

Trg Nikole Pašića 5  
11103 Belgrade, Serbia  
www.rem.rs

Number: 800/2025/I  
Date: 16/07/2025  
Belgrade

### Report of the Monitoring and Analysis Service

---

Ex officio **procedure**, based on the complaint of the CRTA organisation.

**MSP:** PRVA TELEVIZIJA D.O.O. – Prva, Ikarbus 3 Nova 19, Belgrade-Zemun

**Complaint:** 27/06/2025

**Subject of monitoring:** Film NGO files – Black swan effect – Episode 2 on 27 May 2025, from 18:55 to 20:00

**Content:** Film about the NGO sector's ties to an intelligence network operating against Serbia

---

#### **Report:**

The film in question was released without a programme announcement; it was initially identified as a production of the Centre for Social Stability. In terms of genre, it is hybrid in nature, and can be classified as a news or current affairs programme, bearing in mind that it deals with current socio-political issues. The film is mostly composed of voiceover narration and, partly, of statements made by selected interlocutors on the given topic.

It begins with an interpretation of what a "black swan" means in political theory (an unexpected historical phenomenon that does not follow known patterns precisely because it is unique and unexpected), linking it to the election of Donald Trump as President of the United States, then his cancellation of government support to the USAID fund, before linking the fund to Serbian non-governmental organisations and their overall harmful impact on the societies of countries in which they operate. The activities of NGOs, including the complainant organisation, are viewed as part of intelligence operations in Serbia, used to support the claim that there is an international scenario of the overthrow of the Serbian government and state in order to bring political figures to power that would be obedient and loyal to their masters – it is unclear which ones but they are said to be located somewhere in the West. In this sense, the typical claim is made that named activists had intense contacts with representatives of Western intelligence services and the Brussels administration.

In the course of events that begins with vaguely identified centres in the West, as the last link in the chain engaging in social destruction, a movement is mentioned that is consistently described as a "colour revolution" in the film. Overall, the film seeks to show ties with foreign centres of influence that use non-governmental organisations (specifically listed are: BIRN, KRIK and CRTA) and the "colour revolution" in an attempt to overthrow the government and impose their own political

tel: 011/2028 700  
fax: 011/2028 745  
e-mail: office@rem.rs  
TIN: 102945724  
Registry number: 17488554

agenda in Serbia. Also listed among such organisations is the Council of Europe, due to its unfavourable report on the work of the National Assembly of Serbia.

The list of persons who are designated as NGO activists causing harm to state interests includes the names Vukosava Crnjanski Šabović, Tamara Branković, Raša Nedeljkov, Pavle Dimitrijević, Mladen Jovanović, Zoran Stamenković, Emilija Milenković, Nemanja Todorović, Dragana Žarković, Milka Dokmanović, Aleksa Tešić, Ivana Nikolić, Jelena Vasić, Bojana Jovanović, Milica Vojnović, Mirjana Aćimović, Mile Martić, Vojislav Mihailović, some of whom, like Stevan Dojčinović, are directly labelled as persons prone to corruption. In the form of documentary footage used to illustrate the content ("B-roll"), other persons also appear (e.g. Aleksandar Đorđević – BIRN). Of the aforementioned persons, there is no one in the film who presents his or her views on the given topic or anyone in general who would deviate from the described narrative in which NGOs are part of the Western intelligence network, which is operating against the interests of the country of Serbia for financial gain.

The drawing of conclusions in the programme is indirect, such as allegations that non-governmental organisations received an ideological narrative that they should push, based on the circumstance that "the leaders of that organisation have completed several courses organised by the IRI and the NDI".

As predominant financiers of the activities of the non-governmental sector in Serbia, after the termination of funding from the US, the film claims that "the embassies of Sweden, the United Kingdom, Norway and France stand out most of all", and none of the highlighted embassies got an opportunity to shed light on the described situation from their own perspective as well.

Much of the film's content, presented through voiceover narration, is devoted to hard-to-verify claims about the operations of intelligence players, about "manipulative guerrilla groups", as well as other claims in the security domain whose only corroboration consists in the constant repetition of the argument that reads "according to information obtained by the Centre for Social Stability".

Transcript:

*Looking at the composition of the Executive Board of BIRN alone does not leave much room for doubting this hypothesis (there ensues a listing of the members of the Executive Board), all are people deeply entrenched in the global network of influence of Western intelligence structures operating under the guise of humanitarian and media actors fighting for media freedom and freedom of speech. (...)*

*In this way, apart from serving to form a media propaganda effect, the operations of this organisation have largely contributed to an environment for strong intelligence subversive activity in line with the interests of the British intelligence service and structures of the now defeated US democratic establishment as part of the broader foreign policy strategy of the global West towards this part of the world.*

In addition, some ideological stereotypes are presented that are not exposed to any kind of examination or challenge in the film: *Brussels is the last bastion of leftist liberal ideology and globalism*, as well as political propaganda stereotypes with a clear partisan connotation – *"Belgrade Waterfront – Symbol of the Renaissance of Serbia"*.

From the point of view of media regulation, **the main problem is in the one-sidedness of the statements made**, without any attempt made to present an opinion that is at all outside of the framework of the pre-determined theses which are presented not as a conclusion but as a starting assumption, all in the form of questions already in the first minutes of the film. These questions are:

- *How is Serbia being destroyed?*
- *Who are the backers of this?*
- *Who is carrying this out?*
- *If we follow the money, where does it lead?*
- *How much does it cost to reduce Serbia to ashes?*
- *Who will, in the end, live to regret this?*

The one-sidedness of the approach is especially obvious if one considers the choice of interlocutors – the actions of non-governmental organisations are commented on solely by representatives of governmental structures in Serbia – Ana Brnabić, Miloš Vučević, Siniša Mali, Arnaud Gouillon, along with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Hungary Péter Szijjártó. The interlocutors also include Georgian political analyst Ghia Abashidze and politician Givi Mikanadze, who talk about real or alleged similarities in political circumstances between Serbia and Georgia, as well as some lesser-known foreign politicians who support the film's general narrative.

Describing the actions of the media that are influenced by non-governmental organisations, the film says that *In that way, by relying on absolutely fabricated or partially accurate non-incriminating facts, placed in a context that suits them, they give their readers the impression that their claims are true*. With the aforementioned quote, the film's producers largely described their own authorship procedure and mechanism that characterise how the film in question itself works.

Regarding the allegations relating to the CRTA organisation, the complaint contains a transcript of the parts of the programme that the complainant considers problematic and the technical service notes that the quotes are authentic.

The film content related to the CRTA organisation and people mentioned in this context fit the overall tone of the programme, which also includes other non-governmental and research organisations.

The statements made criticising both the CRTA organisation and other organisations, as well as named persons, are entirely of such nature that they entail their justified interest to respond to what was said, within the meaning of Article 8, Paragraph 1 of the **Rulebook on the Protection of Human Rights in the Area of Media Service Provision - Hear the Other Side rule**:

*If information in connection with which a particular person has a justified interest in making a statement is aired in the programme, and especially if allegations of incompetence, immoral or unlawful actions are presented or a dispute involving a conflict of opinions or views, the media service provider shall provide an opportunity for such person to respond to the released information, or participate in the discussion in an equal manner.*

Also, in addition to interested persons, there is also a public interest in terms of the transparency and diversity of information, protected by Articles 4 and 5 of the **Rulebook**.

(General obligation - Article 4, paragraphs 1 and 2: The media service provider shall ensure the provision of free, true, objective, complete and timely information, and in particular that news and current affairs programmes truly and objectively present facts and events and encourage free formation of opinions.)

The media service provider shall ensure the diversity of information content for the purpose of ensuring the exercise of the right to free expression, as well as encourage the free formation of political and critical thinking.

(Truthfulness, completeness and diversity of information - Article 5, Paragraphs 1 and 2: The media service provider shall ensure the truthfulness and completeness of information, as well as the veracity and completeness of the ideas and opinions it broadcasts, especially in the news and current affairs programs with due care corresponding to circumstances and in accordance with the rules of the journalistic profession.

The media service provider shall provide information to media service users based on facts obtained from a number of different sources, as well as provide a variety of views, opinions and issues discussed in the public within its news and current affairs programme.)

---

### **Conclusion:**

Proposal to initiate an examination procedure due to content inconsistent with

- Article 4, Paragraphs 1 and 2;
- Article 5, Paragraphs 1 and 2;
- Article 8, Paragraph 1

of the **Rulebook on the Protection of Human Rights in the Area of Media Service Provision**, in connection with Article 61 of the **Law on Electronic Media**.

---

**Monitoring and Analysis Service**  
**XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**