ciljeva sprečavanje tzv. neregularne migracije. Srbija nije član Evropske unije. Ali želi da to postane.

„...Tako sam putovao iz zemlje u zemlju. Ljudi su mi pomagali. Stigao sam u Tursku. Nisam ni znao da sam stigao u Tursku. Samo su mi jednom rekli:

„Ovo je Turska“. Odveli su me pravo u kamp gde je bilo puno Nigerijaca. Oni su mi rekli da moram da odem iz Turske. U Grčku. Jedan čovek mi je dao novac da odem u Grčku. Ja nisam imao para. Video sam neke crnce koji su isto išli i mnogo su mi pomogli. Kada sam stigao u Grčku, otišao sam u crkvu koja je ista kao moja. Oni su mi dali posao i smeštaj i hranu. Tako sam živeo. Mnogo sam radio za crkvu. Imao sam malo vremena za ostalo, za privatni život. Posle tri godine života u Grčkoj, počeo je ovaj problem sa Zlatnom zorom. Zato sam morao da odem iz Grčke. Ima Afrikanaca koji su dobri. Ima Afrikanaca koji su loši. Ima belaca koji su dobri. Ima belaca koji su loši. U svakoj zemlji ima dobrih i loših ljudi. U Grčkoj ima više loših. U Srbiji su ljudi druželjubivi. Ne svuda. Ne u Bogovađi i Vračeviću. Tri nedelje sam spavao u šumi u Bogovađi. Neki ljudi spavaju u šumi mesec dana, dva meseca, tri meseca. Ja sam imao sreće. Ja sam srećković. Ovde uglavnom gledam televiziju. Ne izlazim da ne bih upao u nevolju. Plašim se nevolja. Tražio sam prijatelja preko interneta i preko ljudi koje sam sreo u Grčkoj. Ali nisam uspeo. Komuniciram sa ljudima koje sam upoznao u Grčkoj i koji nisu mogli da odu drugde a ne smeju da se vrate. Nekad ih stave u zatvor. U zatvor. Jednom kad počneš da ideš, ne smeš da staneš. Ako te uhvate na granici, mogu da te vrate. I pošalju na šest meseci u zatvor. Nekad i na 18 meseci. Ne smem u zatvor. Plašim se zatvora. Jednom sam bio zarobljen i dosta mi je. Voleo bih da dobijem jednogodišnju zaštitu u Srbiji. Ne smeta mi što je zemlja siromašna. Ne bih da me vrate u Grčku. Imam jednog prijatelja u Austriji. Pozvao me je da dođem kod njega. Znam i neke ljude u Italiji. Mogao bih i tamo da pokušam. Bilo bi mi lakše da dobijem vizu ako imam zaštitu u Srbiji. Voleo bih da imam život kao tvoj. Suprugu, decu, posao. Ti imaš više sreće od mene. Ti si pravi srećković.“

Nekih stvari koje uzimamo zdravo za gotovo postanemo svesni tek kada se susretnemo sa slučajevima poput ovog. Shvatimo da su mnoga prava i slobode zapravo rezervisani za određene populacije, te stoga situaciono a ne univerzalno primenjivi, čak ni na teritoriji pod suverenitetom jedne iste države. Ideja univerzalnih ljudskih prava, koja će važiti za sve ljude, je relativno nov fenomen. Potreba za njihovim definisanjem kristalisala se u pokušaju da se preduprede zločini koji bi podsećali na one počinjene tokom Drugog svetskog rata.

Poštovanje i zaštita ljudskih prava koja proizilaze iz Opšte deklaracije o pravima čoveka UN iz 1948. i konvencija i deklaracija koje su joj sledile, percipira se kao vrhunac socio-političkog uređenja neke zemlje. Predstavlja ideal kome treba težiti kako bi se formiralo i ustalilo društvo socijalnih sloboda. Zato je postavljeno kao jedan od imperativa funkcionisanja EU. Međutim, uprkos postojanju velikog broja međunarodnih sporazuma o poštovanju ljudskih prava, kao i različitih komisija, organizacija i agencija za monitoring njihovog sporvođenja,

činjenica je da postojeći sistem za zaštitu ljudskih prava ne funkcioniše najbolje (Crawford 2000). Uzroci takvog stanja su raznoliki, počev od organizacionih, gde je dominantan problem manjak ljudstva i sredstava, preko proceduralnih, budući da su izveštaji o kršenjima ljudskih prava periodični, sporadični i selektivni, pa sve do političkih, kako nacionalnih, tako i međunarodnih. Na nivou države, poštovanje i zaštitu ljudskih prava inhibira, pre svega, marginalizacija sporazuma u unutrašnjoj politici države, ali i sumnjiva stručnost i nezavisnost članova pojedinih komisija (uporedi Alston 2000, 502). Na međunarodnom nivou, osnovni problem je nemogućnost vršenja adekvatnog pritiska na države i strukture koje krše ljudska prava, odnosno, na strukture koje bi mogle da doprinesu njihovoj zaštiti a u datom trenutku su inertne (uporedi Crawford 2000).

O tome da su sporazumi o ljudskim pravima i njihovo sprovođenje, pre svega, nacionalna stvar govori Gallagher: „At the end of the day, individual rights and freedoms will be protected or violated because of what exists or what is lacking within a given state or society, and not because of what is said or done within the United Nations *Palais des Nations* in Geneva.” (Gallagher 2000, 201, italik u originalu). Štaviše, „Human rights are best protected in societies governed by the rule of law and by a representative, accountable government“ (Ibid., 201). Sa druge strane, Alston naglašava da je percepcija da se ljudska prava najbolje štite u liberalno-demokratskim, pre svega zapadnim društvima, u najmanju ruku preterano pojednostavljeno gledište, i to iz nekoliko razloga. Pre svega, kada se porede države među sobom, razlike u poštovanju/kršenju ljudskih prava su razlike u intenzitetu a ne u vrsti. Tako bogate zapadne zemlje često ne dostavljaju izveštaje o kršenjima ljudskih prava na svojoj teritoriji, niti ulažu u strukture koje bi to nadgledale. Povrh toga, u nekim državama koje važe za liberalno-demokratske je čak nemoguće izneti kritiku društva, jer dominira percepcija da se u njima ljudska prava u potpunosti poštuju, ili se smatra normalnim da za neke populacije (socijalne kategorije) važe jedna a za druge neka druga pravila (Alston 2000).

Pravo na azil predstavlja jedno od univerzalnih ljudskih prava. Osoba kojoj se u nekoj državi krše osnovna ljudska prava, konkretnije, koja trpi proganjanje na rasnoj, nacionalnoj, verskoj, političkoj ili na osnovu pripadnosti nekoj društvenoj grupi, ima pravo da u nekoj drugoj državi zatraži azil. Ta druga država treba da bude *sigurna* za lice koje je zatražilo azil, to jest, da mu garantuje zaštitu ranije kršenih prava, odnosno, da mu garantuje život dostojan čoveka.¹ U praksi je ta stvar daleko manje

¹ U preambuli Opšte deklaracije o pravima čoveka iz 1948. evidentno je prisustvo premise o postojanju neke univerzalne ljudske prirode nezavisne od pojedinačnih kultura, istorijskih i geografskih oklonosti. Tu univerzalnu ljudsku prirodu čini ljudima svojstveno dostojanstvo. Iako ta ljudska priroda nije precizirana u Preambuli, ona se može implicitno razumeti na osnovu odredbi koje slede.

uzvišena: “[t]he notion of ‘safe country’ has been described as procedural mechanism for shuttling asylum seekers to other States said to have primary responsibility for them, thereby avoiding the necessity to make a decision on the merits because another country is deemed or imagined to be secure. In simple words, the concept of ‘safe country’ was invented to send asylum seekers back whence they came,” (Lambert 2012, 318).

Jedan od zahteva koje je Srbija morala da ispuni u procesu evrointegracija bilo je i to da dobije status sigurne zemlje. U kontekstu prava na azil, posledice tog priznanja su dvojake: s jedne strane, Srbija je dobila mogućnost i obavezu da dodeljuje azil onima koji ga zatraže i ispunjavaju kriterijume za to, dok su sa druge strane zahtevi za azil koje podnose državljani Srbije u zemljama EU neosnovani. Konkretnije, formiranje nezavisnog azilnog sistema u Srbiji je bio jedan od zahteva koji su postavljeni kako bi se Srbiji dozvolila vizna liberalizacija sa zemljama EU.

Ovde ću se osvrnuti na položaj državljana drugih zemalja koji u Srbiji traže azil. Podaci o broju lica koji su od 2008. godine zatražila i broju lica koja su dobila azil u Srbiji su poražavajući. Odobreno je manje od jednog promila zahteva.² Iako se uzroci takvog stanja mogu tražiti na proceduralnoj ravni (nedostatak kadra, odustajanje od zahteva, obustava slučaja i tako dalje), ovim se samo potvrđuje da je svrha postojanja takvog azilnog sistema političke prirode, tj. da nezavisan azilni sistem predstavlja posledicu napora Republike Srbije da se prilibži EU, a ne posledicu napora da se opravda status sigurne zemlje i ljudima u nevolji pruži utočište. Osim regionalne politike, na položaj lica koja traže azil u Srbiji utiče i konfrontacija lokalnih političkih struktura, koja se lomi upravo na leđima tražilaca azila. To nedvosmisleno pokazuju dešavanja u Obrenovcu, Vračeviću i Bogovađi u jesen 2013. godine, ali i raniji primeri politizacije prisustva migranata u Banji Koviljači, Subotici i Mladenovcu. Ljudsko dostojanstvo postaje rezervisano za državljane, a humanost se transformiše u sredstvo za postizanje političkih ciljeva.

U sredini tog vorteksa nalaze se ljudi na putu, prinuđeni na migraciju u potrazi za (boljim) životom. Osim što su dehumanizovani u smislu kvota kojima se precizira koliko osoba iz koje zemlje će moći po kom osnovu da dobije azil ili dozvolu boravka, ili u smislu toga što ne mogu sami da odrede u kojoj zemlji će zatražiti azil, već to moraju da učine kako ih ne bi automatski deportovali, tražioci azila su dehumanizovani i na taj način što postaju sredstvo političkog sukobljavanja kome svrha leži daleko od azilnog sistema, ljudskih prava i života samih tražilaca azila. Sa stanovišta sistema, nisu čak ni pioniri u nekoj perfidnoj šahovskoj igri, jer i pioniri

² Najnoviji izveštaj lako dostupna n javnosti može se naći na http://azil.rs/doc/periodi_ni_izve_taj_FINALNI_jun_oktobar_2013.pdf

mogu da aktivno učestvuju, već su reifikovani, pretvoreni u stvar, loptice za fliper koje svako gura kako stigne i koje se zaustave tamo gde žele ako baš imaju puno sreće. Zato i ne iznenađuje to što je zaobilazanje sistema nekad jedini način da nefavorizovani migranti i unapred otpisani tražioci azila priđu svom cilju.

Farsičnost ovakvog sistema zaštite osnovnih ljudskih prava, međutim, ne znači da od same ideje ljudskih prava treba odustati iz prostog razloga što se alternativa iz ove perspektive čini previše zastrašujućom. Možda će kritika postojeće prakse dovesti do formiranja efikasnijih modela, a možda će ukazati na konceptualne nedostatke i kroz njihovo ispravljanje doprineti uspostavljanju potpuno novih sistema zaštite ljudskih prava.

Literatura:

Alston, Philip. (2000). Beyond "Them" and "Us": Putting Treaty Body Reform into Perspective. In: *The Future of Human Rights Treaty Monitoring*, Alston, Philip and James Crawford (eds.), pages: 501-525. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crawford, James. (2000). The UN human rights treaty system: A system in crisis?. In: *The Future of Human Rights Treaty Monitoring*, Alston, Philip and James Crawford (eds.), pages: 1-14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gallagher, Anne. (2000). Making Human Rights Treaty Obligations a Reality: Working with New Actors and Partners. In: *The Future of Human Rights Treaty Monitoring*, Alston, Philip and James Crawford (eds.), pages: 201-227. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lambert, Hélène. (2012). 'Safe third country' in the European Union: An evolving concept in international law and implications for the UK. *Journal of Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Law* 26(4): 318-336

Marta Stojić Mitrović

MAN ON THE ROAD: SERBIA AS A SAFE COUNTRY

"I was born in the east of Nigeria in a good Christian family. My father died when I was a child. My mother raised me all by herself. Her family abandoned her because she married of her own will, for a man they didn't approve. The only person who helped us from time to time was one uncle. In our village every child must do initiation. They wanted to initiate me when I was little, but my mother refused. We are Christians. Good Christians. After some years, the "King" (ruler of a geographical-administrative area, A/N) demanded that my mother bring me to him. This happens in 2009. I was 20 then. My mother said that she would not allow anything happen to me. She cried. I didn't understand what was going on. My mother, she never tells me about this before. After some days, the King sent his men to catch me and bring me to his palace. I was in my room. My mother wasn't there. They caught me and took me. One of the King's men, one of his bodyguards was a good friend of mine. He was confused. He didn't know what to do. He knew what I am facing. So after (later, A/N) my mother heard what is going on. She came and they take her to the backroom – I heard her crying. After, they took me out to the place in front of the initiation ground. They tied me upside-down. During the night, the friend of mine visited my mother. He asked if there is something she want him to do. My mother asked him to do anything he could. They came and he released me. After he tied me off, we ran. My mother gave him money to take me to the far, far, far place. We went north. They stopped us somewhere..."

This is how a young man from Nigeria begins the story of his exile. In recent years, and especially after the so-called Arab Spring and the tightening of the control of maritime migration routes' by various European and other agencies, more and more people are arriving to Serbia from Turkey and Greece via Macedonia, Bulgaria, Montenegro, or Kosovo. Applying for asylum in Serbia does not automatically imply that the one can't seek asylum in some other country, because Serbia neither signed international agreements which demand exchange of data about irregular migrants and asylum seekers, such as the notorious Dublin Regulation which got its third version in 2013, nor it became a member of Frontex, an organization that is becoming larger and stronger every day and which has the prevention of the so-called irregular migrations listed as one of its priorities. Serbia is not a member of the European Union. But it aspires to become one.

“...So I travelled from country to country. People helped me. I arrived to Turkey. I didn't know that I arrived to Turkey. They just told me: “This is Turkey”. They took me directly to the camp with many Nigerians in it. They told me that I must leave Turkey. To Greece. A man gave me the money to go to Greece. I had no money myself. I met some black people who were also going there and they helped me a lot. When I arrived to Greece I went to a church which is the same as mine. They gave me work, they gave me shelter and food. This is how I lived. I worked for the church a lot. I had little time for anything else, for private life. After three years in Greece this problem with the Golden Dawn appeared. This was why I had to leave Greece. There are good Africans, there are bad Africans. There are good white people, there are bad white people. Every country has good and bad people. In Greece there are more bad. In Serbia, people are friendly. Not everywhere. Not in Bogovada and Vračević. I slept in the forest for three weeks in Bogovada. Some people sleep in the forest for one month, two months, three months. I was lucky. I am a lucky guy. Here I watch TV most. I don't go out, to avoid troubles. I am afraid of troubles. I tried to find on internet my friends and the people I met in Greece. But I couldn't. I am in contact with people who I met in Greece, and who couldn't go somewhere else and they can't go back. They sometimes put them in prison. In prison. Once you start moving, you must not stop. If they catch you on the border, they can send you back. Or they put you in prison for 6 months. Sometimes even 18 months. I can't go to prison. I am afraid of prisons. I was captured once and that is enough for me. I would like to get one year protection in Serbia. I don't care if the country is poor. I don't want to be sent back to Greece. I have a friend in Austria. He invited me to visit him. I also know some people in Italy. I can also try there. It would be easier for me to get visa if I have Serbian protection. I would like to have a life like yours. A wife, children, a job. You are more lucky than me. You're a true lucky guy.”

We become aware of some things that we take for granted, only when we encounter the cases such as this one. We realize that many rights and freedoms are actually reserved for particular populations, and are thus situationally and not universally applicable, even on a territory of a single state. The notion of universal human rights that would apply to all people, is a relatively recent phenomenon. The need to define them crystalized in the attempts to prevent the crimes that would resemble those committed in the WWII.

Respect and protection of human rights arising from the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948, as well as from the later conventions and declarations, is perceived as a supreme value in the social and political system of a country. It represents the ideal that needs to be strived for

so the society of social freedoms could be founded and maintained. Therefore it became an imperative of the functioning of the EU. However, even though there is a great number of international agreements concerning the respect of human rights, as well as different committees, organizations and agencies that monitor their implementation, the fact is that the existing human rights protection system does not function well (Crawford 2000). The reasons for such situation are various, ranging from organizational ones, where the dominant problem is the lack of human and financial resources, then procedural, due to the fact that the reports on human rights' violations are published periodically, sporadically and selectively, right down to political ones, including both national and international ones. On the level of state, respect for and protection of human rights is primarily inhibited by marginalization of the agreements in the state's internal affairs, as well as by doubtful professionalism and independence of the members of certain committees (compare with Alston 2000, 502). On international level, the basic problem represents the inability to put adequate pressure on the states and structures which violate human rights, or to the structures that could contribute to their protection but which stay inert (compare with Crawford 2000).

The notion that the agreements on human rights and their implementation are of a primarily national character is argued by Gallagher: “At the end of the day, individual rights and freedoms will be protected or violated because of what exists or what is lacking within a given state or society, and not because of what is said or done within the United Nations *Palais des Nations* in Geneva,” (Gallagher 2000, 201, italics in the original source). Moreover, “Human rights are best protected in societies governed by the rule of law and by a representative, accountable government”, (Ibid, 201). On the other hand, Alston emphasizes that the perception of human rights as being best protected in liberal-democratic, mainly western societies, represents oversimplification at the very least, which stems from several different reasons. First, when states are compared with one another, the evident differences pertaining to the human rights' violations are mainly related to the degree rather than species of these violations. Thus the rich western countries often fail to submit the reports on the human rights' violations on their territory, or they do not invest into monitoring structures. Furthermore, in some presumably liberal-democratic countries it is actually impossible to put forward a critique of the society, because of the dominant perception that human rights are fully respected there, or because it is considered to be normal that there are different rules applying to different populations (social categories) (Alston 2000).

The right to ask for asylum represents one of the universal human rights. The person whose basic human rights are violated in a country, or more precisely, who experiences persecution based on his/her racial, national, religious, political or some other affiliation, has the right to seek asylum in some other country. This other country needs to be *safe* for the asylum seeker, i.e. to guarantee the protection of previously violated rights, as well as to guarantee *the life worthy of a man*.¹ In practice, the situation is not that sublime at all: "[t]he notion of 'safe country' has been described as procedural mechanism for shuttling asylum seekers to other States said to have primary responsibility for them, thereby avoiding the necessity to make a decision on the merits because another country is deemed or imagined to be secure. In simple words, the concept of 'safe country' was invented to send asylum seekers back whence they came," (Lambert 2012, 318).

One of the demands that Serbia needed to fulfil in the course of the EU integration process was to obtain the status of a safe country. In the context of the right to asylum, the consequences of this recognition were twofold: on the one hand, Serbia got the opportunity and obligation to grant asylum to those who asked and meet the criteria for it, while on the other hand the asylum applications submitted by the Serbian citizens in the EU countries became unfounded. More concretely, the establishment of an independent asylum system in Serbia was the result of the demands that Serbia needed to meet in order to be granted visa liberalization regime pertaining to the EU.

Here I would address the position of citizens of the other countries who are seeking asylum in Serbia. The discrepancy between the number of persons who asked for asylum in Serbia since 2008 and those who actually got it, is distressing. Not even one in a thousand applications has been granted.² Even though the causes of such a condition could be found in the domain of the procedures (the lack of staff, abandoning the applications, suspension of cases, etc.) this confirms indeed that the purpose of an asylum system of this kind is a political one, i.e. that the independent asylum system is the result of the efforts of the Republic of Serbia to become closer to the EU, rather than to justify its status of safe country and provide refuge to the people in need. Apart from the regional politics, the position of the asylum seekers in Serbia is also influenced by

¹ The Preamble of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights evidently indicates the existence of a certain, universal human nature, independent from individual cultures, as well as from historical and geographical circumstances. This universal human nature incorporates characteristically human dignity. Even though this human nature was not explicitly addressed in the Preamble, it can be implicitly understood based on the provisions which follow it.

² The latest report is easily accessible to public on:

http://azil.rs/doc/periodi_ni_izve_taj_FINALNI_jun_oktobar_2013.pdf

the confrontations between the local political structures, the main impact of which they must suffer. This was undoubtedly demonstrated during the incidents in Obrenovac, Vračević and Bogovađa in the autumn of 2013, but also during the earlier examples of politicization of the presence of migrants in Banja Koviljača, Subotica and Mladenovac. The human dignity thus became reserved exclusively for the nationals, while humanity was transformed into the means to achieve political ends.

In the midst of this vortex are the people on the road, those forced to migrate in their search for (better) life. Apart from being dehumanized by the system of quotas which indicates how many persons from each country, and on what basis, would be granted asylum or a residence permit, as well as by the fact that they cannot decide for themselves in which country they would like to ask for asylum, but need to apply in order not to be deported automatically, asylum seekers are also dehumanized by the very fact that they became the tools in the political confrontations whose real purpose has nothing to do with the asylum system, human rights or the lives of asylum seekers themselves. From the perspective of the system, they are not even the pawns in some malicious game of chess, for even the pawns participate in the game actively, but they are rather reified, turned into things, the balls in a pinball machine which are pushed around capriciously and which can get where they wanted only if they were very lucky. Therefore, it is not surprising that bypassing the system sometimes turns to be the only way for the unfavored migrants and *a priori* rejected asylum seekers to approach their goal.

The farcicality of such a system of basic human rights protection does not necessarily imply that the very notion of human rights should be abandoned due to the mere fact that from this perspective the alternative solution appears to be too intimidating. The criticism of the existing practice could lead to the establishment of some more effective models, while it could also point out the conceptual deficiencies in the system and through their correction it could contribute to the establishment of the entirely new systems of human rights' protection.

Literature:

Alston, Philip. (2000). Beyond "Them" and "Us": Putting Treaty Body Reform into Perspective. In: *The Future of Human Rights Treaty Monitoring*, Alston, Philip and James Crawford (eds.), pages: 501-525. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crawford, James. (2000). The UN human rights treaty system: A system in crisis?. In: *The Future of Human Rights Treaty Monitoring*, Alston, Philip and James Crawford (eds.), pages: 1-14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gallagher, Anne. (2000). Making Human Rights Treaty Obligations a Reality: Working with New Actors and Partners. In: *The Future of Human Rights Treaty Monitoring*, Alston, Philip and James

Crawford (eds.), pages: 201-227. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lambert, Hélène. (2012). 'Safe third country' in the European Union: An evolving concept in international law and implications for the UK. *Journal of Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Law* 26(4): 318-336

Ela Meh

Today I will speak of migrations from the perspective of freedom of movement. The concept of intrinsic equality and the right of every person to lead a self-determined life imply that people should have the right to move freely from one country to another, regardless of their reasons for such movement. From the perspective of freedom of movement, all border controls, as well as all the attempts to document, manage and limit migration seem unjust and problematic. We do not have time here to delve into the argument about the feasibility of lifting borders, or abolishing the systems that actually keep imposing them – but it is important to emphasize that my perspective in this discussion implies prioritizing the value of human life and dignity and equality among people, including their freedom of movement.

I want to focus on the discourse that pertains to migrations in Serbia – on how we talk about migrants, as well as on what words and language we use. I want to show that we need to be careful in using the language that now abounds in the mainstream discourse, as it often masks or distorts the reality that migrants face and serves as justification for the treatment they receive.

Let us think about the way in which migrants are often talked about. The two main ways in which the migrants in Serbia are referred to in the public discourse are, for example, *illegal migrants* and *asylum seekers*, while they are often also called "fake" asylum seekers. These two denominations correspond to the two types of discourses used in discussing migrations: securitarian and humanitarian discourse.

The securitarian discourse perceives migrants, due to the mere fact that they have crossed the border illegally, as perpetrators and a potential threat to the security and peace in the country. This discourse calls for "fight against illegal migration", which is related to "fight against smuggling", a practice that is perceived as unjust and highly exploitative.

While it certainly needs to be stressed that smuggling is exploitative and that many people make a lot of money from taking others across borders "illegally" – it also needs to be emphasized that smuggling and the corresponding abuse are only possible due to the existence of borders in the first place. Besides, in the dominant discourse, the "illegality" of border crossings is often presented as the "fault" of those who have crossed illegally: if all other citizens can get their passports, wait in line

for a visa and travel legally, why these people cannot do the same things in their own country and come here legally? The law is as it is, and it should apply to everyone, or so they say.

But the paradox here – and this is the reality that securitarian discourse tends to mask – is that, if you are from Afghanistan, you might never get your birth certificate or your travel documents. Even if you do, the chances that you took them while you fled a Taliban attack are quite small. And even if you have your documents, the chances of getting a visa to an EU country are virtually non-existent, not to mention that it would cost you more than you earn in a year. The reality is: no one that can get a visa and travel legally into the EU, would be so reckless and choose to travel “illegally”, to risk their life by crossing borders and lose money, health and opportunities along the way. Illegal travel is not a choice, but an option that people concede to when they have no other choice.

So when talking about the “illegals”, we should pause for a moment and think about what being illegal really means. The plain fact that someone broke the law does not automatically make them a danger or threat. We should actually question the laws that make these people illegal. How could someone's mere presence on a territory be illegal? Besides, it is important to bear in mind the reality behind this illegal status, and the way it feels when your mere presence in some country is criminalized. If you are illegal, it means you can be stopped – usually on the grounds of racism – and arrested at any point. You can be detained for up to several weeks, kept in a small room with several other people. You can be deported back across several borders and be forced to start the journey once more. And all these things can be entirely legal; these are the measure that the law stipulates when it comes to the treatment of those who are “illegal”. But the reality of being illegal implies that a range of increasingly traumatic, but also illegal things can happen to you – yet you have no legal protection against them. The police can beat you up, harass you, humiliate you and take your money – and these are all practices that have been identified and documented by the field activists – yet any complaint against these practices can get you in one of the aforementioned situations.

Thus securitarian discourse not only masks the reality of being illegal, but it also further *justifies* the treatment that those who are “illegal” receive. If people are presented as illegal and hazardous to the country, then those incidents of arrest, detention and deportation are justified! If someone is a threat, we can negate their humanity and treat them repressively to protect ourselves.

So the discourse we use is of a crucial importance. If we could only stop perceiving someone as “illegal”, if we would expose the legal framework that illegalizes people as being inhumane, and remember the importance of dignity of all human beings, then the treatment that illegalized migrants receive on the territory of Serbia would become unjustifiable. If we assume that no one should be criminalized just for the fact of being on a certain territory, then we can expose the policies and practices that migrants face for what they are: repressive and inhumane, racist and degrading acts.

Now let us discuss some other names often used for migrants, especially in the media – *asylum seekers*, and often *fake asylum seekers*.

“Seeking asylum” represents the legal framework for the migrants in Serbia to regulate their status at least temporarily, and avoid being “illegal” and consequently criminalized for their very presence on the Serbian territory. The institution of asylum was developed by Serbia under pressure in the course of the EU accession process, in order for the liberalization of the visa regime to be attained and the EU candidate status granted. Current asylum system is largely dysfunctional: it is very difficult to even apply for asylum, in the course of 5 years of the asylum system's application in Serbia, many asylum seekers were not even accommodated, while their chances to get the international protection status have been virtually non-existent. Yet asylum represents an important way for people to resolve the difficult situation of being illegal. With the asylum seekers ID, or a document proving the intention of seeking asylum, these people cannot be arrested, detained and deported.

The discourse pertaining to asylum seekers in Serbia is quite interesting. It is a variant of humanitarian discourse. Asylum seekers are often perceived as legitimate migrants: after all, they claim to have been persecuted on the basis of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or their political opinion – as defined in the asylum legislation, based on the Geneva Convention. The law on asylum protects them, and there are several human rights organizations dealing with their rights.

This kind of reasoning involves a distinction between “dangerous illegals” and “legitimate victims” that need protection. The implication of this is that illegals are dangerous and we should protect our borders against them, while on the other hand we need to have pity for asylum seekers.

In reality, what this discourse pertaining to asylum seekers may mask is the fact that two distinct categories of people actually do not exist (the vulnerable asylum seekers and dangerous illegals), but that these people constitute a single group in Serbia. Furthermore, it also masks the humanity of this group of people.

Since most of the people passing through Serbia have no real possibility, nor subsequent intention to stay here, they all want to leave as soon as possible. They could not get asylum here, or a decent chance to integrate, or to get a job – so why should they stay? They want to move on as soon as possible, but for a variety of repressive measures at the borders and in the country, they are often unable to leave. In these cases, they seek asylum. Not because they believe they can get it, but because they know they would not be arrested in that case. So these same “illegals” from securitarian discourse, then become – once they enter the asylum system – conceptualized as victims, within humanitarian discourse.

There are several problems with the humanitarian discourse in general, from the point of view of freedom of movement and equality and dignity for all. From this point of view, people should be able to move from one country to another, even if they were not persecuted in their home country on one of the 5 counts stipulated under Geneva Convention – but also if they were persecuted as a consequence of neo-colonial economic exploitation or of human induced climate change. Furthermore, people should not be included into society only when degraded to the status of a victim – they should be included for the mere fact that they are people. While the law on asylum might seem like a philanthropic mechanism aimed at including the most vulnerable and victimized migrants who truly deserve such a kind and paternalizing attitude of the host-state, it remains at the same time a part of the wider legal framework that *excludes* those that do not fit into this narrow humanitarian and human-rights’ based interpretation. The danger in utilizing this humanitarian discourse is that it can detract from the wider reality of exclusion/discrimination that it belongs to.

Besides, humanitarian discourse has an alarming consequence. Racism and xenophobia often distort the perspective, and from being seen as genuine victims that require protection, asylum seekers start being perceived as “false” asylum seekers that just exploit the system to benefit from it. Foreigners “pretend” to be the victims of persecution in their home country, while the costs of their nourishment and accommodation are covered by Serbian public funds, thus causing increased poverty and inequalities within Serbian society.

Humanitarian discourse can thus quickly be reduced once again to securitarian discourse: even though some migrants pretend to be victims in need of protection, thus seeking asylum, these migrants can also be perceived as a threat to Serbian society; perhaps not a threat to security and the rule of law, as is the case with “illegal” migrants, but a threat nonetheless to the welfare and prosperity of the already impoverished Serbian society.

Both these discourses mask the reality that migrants live in, justify repression against them (it is ok to arrest, detain and deport them, if they are a threat!), and ultimately negate their humanity. Thus the attention that needs to be paid to the language we use in discussing migration is of crucial importance. How can we develop a language sensitive to the processes of *illegalization* that migrants are faced with and the repressive treatment this entails? How to find the words for migrants, which will not victimize them, and what language to use when advocating for the inclusion of migrants based on our shared humanity and our concern for the respect of human dignity?

Tako sekuritarni diskurs ne samo da prikriva stvarnost ilegalnog statusa, već i dodatno opravdava tretman sa kojim se suočavaju oni koji nose "ilegalni" status. Ako se ljudi prikažu kao ilegalni imigranti koji predstavljaju opasnu pretnju po zemlju, onda takva hapšenja, pritvaranja i deportacije postaju opravdani! Ako neko predstavlja pretnju, onda možemo negirati njegovu ljudskost i tretirati ga represivno da bi zaštitili sebe.

Tako da je diskurs koji koristimo od presudnog značaja. Ukoliko prosto prestanemo da poimamo ljude kao "ilegalne", ako raskrinkamo pravni okvir koji ih stavlja van zakona i dehumanizuje ih, i ne zaboravimo na važnost dostojanstva svih ljudskih bića, onda način na koji se postupa sa ilegalizovanim migrantima na teritoriji Srbije postaje nešto što se ne može opravdati. Ako pretpostavimo da niko ne treba da bude stavljen van zakona samo zato što se nalazi na određenoj teritoriji, onda možemo učiniti da mere i prakse sa kojima se migranti suočavaju budu percepirane onakvima kakve zaista jesu: kao represivne i neljudske, rasističke i degradirajuće.

A sada da se pozabavimo i onom drugom rečju koja se često koristi kada se govori o migrantima, naročito u medijima - *azilant*, a često i *lažni azilant*.

Institucija traženja azila predstavlja pravni okvir putem koga migranti u Srbiji mogu barem privremeno regulisati svoj status, i time izbeći da budu "ilegalni" te na taj način stavljeni van zakona zbog samog prisustva na teritoriji Srbije. Institucija azila razvijana je u Srbiji pod pritiscima procesa pristupanja EU, radi postizanja liberalizacije viznog režima i dobijanja statusa kandidata za pridruživanje EU. Sadašnji sistem azila je u velikoj meri nefunkcionalan: vrlo je teško čak i zatražiti azil, a tokom većeg dela petogodišnjeg trajanja ovog sistema u Srbiji, mnogi tražitelji azila nisu bili ni smešteni, dok su šanse za dobijanje internacionalnog zaštitnog statusa bile gotovo ravne nuli. Pa ipak, institucija azila predstavlja važan način da se za neke ljude reši teška situacija koju podrazumeva ilegalni status. Uz identifikacioni dokument za azilante, ili dokument kojim se dokazuje da je izražena namera da se zatraži azil, oni ne mogu biti uhapšeni, pritvarani niti deportovani.

Diskurs koji se bavi azilantima u Srbiji veoma je zanimljiv. U pitanju je varijetet humanitarnog diskursa. Azilanti se često vide kao legitimni migranti: na kraju krajeva, oni tvrde da su bili proganjeni na temelju rase, vere, nacionalne i pripadnosti određenoj društvenoj grupi, ili usled svog političkog mišljenja - kao što je definisano u zakonodavstvu o azilu koje se temelji na Ženevskoj konvenciji. Zakon o azilu ih štiti, a postoji nekoliko organizacija za ljudska prava koje se bave i njihovim pravima.

U ovom kontekstu, postoji razlika između „opasnih ilegalnih migranata“ i „legitimnih žrtava“ kojima je potrebna zaštita. Ona podrazumeva da su ilegalni migranti opasni i da je potrebno zaštititi naše granice od njih, dok prema azilantima moramo biti milostivi.

Stvarnost koju maskira diskurs vezan za tražioce azila jeste činjenica da zapravo ne postoje dve različite kategorije ljudi (ranjivi azilanti i opasni ilegalni migranti), već da oni u Srbiji jesu jedna te ista grupa ljudi. A ovo takođe predstavlja još jedan pokušaj da se maskira ljudskost ove grupe ljudi.

Budući da većina ljudi koji prolaze kroz Srbiju nemaju stvarnu mogućnost, a shodno tome ni želju, da ostanu ovde, svi žele da iz zemlje odu što je pre moguće. Oni na ovim prostorima ne mogu dobiti azil, niti pristojnu priliku za integraciju ili dobijanje posla - pa zašto bi onda ostajali? Oni žele da što pre odu, ali zbog raznih represivnih mera na granici i u zemlji, oni često nisu u mogućnosti da Srbiju napuste. U takvim slučajevima, oni traže azil. Ne zato što veruju da ga mogu dobiti, već zato što znaju da neće biti uhapšeni. Dakle, isti ti "ilegalci" o kojima govori sekuritarni diskurs, kada uđu u sistem azila počinju da se doživljavaju kao žrtve i o njima se tako govori unutar humanitarnog diskursa.

Postoji nekoliko problema vezanih za humanitarni diskurs u celini, gledano iz perspektive slobode kretanja, jednakosti i dostojanstva za sve. Sa ove tačke gledišta, ljudima bi trebalo da bude omogućeno da se kreću iz jedne zemlje u drugu, čak i onda kada nisu bili proganjeni u svojoj zemlji na osnovu neke od pet stavki koje propisuje Ženevska konvencija - već i ako su morali da odu usled posledica neokolonijalnog ekonomskog iskorišćavanja, ili usled veštački izazvanih klimatskih promena. Takođe, ljude nije potrebno uključiti u društvo samo onda kada su degradirani na status žrtve - njih treba uključiti iz prostog razloga jer su ljudi. Dok se Zakon o azilu može posmatrati kao filantropski mehanizam čiji je cilj uključivanje onih najranjivijih i viktimizovanih migranata koji zaista zaslužuju takav paternalizujući stav od strane države domaćina, on istovremeno predstavlja deo šireg pravnog okvira koji *isključuje* one koji se ne uklapaju u ovaj usko definisani humanitarni okvir tumačenja. Opasnost koju sa sobom nosi humanitarni diskurs jeste skretanje pažnje sa šire, diskriminativne stvarnosti čiji deo on predstavlja.

Osim toga, humanitarni diskurs nosi sa sobom i zabrinjavajuće posledice. Rasizam i ksenofobija često azilante od pravih žrtava kojima je potrebna zaštita pretvaraju u "lažne" azilante koji samo upotrebljavaju i iskorišćavaju sistem. Smatra se da se ovi stranci samo "pretvaraju" da su žrtve progona u svojoj domovini, dok njihova ishrana i boravak padaju

na teret javnog budžeta Srbije, a čime se uzrokuju još dublje siromaštvo i nejednakosti u srpskom društvu.

Humanitarni diskurs može se na taj način vrlo brzo ponovo preobratiti u sekuritarni diskurs: iako se neki migranti pretvaraju da su žrtve kojima je potrebna zaštita, pa traže azil, ovi migranti takođe mogu predstavljati i pretnju za srpsko društvo. Možda ne pretnju za bezbednost i vladavinu prava kao u slučaju "ilegalnih" migranata, ali svakako pretnju za blagostanje i prosperitet već ionako osiromašenog srpskog društva.

I jedan i drugi diskurs maskiraju realnost u kojoj migranti žive, opravdavaju represiju protiv njih (u redu je da se hapse, pritvaraju i deportiraju ako su pretnja!) i na posletku negiraju samu ljudskost migranata. Samim tim, od ključnog je značaja da razmišljamo o tome kakav jezik koristimo kad govorimo o migraciji. Kako razviti jezik koji će biti svestan procesa ilegalizacije sa kojom se migranti susreću i represivnog postupanja koje taj proces sa sobom nosi? Kako pronaći reči za migrante, koje ne podrazumevaju njihovu viktimizaciju i kakav jezik koristiti kada se poziva na uključivanje migranata na temelju naše zajedničke pripadnosti ljudskoj vrsti i brige za poštovanje ljudskog dostojanstva?

Aleksandra Galonja

IMA LI POLITIKE IZVAN BINARNIH OPOZICIJA

Termin *binarne opozicije*¹ u prostor teorijskih razmatranja uvodi francuski antropolog Klod Levi-Stros težeći da svojim tumačenjem strukture, koristeći se binarnim opozicijama kao referentnim okvirom za to tumačenje, prevaziđe manjkavosti koje teorijski okvir na ovaj način trpi.

Pod binarnom opozicijom se ovde podrazumevaju dve jedinice koje se međusobno isključuju istovremeno gradeći totalitet i značenje. Derida je u delu *Bela mitologija*², pozivajući se na rad Levi-Strosa, pokazao na koji način zapadni teorijski humanistički diskurs organizuje svet utemeljen na binarnim opozicijama, pri čemu će članovi binarnih opozicija biti u hijerarhijskom odnosu u kom je jedan član te opozicije vrednosno nadređen, odnosno podređen drugom članu. Derida svoju analizu zasniva na primeru opozicije priroda/kultura za koju smatra da je temeljna filozofska kategorija, „starija i od Platona“³.

Iako već Levi-Stros dovodi u pitanje strukturu utemeljenu na binarnim opozicijama, a Derida tu mogućnost do kraja razobličava, društvena i politička stvarnost odbijaju da uvažavaju teorijska saznanja i svoje strukture uporno temelje na parovima opozicija u koje teže da slože stvarnost i tako, nudeći pojednostavljenu sliku sveta, izađu u susret tendencijama koje psiholozi (od psihoanalitičara/ki do socijalnih konstruktivista/kinja) prepoznaju kao ljudsku sklonost ka generalizacijama i pojednostavlivanju.

Ovde sam već mesec i po. Spavam u jednoj napuštenoj kući. Tu nas je desetero. Za to vreme se nisam ni istuširao. Hladno je, pada kiša, a ja čekam lepo vreme⁴

I Derida će, analizom opozicije priroda/kultura kojom se bavi Levi-Stros, utvrditi da članovima opozicije pripadaju (vrednosno) članovi drugih mogućih i korišćenih opozicija, te tako „prirodi pripada sve što

1 Značenje sintagme izvedeno je iz značenja latinskih reči *binarus* (dvodelan, dvostruk) i *opponere* (biti protivan).

2 Derida Ž., *Bela mitologija*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1990.

3 Ibid.

4 Izjava azilanta, *Kako žive azilanti u Srbiji*, Peđa Obradović, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4WQg2WpYR1s>,

je univerzalno⁵. Ideja o mogućem udruživanju članova parova različitih opozicija predmet je razmatranja teoretičara/ki različitih usmerenja: sociologa/kinja, antropologa/kinja, etnologa/kinja, psihologa/kinja... i kao takva, pruža okvir za tumačenje i utvrđivanje zakonitosti u kreiranju različitih sistema društvenog funkcionisanja.

Esencijalistička želja za otkrivanjem, prepoznavanjem i preciznim definisanjem identiteta, koja je temeljni stub političke aktivnosti od perioda udruživanja u prve (političke) zajednice, svoje pretpostavke tako uglavnom zasniva na razdvajanju i grupisanju identitetskih karakteristika Jednih i Drugih koji se onda, *po prirodi stvari* (reći će i humanistički orijentisani psiholozi, i evolucionisti, i psihoanalitičari) odlikuju karakteristikama uvek jednog člana ma koje binarne opozicije: muškarac-žena, kultura-priroda, solarno-htonsko, dobro-zlo, istina-laž, mi-oni, ja-drugi, ruralno-urbano, belo-crno, levo-desno... Upravo esencijalistički stav o *prirodnosti* razgraničavanja i razdvajanja postiže svoju pravu svrhu u politikama etnogeneze koje, opet, svoju svrhu pronalaze u periodima velikih društvenih i/ili državnih kriza.

U ovom kontekstu su posebno zanimljivi primeri koje je moguće pronaći u aktuelnom diskursu o azilantima u Srbiji. U duhu snažne tendencije za daljim kontruisanjem i rekonstruisanjem društvenokorisnih identiteta koje na teritoriji Srbije koje obeležava svaki aktuelni politički trenutak još od raspada bivše Jugoslavije, prilika da se o Drugima zaključuje se ne propušta.

Morate biti strpljivi, istrajni i ne dozvolite da niko od vas pravi rasiste. Nismo mi to. Mi se prosto bojimo da će dolazak ogromnog broja azilanata u centar Šumadije ugroziti bezbednost i nas i naše dece. Ovo nije političko pitanje već nas, građana iz Šumadije, koji žele da žive na svojoj zemlji⁶

U svakom smislu, konstruisanje identiteta zasnovano je ovde na prethodno razrađenim teorijskim konceptima koji se, kao i u svakom političkom sistemu u istoriji, tumače i koriste u dnevopolitičke svrhe, a opet se, ako u vidu imamo političku upotrebu *tradicionalnih* sistema vrednosti, principi konstruisanja identiteta, zasnivaju na sistematskom pozvanju na *prirodne veze* između članova različitih binarnih opozicija. MI smo u ovom procesu DOBRI, NISMO RASISTI, govorimo ISTINU i PRAVEDNI SMO u svom pokušaju da sačuvamo ono što nam PRIPADA – sopstvena zemlja u srcu Šumadije. Hipoteze o sui generis naciji operacionalizuju se različitim intenzitetom u različitim periodima

5 Derida, Ž., *Bela mitologija*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1990.

6 Dragan Jovanović, predsednik opštine Topola na mitingu protiv azilanata u Mladenovcu 8. marta 2013. godine.

u zavisnosti od kvaliteta kulturološke distance između dveju grupa, ali i balansa moći između njih kao i aktuelnih političkih aspiracija. To u političkoj praksi znači da, što je manja kulturološka distanca između dveju grupa, to će potreba za isticanjem razlika/poricanjem sličnosti bivati veća. Međutim, odgojene na narativima devedesetih, u kojima se etnička samoidentifikacija odvijala kroz utvrđivanje razlika između NAS i SLIČNIH, generacije današnjih glasnogovornika s istim žarom koriste motive s kraja dvadesetog veka.

Unutar prostora MI, precizno se formulišu odnosi prema različitim segmentima stvarnosti: odnosi između muškaraca i žena kao i njihove uloge (tako su NAŠE žene emancipovane), afiniteti i sklonosti (MI smo vredni i poštteni), odnosi prema deci (MI se brinemo za svoju decu)... jer je pretpostavka ovde da dominantan metonimijski odnos između MI i ONI stoji metonimijski za sve odnose koji su važni u procesima identifikacije jer dopunjuju sistem-identitet. Iz inicijalnog odnosa MI i ONI tako se kreira par suprotnosti – prirodno i protiv-prirodno koji se pokazuje veoma otpornim na teorijske poduhvate dekonstrukcije logocentričnog sistema mišljenja u binarnim opozicijama.

Nailazite na njih posvuda, oni su na ulicama danju i noću, a ne znamo ko su ti ljudi.

Mi već mesecima upozoravamo državnu vladu da doživljavamo probleme zbog velikog broja imigranata, ali niko nije uradio ništa da nam pomogne. Zahtevamo da se azilanti izmeste u druge dijelove Srbije.

Mnogi građani ne puštaju decu da idu u školu jer se boje za njihovu bezbednost.

Od 400 učenika u osnovnoj školi u gradu, samo 20 ih ide na nastavu.⁷

Simplifikacija širokog spektra društvenih odnosa odvija se tako u prostorima obeleženim granicama logocentričnog mišljenja. Težnja sistema da se perpetuira i društvene moći da se koncentriše u jednom izvoru (ukoliko pretpostavimo da politička praksa, makar ovde iznetog primera, ne dokazuje Fukoovu tezu o postojanju ne jedne politike već mikropolitika moći) idu u prilog sve učestalijem obnavljanju shvatanja ideje strukture kroz hijerarhijski ustanovljene binarne opozicije koje se tako stavljanju u službu aktuelnih društvenih težnji.

Ako se adekvatnost političkog momenta udruži s jednom od *priroda* politike – simboličnošću – i tako za svoju ekspresiju bira narativni prosede, a kao korespondentnu građu – mit; postiže se formulisanje (političko, u užem i širem smislu te reči, umetničko, naučno...) mitopolitičke stvarnosti koja potpuno ukida mogućnost za shvatanje sveta izvan parova (apsolutnih) suprotnosti.

7 Citati iz novinskih članaka.

U međuvremenu u Bogovađi situacija je bila sve gora i gora. Broj migranata je i dalje bio veoma visok, a onda je pao sneg. Situacija je bila teška, oko stotinu ljudi je boravilo na otvorenom, neki veoma bolesni i u lošem stanju, svi neadekvatno uhranjeni i obučeni, spavajući uglavnom bez skloništa, čak i kad su temperature bile ispod nule. Ljudi su počeli da se useljavaju u napuštene zgrade, džungle su podizane. Ljudi koji su boravili napolju nisu bili samo azilanti već i ilegalizovani imigranti koji su ili bili sprečeni da zatraže azil ili su se nadali skorom odlasku – to je značilo da je policija vršila česte racije u džunglama i skvotovima, skvotovi su bili zatvarani, stvari uništavane, svi oni bez dokumenata o azilu hapšeni, zadržavani u pritvoru i deportovani u Makedoniju.⁸

Analizom posledica upotrebe tradicionalno centriranog mišljenja, na nesreću, posledica koje je moguće meriti brojem ljudskih života, dolazi se do zaključka da je moguće napustiti diskurs unutar koga sistem binarnih opozicija jedino i postoji i neminovno teži da uspostavi kontrolu kroz procese zaokruživanja/dovršavanja identiteta. Gde god da se granična linija identiteta završava i kako god se taj sistem centrirao (nacionalno, rodno, rasno, seksualno...), sam proces jeste prostor političkog nasilja.

Ideja dekonstrukcije binarnih opozicija tako dobija svoj politički smisao i opravdanje.

Ova binarna opozicija, kao deo epistemološkog nasleđa savremenih političkih diskursa o identitetu, strateški je potez u okviru datog skupa značenjskih praksi, i ona ustanovljava to "ja" u, i kroz ovu opoziciju, i postvaruje tu opoziciju kao nužnost, skrivajući diskurzivni aparat kojim je binarnost uspostavljena. Ovo pomeranje sa epistemološkog prilaza identitetu na onaj koji ovu problematiku smešta u prakse označavanja, dozvoljava analizu koja sam epistemološki način smatra jednom mogućom i slučajnom značenjskom praksom.⁹

8 Kontrapunkt, <http://kontra-punkt.info/pamflet/nova-politika-smestaja-za-azilante-i-rasisticka-protiv-mobilizacija-u-vracevicu>

9 Butler, J., *Gender Trouble – Feminism and the subversion of identity*, Routledge, New York & London, 1990., na: www.womenngo.org.yu/sajt/izdanja/zenske_studije/zs_s1/batler.html, u prevodu Ranka Mastilovića.

Aleksandra Galonja

IS THERE POLITICS OUTSIDE BINARY OPPOSITIONS

The term *binary oppositions*¹ was introduced into theoretical consideration by the French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss who aimed with his interpretation of structure, by using binary oppositions as the frame of reference for the interpretation, to try and overcome the thus caused flaws in theoretical framework.

Binary opposition here implies two mutually exclusive units that simultaneously create a totality and meaning. In his *White Mythology*², Derrida refers to the work of Lévi-Strauss and demonstrates the way in which Western theoretical humanist discourse organizes the world based on binary oppositions, with hierarchical relation between the member units of these binaries where one member is of superior/inferior value when compared to the other. Derrida bases his analysis on the example of binary oppositions of nature/culture, which he believes to be a basic philosophical category, "older than Plato"³.

Even though Lévi-Strauss himself calls into question the structure based on binary oppositions, while Derrida totally denounces such concept, social and political reality refuse to acknowledge theoretical findings, and to organize the world accordingly, as they persistently base their structures on binaries and thus, offering a simplified image of the world, indulge the tendencies that psychologists (from psycho analysis to social constructivism) recognize as human affinity to generalizations and oversimplifications.

I have been here for a month and a half already. I sleep in an abandoned house. There are ten of us here. I haven't had a shower once my entire stay. It is cold and raining and I wait for fair weather⁴

By analysing the opposition of nature/culture dealt with by Lévi-Strauss, Derrida would also determine that the members of the opposition

1 The meaning of the term was derived from the Latin words *binarius* (dual, twofold) and *opponere* (be against).

2 Derrida J., *White Mythology*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1990.

3 Ibid.

4 Testimony of an asylum seeker, *The Life of Asylum Seekers in Serbia*, Pedja Obradovic, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4WQg2WpYR1s>,

contain (in terms of value) the members of other potential and used oppositions, and that accordingly "everything *universal* belongs to nature"⁵. The idea of integrating the members of different binaries is the subject of study for theoreticians of different profiles: sociologists, anthropologists, ethnologists, psychologists, etc., thus providing the framework for interpretation and identification of patterns in creating different systems of social functioning.

Essentialist desire to discover, recognize and precisely define identity, which has been the cornerstone of political activity since the period of association into initial (political) communities, is based primarily on division and grouping of identity characteristics of Ones and Others that in their turn (and this is agreed on by humanist psychologists, evolutionists and psychoanalysts) and by their nature, possess characteristics of a member of any binary opposition: man-woman, culture-nature, solar-chthonic, good-evil, truth-lie, we-them, me-others, rural-urban, white-black, left-right... It is exactly this essentialist notion of *naturalness* of the division and separation that achieves its real purpose in the politics of ethnogenesis which, in their turn, find their proper application in the times of major social or state crises.

Of particular interest in this context are the examples that can be found in the present discourse related to asylum seekers in Serbia. In the spirit of a prominent tendency to further construct and reconstruct socially useful identities on the territory of Serbia, which has characterized current political situation ever since the dissolution of Yugoslavia, an opportunity to make conclusions concerning Others is rarely missed.

You have to be patient, persistent and not let anyone make you racists. We are not those. We simply fear that the arrival of a huge number of asylum seekers in the very heart of Sumadija would jeopardize our own and our children's safety. This is not a political issue, but the one related to us, the citizens of Sumadija who want to live on the land of our own.⁶

In every sense, the construction of identity here is based on the previously developed theoretical concepts which are used and interpreted here, just as was the case in every other political system in history, for the purpose of political campaigning. Then again, if we bear in mind political utilization of the *traditional* values, the principles of identity construction are based on systematic referencing to natural bonds between the members of different binary oppositions. In this process we are GOOD, NOT RACISTS, we speak THE TRUTH and we are JUST

5 Derida, Ž., *Bela mitologija*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1990.

6 Dragan Jovanovic, the Mayor of the Topola municipality on the rally against asylum seekers held in Mladenovac on 8th March 2013.

in our attempt to preserve what is rightfully OURS – our own land in the heart of Sumadija. Hypotheses about a *sui generis* nation have been operationalized with varying intensity in different periods, depending on the quality of cultural distance between the two groups, but also on the balance of power between them, as well as political aspirations at the time. In the context of political practice, this implies that the smaller cultural distance between the two groups is, the more pronounced is the need to emphasize differences/deny similarities. However, being brought up on the narratives of 1990's, where ethnic self-identification was realized by identifying the differences between US and THE SIMILAR, spokesmen of the present generation use the 20th century motifs with the same fervour.

Within the space of WE, relations to different segments of reality are precisely defined: the relation between men and women, as well as their roles (thus OUR women are emancipated), affinities and proclivities (WE are hardworking and honest), relation towards children (WE care for our children), etc., since this is based on the assumption that the dominant metonymic relation between WE and THEM is metonymically valid for all the relations important in the identification process that complement the system/identity. Initial relation between WE and THEM thus results in the creation of a pair of opposites – natural and unnatural which proves to be quite resilient to theoretical endeavours to deconstruct the logocentric system of thinking in binary oppositions.

You can find them everywhere, they roam the streets day and night, and we don't know these people. We have been warning the state government for months now that we encounter problems because of a great number of immigrants, but no one did anything to help us. We demand that the asylum seekers be transferred to the other parts of Serbia. Many citizens don't allow their children to go to school, because they are afraid for their safety. Out of 400 primary school pupils, only 20 attend their classes.⁷

Simplification of a wide range of social relations is thus carried out within the boundaries of logocentric thinking. The tendency of the system to perpetuate itself, as well as that of social power to become concentrated in a single source (unless we assume that political practice, at least in the aforementioned example, proves Foucault's argument that instead of a single politics, there are actually micro-politics of power) support evermore frequent attempts to restore the idea of structure as a hierarchy of binary oppositions which are subsequently employed to serve current social aspirations.

If an adequate political moment is combined with one of the *natural*

7 Quotations from newspaper articles.

traits of politics – its symbolism – thus choosing narrative method for its expression, and for its corresponding material – myth; what is achieved is formulation (political, in a wider and more specific meaning of this word, artistic, scientific...) of mythopolitical reality which completely abolishes the possibility of perceiving the world outside the pairs of (absolute) opposites.

In the meantime in Bogovodja the situation was becoming progressively worse. The number of migrants was still quite high when the snow set in. The situation was hard, about one hundred people resided in the open, some of them sick and in a very poor condition, all of them underfed and inadequately clothed, sleeping mainly shelterless even when temperature was below zero. The people began moving in abandoned buildings, the jungles were raised. The people staying in the open were not only asylum seekers, but also illegalized immigrants who had been either prevented from seeking asylum, or they hoped to leave soon – this meant that the police was making frequent raids in jungles and squats, the squats were being closed, their belongings destroyed, all those without asylum documents being arrested, detained and deported to Macedonia.⁸

By analysing the use of traditionally centred thinking and its consequences, unfortunately measured in human casualties, one can conclude that it is possible to abandon the discourse which is in fact the only context in which the system of binary oppositions does exist and seeks to establish control through the processes of finalization/completion of identity. Wherever the borderline of identity ends, and whichever way the system is centred (nationally, gender-wise, racially, sexually...), the process is in fact the ground for political violence.

Thereby, the idea of deconstructing binary oppositions acquires its political significance and justification.

As part of the epistemological inheritance of contemporary political discourses of identity, this binary opposition is a strategic move within a given set of signifying practices, one that establishes the "I" in and through this opposition and which reifies that opposition as a necessity, concealing the discursive apparatus by which the binary itself is constituted. The shift from an epistemological account of identity to one which locates the problematic within practices of signification permits an analysis that takes the epistemological mode itself as one possible and contingent signifying practice.⁹

8 Kontrapunkt, <http://kontra-punkt.info/pamflet/nova-politika-smestaja-za-azilante-i-rasisticka-protiv-mobilizacija-u-vracevicu>

9 Butler, J., *Gender Trouble – Feminism and the subversion of identity*, Routledge, New York & London, 1990.,

Peđa Obradović

MIGRANTI I DRUŠTVO ŽIVOT „ISPOD RADARA“

Sigurno je samo da je nezaustavljivo. Na sve ostalo što vezujemo za savremeni fenomen „ilegalnih migracija“ ne postoji jedan i jednostavan odgovor, jer ni pored svih dostignuća u oblasti zaštite prava pojedinca, nije stvoren odgovarajući „društveni ugovor“, koji bi trebalo da bude baza za adekvatnu reakciju na činjenicu da se radi o hiljadama ljudi koji, prepušteni sami sebi, „tranzitiraju“ na neizvesnom i opasnom putu ka željenom, boljem i perspektivnijem životu.

Za svaki sistem ti ljudi su „problem“. Često bez dokumenata, i samim tim, i bez adekvatnog dokaza o svom identitetu i poreklu, bukvalno pretrčavaju granice, najčešće prateći glavne putne i železničke koridore. Dolaze sa istoka, i žele na razvijeni zapad bežeći od siromaštva, gladi, ratnih razaranja ili političkog progona. Evropska unija je stvorila okvir za prihvatanje novopridošlih i rešavanje njihovih molbi za ostanak kroz sistem azila, što su zemlje koje teže članstvu preuzele kao jedan od uslova za sticanje prava na bezvizno putovanje u zemlje Unije - za sopstvene građane.

Formirani su centri za prihvatanje „tražilaca azila“, kako glasi administrativni naziv za ljude koji zatraže zaštitu zemlje domaćina, način funkcionisanja i donošenja odluka imigracionih vlasti definisan je brojnim zakonskim aktima, ali se, istovremeno, stotine miliona evra godišnje ulaže u ojačavanje „tvrđave Evrope“, kako bi se što veći broj ljudi odvratio ili barem zadržao na spoljnim granicama Unije.

Visoki „bedemi“ te tvrđave, međutim, ne odvrćaju armiju očajnika od često pogibeljnih pokušaja da zid preskoče. Na stotine njih svake godine postane žrtvom krijumčara ljudi ili strada u rekama i morima koje ih dele od cilja. Ljudskim životima plaća se visoka cena zaštite postojećeg imigracionog sistema. Administracija će opravdanje lako naći u tezi da je haos nedozvoljiv i da je prirodna potreba svakog sistema da zadrži kontrolu nad migracijama preko granica – iz bezbednosnih i ekonomskih razloga. Paradoksalno je, kako bi rekao jedan od sagovornika debate, Vladimir Petronijević, *da države odnosno političke elite koje zagovaraju globalizam, kao neumitan proces, toliko posežu za granicama, ograničenjima i zabranama kada je reč o kretanju ljudi.*

Srbija se u toj priči našla između tačke polaska i konačne destinacije, pritisnuta granicama šengenskog prostora i Evropske unije, kao važna tranzitna tačka. Broj ljudi koji migrira preko teritorije Srbije raste iz godine u godinu, ali istovremeno, ne i javna svest o tim ljudima, već, naprotiv, oni ostaju „ispod radara“ sve dok svojim prisustvom ne uzgroze nekakav interes. Pokazalo se, na primerima mesta u kojima postoje centri za azil, da ti ljudi postaju meta verbalnih ali i fizičkih napada kada postanu prepoznati kao uzrok materijalnih gubitaka (u Banji Koviljači, gde veliki broj stanovnika živi od turizma, ilegalni migranti su viđeni kao „problem“ koji navodno odvraća turiste od boravka u banjском lečilištu), ili kada, jednostavno, kao „drugačiji“ i „strani“ počnu da smetaju lokalnom stanovništvu. Ksenofobija, pokazalo se, ostala je endemska boljka malih, zatvorenih lokalnih zajednica koje dugo ne uspeavaju da se prilagode i prevaziđu strah i neprijatnost od susreta za ljudima koji su došli iz daleka.

Medijska slika o ovom fenomenu gradi se dominantno administrativnim rečnikom, dehumanizujući tu populaciju kroz ignorisanje pojedinačnih sudbina. Istini za volju, putnici i sami ne vole da pokazuju lica. Ostajanje ispod radara je i taktičko opredeljenje na putu koji podrazumeva ilegalne prelaskе granica.

Izveštavanje o fenomenu migracije počiva na tezi o „problemu“ koji mora da se reši, i koji je često prepoznat i kao kriminalna aktivnost. Stavljanje pojedinačnih sudbina u kontekst kriminala, dodatno utiče na atmosferu u kojoj lokalna populacija sa podozrenjem posmatra pridošlice.

Praksa pokazuje da ogromna većina putnika Srbiju koristi kao tranzitnu tačku. Makedonsku granicu, na jugu, i mađarsku i hrvatsku na severu i severozapadu deli nekoliko sati vožnje glavnim putnim koridorom. Cilj putnika je da se što pre dokopaju Evropske unije, ali ojačavanje graničnih patrola i sistema nadzora mnoge na nekoliko nedelja pa i meseci zadrži u Srbiji.

Kapaciteti za prihvatanje migranata daleko su od potrebnih, ali se sistem pokazao kao funkcionišući, barem u okvirima centara za azil, gde se migranti okrepljuju i odmaraju za nastavak putovanja. To se, za sistem integracije novopridošlica u lokalno društvo, međutim, ne može sa pouzdanošću reći. Istina je da je premalo primera (one koji ostanu i dobiju azil možemo prebrojati prstima obe ruke) na kojima bi se mogla graditi teza o kvalitetu procesa integracije, ali to istovremeno ne može da amnestira državu koja za sada nije pokazala dovoljno volje i senzibiliteta da izgradi kvalitetan sistem integracije azilanata.

Približavanje Srbije Evropskoj uniji svakako će zemlju učiniti prihvatljivijom za stalniji boravak, pa će se administracija, htela, ne htela, vremenom naći na novom testu, za čije polaganje se, stiče se utisak, u ovom trenutku, nedovoljno sprema.

Teško je oteti se utisku da je postojeća politika prema ovoj vrsti migranata, kako u Srbiji, tako i šire, zapravo bežanje od problema. Sistemi niti uspeavaju da zadrže punu kontrolu nad kretanjem preko granica, niti se pokazuju uspešnim u integraciji novopridošlih. Stiče se, takođe utisak, da neće proći mnogo vremena pre nego što se i javno prizna da je odavno stiglo vreme za novi, globalni odgovor i dogovor.

MIGRANTS AND SOCIETY LIVING „UNDER THE RADAR“

The one thing that is certain is that they are unstoppable. Everything else associated with the contemporary phenomenon of “illegal migrations” defies a uniform and simple answer, since in spite of all the achievements in the field of protection of one’s rights, an appropriate “social response” is not produced to serve as a basis for an adequate reaction to the fact that there are thousands of people “transiting”, left to their own devices, along the uncertain and dangerous road towards the desired, brighter and more promising life.

For each system these people represent a “problem”. Often without personal documents, and thereby without an adequate way to prove their identity or origin, they literally run across borders, usually following the main road and railway corridors. They come from the East and head towards the developed West, escaping poverty, famine, the ravages of war and political persecution. The European Union has created the framework for the reception of the newly arrived, and granting of their applications for stay by introducing the asylum system, a responsibility that the aspiring member countries have undertaken in order to gain the right of visa-free travel to the EU for their own citizens.

Centres for the reception of “asylum seekers”, which is the administrative name for the people that seek the protection of the host country, were established, while the functioning and decision making process of immigration authorities were stipulated by numerous legislative acts. Yet simultaneously, hundreds of millions of Euros are invested yearly in strengthening “Fortress Europe” in order for as many people as possible to be prevented from crossing to, or at least be kept on the outer borders of the EU.

However, the high “ramparts” of this fortress fail to dissuade this army of the desperate from often pernicious attempts to climb over. Each year hundreds of them become victims of human smugglers, or perish in seas and rivers that separate them from their destinations. The high price of protection of the existing immigration system is paid in human lives. Administrative authorities will easily provide justification by applying the

thesis that chaos must not be permitted and that the natural need of any system is to maintain control over cross-border migration – motivated by security and economic reasons. It is quite paradoxical, as one of the participants in the debate, Mr Vladimir Petronijevic, has noted, that the states and political elites which advocate for globalization as inevitable process, employ borders, limitations and prohibitions when it comes to people’s movement.

In this context, Serbia is located somewhere between the points of departure and final destination, pressed against the borders of the Schengen zone and the European Union, being a transit stop. The number of people that migrate over the territory of Serbia increases yearly, however, the upwards trend is not followed by the public awareness related to these people. Quite the opposite, they remain “under the radar” up to the point when they happen to put some interest at risk. It was proved, on the example of the communities where the centres for asylum seekers are located, that these people become victims of verbal and physical assaults when recognized as the cause of material losses (in Banja Koviljaca, where a great number of people live from tourism, illegal migrants are seen as a “problem” that presumably dissuades tourists from visiting this spa resort), or when they start to bother local population, being observed as “different” and “strange”. It turns out that xenophobia remains to be the endemic ailment in small and confined local communities that do not manage to adapt for a long time, and to overcome the fear and discomfort experienced when encountering the people that came from afar.

The media image of this phenomenon is constructed by using the vocabulary that is mainly administrative, while this population is dehumanized by ignoring individual destinies. Truth be told, the passengers themselves often prefer not to expose their faces. Remaining under the radar is also a tactical manoeuvre on the path that involves illegal crossing of borders.

Reporting on the migration phenomenon is based on the hypothesis that this is actually a “problem” that needs to be solved, and is frequently also recognized as a criminal activity. Placing individual destinies in the criminal context additionally heats up the atmosphere of suspicion in the local communities when it comes to the newcomers.

It was proved in practice that the most of the passengers use Serbia as a transit point. Macedonian border in the South and Hungarian and Croatian borders in the North and North-West are separated by only a few hours’ drive along the main road corridors. The aim of the passengers

is to get to the EU as soon as possible, yet the strengthening of the cross-border patrols and monitoring system keep many of them in Serbia for weeks, even months.

Migrants' reception capacities are far from sufficient, but the system proved to be functional, at least when it comes to the asylum centres where migrants would recuperate and rest before continuing their journey. However, this cannot be said for the integration of the newcomers in the local communities. The truth is that there are too few examples (the number of those who stayed and were granted asylum amounts to less than a dozen) to support the hypothesis that the integration process is the one of high quality, yet this cannot be used to absolve the state who failed by now to demonstrate enough willingness and proclivity to build a quality system for integration of asylum seekers.

The fact that Serbia is ever closer to the EU membership will certainly make the country increasingly attractive for more permanent stays, so the administration would willy-nilly face another test in due time, and the impression is that Serbia presently does not invest sufficient effort to prepare for it.

It is hard to escape the feeling that the current policy towards this type of migrants, both in Serbia and in a wider context, actually implies running away from the problem. The systems neither manage to maintain full control of the cross-border movement, nor do they succeed in integrating newcomers. One also gets the impression that before long it will also be publically admitted that it is high time for a new global agreement and response.

Sara Preradović

ZAKONSKI ODOBRENA DEHUMANIZACIJA - SUKOB POSLUŠNOG GRAĐANINA I GLASA ISTINE U NAMA

*“Salam. Dobro si? Ja idem ka granici moli se za mene molim te.ok.
Vidimo se u Nemačkoj insha'allah.”*

Dobijam poruku od našeg druga S. Jednom je već prošao kroz ovaj pakao i sad ponovo.

Nakon dve godine provedene u Engleskoj deportovali su ga nazad u matičnu zemlju Avganistan, odakle je ponovo krenuo ka Evropi. Srbija mu zasigurno neće ostati u lepom pamćenju. Mesecima je pokušavao preći granicu i stići na tlo Evropske unije, u međuvremenu je bio deportovan nazad u Makedoniju, pa se vratio u Srbiju, a zatim posle silnih neuspeha krenuo ka Hrvatskoj. Hrvatska granična policija ga je vraćala najmanje sedam puta vežbajući praksu takozvanog „push-back-a“. Uprkos svemu, crpeći nadljudsku snagu odnekud, neumorno je pokušavao ponovo i ponovo...

Otac i ja se vozimo u kolima, još malo pa smo na mađarskoj granici. Tata ima nekog posla preko, a usput ćemo uzeti maslinovo ulje i još ponešto što je jeftinije nego u Srbiji. Granična kontrola nas i ne pogleda, vraćaju nam pasoše, i mi, odnedavno privilegovani, prelazimo granicu sa zadržavanjem od svega pet minuta. Misleći na S. i stotinu hiljada ostalih, na silne dane, mesece i godine izgubljene na putu, i njihova strašna iskustva, osećam se grozno...

Par dana kasnije još jedna poruka od S.

„Ponovo su me deportovali.“

Šta zapravo čini čoveka „ilegalnim“, ko su ti ilegalni i legani i zašto se insistira na tim terminima „ilegalni migranti“, ili „azilanti“, a zašto se nećemo sresti u ovom kontekstu sa terminom izbeglice? Kakav utisak ostavlja na prosečnog čitaoca - slušaoca ta kategorizacija i naglašavanje reči „legalan“?

Naravno negativan, ili u najmanju ruku izaziva nesigurnost i zbunjenost. Jer, čim je neko ilegalan, znači da je ta osoba učinila nešto loše, protivzakonito, prešla je granicu bez pasoša, a mnogima nije jasno odakle

dolaze ti ljudi i šta hoće ovde.

Cela stvar se u javnosti prezentuje kao da migranti imaju izbor da li će putovati legalno ili ilegalno,

pa su oni, eto, izabrali da budu „ilegalni“ jer je to valjda zanimljiv stil života, pogotovo za žene sa malom decom koje su sigurno željne takvog izazova i avanture.

Ili, možda, jednostavno prate „najnoviji trend ilegalnih migracija“, termin kojim se poslužio jednom prilikom Nenad Banović – upravnik granične policije.

Izgleda da državni organi uz podršku medija, oprezno ali veoma svesno barataju terminima vezano za ovu tematiku. Ne bi valjalo koristiti terminologiju „izbeglice“, treba razdvojiti „njih“ od naših izbeglica da se ne bi slučajno pojavilo saosećanje i empatija među ljudima, prisećanje na mračne devedesete, pa i na međusobno pomaganje i solidarnost.

Nažalost, solidarnosti nema ni među domaćim stanovništvom.

Ako se vodimo idejom da svi imaju jednaka prava na slobodu kretanja, ne smemo prihvatati ni koristiti pojam „ilegalan“, to je izmišljotina sistema, sprovedena zakonima, koja ilegalizuje, kriminalizuje ljude, pa ih zatvara u zatvore i pritvorne centre, često na neodređeno vreme koje može da traje i godinama.

Lov na ljude – treba li da kažemo bravo momci?

Sledeći tekst je odlomak iz „Politikinog“ članka, u kome se predstavlja najnovija tehnologija granične kontrole (dobijeni pokloni sa zapada) i detaljno se opisuje „uspešna“ akcija vredne srpske granične policije.

„... Termovizija ne da detektuje samo ljude, već i životinje. Operateri su toliko iskusni i uvežbani da mogu da prepoznaju zečeve, konje, pa čak i divlje svinje.

To je zapravo naprava koja hvatanje ilegalnih migranata u nepristupačnim šumama i brdima oko srpsko- makedonske granice pretvara u igru mačke i miša u kojoj miš nema dve noge i jedno oko. Jedina stvar koja je mački potrebna za pobedu u ovoj igri je koordinacija između operatera i policajca na terenu, koji često ne vidi prst pred okom i orijentiše se samo prema uputstvima dobijenim od kolege koji je za džojstikom termovizije...

...Glavni akteri ove priče koji su do tog trenutka bili samo tačke na ekranu

su policajci koji su uhvatili migrante i pretrčali više od devet kilometara po gustoj magli....”

Pa se zatim na kraju članka ističu heroji ove akcije po imenu i prezimenu, a kako iz teksta saznajemo njihov plen je šesnaestogodišnji dečak sa roditeljima iz Avganistana.

Mnogi bi rekli da je zaštita granica neophodna, i da granične policije širom sveta obavljaju važan posao u borbi protiv kriminala i krijumčarenja, jer kako bi to izgledalo da nema granica i da se svako kreće kuda god poželi?

Nije sporno da ima i onih koji su napustili svoje zemlje da bi izbegli kazne za učinjene zločine i slično, ali, zaboga, da li će oni rizikovati svoje živote putujući u hladnjačama ili podvlačeći se pod kamione, da li će opasni kriminalci stradati nasred otvorenog mora u nekom malom čamcu?

U martu prošle godine 72 migranta, većinom iz Eritreje, su se ukrcali na brod u Libiji. Cilj im je bio stići do Italije, ali usput su ostali bez goriva. NATO brodovi koji su se nalazili u blizini zbog okupacije Libije primili su SOS signale koje su slali migranti i komande NATO snaga u Rimu i Napulju su bile obaveštene o tome, međutim, naredba za spašavanje nije izdata. Jedan italijanski vojni brod, nezavisan od NATO snaga, je prolazio u blizini, ali je samo prošao, ignorišući znakove poziva za pomoć. Takođe, jedan neidentifikovani vojni helikopter ih je nadletao, davao im nešto vode i biskvite, ali se nikad nije vratio. Desetog dana jedan veliki militantni brod, takođe neidentifikovan, je prošao toliko blizu da je posada fotografisala migrante sa mrtvim telima njihovih drugova koji su stradali od žeđi, bolesti i oluja. Strašne agonije su trajale dve nedelje, posle koje je brod napokon vraćen u libijsku luku. 63 ljudi je izgubilo život, među njima su bile i dve bebe.

Ovaj užasan slučaj je poznat pod imenom “Brod ostavljen na umiranje”.

Kada su zvaničnici NATO snaga pozvani na odgovornost, sve što su imali da izjave je sledeće:

“Jasno je da je reč o veoma tragičnom incidentu. Međutim, kao što je NATO obavestio reportera Saveta Evrope, nije zabeleženo da je bilo kakva letelica ili brod pod NATO komandom video ili ostvario kontakt sa pomenutim migrantskim brodom, iako je puno drugih spasilačkih misija izvršeno tim brodovima i letelicama, u danima pre i posle pomenutog incidenta.”

Za njihovu smrt niko neće odgovarati, a ti ljudski monstrumi će i dalje

ploviti, leteti, okupirati, ubijati prema naredjenju, s oružjem ili bez njega, u službi oslobođenja i demokratije.

“Brod ostavljen na umiranje“ nije jedini slučaj. Samo u 2011. godini, 1500 ljudi je stradalo pokušavajući da preplove Mediteran.

Većina tih putnika koji polaze na ovakav put su pripadnici običnog sveta, sin koga je porodica poslala da se spasi iz ludila, iz sredine gde ljudski život nema nikakvu vrednost, gde se više i ne zna ko se bori protiv koga i zašto, ili su to mladi ljudi koji beže iz represivnih, totalitarnih sistema, željni da se edukuju i imaju jednostavan, normalan život.

A što se zaustavljenja krijumčarenja tiče, najefikasnije rešenje je ujedno i najjednostavnije - otvaranje granica. Ako se sloboda kretanja ne ograničava, nema potrebe za krijumčarima i nerešivi problem je automatski rešen.

No naravno, tvrđava zvana Evropska unija koja ne želi strani priliv na svoje teritorije, a sa druge strane nerazvijene, korumpirane države - sluškinje nikad neće prihvatiti tu činjenicu, a granice će se još više pojačavati. Specijalni sistemi kamera koje poseduje mađarska, hrvatska, pa od skoro i srpska granična policija koštaju nekoliko miliona evra, dok su SAD zadnjih 10 godina potrošile 90 milijardi dolara na kontrolu granice sa Meksikom. Ogroman novac utrošen u deportacije, izgradnju zatvora, pritvornih centara i kontrolu granica opravdaće se kao neophodne mere bezbednosti za očuvanje identiteta bele rase. Važno je usput insistirati na demokratiji i multikulturalnom društvu!

Uostalom, zbog čega bi uopšte trebalo da postoji neki naročit razlog za promenu životne sredine? Ovo pitanje povlači za sobom još jedan aspekt evropske migracione politike. A to je uloga žrtve.

Jednom nam je jedan mladić koga smo upoznali u subotičkoj „džungli“ iskreno rekao: „Istina da imamo teške i nerešive probleme u našoj zemlji, ali ja lično sam hteo samo da putujem kao sav normalan svet. Moj san je bio da naučim 60 različitih jezika.“

U slučaju emigranata zemalja “trećeg sveta” uključujući i Srbiju, čovek mora biti žrtva. Od njega se zahteva da dokaže da je u životnoj opasnosti, da je bio izložen proganjanju, mučenju itd., dok će državljanin/ka Sjedinjenih Američkih Država ili Nemačke bez ikakvih komplikacija dobiti turističku vizu, recimo za Indiju, na pet godina! Tako, ako se odluči da ostatak života provede u toj zemlji, sve što treba da uradi je da svakih pet godina produži svoju turističku vizu.

U sećanje mi dolazi šta nam je naš drug iz Eritreje rekao povodom toga, dok smo razgovarali o njegovom predstojećem intervjuu u kancelariji za strance...

“Znate, naš narod je veoma glup, dozvolili smo prvo da nas kolonizuju Evropljani, i oni su nam podelili Afriku, nazvali države, to je Sudan, to je Etiopija... naši preci su govorili različite jezike i imali svoje parče zemlje na kome su živeli, ali granice nam je beli čovek doneo. Zatim su nam poklonili nezavisnost, i onda sada kad moramo da bežimo od diktature novih vlada, mi treba toj Evropi da dokazujemo: o, pa znate, ja imam problem u mojoj zemlji... da bi, na kraju, oni koji budu imali sreće mogli čistiti ulice Pariza ili nekog drugog grada.“

Istina je uvek prosta i jednostavna, treba da slušamo šta nam zdrav razum i osećaji govore,

nema lepšeg od međusobnog pomaganja, a pomoć ne mora neizbežno da ima oblik humanitarnog paketa ili aktivističke pesnice. Bilo bi poželjno naravno, ali bi takođe bilo dovoljno samo imati ispravne stavove i ne prihvatati nametnute oblike nejednakosti i nepravde.

“Zemlja pripada svima. Svi ljudi imaju pravo da se slobodno kreću, te da se nastane gde god žele na svetu. Mi svi, po principu ”radi koliko možeš, uzmi koliko ti treba”, imamo pravo da brižno i sa poštovanjem koristimo resurse društva i zemlje pod jednakim uslovima... Granice su političke konstrukcije, koje mi, iz moralne dužnosti i bez interesa, ne želimo da prihvatimo i podržavamo... Pravo na slobodu kretanja je za nas nerazdvojivo od prava svih nas da učestvujemo u društvenom životu pod jednakim uslovima.“

Odlomak iz manifesta švedske nezavisne, samoorganizovane grupe „Niko nije ilegalan“ .

Borba za slobodu kretanja i bunt protiv svega što je posledica sprečavanja iste, je samo jedan aspekt sveukupnog svetskog otpora. Pogrešno je razdvajati ga od ostalih, jer su sve borbe međusobno povezane i deluju jedna na drugu, razvijaju se jedna kroz drugu. Na primer, najaktivniji članovi antikapitalističkih pokreta na zapadu često su imigranti.

Tužno je i bolno da uprkos tome što svakodnevno osećamo neizdržljivost današnjeg stanja, ozbiljnije inicijative suprotstavljanja u Srbiji i dalje nema. Neshvatljiva je ravnodušnost i bestidno isprazno provođenje slobodnog vremena većine populacije mladih. Od studenata, kao dela društva, koji je u savezu sa radnicima uvek predstavljao najveću pokretačku snagu revolta, očekivali bismo makar neki pokušaj pomaka u pravcu promena.

Bilo bi zanimljivo proučiti kako je ta prirodna potreba za buntom ugušena jer na osnovu razočaravajućih rezultata zadnjih decenija reklo bi se da su mladalačka energija i entuzijazam uništeni, a umesto njih je zavladała pasivnost i nezainteresovanost. Da li ćemo u skorije vreme kao dužnost svakog pojedinca prepoznati ogromnu važnost aktivnog učestvovanja u nezavisnim građanskim borbama... pokazaće se. Neka svakom lična savest bude merilo te potrebe.

Sara Preradović

LEGALLY APPROVED DEHUMANIZATION – CONFLICT BETWEEN “OBEDIENT” CITIZEN AND THE VOICE OF TRUTH INSIDE US

“Salam. Are you OK? I’m heading towards the border, pray for me, please. OK. See you in Germany, Insha’Allah.”

I receive a message from our friend S. He has gone through hell once, and now he does it once again. After two years spent in England, he had been deported back to his native Afghanistan, from where he headed towards Europe once again. Serbia will most certainly not remain in his good memory. He was trying for months to cross the border and arrive to the EU territory. Meanwhile, he had been deported back to Macedonia, then he returned to Serbia and after a series of failures headed to Croatia. Croatian cross-border police sent him back at least seven times, practicing so-called “push-back” practice. In spite of it all, he drew some superhuman strength and continuously tried again and again...

My father and I are driving in our car and have almost reached Hungarian border. Dad has some business to attend to there, and we will use the opportunity and, along the way, buy us some olive oil and other things that are cheaper than in Serbia. Border police don’t even look at us, they return us our passports and we, privileged as of late, cross the border in less than five minutes. Thinking about S. and about thousands of others, their countless days, months and years lost on the road, and about their horrific experiences, I feel terrible...

Few days later, another message from S: “I was deported again.”

What does actually make a person “illegal”, who are those illegal and legal people and why is it always insisted on using those terms “illegal migrant” and “asylum seeker”, while the term refugee is never used in this context? What kind of impression on an ordinary reader/listener does this categorization and emphasizing of the word “illegal” make? The impression is negative, of course, and, at best, it provokes uncertainty and confusion. Indeed, when a person is characterized as illegal this implies that this person has done something bad, something against the law; he/she had crossed the border without passport, and many do not comprehend where these people come from and what they are doing here.

The whole thing is publically presented so that one might think that the migrants had a choice to travel legally or illegally, so they chose to be "illegal" because it presumably makes for an interesting lifestyle, especially for women with small children, who are bound to be craving for such challenges and adventures. Or they simply follow "the latest trend of illegal migrations", a turn of phrase used once by Mr. Nenad Banovic – the chief of Border Police.

It seems that the state authorities, supported by the media, cautiously but quite deliberately manipulate the terms related to this topic. The term "refugee" should not be used, these people need to be separated from them, from our refugees, or we might induce compassion and empathy among people, we might bring back the memories of the gloomy nineties, thus of the mutual help and solidarity too. Unfortunately, the sense of solidarity is now missing even among domestic population.

Providing that we are governed by the idea that everyone has equal right to free movement, we must not accept, nor use the term "illegal", because that is a fabrication invented by the system and carried out by law, which illegalizes and criminalizes people, only to lock them up in prisons and detention centres, often for an indefinite period that may last for years.

Manhunt – Should We Say Well Done, Guys?

The following excerpts are from an article in the "Politika" daily, which presents state-of-the-art technology of the cross-border control ("presents received from the West") and provides a detailed account of a "successful" action carried out by the diligent Border Police of Serbia.

"...Thermovision detects not only people, but also animals. The operators are so experienced and well trained that they can recognize rabbits, horses, even wild boars...

This is actually a device that transforms the catching of illegal migrants in the impassable forests and hills that surround Serbia-Macedonia border into the cat-and-mouse game in which the mouse has two legs and one eye. The only thing that the cat needs to triumph in this game is good coordination between the operator and the policemen on the ground, who often cannot make out anything in the dark and their only means of orientation are the directions provided by the colleagues operating the joysticks of Thermovision...

.... Until few moments ago only points on the screen, the protagonists of this story are actually the policemen who caught the migrants and ran more than

nine kilometres in thick fog..."

Then, at the end of this article, the heroes of the action are named, while we find out from the text that their prey was actually an Afghan sixteen-year-old with his parents.

Many would say that the protection of borders is necessary, that border police forces around the world play a major role in combating crime and smuggling, and wonder what it would be like if there were no borders so everyone was free to go wherever they like.

There are undoubtedly those who left their countries to avoid prosecution for the crimes they had committed, but for god's sake, would they risk their lives by traveling in refrigerator cars, or under trucks? Would dangerous criminal be willing to perish in a small boat in the middle of the open sea?

Last year in March, 72 migrants mainly from Eritrea boarded a boat in Libya. Their aim was to get to Italy, but they ran out of fuel somewhere along the way. NATO ships located nearby due to the occupation of Libya, received the SOS signal emitted by the migrants, and the commands of NATO forces in Rome and Napoli were informed about the incident, however the order to rescue them was not issued. An Italian army ship, independent from NATO, was passing nearby, but continued on its way, ignoring the call for help. Furthermore, an unidentified army helicopter flew above them, left them some water and biscuits, but it never came back. On the tenth day, a large military ship, also unidentified, passed so close by that the crew took photographs of the migrants with the dead bodies of their fellow passengers who had died of thirst, disease and stormy weather. Unprecedented agony lasted for two weeks, after which the boat was finally sent back to the Libyan port. Sixty three people lost their lives, two babies among them. This horrible case became famous as the case of the "Left-to-Die Boat".

When NATO officials were called to account, they issued the following statement:

"Clearly, this was a very tragic incident. However, as NATO has informed the Council of Europe rapporteur, there is no record of any aircraft or ship under NATO command having seen or made contact with the migrant boat in question, though a number of other search-and-rescue missions were executed by those ships and aircraft, including in the days preceding and following this incident. "

No one will be held accountable for their death, while those human monsters will continue to sail, fly, occupy and kill as ordered, with or without arms, in the name of liberation and democracy. "Left-to-Die Boat" was not the only case. Only in 2011, 1500 people died trying to cross the Mediterranean. Majority of the passengers that would set off on a journey such as this, are actually common people: a son sent by his family to be rescued from the madness of a country in which human life has no worth anymore, where no one knows any longer who fights against whom and for what reason; or young people that try to escape repressive, totalitarian systems, yearning for education and simple, ordinary life.

And when cessation of smuggling is concerned, the most efficient solution is simultaneously the simplest – opening of the borders. If the freedom of movement is not limited, there is no need for smugglers and the unsolvable problem is automatically solved.

However, the fortress called European Union, which does not want the inflow of foreigners to its territory, and is supported by underdeveloped and corrupted minion states, would never accept this fact and the borders would keep being reinforced. Special camera systems owned by Hungarian, Croatian, and as of late Serbian border police, are worth several million euros, while the United States has spent 90 billion dollars in the last 10 years to control their border with Mexico. Humungous amount of money spent on deportation, erection of prisons and detention centres, as well as to control borders, would be justified as necessary security measures for preservation of the white racial identity. While we simultaneously advocate for democracy and multiculturalism!

Besides, why would anyone need some particular reason to change his living environment? This question entails another aspect of European migration policy, the role of victim.

A young man that we have met once in Subotica "jungle"* sincerely told us:

"It's true that we have major and unsolvable problems in our country, but I, personally, only wanted to travel like any normal man would do. My dream was to learn sixty languages."

When it comes to the migrants from the "Third World", including Serbia, they need to be victims. Person is required to prove that he/she was in mortal danger, that he/she was persecuted, tortured, etc. while any citizen of the United States or Germany would receive a tourist visa for India lasting for five years with no problem at all! Thus, in case he/she decides to spend the rest of his/her life in India, the only thing that he/she would

have to do is to extend the visa once in five years.

I recall what our friend from Eritrea told us when we talked to him about his upcoming interview in the Office for Foreigners:

"Our people are very stupid, you know. We let European colonize us and they were the ones that divided Africa, gave names to the countries, the ones who said this is the Sudan, this is Ethiopia... Our ancestors spoke different languages and had their own portions of land that they lived on, but white men brought us the borders. Then they gifted us our independence, and now when we need to escape the dictatorships of the new governments, we have to prove ourselves to this very Europe: Well, you know, I have problems in my country... And only so that the luckiest among us would be allowed to clean the streets of Paris or some other city."

The truth is always neat and simple; we need to listen to our common sense and feelings. There is nothing better than mutual support, while the support doesn't necessarily have to entail humanitarian aid packages, or the activist fists. It would be advisable, of course, but also quite sufficient just to have proper attitudes and not accept imposed forms of inequality and injustice.

"The earth belongs to all of us. We each have the right to free movement across its lands and to settle wherever we please. According to the principle "From each according to his ability, to each according to her need", we are entitled to equal access to the world's land and resources..."

We do not accept the legitimacy of national borders and merely acknowledge them as political constructions to which neither moral justification or an interest in their upholding exists..."

The right to freedom of movement is to us inseparable from the right to participate in society under equal conditions..."

From the Manifesto of the Swedish independent, self-organized group "No One Is Illegal".

Struggle for freedom of movement and revolt against anything that derives from the prevention thereof, constitute just one aspect of the totality of global resistance. It is wrong to separate it from the rest, since all struggles are mutually connected and influence one another, or rather promote one another. For example, the most active members of the anti-capitalist movements in the West are often immigrants.

It is both sad and painful that, even though we daily feel insufferableness of the current situation, a decisive action against it is yet to be organized

in Serbia. Indifference and shameless idleness with which the majority of youth spend their spare time are inconceivable. We would expect students, who have always represented a major impetus for revolt, together with workers, to make at least some attempt to make a difference. It would be interesting to examine what extinguished this natural need for rebellion, for disappointing results of the previous decades seem to have drained youthful energy and enthusiasm, leaving passivity and indifference in their wake. Would we soon recognize that it is every person's duty to actively participate in independent civil struggle? We will see. Let every person's conscience become the measure of this need.

Eva Otavy

BORDERS: SIMILAR CAUSES, SIMILAR EFFECTS

The European Union (EU) and its Member States put in place since the early 2000s, a common policy on immigration and asylum laying down the procedures for the integration of regular migrants in the territory of the Union of reception of applicants for asylum and external border control. Quickly, border control took over, Member States deciding to invest significant resources in the security field.

In recent years, the discourses of many European politicians are threatening. Thus, we speak of "invasion", of "mass influx", of "migration wave." Terminology, frequently taken by the media, to facilitate the invention of an enemy: the "migrant".

To combat this "enemy", Europe has a policy of securing the external borders in cooperation with neighbouring States. Thus, some countries of migration passages become transit countries or countries of installation. This is the case of Morocco, in particular, which for several years cooperates with the EU for border management. Neighbouring States cooperate in the framework of the accession process to the European zone, as Serbia is, which in turn, becomes a transit country. Like Romania, Bulgaria or Croatia soon, Serbia needs to adapt its legislation to EU standards if it wants to join the EU.

Upon entering the Union, the States become the new external borders of the European territory. These borders are the subject of special attention from the EU. Indeed, it is even a dedicated Agency, Frontex. Throughout the accession process, the candidate state must amend its legislation. Thus, Serbia has put in place legislation on foreigners and asylum in 2008. The same year, the country has also made progress on the harmonization of legislation on border controls and also cooperates with Frontex via an agreement.

As part of the accession process, the EU can also financially support the creation of detention centres for foreigners or even reception centres for asylum seekers. For the international network Migreurop, these centers, also called camps, whether open or closed, are places putting aside foreigners considered undesirable. In parallel, informal makeshift camps mushroom at European borders, as to Calais in the north west of

France where migrants gather in "jungles" blocked at the border in their migratory path to England. These informal camps are called "tranquillos" to Oujda in Morocco to the border with Algeria. They can be found at Patras in Greece and, in recent years, in Subotica in northern Serbia on the border with Hungary.

Thus, the same causes have the same effects. European migration policies setting aside foreigners and their consequences apply on European territory but are also exported via the cooperation with neighbouring countries.

These policies have also resulted in the criminalization of migration. They categorize them: regular migrants, irregular, asylum seekers, refugees ... etc. These categorizations help to get into the heads that some people have more rights or legitimate access to EU territory and neighbouring states; hence the importance of the choice of words. Where States talk about "illegal" or "clandestino", it is important to use words that do not come criminalize foreigners. In French, the word "sans-papiers" is used, in English, "undocumented migrants". The media also play an important role in spreading the idea of an imaginary 'enemy'. If Serbia, media still address very little the issue of foreigners, making invisible the subject; on the territory of the EU, they often adopt the terminology used by the States who plays for criminalization. Migration issues remain an unknown subject or too often tackled sporadically.

This is policies in place that are "illegalized" people in migration. Therefore, why not talk about "illegalized" person as proposed during the debate organized in REX by the Crossroads East West project.

Eva Otavi

GRANICE: SLIČNI UZROCI, SLIČNI REZULTATI

Evropska unija (EU) i njene države članice uspostavile su početkom novog milenijuma zajedničku politiku koja se tiče imigracije i institucije azila, usvojivši procedure za integraciju regularnih migranata na teritoriji EU, prijem azilanata, kao i kontrolu spoljnih granica Unije. Ubrzo je pogranična kontrola preuzela primat, a države članice su odlučile da ulože značajna sredstva u oblast bezbednosti.

Poslednjih godina, diskurs kojim se koriste mnogi evropski političari pun je pretnje. Tako se govori o „invaziji“, „masovnom prilivu“, odnosno „talasu migracija“. To je terminologija koju često preuzimaju i mediji, a za cilj ima da se izmisli neprijatelj: „migrant“.

Kako bi se borila protiv ovog „neprijatelja“, Evropa vodi politiku obezbeđivanja spoljnih granica uz pomoć susednih država. Tako neke zemlje kroz koje vodi put migracija postaju zemlje tranzita, odnosno zemlje zadobijanja statusa migranta ili tražioca azila („countries of installation“). U takvoj je poziciji naročito Maroko, koji već više godina saraduje sa EU na kontroli granica. Države susedi saraduju u sklopu procesa pristupanja Uniji, kakav je slučaj i sa Srbijom, te zahvaljujući tome postaju zemlje tranzita. Poput Rumunije, Bugarske i Hrvatske pre nje, Srbija mora da prilagodi svoju pravnu regulativu evropskim standardima ukoliko želi da postane članica EU.

Nakon ulaska u Uniju, ove države postaju nova spoljna granica evropske teritorije. Ove granice su za EU nešto čemu se posvećuje izuzetna pažnja. Postoji zapravo i posebna evropska organizacija koja se bavi ovim problemom, po imenu Frontex. Tokom procesa pristupanja, zemlja koja je kandidat za prijem u Uniju prinuđena je da prilagođava svoje zakone i propise. Tako je Srbija 2008. usvojila zakon o stranim državljanima i azilu. Iste godine zemlja je takođe napravila pomak u usklađivanju regulative u vezi sa kontrolom granica, a putem sporazuma je uspostavljena i saradnja sa Frontexom.

U sklopu procesa pristupanja, EU u pojedinim slučajevima finansira otvaranje centara za zadržavanje stranaca, ili čak prihvatnih centara za azilante. Za međunarodnu mrežu Migreurop, ovi centri, koji se još nazivaju i kampovima, bilo da su otvorenog ili zatvorenog tipa, predstavljaju mesta za sklanjanje stranaca koji se smatraju nepoželjnim.

Istovremeno, neformalni improvizovani kampovi bujaju na granicama Evrope, kao što je slučaj u Kaleu na severozapadu Francuske, gde se migranti sakupljaju u takozvanim „džunglama“ jer im je uskraćena mogućnost da pređu granicu na migracionom putu ka Engleskoj. Ovi neformalni kampovi se nazivaju „tranquillos“ u mestu Udžda na granici između Maroka i Alžira. Oni postoje i u Patri u Grčkoj, kao i poslednjih nekoliko godina u Subotici, na krajnjem severu Srbije, na granici sa Mađarskom.

Tako istovetni uzroci dovode do istih rezultata. Evropske migracione politike kojima su strani državljani skrajnuti, primenjuju se na teritoriji EU, ali se putem saradnje izvoze i u susedne zemlje.

Ove politike su takođe dovele i do kriminalizovanja migracija. Njima se migranti kategorizuju: regularni migranti, neregularni migranti, azilanti, izbeglice... Ovakva kategorizacija pomaže da se usadi ideja kako neki ljudi imaju jače pravo da legitimno uđu na teritorije EU i susednih država; zato izbor reči jeste tako značajan. Tamo gde države govore o „ilegalnim migrantima“ ili „klandestinima“, važno je preći na diskurs kojim se strani državljani ne kriminalizuju. Na francuskom se koristi izraz „sans-papiers (ljudi bez papira)“ na engleskom „undocumented migrants (nedokumentovani migranti)“. Mediji takođe igraju značajnu ulogu u širenju ideje o izmišljenom „neprijatelju“. U srpskim medijima se o stranim državljanima i dalje malo govori, čime ovaj problem ostaje slabo vidljiv; na teritoriji EU, obično se usvaja terminologija koju koriste članice, a kojom se potencira kriminalizovanje stranaca. Pitanje migracije i dalje ostaje nepoznanica, ili se u najvećem broju slučajeva o njemu govori sasvim sporadično.

Ovo jesu mere kojima se migranti stavljaju izvan zakona. Zato predlažem da o „ilegalizovanim“ ljudima razgovaramo na način koji je predložen tokom debate organizovane u REXu u okviru projekta „Raskršća istok zapad“.

Christophe Lalouque

EIGHT SMALL PIECES THAT TESTIFY.

1

The language, vocabulary, the images we create around the issue of immigration contribute concretely to how humans physically confronted with the issue of immigration are treated. The immigration policies of Europe itself influence states, affect Serbia, influence the media and public opinion. Migrants find themselves victims, not just from a system, but from people.

2

What humanity do we want to be? We have an obsession with the document, the form, the ID. Cultures, History, mythologies of the people have no reason to be inside this system. Immigration policies are proving to be the paradigm of security horror.

3

Who are they? What do they want? What are their plans? Where are they? Where do they come from? Where do they go? Are they dangerous? Why here? Why with us? Why do they scare us? Why are they taking our jobs, our money, our homes, our children? What are politicians doing? What are the police doing? What is Europe doing? The fear of the middle class is irrational. But the society is ready to provide rules for the irrational.

4

Migrants do not come by accident. They aren't criminals. Our society is a society of migrants who are systematically targeted as offenders. Institutions neglect this issue of immigration, and refuse to address it frontally, in relation to justice, freedom, the constitution, the democratic spirit ... Everything that normally has value with other societal issues, is no longer valid here. The issue of immigration is an issue that generates its own laws, its own rules, its own injustices, its own punishment. Institutions finally settle with specific agreements on this subject. Arrangements which, by these same institutions, seem unacceptable when they concern other subjects.

5

The courage of migrants demands our respect. The strength of children too. Physically and spiritually, what they support is huge. Fleeing a dangerous existence, to save their lives, they face extreme dangers. Cold. Hunger. Fear. Those who survive, those who manage to survive, must be superhuman in terms of what a human being is normally capable of supporting. They run. And in this ruthless race, they do not have the time to ask for papers, to make asylum claims. They do not care about their rights. Where are the rights of man in the scale of the survival of a man? The chances of getting the right to live legally are minimal. Take the risk of illegality itself is the shortest path to a better life.

6

Large sums of money are incredibly spent to monitor, control, stop, punish and send back migrants. Sophisticated technology is developed to capture unarmed and frail human beings. Infrared cameras. Helicopters. Robotic systems. The gap between the armada implemented by the states, and the apparent vulnerability of human beings against which it unleashed is shameful. The controls are more and more important. How far are we willing to go? Do we want to go against this policy or do we accept to be accomplice? Ping Pong. Yo yo. Killing game. The human cost of these policies will remain immeasurable.

7

In which side is the crime? The society forgive the violation of human rights, turn a blind eye on traffic, the real values of Europe are not those who are written. The dignity of every human being is related to freedom of movement all around the world. How do we get these discriminatory words we use when we talk about migrants? What is behind those words? What reality? Clandestine or asylum seeker: two opposing speeches for the same reality. These are the same types of people. But you just need one word for a man to pass from an innocent status to a criminal. The discourse of security in a world at war, against the one of humanity in a world at peace. Clandestine or asylum seeker: two realities opposed to a single lie. The danger, the insecurity and the death, or the protection, the work, the integration. A human being can't in be illegal. His actions can. And the respectable man, simply because he goes somewhere on earth where he could live in dignity, is crashed, dehumanized by abject laws. In the eyes of others, he only exists by his acts of survival.

8

Europe seems to cope very well with a Serbia that would play its role as a filter, holding up the migration to the West. Serbia has a modest experience with the reception of migrants. Serbia is a land of passage, of transit. She can't decide for the migrants if they have to go, stop or leave. This may be a chance to educate, persuade, explain the characteristics of migration. Culture can be a powerful way to unify ours communities together, but also migrants with the people they meet, the media, the political powers. Even if it does not seem to do so, it is possible to devise new rules of "living together".

OSAM KRATKIH ODLOMAKA KOJI SVEDOČE.

1

Jezik, rečnik i slike koje stvaramo, a tiču se pitanja imigracije, imaju konkretan uticaj na način na koji se postupa prema ljudima koji se fizički suočavaju sa pitanjima imigracije.

Imigracione mere Evropske unije utiču na sve države, pa i na Srbiju, utiču na medije i javno mnjenje.

Migranti tako postaju žrtve, ne samo sistema, već i drugih ljudi.

2

Kakvo čovečanstvo mi želimo da budemo?

Imamo opsesiju dokumentima, formom, ličnim papirima. Kulture, istorija i mitologije naroda nemaju razloga da budu unutar ovog sistema.

Pokazalo se da su mere imigracione politike paradigma sekuritarnog horora.

3

Ko su oni? Šta oni žele? Šta oni planiraju? Gde su oni? Odakle oni dolaze? Kuda oni idu? Da li su oni opasni? Zašto ovde? Zašto kod nas? Zašto nas oni plaše? Zašto nam oni uzimaju naše poslove, naš novac, naše domove, našu decu?

Šta rade političari? Šta radi policija? Šta radi Evropa?

Strah srednje klase je iracionalan. Ali društvo je spremno da ovu iracionalnost podrži propisima.

4

Migranti ne dolaze slučajno. Oni nisu kriminalci.

Naše društvo jeste društvo migranata koji se sistematski gone kao da su prestupnici.

Institucije zanemaruju problem imigracije i odbijaju da se sa njim suoče

licem u lice, u kontekstu pravde, slobode, ustava, duha demokratije... Sve ono što važi za druga društvena pitanja, ne važi i za imigraciju. Problem imigracije je pitanje koje rađa svoje sopstvene zakone, svoja sopstvena pravila, svoje sopstvene nepravde i svoje sopstvene kazne. Institucije se u slučaju imigracije na posletku zadovoljavaju specifičnim rešenjima. To su rešenja koje su za iste te institucije sasvim neprihvatljiva kada se govori o bilo kom drugom aspektu života.

5

Hrabrost koju migranti pokazuju mora se poštovati. Takva su čak i deca migranti. Ono kroz šta oni prolaze predstavlja izuzetan fizički i psihički teret. Bežeći od opasnosti koje nosi svakodnevni život oni se suočavaju sa izuzetnim opasnostima dok pokušavaju da spase sopstveni život. Hladnoća. Glad. Strah. Oni koji prežive, oni kojima to pođe za rukom, moraju imati nešto nadljudsko jer je njihova muka neuporedivo veća od onoga sa čime se običan čovek suočava.

Oni beže. I tokom ove bespoštedne trke oni nemaju vremena da zatraže azil, niti da im se izdaju dokumenti. Oni ne haju za svoja prava. O kakvim to pravima govorimo kada se vodi borba za goli opstanak? Šanse su minimalne da će im se pružiti prilika da ozakone svoje bivstvovanje. Preuzimanje na sebe rizika koji ilegalni status sa sobom nosi predstavlja za njih najkraći put ka boljem životu.

6

Neverovatne su sume novca koje se troše na nadzor, kontrolu, zaustavljanje, kažnjavanje i vraćanje migranata. Razvijaju se sofisticirana tehnologija kako bi se pohvatali goloruki i nemoćni ljudi.

Infracrvene kamere. Helikopteri. Robotizovani sistemi.

Odnos između sile kojom raspolazu armade angažovane od strane država i očigledne ranjivosti ljudi na koje one kidišu, naprosto je sramotan.

Kontrolama se pridaje sve veća i veća važnost. Koliko daleko smo spremni da idemo? Želimo li da se suprotstavimo ovakvoj politici, ili prihvatamo da budemo saučesnici?

Ping Pong. Jojo. Igra ubijanja.

Ljudska cena ovih politika i postupaka ostaće nemerljiva.

Koja od ove dve strane je kriminalna?

Društvo oprašta kršenje ljudskih prava, žmuri na jedno oko pred trgovinom ljudima, a prave evropske vrednosti nisu one koje su zapisane.

Dostojanstvo svakog ljudskog bića povezano je sa pravom da se slobodno kreće svuda po svetu.

Odakle nam ove reči pune diskriminacije koje upotrebljavamo kada govorimo o migrantima? Šta se krije iza tih reči? Kakva realnost?

Ilegalni imigrant ili tražilac azila: dva različita izraza za jednu te istu realnost. U pitanju je jedna ista vrsta ljudi. Ali potrebna je tek jedna reč, pa da se od nedužnog čoveka načini kriminalac. Sekuritarni diskurs za ratna vremena, naspram humanitarnog diskursa u mirnodopskim uslovima.

Ilegalni imigrant ili tražilac azila: dve realnosti, a naspram njih jedna laž. Opasnost, nesigurnost i smrt sa jedne strane, ili zaštita, rad i integracija sa druge.

Čovek ne može biti ilegalan. To mogu biti samo njegovi postupci. Sa druge strane, jedan čovek dostojan poštovanja biva dehumanizovan i smožden pod teretom zakona koji su dostojni prezira, samo zato što se zaputio na neko mesto gde može živeti dostojanstveno. U očima drugih, njegovo preživljavanje je jedina afirmacija njegovog postojanja.

Čini se da Evropi jako odgovara Srbija čija bi uloga bila da bude filter i zaustavlja migracije koje se kreću ka zapadu. Srpsko iskustvo u prihvatu migranata je skromno. Srbija je zemlja kojom se proputuje, zemlja tranzita. Ona ne može da odlučuje umesto migranata da li treba da nastave dalje, da se zaustave ili da napuste njenu teritoriju.

Možda je ovo prilika da se ljudi edukuju i uvere, da im se objasne karakteristike migracija. Kultura ima veliku moć da približi naše zajednice, kao i da uspostavi bliskost između migranata i ljudi sa kojima se susreću, medija i političkih snaga. Iako se tako ne čini, moguće je uspostaviti nova pravila „zajedničkog življenja“.

Jovana Vuković

aktivistkinja Regionalnog centra za manjine.
(<http://www.minoritycentre.org>)

the activist of The Regional Centre for Minorities
(<http://www.minoritycentre.org>).

Vladimir Petronijević

je Izvršni direktor Grupe 484. Radio je kao pravni savetnik u Kabinetu potpredsednika Vlade zaduženog za evropske integracije Božidara Đelića, gde je bio zadužen za pravna pitanja u okviru procesa evropskih integracija i pitanja vizne liberalizacije. Član je Izvršnog komiteta Evropskog saveta za izbeglice i prognanike (ECRE). Pored toga, član je UNDP konsultantske grupe: ekspert za izveštaje o humanom razvoju (izbeglice i raseljena lica), konsultant za pitanja zapošljavanja interno raseljenih lica i konsultant za položaj dijaspore u srpskom pravnom sistemu. U Grupi 484 je od 2005. godine. Odgovoran je, pored ostalog, za razvoj organizacije, prikupljanje sredstava i upravljanje projektima. Diplomirao je na Pravnom fakultetu.

is an Executive Director of Group 484, for which he has worked since 2005. He worked as a Legal Adviser in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister for EU Integration Bozidar Đelić and was responsible for legal affairs in the EU integration process related to visa liberalization issues. Vladimir Petronijević graduated from the Faculty of Law, University of Belgrade. He is a member of the Executive Committee of European Council for Refugees and Exiles (ECRE). Mr. Petronijević is also a member of National Council for EU Integration, National Convent for European Integration Process, National Mirror Committee for Corporate Social Responsibility Standard (ISO 26000), Serbian Refugee Council and Association of Lawyers for Criminal Law. He has conducted researches and participated in the development of publications on human rights of refugees.

Marta Stojić Mitrović

je završila osnovne studije etnologije i antropologije na Filozofskom fakultetu Beogradu, a magistrirala antropologiju na Fakulteti za društvene vede u Ljubljani. Radi u Etnografskom institutu SANU. Bavi se proučavanjem marginalizovanih i/ili ilegalizovanih populacija, poput „izbisanih“ u Sloveniji, stranih fizičkih radnika, a u poslednje vreme se fokusira na tzv. neregularne migrante i tražioce azila u Srbiji.

has a bachelor's degree in ethnology and anthropology from the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade. She earned her M.A. in anthropology from the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana. She has been doing research into the marginalized and/or illegalized population, such as the Erased in Slovenia, or foreign unskilled workers. She has recently begun focusing on the so-called irregular migrants and asylum seekers in Serbia.

Ela Meh

earned a degree in philosophy and became involved in a form of activism that links the fight against climate change to the fight against capitalism. Since 2010, she has focused on the no borders activism, advocating freedom of movement and opposing the border system. She has lived and worked alongside different autonomous and no borders collectives on the French-English border in Calais. In 2012, she was a Migreurop volunteer living in Belgrade and researched the consequences of the externalization of the EU migration policy and the position of migrants in Serbia. She is currently living in Ljubljana, where she is taking a master's degree course in ethnology and cultural anthropology and continues her research into migrations.

diplomirala filozofiju, bavila se aktivizmom koji povezuje borbu protiv klimatskih promena sa antikapitalističkom borbom, a od 2010. uglavnom se bavi no borders aktivizmom, za slobodu kretanja i protiv sistema granica. Živela i radila uz različite autonomne i no borders kolektive, recimo na francusko-engleskoj granici, u Kaleu. Tokom 2012. godine bila je volonterka Migreurop, živela u Beogradu i istraživala konsekvencije eksternalizacije migracione politike EU i situaciju migranata u Srbiji. Trenutno živi u Ljubljani gde je na master studijama etnologije i kulturne antropologije i nastavlja da istražuje migracije.

Aleksandra Galonja

je komunikološkinja sa bogatim iskustvom u oblasti upravljanja programima, monitoringa i evaluacije, unapređenja kapaciteta organizacija civilnog društva, držanja obuke, razvoja metodologije i istraživanja. Aleksandra od juna 2009. godine radi u Institutu za održive zajednice, gde je menadžerka programa „Za smanjenje siromaštva: civilno društvo i odgovorna Vlada“. Pre toga je radila u Međunarodnoj organizaciji za migracije kao menadžerka za mobilizaciju društva i kontakt osoba zadužena za rodnu ravnopravnost. Od 2000. godine, saraduje sa brojnim organizacijama u zemlji, kao i međunarodnim

organizacijama i institucijama kao konsultant, evaluator, trener, istraživač, kontakt osoba zadužena za rodnu ravnopravnost i menadžerka.

is a communicologist with extensive experience in program management, monitoring and evaluation, capacity building of civil society organizations, training delivery, methodology development, and research. Aleksandra joined ISC in June 2009 as a CSGA Program Manager. Prior to that, she worked as Social Mobilization Manager and Gender Focal Point in the International Organization for Migration. Since 2000, she has been working with numerous international and national organizations and institutions as a consultant, evaluator, trainer, researcher, gender focal point and manager.

Peđa Obradović

je televizijski novinar i urednik. U novinarstvo je ušao 1998. godine, kao novinar gradske redakcije dnevnika „Blic“. U sledećih petnaest godina, proći će gotovo sve stepenice koje postoje u novinarstvu: od izveštaja o cenama na zelenim pijacama, do rada na dokumentarnim filmovima.

Posle četiri godine rada u „Blicu“, prvi put postaje reporter Televizije B92. Osim izveštavanja za emisije Vesti, oprobao se i kao autor dokumentarnih filmova. 2005. godine, za dokumentarnu reportažu „Čija je moja zemlja“, o životu povratnika, Srba, u Hrvatsku, dobija Grand prix na festivalu reportaže „Interfer“. U narednim godinama, radi i istraživačke dokumentarne filmove i devedesetominutni TV film o nepoznatim aspektima života Zorana Đinđića.

Veruje u „dok“, i u budućnosti sebe vidi kao autora dokumentarnih filmova. Ipak, još voli da uređuje vesti i izveštava; misli da tu još ima šta da kaže.

is a TV journalist and editor. He entered the world of journalism in 1998, working at the local news section at the daily newspaper Blic. In the fifteen years that followed he passed through almost all the stages there can be in a journalistic career: from reporting on the prices in open-air markets to the working on documentaries. Having spent four years at Blic, Peđa became for the first time a reporter for TV B92. In addition to being a reporter for TV News, he tried his hand at documentary filmmaking. His documentary *Whose Land is My Land?* about the life of Serbs who returned to Croatia, won the Grand Prix at the Interfer festival. He then went on to make investigative documentaries and a ninety-minute TV film about the unknown aspects of the life of Zoran Djindjic. He believes in doc and in the future sees himself as an author of

documentaries. However, he still loves to work as a news editor and reporter. He believes that he still has something to say in that domain.

Sara Preradović

rođena 11.04.1990. u Senti, srednju muzičku školu je završila u Subotici, a zatim upisuje Fakultet dramskih umetnosti u Beogradu. Diplomirala na odseku kamere, 2013. godine. Tokom studija, snimala je više kratkih i dugometražnih dokumentarnih filmova, kratkometražne eksperimentalne filmove i animacije. Pored filma, uključuje se u rad nezavisne, neprofitne grupe, koja pruža podršku migrantima i nedokumentovanim licima. Grupa se zalaže za slobodu kretanja i naseljenja, kao i za ukidanje režima granica i migracione politike, koja se vodi u Evropi i širom sveta, a samim tim i u Srbiji i na Balkanu.

was born on April 11th, 1990 in Senta. She graduated from the Secondary School of Music in Senta and subsequently enrolled at the Faculty of Drama Arts in Belgrade, where she graduated from the Camera Department in 2013. As a student, she made a number of short and feature-length student documentaries, short, experimental and animated films. In addition to being a film-maker, she is also a member of an independent, non-profit group, providing support to migrants and people without papers. The group advocates freedom of movement and freedom to settle, as well as the ban on the current border regime and migration policy implemented in Europe and throughout the world and therefore in Serbia and the Balkans too.

Eva Ottavy

is the co-coordinator of the African Euro network Migreurop (www.migreurop.org). Migreurop works on migration issues and more specifically on the impact of the European policies on migrant detention and border controls. Eva Ottavy has been working for nearly nine years now on these issues with a focus on readmission agreements, the European agency Frontex, human rights at sea and Eastern countries.

je sukoordinator afričke evro mreže Migreurop (www.migreurop.org). Migreurop se bavi pitanjima migracija, preciznije posledicama evropske politike u domenu pritvaranja migranata i granične kontrole. Eva Otavi se već skoro devet godina bavi ovim pitanjima, a posebnu pažnju posvećuje sporazumima o readmisiji, evropskoj agenciji „Frontex“, ljudskim pravima na moru i istočnim zemljama.

Christophe Lалуque

earned his M.A. degree from the Department of Theatre with Jean Jourdheuil. In the context of theatre research accessible to all, he stages B. Brecht, G. Stein, A. Daudet, R.M. Rilke, R. Walser. He integrates video in his plays and has begun collaborating with living authors. In collaboration with the CIMADE or the RESF network, he organizes regular meetings, discussions and readings about foreign cultures as part of the Strange Foreigners programme that he initiated himself. Since January 2012, he has managed the theatre La Friche des Lacs de l'Essonne in a renovated factory. He develops residencies, theatre companies and public cultural education intended for the local people.

je magistrirao na Katedri za pozorište kod Žana Žurdeja. U kontekstu pozorišnog istraživanja dostupnog svima, na scenu je postavio dela B. Brehta, G. Stajna, A. Dodea, R. M. Rilkea, R. Valzera. Video radovi su sastavni deo njegovih predstava, a počeo je da saraduje i sa živim autorima. U saradnji sa organizacijom CIMADE ili mrežom „Obrazovanje bez granica“ održava redovne sastanke, diskusije i javna čitanja na temu stranih kultura u okviru programa „Čudni stranci“ koji je pokrenut na njegovu inicijativu. Od januara 2012., rukovodi pozorištem „La Friche des Lacs de l'Essonne“, smeštenom u renoviranom napuštenom industrijskom objektu. Bavi se studijskim programima, pozorišnim trupama i obrazovanjem građana u oblasti kulture namenjenim lokalnom stanovništvu.

Debata ČOVEK NA PUTU
(u očima i poimanju njegovih nevoljnih domaćina)
Debate MAN ON THE ROAD
(Seen through the eyes of his reluctant hosts)

Tekstovi učesnika i učesnica debate
u Kulturnom centru REX 21. aprila 2013 /
Essays by participants in the debate held in
Rex Cultural Centre on April 21, 2013

Ova publikacija je nastala kao rezultat projekta "Raskršća istok zapad" koji je Fond B92/Kulturni centar Rex realizovao u periodu od aprila 2011. do maja 2014. godine u okviru projekta "Engine Room Europe" realizovanog zajedno sa još 11 centara iz Evropske mreže nezavisnih kulturnih centara - Trans Europe Halles.

This publication was created as a result of the Crossroads East West project, realized by Fund B92/Rex Cultural Centre in the period of April 2011 to May 2014 as a part of "Engine Room Europe", a project realized in cooperation with 11 other centers in the Trans Europe Halles - European network of independent cultural centers.

Tekstovi / Contributors: Jovana Vuković, Vladimir Petronijević,
Marta Stojić Mitrović, Ela Meh, Aleksandra Galonja, Peđa Obradović,
Eva Ottavy, Christophe Laluque

Prevod / Translation: Milan Marković

Urednik / Editor: Nebojša Milikić

Izdavač / Published by: Fond B92

Organizacija i produkcija debata i publikacije:

Fond B92/Kulturni centar Rex

Debates and publication produced and organized by:

Fond B92/Rex Cultural Centre

www.rex.b92.net

Koordinatori projekta / Project coordinators:

Dušica Parezanović i Nebojša Milikić

škart design

Izdavanje publikacije pomogli su Evropska komisija u okviru programa Kultura 2007 – 2013 i Ministarstvo kulture i informisanja Republike Srbije. Debata je bila deo i "Govornih programa KC REXa" koji su pomogli Fondacija za otvoreno društvo i Sekretarijat za kulturu grada Beograda.

This publication was made possible with the assistance of the European Commission, as a part of Culture 2007-2013 programme and the Ministry of Culture and Information of Serbia. The debate was held also as part of the Talks programmes at Cultural Centre REX, supported by the Fondation for an Open Society and the Secretariat for Culture, City of Belgrade.

Beograd 2014.

CIP - Каталогизација у публикацији
Народна библиотека Србије, Београд

314.15-054.7(497.11)(082)
316.662-054.7(497.11)(082)

ДЕБАТА Човек на путу (2013 ; Београд)
Debata Čovek na putu = Debate Man on the
Road : (u očima i poimanju njegovih nevoljnih
domaćina) = (seen through the eyes of his
reluctant hosts) : tekstovi učesnika i
učesnica debate u Kulturnom centru Rex 21.
aprila 2013. = essays by participants in the
debate held in Rex Cultural Centre on April
21th 2013. / [urednik, editor Nebojša Milikić
; prevod, translation Milan Marković]. -
Beograd : Fond B92, 2014 (Beograd : Standard
2). - 96 str. ; 23 cm

Uporedo srp. tekst i engl. prevod. - "Ova
publikacija je nastala kao rezultat projekta
'Raskršće istok zapad' koji je Fond
B92/Kulturni centar REX realizovao u periodu
od aprila 2011. do maja 2014. godine u okviru
projekta 'Engine Room Europe ...'" --> str.
94. - Tiraž 300. - Kratke biografije: str.
89-93.

ISBN 978-86-89891-03-4

1. Уп. ств. насл.

а) Мигранти - Србија - Зборници
COBISS.SR-ID 206241036