Between impositions and promises: democracy in Macedonia

Gromes, Thorsten

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Arbeitspapier / working paper

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:
Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung (HSFK)

PRIF HSFK
Peace Research Institute Frankfurt
Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung

PRIF-Reports No. 91

Between Impositions and Promises: Democracy in Macedonia

Thorsten Gromes

Member of Leibniz Association

I would like to thank the German Research Foundation for the grant awarded for my project "No State and Nation – No Democracy. Democratization of Post-Civil War Societies".

Correspondence to:
PRIF · Baseler Straße 27-31 · 60329 Frankfurt am Main · Germany
Telephone: +49(0)69 95 91 04-0 · Fax: +49(0)69 55 84 81
E-Mail: gromes@hsfk.de · Internet: www.prif.org

ISBN: 978-3-937829-95-1

Euro 10,-

Summary

Democracy promises intrastate peace therefore post-civil war societies are often prescribed democratization. However, in ethnically divided societies building democratic institutions where all former warring parties operate is tantamount to an impertinent demand. In many cases at least one of the conflict parties refuses to be a single *demos* together with the other party and coexist with it in the same political community. There can, however, be no success in building or remodeling democratic institutions as long as one of the conflicting parties rejects the state, its borders or internal structures. Likewise, an absence of common democratic institutions prevents all the conflicting parties from accepting the state as their own. In the context of these considerations the present report discusses whether democratization in Macedonia has succeeded in making progress after the fighting in 2001 and fulfilling the promise of peace through democracy.

In 2001 the (Albanian) National Liberation Army (UÇK) attacked the Macedonian security forces. Initially, it also promoted secessionist objectives but later it restricted itself to demands for empowerment of Albanians in Macedonia. The fighting came to an end with the Ohrid Agreement between the largest Macedonian and Albanian parties. The peace agreement required the dissolution of the UÇK and promised comprehensive reforms of state institutions in return.

Macedonia enjoyed initially a relatively favorable environment for democratization because the government institutions where Macedonian and Albanian parties shared power had persisted even during the fighting. Hence the subsequent democratization only required a remodeling of common institutions rather than having to set up new ones from scratch. A large majority of Albanians accepted the Republic of Macedonia but not its old structures. Even so, Albanian politicians avoided showing their loyalty to Macedonia. The majority of Macedonian citizens wanted Macedonia to be their nation-state and rejected the reforms envisaged in the Ohrid Agreement. Therefore it appeared questionable that the formula of "peace for more rights" could work.

However, many of the remodeling measures in state institutions as envisaged in the peace agreement were implemented after 2001. Moreover, the UÇK disbanded itself and its political leadership established a new Albanian party that in 2002 joined the Macedonian government against which it had fought just a year and a half earlier. Advances in democratization were achieved although the Macedonians rejected the new definition of the Republic and institutional reforms. The prospect of accession to the European Union cancelled out the lack of acceptance for the conceived institutional order. A very large majority of Macedonian citizens wanted the integration, which was used by the European Union to press for implementation of the Ohrid Agreement. Without the implementation of this agreement there could be no further convergence. Once the provisions of the peace agreement were implemented Albanian citizens and politicians started to show greater commitment to the Republic of Macedonia. Nevertheless, they continued to shun the national flag and venerate Albanian symbols. But the number of opponents of the agreement diminished because of increasing avowals of loyalty by the Albanians and the realization that the Macedonians' fears of being degraded proved to be unfounded. In the last

few years only fringe organizations or politicians consistently repudiated the Ohrid Agreement or the common state.

Despite some improvements Macedonia even in 2009 exhibited a democracy deficit in some respects. Violent incidents and irregularities overshadowed the most recent parliamentary elections. The ruling parties sought to fill public service jobs with their supporters. Independence of judges remained precarious. Multiple boycotts of parliamentary sessions presented another problem. However, most of these shortcomings stemmed neither from insufficient acceptance of the common democracy, nor from interethnic conflict but from the legacy of the long authoritarian rule and a lack of democratic attitudes in the political elite.

The largest source of potential destabilization in 2009 was the quarrel over the name of Macedonia with Greece, which threatened to block Euro-Atlantic integration. Politicians and experts thought that the fundamental consensus holding the Republic together was at risk. If accession to the European Union remains barred, the acceptance of the Ohrid Agreement as well as a common democracy would possibly diminish.

The report advises the international presence in Macedonia not to circumvent the rules of democracy in its efforts to mediate between the ethnic groups and political parties. In the quarrel over the name of Macedonia with Greece both parties should be urged to exercise restraint so that the success story of the Macedonian peace process does not come to a bitter end after all. Despite the hitherto relative success Macedonia is hardly a suitable model for democratization in other post-civil war societies because the conditions for its success are absent in most of the other cases.

Contents

1. Introduction[1]

"Impositions and promises" is the subtitle of a collection of theses on democracy (Möllers 2008). One of the central promises of democracy is that it protects both international and intrastate peace. The international political community has so much faith in this promise that it often declares the promotion of democracy to be a strategy for peace. Hence, since the end of the Cold War democratization has been one of the standard requirements in agreements that are expected to put an end to intrastate wars (Paris 2004: 5). This report discusses to what extent democratization might deliver regarding its promise of peace. However, it does not deal with its dark sides, which could jeopardize peace both inside and between states (Gromes 2007: 70-94; Jarstad/Sisk 2008; Mann 2005; Müller/Geis/Wagner 2007). It is rather a question of whether the undertaking of democratization could succeed and produce a democracy. Here the focus is on democratization of ethnically divided societies that have experienced an armed conflict in their recent past.[2]

The fact that there was such a conflict in Macedonia in 2001 is not surprising, but it is nevertheless remarkable. An armed conflict in Macedonia is a reminder of the two wars in the Balkans at the beginning of the last century that had to do with the "Macedonian question". Yet at the end of the same century only the Republic of Macedonia had succeeded in seceding peacefully from the disintegrating Yugoslavia. At that time Macedonia seemed to be more of a model and less of a powder keg in two respects at once: the fact that Macedonian parties always built governments with an Albanian party paved the way for a peaceful settlement in ethnically divided societies. Moreover, the United Nations boasted about having kept Macedonia away from the maelstrom of Yugolavia's disintegration wars with the help of peacekeepers. Yet when the Albanian National Liberation Army (UÇK) attacked the Macedonian security forces at the beginning of 2001 the country risked descending "from the success story to a heap of ruins" (Hatschikjan 2001). The Ohrid Agreement put a stop to the armed conflict in August 2001. Here democratization was also deemed to be a tried and tested means for securing the peace. Could it succeed in putting Macedonia back on the path to success?

If there are any necessary preconditions for successful democratization at all, scholars of democracy see them in the existence of a state, on the one hand: "no state, no democracy" (Munck 2004: 72). Democracy needs a state to implement political decisions (Tilly 2007: 11). On the other hand, an advanced level of nation-building is considered a prerequisite for successful democratization (Berg-Schlosser 2004: 14). Democracy functions

1 I thank Tome Sandevski, Aleksandra Stojkovski and Merle Vetterlein for their suggestions about field research in Macedonia. Additionally, Henri Bohnet from the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, Nena Trajkovska from the Friedrich Ebert Foundation, as well as political scientists Židas Daskalovski and Dane Taleski helped me a lot in Skopje. I am grateful to all my interviewees. I would also like to thank Claudia Baumgart-Ochse, Cemal Karakaş, Bernhard Moltmann, Tome Sandevski, Hajo Schmidt and Bruno Schoch for constructive criticism.

2 This project resulted in a case study about Bosnia and Herzegovina, which is also available as a HSFK Report (Gromes 2008).

only if all significant groups accept the borders of the political community and the definition of the *demos*.[3] Dankwart Rustow (1970: 351-353) believed that the only "background condition" for democracy was that the majority of the population would know to which political community it belonged and would not reject it.

Indeed, some societies still have institutions of government after civil wars between ethnically defined parties that were terminated in peace agreements. But at least one party does not see them as common structures and at least one party to the conflict operates primarily outside of these institutions. Consequently, democratization requires that such structures of the state be made available where all parties to the conflict would operate. To this end the institutions of government have to be reestablished or at least altered (state-building). This report will not deal with each and every form of design for structures of the state, but will instead concentrate exclusively on state-building as a subtask of democratization of ethnically divided post-civil war societies.

What is mostly missing after a civil war between ethnically defined parties, is acceptance of the definition of the *demos*, of the structure of the state or even the common state itself. The parties to the conflict face each other in their hardened particular identities and at least one party opposes building a nation together with the other one. To recall Benedict Anderson (1988: 15-17): one of the conflicting parties does not even want to imagine a political community with the other party. It perceives a common democracy more as an impertinent demand and less as a promise and obstructs the reconstruction or modification of state institutions. Therefore, democratization in ethnically divided post-civil war societies faces the challenge of creating a modicum of mutual recognition so that common institutions can function. It requires that enemies start to regard each other as political opponents and a sense of belonging emerges to overarch or reduce the weight of the forcibly cemented particularist identities. I call this transition nation-building.[4]

Given the assumed necessary conditions for a successful democratization on the one hand, and the initial situation in ethnically divided post-civil war societies on the other hand, democratization has to cope with the dual task of state-building and nation-building. To this end there are three options available:

One option is to concentrate on nation-building first and subsequently build or modify a common democratic state. But where should the notion of the political community come from if ethnic groups remain gridlocked in confrontation with each other in their fixed cemented identities, fears and mistrust? Oftentimes in history it was the state that showed different groups that they shared a social space. Thus, over time, these groups perceived themselves as a political community. But the common state or its structure is

3 Anselm et al. (1999); Bendel/Krennerich (2003); Merkel (1999); Schmitter (1994); Shain/Linz (1995).

4 There are many definitions of nation-building (see Hippler 2004: 14-20) that equate it either with democratization, or with the building of new states, or with consolidation of peace by military means. Other concepts describe nation-building as the emergence of a state-wide identity, which supersedes particularist ethnic identities. In this report nation-building means a process at the end of which the conflicting parties no longer dismiss the notion that together they constitute a political community.

the central object of the conflict in societies after a civil war between ethnically defined parties. Nation-building should bring about the very acceptance of the common state and therefore it cannot be based on state-building.

The other option would be to try it the opposite way and first furnish the common democratic structures of the state in order to pave the way for nation-building. But without the collaboration of all conflicting parties the institutions laid out for democracy would remain empty shells. However, the willingness of working in these institutions depends on the acceptance of the state and the definition of the *demos* embodied in its institutions. Therefore, building or remodeling the state in the framework of democratization requires advances in nation-building but it cannot generate them.

The remaining third option is pursuing *state-building* and *nation-building* at the same time. History offers many examples of how the availability of state institutions can promote the sense of national community, or conversely of how the existence of such a sense of belonging builds institutions of the state and breathes life into them (Breuilly 1999; Reinhard 2000; Schulze 1994). But under the initial conditions of ethnically divided post-civil war societies and the requirement of democratization these interrelations look like a vicious circle: a lack of common democratic institutions obstructs nation-building while lack of acceptance of the common state hinders state-building.[5]

This report discusses whether the conjectured vicious circle of state-building and nation-building has constrained (further) democratization in Macedonia. If not, how was it possible to advance the building or remodeling of the common democracy although the largest ethnic groups disagreed about the structure of the common state? The report describes the starting position for democratization and discusses the roles of the course of conflict, the envisaged institutions, the economic development as well as the influence of international factors, first and foremost among them, the prospect of accession to the European Union.

Firstly, the report gives a summary of the armed conflict in Macedonia (Chapter 2) and reviews how to assess the level achieved in the establishment of democratic institutions and nation-building (Chapter 3). It then describes the starting position for democratization after the peace agreement was signed (Chapter 4). The subsequent chapters (Chapters 5 and 6) deal with two phases (2002-2006, 2006-2009) and discuss the link between the establishment of democratic institutions and nation-building separately for each of the phases. The closing chapter (Chapter 7) evaluates the democratization in the light of the conjectured vicious circle, outlines potential sources of destabilization and offers policy recommendations.

5 Not all democratic deficiencies in ethnically divided post-civil-war societies can be attributed to this vicious circle. By the same token, advances in democratization offer little assurance of a constructive conflict process (Gromes 2007: 70-94).

2. The armed conflict in Macedonia

There are several Macedonias: the ancient Macedonia of Alexander the Great, the Macedonia shaped by the Ottoman Empire, a region which also included parts of the current states of Albania, Bulgaria and Greece, a province in the northern part of Greece, and finally the state which calls itself the Republic of Macedonia but in many texts is referred to as the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM). The subject of this report is this state that I will simply call Macedonia for the sake of brevity.[6]

Macedonia is a multi-ethnic, multilingual and multireligous state. In the 2002 population census 64.2% of the country's two million citizens identified themselves as Macedonians, 25.2% as Albanians, 3.9% as Turks, 2.7% as Roma and 1.8% as Serbs (Oschlies 2003: 1). All these people count as Macedonians in the sense of being citizens of Macedonia, only some two thirds of them call themselves Macedonians in the ethnic sense. If later in this report Macedonians are mentioned, this term refers to the largest ethnic group. The majority of Macedonians speak Macedonian, use the Cyrillic alphabet[7] and just like most of the Serbs belong to Orthodox Christianity. The Albanians, on the other hand, speak the Albanian language, use the Latin alphabet and most of them share the Muslim faith with the majority of the Turks and Roma. While the Macedonians live all over the state territory, the Albanians are concentrated in the northern and northwestern regions and in the capital of Skopje (Daskalovski 2006: 62f). The 2002 census showed that almost two thirds of the citizens resided in census districts where a single ethnic group constituted at least 80% of the population.[8] Macedonia is marked less by interaction or mixing between ethnic groups and more by their parallel existence (Hislope 2003: 134). In 2008 only seven percent of weddings resulted in mixed marriages, 95% of the Macedonians and 96% of the Albanians found a marriage partner from their own ethnic group (Republic of Macedonia State Statistical Office 2009: 36).

Nevertheless, until early 2001, Macedonia was considered a model for inter-ethnic settlement and an example of successful prevention of violence. A deadly attack with grenades on January 22, 2001 disrupted the country's success story. It initiated a series of events (Philips 2004: 202) that were called war, staged war, near war, armed conflict, terrorism, drama, crisis or simply "2001". The violence was perpetrated by the (Albanian) National Liberation Army (UÇK in Albanian, ONA in Macedonian) and it led to fighting between this paramilitary group and the Macedonian military and police forces. What objectives the UÇK[9] was in pursuit of, remained very contentious even among the Albanians. Initially members of the UÇK said that they wanted to liberate Albanian-populated

6 By doing so in no case do I embrace any of the positions of the Macedonian government in its quarrel with Greece over the name of the state.

7 I use diacritical signs to transcribe Cyrillic names in the Latin alphabet.

8 I made the calculation myself on the basis of the data in: Republic of Macedonia State Statistical Office 2005: 34f.

9 I use Macedonian abbreviations for Albanian organizations. However, I made an exception for the UÇK because German-speaking readers know it by this name.

areas from "Macedonian oppressors" and join them to Kosovo or Albania (Ackermann 2001: 119; Naegele 2001; Rozen 2001). Just a few weeks later, however, a different argument became predominant: the UÇK claimed to be fighting for more rights for the Albanians and in doing so it took up the very demands that the Albanian parties had been making since Macedonia became independent in 1991. Thereby the UÇK ceased to expressly challenge Macedonia's territorial integrity (Daskalovski 2006: 76f; Rusi 2004). The Democratic Party of Albanians (DPA in Macedonian, PDSh in Albanian), a member of the government coalition since 1998, rejected this interpretation saying that the sole objective of the war was to oust the party from the government (Dnevnik, 21.4.2003). Many observers in academia also believed that this was less of a conflict between the Albanians and the Macedonians and more of a conflict among the Albanians themselves. Apparently, the UÇK competed with the DPA for control over Albanian-populated areas including smuggling routes (Pearson 2002: 3f).

At first, high-ranking representatives of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union (EU) called the UÇK members terrorists or criminal extremists and backed the actions of the Macedonian government. Also due to solidarity with the government, the EU concluded a Stabilization and Association Agreement with Macedonia in April 2001. Later, the EU and NATO requested the Macedonian security forces to exercise military restraint and successfully pressed for a "government of national salvation". The government composed of the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization – Democratic Party for Macedonian National Unity (VMRO-DPMNE), the DPA and the Liberal Party (LP), was expanded to include the former opposition Social Democratic Union of Macedonia (SDSM), the Albanian Party for Democratic Prosperity (PDP) and also the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP). Accompanied primarily by pressure and assistance from the EU and USA the government of national salvation negotiated a framework agreement, which was agreed in Ohrid and signed by the four largest political parties in Skopje on August 13, 2001 (Framework Agreement 2001). As requested by the Macedonian parties, as well as by the EU, NATO and USA, the UÇK did not participate directly in the talks but accepted the agreement.[10] The Framework Agreement put an end to the armed conflict, which had claimed the lives of some 150 to 190 people and forced 140,000 to 150,000 people to leave their homes (Daskalovski 2006: 203; Mitevski 2008: 167; Sandevski 2009: 30).

Whatever the primary point of conflict might have been, the main objective of the agreement was to improve the status of Macedonia's Albanian citizens. Many Albanians felt they were second-class citizens and therefore they demanded proportional representation in public institutions, mandatory consensus-based decision-making in parliament on certain issues, the introduction of Albanian as second official language, higher education in Albanian language, the right to live their culture and express their identity, as well as the decentralization of the state (Cekić 2008: 41-44; interview with Ismet Ramadani 2009).

10 About the events from the start of the escalation until the Framework Agreement, see Altmann (2003); Mitevski (2008); Schlotter (2002), as well as reports by the International Crisis Group (ICG) at www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=1244&l=1 (24.11.2009).

Since they believed that their concerns were being ignored, most Albanians boycotted the independence referendum on September 8, 1991. In parliament Albanian representatives abstained from the vote on the constitution. Since the independence, Albanian parties have, however, always been part of the government (Daskalovski 2006: 64-68, 193; Hislope 2003: 139).

The essence of the Ohrid Agreement is expressed by the formula of "more rights for peace".[11] Its objective is to secure the future of democracy and to bring Macedonia closer to the EU and NATO. It categorically rejects politically motivated violence. The agreement confirmed that there were no territorial solutions to ethnic issues. The UÇK was required to disarm and disband, NATO troops would safeguard the ceasefire and disarmament. In return, the "communities" (ethnic groups) should be equally and proportionately represented in local and central institutions. Henceforth, a double majority was needed in parliament to adopt any laws directly linked to culture, language and symbols, education, personal identity documents, as well as local self-government. These laws required a majority of the representatives including a majority of non-Macedonian representatives. Any language, if spoken by at least 20 percent of the population, would become an official language in addition to Macedonian. The state would have to finance education in such languages. Moreover, the Framework Agreement envisioned a decentralization of Macedonia. Local authorities received the right to display symbols of the community's ethnic majority next to the signs of the Republic in front of public buildings. Lastly, the Ohrid Agreement called for a new population census and, in addition to NATO and the EU, it invited the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), as well as other international organizations, to assist in the implementation of the Agreement's provisions.[12] The prospect of amnesty for the UÇK fighters was another important aspect of the peace process, even though it was not included in the Framework Agreement.

The rest of the report will attempt to evaluate the democratization in Macedonia since the signing of the Framework Agreement. To this end the report will first have to explain how it ascertains the level of democratic institutions of the state and the progress in nation-building.

3. Criteria of democratic institutions and nation-building

Democratization means transition to a democracy, which is characterized by the five following features (Dahl 1999: 37-40; Schiller 1999: 31-33):

11 Vetterlein (2010) offers a detailed analysis of fault lines in Macedonia prior to 2001 and an extensive discussion of the Framework Agreement and effects of its implementation.

12 Ljubomir Danailov Frčkoski took part in the talks as an expert and wrote a part of the draft agreement. In the interview (2009) he said: "We had a classical negotiation process with non-papers. 60% of the non-papers were written by the foreign experts. These drafts, however, had not been prepared before the talks but were written on the spot. (...) The framework agreement was no foreign imposition. Internationals had a huge responsibility for its contents, but they gave us free zones".

1. Governments and parliaments are elected through secret ballot in free, general, equal, competitive, and regular elections.
2. The elected governments and parliaments possess decision-making powers, which are limited only by the rule of law and separation of powers but not by actors or structures without democratic legitimacy.
3. There is freedom of opinion, freedom of assembly and association, freedom of movement, and freedom of information.
4. Citizens have access to pluralistic mass media, which are independent from the state.
5. Rule of law and separation of powers are well established.

Democratic institutions and freedoms have to exist in reality and not only in the constitution. Moreover, institutions of the state have to be functional, they have to serve as a venue for the resolution of substantial political conflicts and have to be relevant for the political life. Therefore, I will ascertain the progress achieved in building democratic institutions of the state on the basis of five additional criteria:

6. Political competition takes place without violence or threats of violence.
7. The democratic institutions exist independently from external actors.
8. The government and parliament hold meetings and make decisions.
9. Meetings of the government agencies and parliament are not boycotted.
10. The conflicting parties possess no illegal ethnically exclusive decision-making structures (such as parallel parliaments or governments) and separate instruments of coercion (such as party police or militia).

To what extent Macedonia fulfills the ten criteria can be seen in reports by election observers[13], human rights activists[14], Freedom House[15], the European Commission[16] and in scientific publications. Additionally, the "barometers" of the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Macedonia have proven to be a rich source. After a brief review of the point of departure, the report will focus on only those criteria whose ratings have changed. This approach is designed to show whether efforts of democratization in Macedonia have produced a fully developed democracy or only an illiberal (Zakaria 2003) or deficient democracy (Merkel et al. 2003).

13 See www.osce.org/odihr-elections/14365.html (20.11.2009).

14 See www.mhc.org.mk (20.11.2009).

15 See www.freedomhouse.org (20.11.2009). I used primarily the annual "Nations in Transit" reports to obtain information on individual criteria. The Freedom House Democracy Index, on the other hand, was not very helpful. It assigns a value from one to seven both to political rights and civil liberties, whereby a lower value stands for more democracy. Macedonia was rated 4/4 in 2001, afterwards it always received 3/3. As this report demonstrates, the level of democracy has changed more than these numbers imply.

16 See http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/candidate-countries/the_former_yugoslav_republic_of_macedonia/key-documents/index_en.htm (20.11.2009).

Progress in nation-building is illustrated by the following two indicators:

1. Attitudes of the Macedonian and Albanian citizens to the common state.
2. Attitudes of the Macedonian and Albanian elites to the common state.

Public opinion surveys shed light on the attitudes of the citizens over Macedonia. There are also data available about citizens' preferences for options beyond the common state or different structures for the Republic of Macedonia, but they cover only part of the timeframe of the study. But there are other surveys which document without significant gaps to what extent the citizens accept or reject the Framework Agreement and the state structure stipulated within it. Other studies ascertain whether the respondents see themselves as Macedonian citizens or love the country.

I studied the attitudes of the political elite regarding the common state on the basis of speeches held by leading politicians during election campaigns, at anniversary celebrations of the peace agreement and of national independence, as well as at other important events. In this context my most important source was the Macedonian daily newspaper Dnevnik, which is believed to be the most reliable print media outlet.[17] Moreover, this report is based on more than three dozen interviews with politicians and experts. With regard to the attitudes of the political elites I was interested in more than just their acceptance of Macedonia or the structure of the state. Of equal importance is, whether the elites make their acceptance or even demands for alternatives contingent on certain conditions.

4. The point of departure after the peace agreement

Macedonia was by no means a perfect democracy, neither before nor during the conflict, but it did have democratic institutions where Albanian representatives played a part. Hence, after the end of the hostilities, Macedonia did not need to democratize from scratch, it only needed to carry on democratization. Hereinafter I will refer to this task as further democratization. After the peace agreement was signed, it was not a question of setting up new common democratic structures for the different ethnic groups. On the contrary, the focus was on remodeling the existing institutions, as well as reasserting their authority in those areas where the UÇK had assumed control. Nation-building faced fewer problems too than it did after wars of secession, particularly because in the later phases of the armed conflict the UÇK declared that it did not question the borders of Macedonia. Furthermore, opinion polls showed that most Albanians were committed to the common Macedonian state.

17 See www.dnevnik.com.mk (20.11.2009). Quotes without page numbers come from the newspaper's Internet edition.

4.1 The common democratic institutions

In 2001 Macedonia could look back to regular general presidential, parliamentary and local government elections, where a number of parties or candidates ran against each other. However, OSCE observers noticed that the 2000 municipal elections fell short of many international democratic standards. For example, there were problems with respect to safeguarding the secrecy of the ballot and conducting an election process free from violence and intimidation (OSCE/ODIHR 2000: 1, 7, 13f). One person died in a shoot-out between rival Albanian parties; outbreaks of violence had already occurred in earlier elections (Helsinki Committee for Human Rights 1999: 1 and 2000: 1). The citizens' votes did not carry the same weight in the parliamentary elections because of the unequal size of electoral districts. While one member of parliament represented only 7,000 voters, another one represented about 70,000 citizens (Fraenkel 2003: 17). Parliament and government possessed decision-making powers, which were generally speaking not curtailed by non-democratic actors or structures. However, particularly in the UÇK strongholds as well as in other predominantly Albanian-populated communities, the state maintained at best a limited presence. The democratic freedoms were considered to be generally guaranteed (Commission of the European Communities 2002: 9f). The country had a diverse media landscape including many non-state broadcasters and newspapers that offered different political perspectives (OSCE/ODIHR 2000: 8). Nevertheless, human rights activists complained that the media failed to maintain professional standards during the fighting and became hostages to prejudices (Helsinki Committee for Human Rights 2001: 4). Courts were believed to be prone to inadmissible political interference. Parliament elected all judges, a fact that raised doubts about their independence and professionalism. Public service institutions proved to be highly susceptible to corruption (Commission of the European Communities 2002: 7f).

In particular, the elections gave rise to politically motivated violence, however, its scale never reached the level of escalation of 2001. The armed conflict was the greatest threat to democracy in independent Macedonia. The OSCE, which had maintained a small field mission since 1992, along with the EU, NATO and USA made great efforts to contain the violence, to shield the democratic structures from the escalation and to assist these institutions in finding a way out of the crisis. The strength of the democracy is demonstrated by the fact that it did not fall apart during the armed conflict. In 2001 the government and parliament remained capable of making decisions, in fact, the representatives adopted many dozens of laws.[18] Admittedly, the Parliament conducted only one session during the crisis (Petroska-Beska/Nejcevska 2004: 8). Moreover, there was a legacy of boycotts. In 1994 the VMRO-DPMNE, the strongest party in the 1990 elections, together with the Democratic Party boycotted the second round of the parliamentary elections after allegations of irregularities (Karakamiševa 2004: 263f; Škarić 2005: 61-68).[19]

18 See the register in the Služben Vesnik at www.slvesnik.com.mk/default.asp?ItemID=D8C94B5FE87249408FFBC368F8952B4A (9.7.2009).

19 At the time the citizens elected the Parliament by majority vote in 120 electoral districts.

In 2001 the UÇK had the largest illegal coercion apparatus. Furthermore, the Lions, a mono-ethnic special police unit, had the reputation of being a party militia for the VMRO-DPMNE (Helsinki Committee for Human Rights 2001: 2; Ordanoski 2004: 24-27).

4.2 Progress in nation-building

According to a US State Department survey, only 16% of the Albanian respondents demanded a Greater Albania during the crisis, while 71% favored a multi-ethnic Republic of Macedonia (Judah 2001). In fact, most of the Albanians accepted the external borders of Macedonia but they objected to the existing institutions. 97% of them complained that non-Macedonians had fewer rights. Only four percent of Macedonian respondents agreed with this (UNDP 2001: 22).

A survey in late August 2001 revealed that 51% of Macedonian respondents opposed the signing of the Framework Agreement, while 44% of them supported it. On the other hand, 78% of Albanian respondents endorsed it (Gaber-Damjanovska/Jovevska 2001: 19). At the end of 2001 the International Republican Institute (IRI) ascertained that a narrow relative majority of 49% of all respondents supported the Ohrid Agreement (IRI/USAID 2008: slide 9). It can be assumed from these figures that at least 78% of the Albanians approved of the agreement. Hence, the overall approval by 49% of respondents probably indicated that a majority of the Macedonians still rejected the agreement and the remodeling of institutions envisaged in it. The Albanians saw a promise in the signing of the agreement, while the Macedonians thought of it as an imposition.

The attitude of the political elite to the Ohrid covenants is demonstrated by a parliamentary debate about the introduction of the constitutional reforms required by the agreement. 91 of the 120 members of Parliament approved of it (Dnevnik, 7.9.2001), including all Albanian representatives and all parliamentarians from the Social Democratic Union and the Liberal Democratic Party. A majority in the strongest faction, that of the VMRO-DPMNE, also supported the constitutional reforms. The fact that it did so even though it did not trust the agreement is proved by Prime Minister Ljupčo Georgievski's statements: he did not believe in the agreement, but it was necessary to accept it. Macedonia was ostensibly under an informal economic embargo. Georgievski also said: "Macedonia is under big pressure by the foreign experts that whoever votes for the constitutional changes is for peace, but those who vote against are for war" (Gaber-Damjanovska/Jovevska 2001: 7f). On the other hand, Abdurahman Aliti from the Albanian PDP declared that he had always protested against the second-class citizen status of the Albanians. But after the adoption and implementation of the Framework Agreement he had nothing left to complain about. The Democratic Alternative, which had received eleven percent of the votes in the 1998 parliamentary elections, and a splinter group from the VMRO-DPMNE voted unanimously against the introduction of the constitutional reforms

(Gaber-Damjanovska/Jovevska 2001: 9). The Democratic Alternative criticized the signing of the agreement as a threat to national interests (Dnevnik, 14.8.2001).[20]

At large, the point of departure in Macedonia was as follows: there existed democratic institutions in which both Macedonian and Albanian parties operated. Therefore, the further democratization only required a remodeling of the common democratic structures rather than having to set up new ones from scratch. But even such a reform would have been blocked if the conflicting parties had rejected it as being contrary to their concept of the state. Most Albanians supported the remodeling measures as envisaged in the Framework Agreement. In case the Ohrid Agreement were not implemented, it is uncertain whether the Albanians would still accept a common state with the Macedonians. The implementation of the Framework Agreement appeared to be precarious insofar as the majority of the Macedonians rejected it. The two most important Macedonian parties were among the signatories of the Ohrid Agreement and it was the largest one of them, the VMRO-DPMNE, that explicitly expressed its reservations. For this reason the further democratization of Macedonia did indeed appear to be threatened by the initially mentioned vicious circle.

The subsequent chapters will deal with two phases, as identified in the course of nation-building, after the signing of the peace agreement. The second part of 2006 marks the change from the first (2002-2006) to the second phase (2006-2009). Until the end of the first stage Albanian citizens and politicians showed increasingly greater commitment to the Republic of Macedonia. In the fall of 2006 the number of supporters of the Framework Agreement was at its peak and there had never been so few opponents. This happened after the government was formed by the VMRO-DPMNE and DPA, the very parties in which the Framework Agreement had been questioned most explicitly.

5. 2002-2006: Democracy under "Guns 'n' Roses"

After the 2002 elections the government was formed by a coalition that observers nicknamed "Guns 'n' Roses" (ICG 2002: 2). The "Guns" stood for a party that had for the most part emerged from the UÇK, the "Roses" alluded to the symbol of the Social Democrats. The transformation of the UÇK and the curbing of politically motivated violence were the greatest achievements of the further democratization. Nevertheless, the elections took place again in an environment of violence and irregularities. Boycotts of parliamentary sessions and the precarious independence of the judiciary were persistent democratic deficits. Between 2002 and 2006 the Albanian citizens showed greater loyalty to the Republic of Macedonia, while the majority of the Macedonians rejected the Framework Agreement. Only fringe organizations openly repudiated the Ohrid Agreement and the common Macedonian state.

20 As for the other ethnic parties, the Turks and the Bosnians welcomed the agreement, while the Democratic Party of Serbs rejected it (Dnevnik, 15.8.2001).

5.1 The remodeling of institutions

The obvious decline in politically motivated violence and the curbing of illegal apparatuses of coercion signified the greatest accomplishments in democratization between 2002 and the summer of 2006. The signatures to the Ohrid Agreement put an end to the UÇK attacks as well as to clashes between UÇK and the security forces of Macedonia. When the parliament passed an amnesty law in March 2002, most of the UÇK commanders abandoned their plans to prepare their units for new hostilities (Bieley 2002). The amnesty would, however, not apply to individuals who had committed war crimes (Brunnbauer 2001: 364). A large number of the UÇK leaders made the transition "from bullets to ballots" and went into party politics. Many of them established the Democratic Union for Integration in June 2002 (DUI in Macedonian, BDI in Albanian). Ali Ahmeti, who had acted as the UÇK "political representative" in 2001, became the spearhead of the DUI. However, the new party also involved people like the social scientist Teuta Arifi, who had nothing to do with the UÇK (Pettifer 2002). In its founding platform the DUI called for implementation of the Framework Agreement in full, a multi-ethnic Macedonia where all citizens would be free and equal, as well as integration into European and Atlantic structures (DUI 2002). Just how important these integration aspirations are for the DUI can be seen from the fact that in front of its party headquarters next to the Albanian flag and the party flag you can also find the flags of the EU, NATO and the US. But the DUI never hoisted the flag of the Republic of Macedonia. Outside of state buildings DUI politicians are rarely seen next to the Macedonian flag.

The Framework Agreement cleared the way to legitimate politics for the UÇK members. Even though the UÇK was barred from the direct negotiations on the agreement, its objectives were, however, largely consistent with Ahmeti's demands. By the time the DUI was founded, the Ohrid Agreement had already proven that it did not just exist on paper. In November 2001 parliament had adopted the necessary constitutional changes by more than a three-fourths majority (Dnevnik, 17.11.2001), and there were further efforts to implement the agreement. NATO and the EU acted as guarantor powers for this process. The primary mission of the NATO peacekeeping force (Task Force Harvest)[21] was to inspect the disarmament of the UÇK, but its presence also signaled how important the implementation of all the provisions of the Framework Agreement was for the Alliance. The ethnic groups in Macedonia were united in their desire for the country to join the European Union, over 90% of the citizens supported such membership (IRI 2008: slide 15). The EU made it repeatedly clear that only a complete implementation of the Framework Agreement would pave the way to accession (Ilievski/Taleski 2009: 360).

21 Information about this mission (August 27 through September 26, 2001) is available at www.nato.int/fyrom/tfh/home.htm. It was superseded by the Task Force Fox until December 15, 2002 (www.nato.int/fyrom/tff/home. htm), the NATO Operation Allied Harmony until March 31, 2003 (www.nato.int/ fyrom/ah/home.htm) and the EUFOR until December 15, 2003 (www.consilium.europa.eu/showPage.aspx?id=594&lang= En). All webpages accessed on 20.11.2009.

However, Albanian armed groups did not disappear completely after the emergence of the DUI. The Albanian National Army (ANA in Macedonian, AKSh in Albanian) had been formed before the UÇK, but it was not militarily independent in 2001. The ANA aspired to create a Greater Albania and rejected the Ohrid Agreement (Lipsius 2001: 472-475). A confrontation between the ANA and former UÇK militants occurred in late March 2002 in which four people died (Bieley 2002). A couple of months later the ANA claimed responsibility for the murder of two Macedonian police officers (Alagjozovski 2002). In late August 2003, for instance, it detonated a bomb in front of government offices in Skopje, in response to which the Macedonian security forces launched the largest operation since 2001 (Dnevnik, 1.9.2003 and 9.9.2003).

The dissolution of the Lions special unit, which was considered to be an armed branch of the VMRO-DPMNE, contributed to further curbing of illegal apparatuses of coercion (Commission of the European Communities 2004: 31). The EU had insisted on this measure but with the SDSM in the government it was preaching to the converted.

Another positive development was the growing number of laws adopted in the process of the Framework Agreement implementation. In 2002 alone the parliament passed 142 laws, and over the following few years the official gazette never published fewer than a 100 laws.[22] Moreover, the democratic institutions survived the withdrawal of the peacekeeping forces, which were first led by NATO and subsequently by the EU, in late 2003. Observers acknowledged improved media coverage in contrast to 2001; hate speech appeared only seldom (Helsinki Committee for Human Rights 2004: 5).

One deficiency in democracy that remained concerned elections: observers recorded violent incidents, including fatalities in 2002, and a number of irregularities. Group voting violated the secrecy of the ballot; in a number of polling stations citizens cast votes on behalf of other people. Moreover, there was ballot stuffing, intimidation of voters in some places and violations of counting rules. The irregularities were concentrated in the western part of the country (OSCE/ODIHR 2002, 2004, 2005b and 2006). What should be appraised positively is that a reform of the electoral system removed the problem of the unequal weight of cast ballots. Since 2002 the citizens elect 120 members of parliament in six electoral districts of roughly 280,000 eligible voters each. The voting system is now based on proportional representation (OSCE/ODIHR 2002: 4). It was noticeable that violence was more pronounced during the parliamentary elections in 2002 and 2006 than during the 2004 presidential elections and 2005 municipal elections

As endorsed by more than 180,000 citizens a referendum on the new municipal boundaries, which the government had adopted during the process of decentralization, took place in November 2004. The government called upon the voters to abstain from the referendum so it would fail for lack of quorum. Those who went to the polls anyway revealed themselves as opponents of the municipal redistricting reform. The

22 See the data at www.slvesnik.com.mk/default.asp?ItemID=D8C94B5FE87249408FFBC368F8952B4A (9.7.2009).

government's boycott appeal undermined the principle of a secret ballot (OSCE/ ODIHR 2005: 4).

The violence during the election campaigns cannot be seen as a rejection of the common democracy, because it occurred primarily within one ethnic group and not between the Macedonians and the Albanians. Indeed, the conclusion of the Ohrid Agreement strengthened the propensity for violence because even though the UÇK was not allowed to participate directly in the Ohrid talks its violence had paid off. This might put a strain on Macedonian democracy for a long time (interview with professor of political science Biljana Vankovska). Admittedly, there had been violent incidents in earlier election campaigns too, so the events of 2001 cannot completely explain this problem. Observers, activists and politicians criticize the extent to which all parties in every government attempted to bring administrative agencies and other public institutions under their control, both at the central level and in the communities, in order to reward their supporters with jobs there. Given the extremely weak private economy, the material existence of many people depends on whether "their" party is in government (interviews with Valon Bela and Arjanit Hoxha). "You cannot work in a public toilet, if you do not support the political party in government", Mersel Bilalli, a former PDP Member of Parliament, explained in an interview. Still it is not convincing to explain the violence by arguing that this "partyization" puts so much at stake in elections for many people. Because this argument would apply not only to the western region, but also to other parts of the country that do not suffer from similar problems with violence. One reason why there is a higher level of violence in the western region could be that government agencies had had a significantly weaker and ineffective presence there for a long time, and they could enforce the state's monopoly on a legitimate use of force to a lesser extent. Proponents of culturalist theories may also point to the culture of carrying weapons.

Just as before 2001, boycotts continued to torment parliament in the subsequent years. After the 2002 elections the VMRO-DPMNE absented itself from parliamentary sessions in protest against the DUI participation in the government coalition (Fraenkel 2003: 8). The DPA boycotted parliament in 2003, then the second round of the 2005 municipal elections, and again parliament until February 2006 (Commission of the European Communities 2006: 5; Gaber-Damjanovska/Jovevska 2005a: 11). However, these boycotts were not aimed against the common democracy but against the government and mainly against the fact of not being represented in the government. Whatever the objectives of the boycotts might have been, they damaged democracy in any case.

With regard to the rule of law, the dependence of judges on politicians continued to be a problem. However, parliament adopted a number of reforms in 2005 in order to reduce, among other things, the influence of the parties on the appointment of judges. A Judicial Council composed of 15 persons received a mandate to appoint and discipline judges by a two-thirds majority. Eight members were to be judges and to be elected by the judges, five members were to be elected by parliament, and the Minister of Justice and the President of the Constitutional Court would complete the members of the Council. Corruption remained a major problem (Commission of the European Communities 2006: 9-11). Neither the precarious independence of the courts, nor the corruption stemmed from the

inter-ethnic conflict over the structure of the state or from the much feared vicious circle of the insufficient development of state institutions and deficient nation-building. On the contrary, this lack of democracy is part of the legacy of a long authoritarian rule and reflects the absence of democratic attitudes. The corruption, however, is also rooted in the weakness of state institutions, which at least in part stems from the quarrel between the ethnic groups.

5.2 Growing loyalty towards the state, broader acceptance of reforms

Despite all efforts to implement the Framework Agreement, the Albanians' approval of a Greater Albania increased from 16% in May 2001 to 48% in May 2002. This was at odds with the fact that at the same time 68% of Albanian respondents supported the common state of Macedonia (Judah 2002). In early 2003, however, only 24% demanded full independence for Albanian-populated areas, while 12% of the Macedonians wanted a state without the Albanians (UNDP 2003: 41). In the subsequent years none of the studies asked questions about options outside of the common state. Nevertheless, the attitudes of the Albanians towards Macedonia can be deduced from responses to other questions. For example, in 2003 only 17% of the Albanians said they loved Macedonia. In contrast to this, 82% said they did in November 2005 and even 88% in May 2006. At the same time 78% of the Albanians identified themselves as Macedonian citizens (Causidis 2006; UNDP 2005: 37 and 2006b: 41). But the Macedonians did not notice any growing loyalty on the part of the Albanians towards Macedonia. In February 2006, 44% of them insinuated that there were ethnic groups in Macedonia that threatened the sovereignty of the state (UNDP 2006a: 15). 63% of the Macedonians believed that the Albanians did not think of Macedonia as their homeland(UNDP 2006b: 16). Evidently, improvements in the status of the Albanians, which were achieved in the course of the Framework Agreement implementation, strengthened their allegiance to Macedonia. The institutional reform enhanced the acceptance of the state among the Albanians so that contrary to the presumed vicious circle the endeavors of state remodeling have led to progress in terms of nation-building on the part of the Albanians.

The ethnic groups still differed in their perceptions of the Framework Agreement. In March 2002, 84% of the Albanians but only 13% of the Macedonians considered the full implementation of the Ohrid Agreement to be a priority for peace and stability. 43% of the Macedonians but merely 6% of the Albanians believed that the peace deal demanded excessively extensive reforms (Irwin 2002: 63-66). In May 2002, 90% of the Albanians supported the agreement, whereas 63% of the Macedonians rejected it (Judah 2002). Until 2006 the acceptance was highly variable, but it was only in June 2002 and in March 2004 that a majority of all the respondents rejected the agreement (IRI 2008: slide 9). Apparently, the Macedonians refused to support the Ohrid Agreement throughout (virtually) the whole period of time. Many of them interpreted its provisions as a reward for violence. Moreover, they had no appreciation of the required reforms because Macedonia had long been considered a model, among other things, due to its multi-ethnic governments. What was meant to improve the status of the Albanians was seen by many Macedonians as their

particular loss, to some extent with justification. Increasing the representation of the Albanians in public institutions implied that henceforth fewer Macedonians could find employment there.

Significantly, the only Albanian party in attendance at the first anniversary celebration of the Ohrid Agreement was the Democratic Union for Integration (DUI) (Dnevnik, 14.8.2002). Many Macedonians assessed the agreement as a defeat, and it certainly did not boost the Macedonian acceptance of the peace deal when Ahmeti triumphantly announced at a DUI party congress: "We have won the war" (Dnevnik, 14.8.2002).

In the 2002 electoral campaign the political parties did not exactly make the contents of the Framework Agreement their central focus. Thus, they indirectly confirmed that there was no alternative to it. The parliamentary elections yielded a coalition government between the SDSM, LDP and DUI. Former UÇK militants joined the very government against which they had fought less than a year and a half earlier.

Politicians and organizations that rejected the common Macedonian state or the Framework Agreement remained on the fringes during the 2002-2006 legislative period. While the Albanian National Army presented the biggest military challenge, it was the former Prime Minister Georgievski who launched the fiercest political assault. In an editorial in the daily newspaper Dnevnik (18.4.2003) he demanded that the former Yugoslav republics should be divided according to ethnicity and a wall should be built between Albanians and Macedonians. Georgievski's statement elicited heavy criticism. The ruling SDSM considered the former Prime Minister's ideas to be a threat to peace (Dnevnik, 19.4.2003). In a joint letter representatives of the EU, the US, NATO and OSCE emphasized that the Ohrid Agreement was the only way forward while alternative options would obstruct Euro-Atlantic integration (Dnevnik, 22.4.2003). The Macedonian President Boris Trajkovski (VMRO-DPMNE) and Albania's government also reiterated their commitment to the Framework Agreement (Dnevnik, 23.4.2003). Georgievski alienated himself so much from the VMRO-DPMNE that he later left the party. The DPA, however, indicated that they understood his point of view. Its leadership believed that the Ohrid Agreement was dead, that there was no hope for a multi-ethnic Macedonia, and mono-ethnic states would be the best option (Petruseva 2003; Dnevnik, 21.4.2003). But in the subsequent years even the DPA did not consistently reject the Framework Agreement and the common Macedonian state. Like the PDP, on some occasions it demanded the creation of new states, provided that the implementation of the Framework Agreement failed (Dnevnik, 14.7.2003; 15.7.2003; 15.9.2003; 8.4.2004 and 10.4.2004; Gaber-Damjanovska/Jovevska 2003: 19). However, before the 2004 presidential elections the DPA urged the Albanians to defend the agreement like a mother would defend her child (Dnevnik, 9.4.2004). In November of the same year, along with all the other stakeholder parties, it signed a "Euro-Atlantic Declaration", which, among other things, reaffirmed the Ohrid Agreement (Gaber-Damjanovska/Jovevska 2004: 13f).

Despite the achievements in the implementation of the Framework Agreement the Albanian politicians had obvious problems with showing their loyalty to Macedonia. The official anniversary celebration of the country's independence on September 8, 2003 took place without the Albanian ministers and members of parliament (Dnevnik, 9.9.2003). A

year later DUI representatives did in fact take part in the celebrations, but the party leader Ahmeti was absent (Dnevnik, 9.9.2004). At a party congress in November 2005 Ahmeti reaffirmed his earlier statement that Macedonia was his homeland (Gaber-Damjanovska/ Jovevska 2005b: 32f). However, just like the DPA, in its election campaign the DUI only displayed the black double-headed eagle against a red background, the flag of Albania and the Albanians, but not the Macedonian flag (Gaber-Damjanovska/ Jovevska 2006a: 22f).

6. 2006-2009: Rebirth of the VMRO-DPMNE, survival of the agreement

In the run-up to the 2006 elections the VMRO-DPMNE campaigned for a rebirth, and after its defeat at the polls in 2002 it succeeded four years later in coming back as the strongest party in Macedonia. Together with the parties making up its pre-election coalition and more importantly the DPA, the New Social Democratic Party, a splinter group of the SDSM, and two additional small parties it formed a new government. In snap elections in 2008 the alliance around the VMRO-DPMNE again achieved the best result; this time, however, it brought the DUI into the government instead of the DPA. The rebirth of the VMRO-DPMNE was by no means the death of the Framework Agreement, even though critics reproached the party for implementing the provisions of the Agreement only under pressure. Furthermore, only marginal forces opposed the Ohrid Agreement or the common state. Albanian politicians avowed their loyalty to Macedonia. However, greater progress in democratization failed to materialize, and there were even negative tendencies as far as independent media were concerned.

6.1 Democracy with some faults

The parliament dissolved itself[23] in 2008, new elections followed, in which, according to observers, democratic standards were not implemented. During the election campaign, especially in the Albanian areas numerous violent incidents occurred, including shots being fired at Ahmeti. One person died on election day. In view of the many irregularities recorded, the election commission ordered a re-vote at around 200 polling stations (OSCE/ODIHR 2008: 1, 10 and 18-24). The 2009 presidential and municipal elections provided a better picture, with observers now declaring that most international standards had been met. There were only sporadic violent incidents, although the observers reported many cases of voter intimidation by supporters of the ruling parties across the country (OSCE/ODIHR 2009: 1 and 11f). The electoral register raised doubts since almost 88% of the population was allegedly eligible to vote. This was not only a high proportion in comparison to other countries, but also exceeded the previous figure for the number of persons eligible to vote by eight percentage points (Dnevnik, 10.3.2009). The press also

23 See the data at www.slvesnik.com.mk/default.asp?ItemID=D8C94B5FE87249408FFBC368F8952B4A (9.7.2009).

reported cases of government officials campaigning during their working hours with public funds for the party that had helped them get their jobs (Dnevnik, 9.3.2009).

Even during earlier presidential elections there had been less violence than during the parliamentary elections. Violence had occurred above all in areas primarily inhabited by Albanians; the presidential elections however were of no interest to the Albanians because only Macedonian candidates were competing in them. Parliamentary elections on the other hand determined which party could supply its supporters with posts and income. The same naturally applied to the municipal elections. The fact that the 2009 municipal elections proceeded with relatively little violence can be put down to the severe criticism by external powers of the events of 2008. In 2009 the EU held out the prospect of a date being set for the start of accession negotiations if the elections were democratic and reforms were implemented (Dnevnik, 11.3.2009).

In 2009 the EU assessed the range of freedoms as satisfactory (Commission of the European Communities 2009: 18). However, the aforementioned instances of intimidation undermined these freedoms. Furthermore, the Vice-President of the SDSM, Gordan Georgiev, complained: "In small towns, people are afraid to talk to me, when they know I am from the opposition" (interview). The political adviser Eben Friedman added that many people believed that they were under state surveillance (interview).

There was an alarming development in the media. The VMRO-DPMNE-led government promoted its ideas in huge campaigns and thus became the most important advertising client. Critics saw in this a growing dependency of the media on the state (OSCE/ODIHR 2009: 14). A lack of professionalism and a concentration of private media in the hands of politicians or their closest relatives were considered to be further problems (interview with Biljana Bejkova). Occasionally, journalists were attacked or threatened.

Despite some progress in the rule of law, the EU continued to question the independence of part of the judiciary (Commission of the European Communities 2009: 57). The legal expert Aleksander Spasov described the situation as follows: judges did indeed now appoint their colleagues via the judicial council, but many of the incumbent judges had come to office at a time when professional qualifications and integrity were not crucial criteria. Unlike in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the posts for all judges were not re-advertised (interview).

Many politicians followed the motto "law is what suits me". The reaction of Albanian parties to a judgment pronounced by the constitutional court on the use of flags demonstrated this. The PDP demanded the resignation of the judges, the DPA suspected a plan for destabilization, while Ahmeti announced that municipalities with a mayor belonging to his party would ignore the judgment (Gaber-Damjanovska/Jovevska 2007: 31f).

Violence and threats of violence remained a major problem, and not only during election campaigns. In the 2006 parliamentary elections the DUI in fact achieved the best result among the Albanian parties, but still on the Macedonian side the victorious VMRO-DPMNE did not want to form a government with it. The DUI alleged that the VMRO-DPMNE in the future intended to ignore the principle of the double majority that had been provided for certain questions. DUI representatives subsequently threatened not only to destabilize the country but even to get their Kalashnikovs out (Gaber-

Damjanovska/Jovevska 2006b: 8). In September 2007 members of the DUI, DPA and PDP got into a fight in parliament, and DUI and DPA "security forces" clashed with the police in front of the building (Balkan Insight, 25 and 26.9.2007; Gaber-Damjanovska/Jovevska 2007: 9). These incidents once again illustrated the absence of democratic attitudes on the part of those involved and supported the impression that these parties had groups of thugs or even party militia at their disposal.

With the new governments from 2006 onwards the parliament passed a great number of laws, and this was contrary to the fear that a procedure like the double majority would cripple the decision-making process. Zoran Ilievski, adviser to the President of Macedonia, stressed that power-sharing between Macedonians and Albanians had not delayed a single law (interview). [24] Ljubomir Danailov Frčkoski also saw no obstacles, and said with regard to the double majority: "Some poison in a small quantity is a medicine" (interview). Irfan Arsani, Ahmeti's chief of administration, also believed that power-sharing between Macedonians and Albanians worked. He did, however, complain that the VMRO-DPMNE withheld key ministries and other top-ranking appointments from the DUI (interview). [25] The DUI Member of Parliament Ermira Mehmeti criticized that the VMRO-DPMNE wanted the Macedonian ministers to deal only with Macedonian interests and the Albanian ministers only with Albanian affairs. Through this, the powers of the Albanian ministers would be severely restricted and the democratic institutions would appear to be disintegrating (interview). Aleksander Spasenovski, a Member of Parliament from the VMRO-DPMNE, rejected such accusations: "No one is pushing the Albanians to the margins" (interview).

Boycotts continued to plague the democratic institutions. In 2008 the SDSM left parliament for two and a half weeks, among other reasons because the new government majority adopted over 170 laws through a fast-track procedure. The DPA boycotted parliament in 2008 and again from August 2009 on (Commission of the European Communities 2008: 9; Dnevnik, 19.8.2009). The DUI, which was at that time in the opposition, started the most important boycott for inter-ethnic relations in 2006/2007 together with the PDP and protested through this against what it perceived as the government's failure to observe the double majority principle (Commission of the European Communities 2007: 6f). The DUI ended its boycott after it had reached a number of agreements with the VMRO-DPMNE (Dnevnik, 30.5.2007) Present at this agreement were representatives of the EU delegation and US embassy, which had previously pushed for reconciliation between the government and the opposition. Without abnegating the tradition of boycotting, the political scientist Židas Daskalovski saw in the actions of external powers an incentive for such steps: "When someone boycotts the parliament, Americans are very concerned and try to get them back into the parliament. They pressure the government to find some compromise" (interview). Similarly Lidija Hristova, profes-

24 See the data at www.slvesnik.com.mk/default.asp?ItemID=D8C94B5FE87249408FFBC368F8952B4A (9.7.2009).

25 See the data at www.slvesnik.com.mk/default.asp?ItemID=D8C94B5FE87249408FFBC368F8952B4A (9.7.2009).

sor of political science, claimed: "The politicians do not want to fight openly but prefer to blackmail, as they know that the international community will pressure the government to compromise" (interview).

A member of the EU presence in Macedonia[26] denied that the external powers solved problems that would not even arise without them. The animosities between the parties were real, and there was in fact an absence of cooperation (interview). In response to the question whether the democratic institutions could collapse without the external actors, he referred to the conflict surrounding an encyclopedia which the Macedonian Academy of Science and Art presented in September 2009. This described the Albanians in derogatory terms and did not include them among the autochthonous population of Macedonia. Since the Academy served as the mouthpiece of the ruling VMRO-DPMNE, the Albanian parties demanded that the book be withdrawn from the market and that Prime Minister Nikola Gruevski (VMRO-DPMNE) distance himself from it. When this initially failed to happen, Ahmeti went as far as saying that the encyclopedia had broken the ceasefire between Macedonians and Albanians. Following a joint declaration by Ahmeti and Gruevski the conflict subsided (Dnevnik, 19.-24.9.2009 and 28.-30.9.2009). My interviewee from the EU presence explained that the quarrel over the encyclopedia had brought Macedonia very close to the events of 2001. Only international elements behind the scenes had reconciled Gruevski and Ahmeti. Things could also have been much worse during the 2008 elections without the action of external powers. Ahmeti's chief of administration did not want to confirm the international role in the conflict surrounding the encyclopedia, but did say of the external powers: "The state would collapse without the external presence. Its help is needed on the way to EU and NATO. Without the external presence, the Framework Agreement would not be implemented and we would come to the situation like before 2001" (interview with Irfan Asani).

Where Macedonia fell short of the demands of democracy, this was due only to a lesser extent, if at all, to insufficient nation-building, that is a lack of acceptance of the common state or its structures. Thus these shortcomings could not be a consequence of the much feared vicious circle. The reasons for the violence, electoral irregularities, party influence over public institutions, the precarious independence of judges and most of the boycotts were rather a legacy of undemocratic rule and the weak commitment of the political elite to democratic values. Admittedly, the DUI parliamentary boycott was linked to the inter-ethnic dispute surrounding the need for the double majority. The prominent role of external powers stemmed at least in part from the fact that the ethnic groups could not resolve their disputes within the democratic institutions. The ethnic division of Macedonia resulted in a large number of media. Their small circle of readers, listeners or viewers meant that the continued existence of many media depended on the government placing adverts. The sociologist Petar Atanasov saw the ethnic conflict not as a cause but rather as a consequence of the state of affairs with respect to democracy in Macedonia (interview).

26 See the data at www.slvesnik.com.mk/default.asp?ItemID=D8C94B5FE87249408FFBC368F8952B4A (9.7.2009).

His colleague Lidija Hristova explained this correlation by suggesting that the ethnic groups did not perceive the poorly functioning institutions as a general problem. Instead they regarded the institutions' shortcomings as something that affected only their own ethnic group (interview).

6.2 "Macedonia is our state"

For the last few years there have been no polls as to whether the citizens favored options beyond the common democracy. Studies continued, however, to ascertain the attitude towards the Ohrid Agreement. The number of people in favor of the Framework Agreement was never higher than when the new government came to power. This government was formed together with precisely those larger parties – the VMRO-DPMNE and DPA – that had criticized the provisions of the peace agreement most. 59% of citizens supported the agreement, only 28% rejected it (IRI 2008: slide 9). The fact that the parties they trusted pledged their support for the agreement clearly reduced the skepticism on the part of many citizens towards the Ohrid agenda. During the following years support for the agreement never fell below 50%, while at no point did more than 37% of the citizens reject it (IRI 2008: slide 9; Dnevnik, 12.8.2009). These figures should, however, not disguise the fact that most of the time a majority of Macedonians rejected the agreement. In a survey in 2009 almost 50% of the citizens consulted said the Albanians benefited from the Framework Agreement, while around 27% believed all citizens benefited from it. 14% of those consulted said that inter-ethnic relations had improved after the agreement, a further 40% believed these relations had improved slightly (IDSCS 2009: slide 12f).

Even after the change of government in 2006 only marginal forces rejected the common state or the Framework Agreement. The DPA went back and forth regarding its position. It distanced itself from Greater Albania (Dnevnik, 17.5.2008), but said in its 2009 election campaign that Macedonia would cease to exist without NATO accession (Gaber-Damjanovska/Jovevska 2009: 35). The presidential candidate, Mirushe Hoxha, complained that the concept of the state did not reflect the multi-ethnic society; nevertheless she called for the Ohrid Agreement to be implemented in full (Dnevnik, 9.3.2009 and 11.3.2009). On the other hand, on the occasion of the anniversary of the signing of the peace accords in August 2009, the DPA declared the Framework Agreement dead (Dnevnik, 13.8.2009).

In 2008 the government organized a celebration for the first time to mark the anniversary of the signing of the peace agreement. Ahmeti declared that the agreement's greatest achievement was that all citizens now regarded the state as their own and were loyal to it. The agreement also signified a victory for the Macedonians (Dnevnik, 15.8.2008). A few years earlier he had still claimed that the UÇK had won the war.

Rizvan Sulejmani, a former member of parliament and Minister for Local Self-Government, explained how much the Framework Agreement had accounted for the acceptance of Macedonia on the part of the Albanians: "The Framework Agreement was decisive to make the Albanians loyal to Macedonia. We got rights in exchange for our recognition of the Republic. Macedonia is our state, as we are equal here. Formerly, I as

the most moderate of PDP's members of parliament did not say that Macedonia is my state. But since 2001, all Albanian parties have been saying that Macedonia is our state" (interview).

Statements by leading politicians in Kosovo made it easier for the Albanians in Macedonia to accept the Republic and not to strive for a Greater Kosovo. Fatmir Sejdiu, President of Kosovo, declared that the region was tired of the ideas of a Greater Serbia, Greater Albania or Greater Kosovo (Gaber-Damjanovska/Jovevska 2006a: 13). When Kosovo declared its independence, Prime Minister Hashim Thaçi rejected a Greater Kosovo, calling instead for good relations with all neighbors (Dnevnik, 18.2.2008). The political elite in Kosovo knew that they would not win acceptance for their state if they questioned the territorial integrity of Macedonia. The Albanians in Macedonia were far more aligned with Kosovo than with Albania, after all, Macedonia and Kosovo had both belonged to Yugoslavia and many Albanians, including leading members of the UÇK, had studied in Pristina. "There are not so strong ties with Albania, as we never have been one country", Irfan Asani explained (interview). More importantly, prior to its democratization Albania had cut itself off from the world. If present-day Albania posed any danger to the continued existence of Macedonia, the former would have to give up its ambitions of Euro-Atlantic integration.

The DUI expressed its growing acceptance of the Republic of Macedonia in 2006 by interrupting its parliamentary boycott for the independence day celebrations in 2006 (Dnevnik, 9.9.2006). At the same event three years later, the top officials of all the major Albanian parties were present at the official reception (Dnevni, 9.9.2009).

Open criticism or rejection of the Framework Agreement among the ranks of the VMRO-DPMNE faded once the former Prime Minister Georgievski had left the party. The Members of Parliament Petar Pop-Arsov and Aleksandar Spasenovski reaffirmed that the VMRO-DPMNE would implement the peace agreement (interviews). Andrej Lepavcov, adviser to Prime Minister Gruevski, even called the Framework Agreement a success story (interview). In the introduction to the VMRO-DPMNE 2008 electoral program Gruevski wrote: "We will go on with the implementation of the Ohrid Agreement" (VMRO-DPMNE 2008: 7). The party had the courage to give its supporters an unpopular message. Members of the opposition, the Social Democrats and Albanian politicians, mistrusted these statements however. Jovan Despotovski from the SDSM and an anonymous fellow member of the party stressed that the VMRO-DPMNE would only agree to the implementation of the Framework Agreement under pressure and was not acting out of conviction (interviews). [27] Arjanit Hoxha, spokesman for the New Democracy Party, which had split from the DPA in 2008, argued that the VMRO-DPMNE was not openly against the agreement, but just did not like implementing its provisions (interview). Ermira Mehmeti from the DUI, in the government with the VMRO-DPMNE since 2008, complained that the largest Macedonian party adhered to a rhetoric that portrayed the

27 See the data at www.slvesnik.com.mk/default.asp?ItemID=D8C94B5FE87249408FFBC368F8952B4A (9.7.2009).

agreement as a loss for the Macedonians and referred to the state as belonging to the Macedonians. According to Mehmeti, the VMRO-DPMNE intended to give the state back to the Macedonians (interview).

7. A look back, forward and beyond Macedonia

7.1 Looking back: taking stock of democratization

In ethnically divided post-civil war societies the task that democratization has to tackle is two-fold. It has to build or remodel common state institutions in accordance with democratic principles; at the same time, all the parties to the conflict must begin to accept the disputed state and its new structures. Since both tasks have to be dealt with at the same time, there is the threat of a vicious circle emerging in which shortcomings in state-building impede nation-building and vice versa. Before I examine the case of Macedonia under consideration of the supposed vicious circle, I will summarize the development of the democratic institutions and the acceptance of the common state.

Even during the escalation of 2001 the Macedonian and Albanian parties operated in common democratic institutions. Hence, the further democratization process after the conclusion of the peace agreement did not have to build new institutions from scratch but merely remodel existing structures. Furthermore, it was essential to get the state challenged by the UÇK accepted across the entire area. A lack of democracy manifested itself mainly in politically motivated violence, electoral irregularities, a lack of rule of law and boycotts of the parliament. Until 2006 democratization proceeded well, thereafter however it failed to achieve any further substantial progress. In the years following the peace agreement there was some success in curbing politically motivated violence. Macedonia even appeared quite stable after the international peacekeeping troops had been withdrawn. The judiciary underwent reforms intended to strengthen the independence of the courts. But Macedonia could not be classed a full-fledged democracy mainly because of the violent incidents and irregularities during elections.

Even in 2001 the majority of Albanians were not against the Republic of Macedonia. As important provisions of the Framework Agreement were implemented, many of them said they loved Macedonia. While most Albanians always supported the Ohrid Agreement, the majority of Macedonians almost always rejected it. Overall, however, the number of critics of the peace agreement went down. Only marginal forces openly opposed the common state or the Framework Agreement. On the one hand, Albanian politicians showed greater respect for the state, by taking part in the independence day celebrations. On the other hand, they flaunted the Albanian flag excessively, and shunned the Republic's flag.[28]

28 The explanation I received from Albanian politicians for this behavior was that the flag had been adopted without their involvement.

Macedonia was able to escape the vicious circle in which the outstanding tasks of state-building obstruct nation-building or vice versa. This happened because both the democratic institutions and the acceptance of the common state were at a higher base level than it is usually the case after violent conflicts over secession. The fact that the inter-ethnic dispute focused more on the structures of the state and less on the continued existence of the common state itself made further democratization of Macedonia easier. For the Albanians the Ohrid Agreement was a promise, for the Macedonians, however, it was an imposition. Remodeling the state institutions as stipulated in the peace agreement was dependent on whether the Macedonians accepted the new state structure despite their major reservations. If they had not done so, the deal of "more rights for peace" and the tradeoff of "loyalty for reform" would have fallen through. In that case the lack of acceptance for the envisaged state structure would have constrained the remodeling of the democratic institutions.

The Macedonian elite went along with the reforms envisaged in the Ohrid Agreement for at least three reasons:

Firstly, the representatives of the EU and NATO made it clear to them that only the implementation of the Framework Agreement would keep the popular prospect of Euro-Atlantic integration alive. This conditioning possibly worked so well because Macedonia was already on the path to rapprochement and did not have to be enticed into the process first.

Secondly, in 2001 Macedonia profited from the political leadership of the then President Trajkovski, who resisted the opposition within his own party, the VMRO-DPMNE, and did much to champion the peace agreement. He trusted that the Macedonians would later appreciate the value of the peace agreement. Branko Crvenkovski (SDSM), his successor as president, highlighted this political leadership at the memorial service held for Trajkovski (Dnevnik, 6.3.2004). Trajkovski was killed in an accident in Bosnia and Herzegovina in late February 2004.

Thirdly, over time the skepticism towards the agreement diminished because the fears associated with it proved to be unfounded. Zoran Ilievski, adviser to the current President Gjorge Ivanov (VMRO-DPMNE), explained: "Macedonians were scared to become second-class citizens. But they saw that nothing dramatic happens and things are not worse for Macedonians. Moreover, they saw a growing stability" (interview). Professor Mirjana Maleska expressed a similar opinion (interview).

Economic developments did not contribute significantly to the fact that the Macedonian citizens and politicians increasingly accepted the implementation of the Framework Agreement. It is true that from 2003 to 2008 the gross domestic product grew annually between 3.1% and 5.9%.[29] However, in terms of per capita GDP and growth,

29 Data for 2004 to 2008 available at: www.investinmacedonia.com/Default.aspx?item=menu&itemid=696&themeid=304 (18.12.2009); data for 2001 to 2003 in Länderstudie Makedonien in the Bertelsmann Transformation Index (2006: 18).

Macedonia was in the same league as Bosnia and Herzegovina.[30] Like in that country the people of Macedonia saw the economic situation as a massive problem and not least because of that the Social Democrat-led government of Macedonia lost the parliamentary elections in 2006. After 2001 the unemployment rate was never below 30% and for people under 24 years of age always higher than 56%.[31]

A precondition for reforming the state structures was that the reluctance of the Macedonians to go along with this was neutralized. That way insufficient nation-building could not stand in the way of the reorganization of the state. The progress in the implementation of the Framework Agreement meant that the Albanians showed greater loyalty to the common state. This, in turn, prompted many Macedonians to accept rather cautiously the remodeling of the democratic institutions.

Macedonia is still a state, which only partly satisfies some of the criteria of democracy. Most shortcomings however are due neither to the much feared vicious circle nor to inter-ethnic conflicts. It is above all rather the legacy of long authoritarian rule and an absence of democratic leanings that hinder further democratization.

7.2 Looking ahead: the potential for destabilization

Macedonians and Albanians live in the same country but in different worlds. Macedonians and Albanians vote almost exclusively for parties from their own ethnic group, they set other, sometimes conflicting political priorities, they make use predominantly of media in their language, and they almost always marry people from their own ethnic group and, above all, their religion. A large proportion of the citizens live in areas where most neighbors belong to the same ethnic group. "There is coexistence but no mixing", as the political adviser Eben Friedman observed (interview). Even if they are involved in non-governmental organizations, people divide themselves into ethnic categories. The education expert Harald Schenker believes that the education system[32] is in the process of turning into a centrifugal force. The nine largest schools separated Macedonians from Albanians, and more than half of the Albanian pupils were affected by this segregation. Ethnocentrism has forced its way into the textbooks so nothing is learned about the other ethnic groups (interview). A life in parallel spheres can make it easier to mobilize against the other ethnic group since such a life offers hardly any opportunity to reduce prejudices and stereotypes. The controversy surrounding the encyclopedia is a reminder of how quickly tensions in inter-ethnic relations can erupt. It is such a crisis situation that within an ethnically segregated society can finally trigger the question whether there has to be a common state at all.

30 See www.globalpropertyguide.com/Europe/Macedonia/gdp-per-capita and www.globalpropertyguide.com/Europe/Macedonia/gdp-per-capita-5-years (both 18.12.2009).

31 According to the figures from the Statistical Office at: www.stat.gov.mk/Indikatori/novi%20indikatori/INDIKA TOR45_eng.pdf (18.12.2009).

32 For the educational system see also Atanasovski (2008) and Vetterlein (2007).

However, if you compare the situation in Macedonia with that in Bosnia and Herzegovina, it does not look quite so bleak. In that country the ethnic groups see themselves at the (provisional) end of a long series of extremely bloody conflicts, while in Macedonia they do not (interview with Hristova). Unlike in Bosnia and Herzegovina the role of Macedonia's religious communities is a constructive one. "Religious communities are more cooling down than boiling the inter-ethnic relations. Macedonia had never been radicalized on a religious base", the sociologist Atanasov noted (interview). Despite all the criticism, the education system is not designed to create ethno-nationalists (interview with Schenker). Likewise election campaigns are clearly less polarized between the ethnic groups than is the case in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The greatest danger for a stable Macedonia comes from a blockade against Euro-Atlantic integration: "Integration into NATO and the EU is what holds Macedonia together. Without the European option, the national option would be an alternative, especially for the Albanians", Andreas Raab from the Ohrid Institute explained (interview). Mersel Bilalli feared: "The main fundament for Macedonia is the Euro-Atlantic integration. If this fundament is destroyed, Macedonia has no perspective to exist as a state" (interview).[33] Accordingly, the Deputy Chairman of the DUI, Rafiz Aliti, threatened in November 2009 that the Albanians would join NATO with or without the Macedonians. He said this in light of the quarrel between Macedonia and Greece over the country's name, which posed the greatest obstacle to Macedonia's Euro-Atlantic integration. In April 2008 Greece had blocked Macedonia's admission to NATO. In December 2009 the Greek government prevented Macedonia from receiving a date from the EU for the start of accession negotiations. The conflict is not limited to the constitutional name "Republic of Macedonia", which Greece regards as an attack on its territorial integrity. The Greek government is likewise irked at the self-designation as Macedonians, especially as the VMRO-DPMNE portrays the Macedonian citizens as descendents of the ancient Macedonians. The Gruevski government renamed the tiny airport in Skopje "Alexander the Great Airport" and erected ancient looking statues in front of the government building. Buildings intended to lay claim to an ancient heritage are being built in many places. The Greek government even rejects the term "Macedonian" for the most widely spoken language in this country. Furthermore, Macedonia and Greece are arguing about the conditions for a return of those people who came to the then Yugoslavia as a result of the Greek civil war (1946-1949). In addition, Macedonia accuses Greece of discriminating against the Slavs in northern Greece, while the Greek government denies their Slavic identity and discrimination.[34]

The conflict with Greece can put a massive strain on relations between Macedonians and Albanians in Macedonia. 69% of the Albanians but only three percent of the Mace-

33 According to Dane Taleski, political scientist and member of the executive board of the SDSM: "The basic consensus here on the common state rests on Euro-Atlantic integration. Without that integration prospect Macedonia could become Lebanon. The acceptance of the state would erode" (interview).

34 On the conflict between Macedonia and Greece see: Danailov Frčkoski (2009); Engström (2002); Euro-Balkan (2009).

donians thought that the Republic should join NATO and the EU if this meant the loss of the present name (GALLUP 2008: 10). If the quarrel about the name were to constrain Euro-Atlantic integration, many Albanians would be angry at the Macedonians for putting alleged sensitivities regarding their identity above the interests of all the ethnic groups in the republic. The Macedonians, on the other hand, are probably frustrated by the lack of understanding on the part of the Albanians, especially as they believe in the years following the peace agreement they have accommodated many of the Albanians' demands. Without the prospect of accession, there is one less incentive to seek a compromise with the other ethnic group. If integration is blocked long term this may result in the destructive potential of an ethnically segregated society outlined above being unleashed. The continuing problem of politically motivated violence, which is particularly evident during elections, also provides cause for concern. If the political situation worsens this problem may again change from a primarily intra-ethnic phenomenon into an inter-ethnic one.

7.3 The expanded view: Macedonia as a model?

The prospect of Euro-Atlantic integration overcame some opposition to the Framework Agreement and its implementation. The EU can provide incentives for further democratization in Macedonia, in that it attaches conditions to rapprochement. This strategy of conditioning must ensure, however, that it does not play into the hands of precisely those actors who do not want too rapid an integration or do not want accession to the European Union at all. The large majority of citizens must not be held hostage by a few foot draggers and obstructionists.

The most powerful obstructionist to integration, however, lies outside Macedonia, namely Greece. German and international politicians should urge the Macedonian government to refrain from provocations such as references to an ancient Macedonian heritage. Furthermore, the Macedonian government should be advised not to complicate a possible agreement with Greece through procedural hurdles. In holding a referendum on a possible compromise with Greece, Prime Minister Gruevski may shift responsibility for the failure of a settlement from himself, but his deceased fellow party member Trajkovski had demonstrated what political leadership in a positive sense can mean. The government of Greece and its supporters within the EU must not lose sight of the following: it cannot be in Greece's own interest to border on an unstable state. Furthermore, the Greek government needs to remember that the European communities were ready after the end of the military dictatorship to support Greece's democracy through a very rapid start of accession negotiations. Given its minorities policy Greece would have difficulty in fulfilling the current criteria for EU accession. Greece cannot see itself as simply a beneficiary of stability, especially since it supported Serbia's aggressive policy during the violent breakup of Yugoslavia. However, I advise against assuming that in view of its acute debt crisis Greece would be particularly susceptible to outside pressure. The Greek government must currently ask so much of its citizens that it could scarcely risk caving in when it

comes to foreign policy. It remains to be seen whether the Greek government uses the quarrel over the name as a "lightning rod" as soon as it gets into difficulties at home.

While Germany and the EU have to fulfill their responsibility to Macedonia, they must not allow Macedonia's politicians to shirk responsibility for democracy and peace. Representatives of the EU, NATO and the OSCE are doing the right thing in condemning political violence in Macedonia and calling on the Macedonian politicians to distance themselves from this violence and take measures to counter it. If there is a lack of democracy it is only right to point it out as such clearly. However, the international presence must avoid inadvertently acting as an advocate of party political interests. If it forces the government, as happened in 2007, to come to an agreement with an opposition party boycotting parliament, it hoodwinks the rules of democracy. Furthermore, it provides an incentive for parties to persist in their extreme positions on the assumption that the EU or another external power would in any case find a way out of a possible crisis. Democracy includes the promise of the freedom to decide one's own affairs. At the same time, democracy imposes the need to bear the consequences of these decisions and take responsibility for them. You cannot have the promises of democracy without its impositions. No external aid for democratization can do anything to change this.

External aid played a significant role in 2001 in preventing the escalation into a major war and brought about peace accords relatively quickly in the form of the Ohrid Agreement. This success was reminiscent of the "Macedonian model" that had become a set phrase in the 1990s. Several circumstances proved to be essential for this success in 2001. NATO, in the form of bases for the peacekeeping troops in Kosovo, and the OSCE were already present and familiar with the situation in Macedonia. This created the institutional framework for a greater involvement. A high degree of international consensus forced the UÇK to lower its goals to the demands already made by Albanian parties earlier. In this way it was already clear which reforms would offer a way out of the escalation. The process of rapprochement already initiated with the EU made it easier for the Macedonians to accept the remodeling of the state institutions. The successful prevention of a bigger war turned out on balance to be contingent on many factors. In this sense Macedonia is not so much a model, which could easily be replicated elsewhere, but rather a unique case.

The same applies to the time after the peace agreement. It is true that the Framework Agreement and its implementation can be seen as a success story. For most ethnically divided post-civil war societies, however, Macedonia does not offer a recipe for peace through democratization. Compared with wars in such places as Bosnia and Herzegovina or Lebanon the brief clashes in Macedonia seem like skirmishes. In comparison to conflicts of secession like the one in Kosovo the goals of the UÇK appeared modest; and unlike in most parts of the world international interest and commitment were high and equipped with tools for integration. Common democratic institutions continued to exist even during the fighting and thus spared Macedonia the imposition of having to build democratic structures completely from scratch after the conclusion of the peace agreement.

8. Bibliography

8.1 Official references

Commission of the European Communities 2002: Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: Stabilisation and Association Report, [COM(2002) 163], Brussels.

Commission of the European Communities 2004: Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: Stabilisation and Association Report 2004, {COM(2004) 204 final}, Brussels.

Commission of the European Communities 2006: Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia Progress Report, {COM (2006) 649 final}, Brussels.

Commission of the European Communities 2008: The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2008 Progress Report accompanying the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2008-2009, {COM(2008) 674}, Brussels.

Commission of the European Communities 2009: The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2009 Progress Report accompanying the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council: Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2009–2010, {COM(2009) 533}, Brussels.

DUI 2002: Inaugural Assembly of the Democratic Union for Integration, in: Institute of War & Peace Reporting/Defence Academy of the United Kingdom – Conflict Studies Research Centre: The 2001 Conflict in FYROM – Reflections, Surrey, 15-16.

Framework Agreement 2001, www.vmacedonia.com/crisis/doc/fagreeme.htm (24.11.2009).

GALLUP 2008: Balkan Monitor. Insights and Perceptions: Voices of the Balkans, 2008 Analytical Report, www.balkan-monitor.eu/files/BalkanMonitor-2008_Analytical_Report.pdf (24.11.2009).

Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia 1999: Annual Report for Year 1999, www.mhc.org.mk/default-EN.asp?ItemID =0C5282771177B44AAEE4F6 80795ADBC9 (20.5.2009).

Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia 2000: Annual Report for Year 2000, www.mhc.org.mk/default-EN.asp?ItemID=472E174E4DC0A847BB472893B7 A2DC83 (20.5.2009).

Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia 2001: Annual Report for Year 2001, www.mhc.org.mk/default-EN.asp?ItemID=C880BF2DE1FD5846941FCE 9B70B54841 (20.5.2009).

Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia 2004: Annual Report for Year 2003, 15. January 2004, www.mhc.org.mk/default-EN.asp?ItemID=6F2DCCE DDB037641A0D0D2357EE1A2F1 (20.5.2009).

IDSCS 2009: Presentacija na resultatite od istražuvanjeto za Ohridskiot Ramkoven Dogovor, o.O.

IRI/USAID 2008: Macedonia 2008.

OSCE/ODIHR 2000: Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Municipal Elections, 10 September 2000. Final Report of the OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission, Warsaw.

OSCE/ODIHR 2002: Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Parliamentary Elections, 15 September 2002. OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission Final Report, Warsaw.

OSCE/ODIHR 2004: Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Presidential Election, 14 & 28 April 2004. OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission Final Report, Warsaw.

OSCE/ODIHR 2005a: Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Referendum, 7 November 2004. OSCE/ODIHR Observation Mission Final Report, Warsaw.

OSCE/ODIHR 2005b: Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Municipal Elections, 13 and 27 March, and 10 April 2005. OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission Final Report, Warsaw.

OSCE/ODIHR 2006: International Election Observation Mission: Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: Parliamentary Elections – 5 July 2006: Statement of Preliminary Findings and Conclusions – Corrected Version, Skopje.

OSCE/ODIHR 2008: The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: Early Parliamentary Elections, 1 June 2008. OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission Final Report, Warsaw.

OSCE/ODIHR 2009: The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: Presidential and Municipal Elections, 22 March und 5 April 2009. Early Parliamentary Elections, 1 June 2008. OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission Final Report, Warsaw.

Republic of Macedonia State Statistical Office 2005: Census of Population, Houses and Dwellings in the Republic of Macedonia, 2002 – Book XIII, Skopje.

Republic of Macedonia State Statistical Office 2009: Natural Population Change, 2008, Skopje.

UNDP 2001: Early Warning Report, Nr. 6, o.O.

UNDP 2003: Early Warning Report, FRY Macedonia, Nr. 1/2003, Skopje.

UNDP 2005: Early Warning Report Macedonia December 2005, o.O.

UNDP 2006a: Early Warning Report Macedonia March 2006, o.O.

UNDP 2006b: Early Warning Report Macedonia June 2006, o.O.

VMRO-DPMNE 2008: Program of VMRO-DPMNE for Rebirth 2008-2012. Rebirth in 100 Steps. Upgraded and Expanded, o.O.

8.2 Academic references

Ackermann, Alice 2001: On the Razor's Edge: Macedonia Ten Years after Independence, in: IFSH (ed.): OSCE Yearbook, Baden-Baden, 117-135.

Alagjozovski, Robert 2002: Pre-Election Destabilization, in: Transitions Online, Balkan Reconstruction Report, 2.9.2002.

Altmann, Franz-Lothar 2003: Chronik zur Lage in Makedonien, SWP-Diskussionspapier der FG 2 EU-Außenbeziehungen, 2003/1, Berlin.

Anderson, Benedict 1988: Die Erfindung der Nation, Frankfurt a. M.

Anselm, Elisabeth/Freytag, Aurelius/Marschitz, Walter/Marte, Boris 1999: Das Politische ordnet sich neu. Oder: Wieso das Demokratieorchester Playback spielt, in: Anselm, Elisabeth/Freytag, Aurelius/Marschitz, Walter/Marte, Boris (eds.): Die neue Ordnung des Politischen. Die Herausforderungen der Demokratie am Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts, Frankfurt a M. und New York, NY, 9-20.

Atanasovski, Emil 2008: Educational Segregation of Communities in Macedonia; an unsustainable policy severely hampering integration efforts, in: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Office Macedonia: Power Sharing and the Implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement, Skopje, 179-193.

Bendel, Petra/Krennerich, Michael 2003: Einleitung: Staat und Rechtsstaat in jungen Demokratien – eine Problemskizze, in: Bendel, Petra/Krennerich, Michael/Rüb, Friedbert W. (eds.): Demokratie und Staatlichkeit. Systemwechsel zwischen Staatsreform und Staatskollaps, Opladen, 9-34.

Berg-Schlosser, Dirk 2004: Introduction, in: Berg-Schlosser, Dirk (ed.): Democratization. The State of the Art, Wiesbaden, 13-29.

Bertelsmann Transformation Index 2006: Macedonia, http://bti2006.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/fileadmin/pdf/en/2006/EasternCentralAndSoutheasternEurope/ Macedonia.pdf (17.3.2009).

Bieley, Jeff 2002: Macedonia: Albanian Factions Clash. In: Institute for War & Peace Reporting, Balkan Crisis Report 327, 28.3.2002.

Breuilly, John 1999: Nationalismus und moderner Staat, Köln.

Brunnbauer, Ulf 2001: Doch ein historischer Kompromiß? Perspektiven und Probleme der Verfassungsreform in Makedonien, in: Südosteuropa, vol. 50, no. 7-9, 347-367.

Causidis, Tamara 2006: Nationalist Politicians Keep Playing with Fire, Balkan Insight, 3.8.2006.

Cekić, Aneta 2008: Predizvicite pri sproveduvanjeto na Ohridskiot Ramkoven Dogovor vo Republika Makedonija, master thesis, Skopje.

Dahl, Robert A. 1999: On Democracy, New Haven, CT, und London.

Danailov Frčkoski, Ljubomir 2009: The Character of the Name Dispute Between Macedonia and Greece, www.fes.org.mk/pdf/Frckoski%20-%20Character%20of%20the%20Name%20Dispute.pdf (20.11.2009).

Daskalovski, Židas 2006: Walking on the Edge. Consolidating Multiethnic Macedonia 1989-2004, Chapel Hill, NC.

Engström, Jenny 2002: The Power of Perception. The Impact of the Macedonian Question on Inter-ethnic Relations in the Republic of Macedonia, in: The Global Review of Ethnopolitics, vol. 1, no. 3, 3-17.

Euro-Balkan Institute for Social and Humanities Research 2009: The Name Issue. Exposing and deconstructing the Greek arguments, o.O.

Fraenkel, Eran 2003: Freedom House: Nations in Transit – Macedonia (2003), www. freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=47&nit=242&year=2003 (20.5.2009).

Gaber-Damjanovska, Natasha/Jovevska, Aneta 2001: Barometer: Political Parties Development in the Republic of Macedonia, no. 2, September 2001, www.fes.org.mk/pdf/ barometerNo2.pdf (17.8.2009).

Gaber-Damjanovska, Natasha/Jovevska, Aneta 2003: Barometer: Political Parties Development in the Republic of Macedonia, no. 9, December 2003, www.fes.org.mk/pdf/ barometerNo9.pdf (18.8.2009).

Gaber-Damjanovska, Natasha/Jovevska, Aneta 2004: Barometer: Political and Parties Development in the Republic of Macedonia, no. 11, December 2004, www.fes.org.mk/pdf/ BarometerDecember2004.pdf (19.8.2009).

Gaber-Damjanovska, Natasha/Jovevska, Aneta 2005a: Barometer: Political and Parties Development in the Republic of Macedonia, no. 12, June 2005, www.fes.org.mk/pdf/ Barometer_june_Nr.12-2005.pdf (19.8.2009).

Gaber-Damjanovska, Natasha/Jovevska, Aneta 2005b: Barometer: Current Events and Political Parties Development in the Republic of Macedonia, no. 13, December 2005, www.fes.org.mk/pdf/Barometer_Nr.13-2005%20final.pdf (20.8.2009).

Gaber-Damjanovska, Natasha/Jovevska, Aneta 2006a: Barometer: Current Events and Political Parties Development in the Republic of Macedonia, no. 14, June 2006, www.fes.org.mk/pdf/Barometer_June_July%202006.pdf (20.8.2009).

Gaber-Damjanovska, Natasha/Jovevska, Aneta 2006b: Barometer: Current Events and Political Parties Development in the Republic of Macedonia, no. 15, December 2006, www.fes.org.mk/pdf/Barometer%20Macedonia%20No.15.pdf (20.8.2009).

Gaber-Damjanovska, Natasha/Jovevska, Aneta 2007: Barometer: Current Events and Political Parties Development in the Republic of Macedonia, no. 16, June 2007, www.fes.org. mk/pdf/Barometer%20June%202007.pdf (21.8.2009).

Gaber-Damjanovska, Natasha/Jovevska, Aneta 2009: Barometer: Current Events and Political Parties Development in the Republic of Macedonia, no. 20, June 2009, www.fes.org. mk/pdf/Barometer%20June%202009%20No.20.pdf, (24.8.2009).

Gromes, Thorsten 2007: Demokratisierung nach Bürgerkriegen. Das Beispiel Bosnien und Herzegowina, Frankfurt a. M.

Gromes, Thorsten 2008: Gemeinsame Demokratie, geteilte Gesellschaft. Die Un-Möglichkeit einer Friedensstrategie in Bosnien und Herzegowina, HSFK-Report 9/2008, Frankfurt a. M.

Hatschikjan, Magarditsch 2001: Mazedonien am Rande des Abgrunds. Zehn Jahre Eigenstaatlichkeit: Von der Erfolgsgeschichte zum Trümmerhaufen, in: Europäische Rundschau, vol. 29, no. 1, 21-32.

Hippler, Jochen 2004: Gewaltkonflikte, Konfliktprävention und Nationenbildung – Hintergründe eines politischen Konzepts, in: Hippler, Jochen (ed.): Nation-Building. Ein Schlüsselkonzept für friedliche Konfliktbearbeitung?, Bonn.

Hislope, Robert 2003: Between a bad peace and a good war: insights and lessons from the almost-war in Macedonia, in: Ethnic and Racial Studies, vol. 26, no. 1, 129-151.

ICG 2002: Moving toward self-sufficiency: a security approach for NATO and the EU, ICG Balkans Report 135, Skopje/Brussels.

Ilievski, Zoran/Taleski, Dane 2009: Was the EU's Role in Conflict Management in Macedonia a Success?, in: Ethnopolitics, vol. 8, no. 3-4, 355-367.

Irwin, Collin 2002: Peace, Stability, and Elections: An Opinion Poll and Its Implications, in: Global Review of Ethnopolitics, vol. 2, no. 1, 62-74.

Jarstad, Anna K./Sisk, Timothy D. (eds.) 2008: From War to Democracy. Dilemmas of Peacebuilding, Cambridge et al.

Judah, Tim 2001: Albanians Back Macedonian Unity, Institute for War & Peace Reporting, Balkan Crisis Report 250, 25.5.2001.

Judah, Tim 2002: Macedonia: "Greater Albania" Gathers Support, Institute for War & Peace Reporting, Balkan Crisis Report 341, 7.6.2002.

Karakamiševa, Tanja 2004: Izbori i izborni sistemi, Skopje.

Lipsius, Stephan 2001: Wer ist die AKSH in Makedonien?, in: Südosteuropa, vol. 50, no. 10-12, 472-487.

Mann, Michael 2005: The Dark Side of Democracy. Explaining Ethnic Cleansing, Cambridge et al.

Merkel, Wolfgang 1999: Systemtransformation, Opladen.

Merkel, Wolfgang/Puhle, Hans-Jürgen/Croissant, Aurel/Eicher, Claudia/Thiery, Peter 2003: Defekte Demokratie, Band 1, Theorien und Probleme, Opladen.

Mitevski, Mančo 2008: 2001. Vojna so dve lica, Skopje.

Möllers, Christoph 2008: Demokratie: Zumutungen und Versprechen, Bonn.

Müller, Harald/Geis, Anna/Wagner, Wolfgang (eds.) 2007: Schattenseiten des Demokratischen Friedens. Zur Kritik einer Theorie liberaler Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik, Frankfurt a. M. et al.

Munck, Gerardo L. 2004: Democracy Studies: Agendas, Findings, Challenges, in: Berg-Schlosser, Dirk (ed.): Democratization. The State of the Art, Wiesbaden, 65-97.

Naegele, Jolyon 2001: UCK Guerrillas Flex Their Muscles, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Balkan Report, 23.3.2001.

Ordanoski, Sašo 2004: Lions & Tigers. The Militarisation of the Macedonian Right, in: Institute of War & Peace Reporting/Defence Academy of the United Kingdom – Conflict Studies Research Centre: The 2001 Conflict in FYROM – Reflections, Surrey, 17-28.

Oschlies, Wolf 2003: Makedonien. Volkszählung und interethnische Turbulenzen, SWP-Diskussionspapier, Berlin.

Paris, Roland 2004: At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict, Cambridge.

Pearson, Brenda 2002: Putting Peace into Practice: Can Macedonia's New Government Meet the Challenge? United States Institute of Peace, Special Report 96, Washington, DC.

Petroska-Beska, Violeta/Najcevska, Mirjana 2004: Macedonia: Understanding History, Preventing Future Conflict, United States Institute of Peace, Special Report 115, Washington, DC.

Petruseva, Ana 2003: Macedonia: Storm Over Opposition Resignations, Institute for War & Peace Reporting, Balkan Crisis Report 425, 25.4.2003.

Pettifer, James 2002: Ali Ahmeti and the New Albanian Political Party in FYROM, in: Südosteuropa, vol. 51, no. 1-3, 88-92.

Phillips, John 2004: Macedonia. Warlords and Rebels in the Balkans, New Haven und London.

Reinhard, Wolfgang 2000: Geschichte der Staatsgewalt. Eine vergleichende Verfassungsgeschichte von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, München.

Rozen, Laura 2001: NLA Autonomy Goal, Institute for War & Peace Reporting, Balkan Crisis Report 228, 21.3.2001.

Rusi, Iso 2004: From Army to Party. The Politics of the NLA, in: Institute of War & Peace Reporting/Defence Academy of the United Kingdom – Conflict Studies Research Centre: The 2001 Conflict in FYROM – Reflections, Surrey, 1-16.

Rustow, Dankwart A. 1970: Transitions to Democracy. Toward a Dynamic Model, in: Comparative Politics, vol. 2, 337-363.

Sandevski, Tome 2009: External Democracy Promotion in Post-Conflict Zones: Evidence from Case Studies: Macedonia, Berlin.

Schiller, Theo 1999: Prinzipien und Qualifizierungskriterien von Demokratie, in: Berg-Schlosser, Dirk/Giegel, Hans-Joachim (eds.): Perspektiven der Demokratie. Probleme und Chancen im Zeitalter der Globalisierung, Frankfurt a. M., 28-56.

Schlotter, Peter 2002: Gewaltprävention durch Demokratisierung? Mazedonien zwischen Krieg und Frieden, HSFK-Standpunkte 2/2002, Frankfurt a. M.

Schmitter, Philippe C. 1994: Dangers and Dilemmas of Democracy, in: Journal of Democracy, vol. 5, no. 2, 57-74.

Schulze, Hagen 1994: Staat und Nation in der europäischen Geschichte, München.

Shain, Yossi/Linz, Juan J. 1995: Between States: Interim Governments and Democratic Transitions, Cambridge.

Škarić, Svetomir 2005: Democratic Elections in Macedonia, 1990-2002. Analyses, Documents and Data, Berlin.

Tilly, Charles 2007: Democracy, Cambridge et al.

Vetterlein, Merle 2007: Bildungspolitik als Schlüssel zur Konfliktlösung in Makedonien, Friederich-Ebert-Stiftung, Internationale Politikanalyse, February 2007, Bonn.

Vetterlein, Merle 2010: Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Konfliktregulierung durch power-sharing-Modelle: das Fallbeispiel der Republik Makedonien, Baden-Baden.

Zakaria, Fareed 2003: The Future of Freedom. Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad, New York, NY und London.

9. Interviews

Anonymous interview with an employee of the EU presence in Macedonia, Skopje, 6.10.2009.

Anonymous interview with a member of the SDSM, Skopje, 23.9.2009.

Asani, Irfan ("Dreni"), DUI, head of Ali Ahmeti's cabinet, Tetovo, 8.10.2009.

Atanasov, Petar, professor of sociology at the Institute for Sociological, Political and Juridical Research, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, 1.10.2009.

Bela, Valon, president of the "Realiteti" NGO, Skopje, 6.9.2009.

Bejkova, Biljana, director of the NGO Info-center, Skopje, 2.10.2009.

Bilalli, Mersel, professor at the faculty of law, FON University, PDP member of Parliament of the Republic of Macedonia in 1994-2002, member of the PDP delegation at the Ohrid negotiations, Skopje, 7.9.2009.

Cekić, Aneta, political scientist at the Institute for Sociological, Political and Juridical Research, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, 5.10.2009.

Dakalovski, Židas, president of the Center for Research and Policy Making, Skopje, 3.9.2009.

Despotovski, Jovan, SDSM, Skopje, 15.9.2009.

Danailov Frčkoski, Ljubomir, professor of international law at the Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, presidential candidate for the SDSM in 2009, former Minister of Internal and External Affairs of the Republic of Macedonia, Skopje, 28.9.2009.

Friedman, Eben, political scientist and adviser for political development, Skopje, 6.10.2009.

Georgiev, Gordan, vice-president, SDSM, Skopje, 18.9.2009.

Hoxha, Arjanit, spokesperson of the New Democracy Party, Skopje, 10.9.2009.

Hristova, Lidija, professor of political science at the Institute for Sociological, Political and Juridical Research, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, 15.9.2009.

Ilievski, Zoran, political adviser in the cabinet of the President of the Republic of Macedonia, Skopje, 8.10.2009.

Lepavcov, Andrej A., VMRO-DPMNE, foreign policy adviser in the office of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Macedonia, Skopje, 18.9.2009.

Maleska, Mirjana, professor at the faculty of public administration, South East European University, Skopje, 2.10.2009.

Mehmeti, Ermira, DUI, member of Parliament of the Republic of Macedonia, Skopje, 11.9.2009.

Pop-Arsov, Petar, VMRO-DPMNE, member of Parliament of the Republic of Macedonia, chairman of the Committee on European Affairs, member of the National Council for European Integration, Skopje, 22.9.2009.

Raab, Andreas, Ohrid Institute, member of the executive board, Skopje, 18.9.2009.

Ramadani, Ismet, PDP, member of Parliament of the Republic of Macedonia in 1991-2006, member of the PDP delegation at the Ohrid negotiations, Skopje, 11.9.2009.

Schenker, Harald, education expert on behalf of the OSCE Higher Commissioner on National Minorities, former spokesperson of the OSCE Spillover Mission, Skopje, 23.9.2009.

Spasenovski, Aleksandar, VMRO-DPMNE, member of Parliament of the Republic of Macedonia, Skopje, 9.9.2009.

Spasov, Aleksandar, research associate at the faculty of law, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, program manager at the Progress Institute for Social Democracy, Skopje, 30.9.2009.

Sulejmani, Rizvan, professor at the University of Tetovo, PDP member of Parliament of the Republic of Macedonia in 1996-2002, former Minister for Local Self-Government, Skopje, 30.9.2009.

Taleski, Dane, SDSM, member of the executive committee, political scientist, Skopje, 5.9.2009.

Vankovska, Biljana, professor at the Institute for Defense and Peace Studies, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, 29.9.2009.

Abbreviations

ANA/AKSh	Albanian National Army
DPA/PDSh	Democratic Party of Albanians
DUI/BDI	Democratic Union for Integration
EU	European Union
FYROM	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
ICG	International Crisis Group
IDSCS	Institute for Democracy "Societas Civilis" Skopje
IRI	International Republican Institute
LDP	Liberal Democratic Party
LP	Liberal Party
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	Non-governmental organization
ODIHR	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights
OSCE/OSZE	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PDP	Party for Democratic Prosperity
SDSM	Social Democratic Union of Macedonia
UÇK/ONA/NLA	National Liberation Army
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
US(A)	United States (of America)
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VMRO-DPMNE	Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization – Democratic Party for Macedonian National Unity