THE ROLE OF PUBLIC INTELLECTUALS IN
THE PROCESS OF DEMOCRATIZATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT
OF MULTICULTURALISM IN POST CONFLICT MACEDONIA

Gorica Atanasova

IHJR-CHDR Meeting: Facing the Past, Searching the Future

Teams: Myths Factories & Collaboration and Resistance in WWII

September 13-16, 2009

Opatija, Croatia

Gorica Atanasova

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the role and impact of public intellectuals in the post-conflict Macedonian context vis-à-vis democratization and the building of a stable multicultural identity. The research seeks to examine the impact of public intellectuals as a possible counter force to political elites in challenging their failed policies of democratization and fostering multiethnic cohabitation. Simultaneous processes such as state and nation building contribute the dysfunctional nature of post-communist systems and subsequently enhance ethnic cleavages. The main analysis focuses on the deliberations of public intellectuals on the Framework Agreement and on their post-conflict discourses in view of democratization and inters ethnic co-exsitence.

The purpose of the research is to show the creation of democratic and multicultural discourses by intellectuals, differentiating them from general political ones, in the present Macedonian context. The study aims as well to indicate that the impact of intellectuals' discourses remains minimal due to the absence of communication within intellectuals' circles thus inhibiting their individual voices to gather momentum by converging individual messages.

Accordingly, this research implies that intellectuals' activism is an indispensable undertaking in the new democracies of South -Eastern Europe. The processes of democratization including the development of stable multicultural societies remain uncompleted in the region hence augmenting the need for genuine participation by intellectual elites.

KEYWORDS

Public Intellectuals, democratization, multiculturalism, post-communism, post-conflict, Ohrid Framework Agreement, discourses

Gorica Atanasova

I. INTRODUCTION

The Republic of Macedonia, a successor state of the former Yugoslavia, just celebrated the eighteenth birthday since the proclamation of independence and the eight year anniversary since the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. The first anniversary denotes the time frame of existence of the country as a separate and independent entity and the efforts directed towards its democratization. The second jubilee marks a momentum in the modern history of the state that brought the end of the inter-ethnic crisis in 2001 and strengthened the foundation for building a stable democratic and multicultural state.

We are standing at a crossroad…Where have we gone, where are we and where are we going?

Post-communist, transitional, post-conflict, pro-European Macedonia…

The Republic of Macedonia was faced with numerous challenges related to its nation and state building in the post-communist period. Both externally and internally constructed myths and conflicting narratives are surrounding the Macedonian story since the breakup of the former Yugoslavia. Currently, Macedonia is undergoing the processes of Euro-Atlantic integration while at the same time the underlying problems such as the name dispute, the recognition of its minorities in neighboring states, the latent inter-ethnic tensions inside the country, continue to dominate the political scene. Political parties in power regardless of their ideological cleavage have demonstrated incapability of successfully managing and resolving the pending political issues.

Therefore, it is undoubtedly necessary to generate discourses from social groups which are different from those generated by political elites. Social actors capable of dispelling the myths that run counter to the democratization project are necessary. An assessment of the role of civil society and the role of public intellectuals specifically, as a category which has an inherent predisposition to influence the value system from within a given setting, is imperative. This evaluation poses a particular challenge in the post-conflict period. Concomitantly, it brings forward a different and rarely analyzed prism – the one related to the role of public intellectuals.

The main premise presupposes that the role of public intellectuals in the creation of discourses aimed at challenging and reassessing the political processes is insufficiently lamented in the Macedonian context (post-conflict). The premise is based upon the need of evaluation whether and to what extent public intellectuals are vocal in the domestic arena and whether they generate discourses that foster democratization or they represent merely a cacophony of individual powerless voices. The analysis of the role of public intellectuals in the Macedonian post-conflict realm is centered on their deliberations vis-à-vis the Ohrid Framework Agreement and their efforts towards fostering inter-ethnic cohabitation.

II. MACEDONIA'S POST-COMMUNIST AND POST-CONFLICT CONTEXT

The Republic of Macedonia was established as an independent and sovereign state through the exercise of its right to self – determination with the referendum held on September 8, 1991. The departure from the Yugoslav Federation towards independence was realized in a peaceful and democratic manner. Since the declaration of independence, Macedonia embarked upon the process of democratization coupled with the establishment of good neighborly relations as well as with the quest for international recognition. The first decade of the country's democratization was a complex endeavor due to both the absence of a historical democratic tradition as well as due to the challenge of independence as a separate state outside of the Yugoslav framework.

The main difficulties in the country's progress derived from the processes of state and nation – building as simultaneous to the democratization efforts. A similar pattern of state and nation building was followed in the constituent states of the former Yugoslavia. Unfortunately, in most of these countries (e.g. Bosnia, Croatia, Serbia) the regime – change brought about the eruption of violent conflicts geared by nationalistic forces that ultimately regressed the modernization project of the former Yugoslav countries towards stagnation. Macedonia, a country with a history of multicultural coexistence, remained outside the limits of the contemporary Balkan wars and followed a path of peaceful political and societal development. However, the underlying interethnic tensions would come to the surface in Macedonia, as well.

The case of Macedonia exemplifies the evolution of political processes associated with state and nation building, or what Daskalovski refers to as the 'stateness problem'[1] and the formation of nationalistic identities divided on ethnic fault lines between the two main ethnic groups (Macedonians and Albanians) instead of consolidating a multicultural democratic society. Prior to the signing of the Framework Agreement, Macedonia's "main problems achieving democratic consolidation [were perceived as resulting from] its 'stateness' problem, namely the various disputes over the character of the state, and the question regarding who has a right to citizenship."[2] State-building' features are mistakenly equated with democratization in Southeastern Europe because they only provide the illusion of democratic control.[3] In reality, state-building processes can run directly counter to the democratization attempts while exacerbating nationalistic identity formations in the region which has been, to a lesser extent, the case in Macedonia (as compared to Serbia, Bosnia, Croatia).

The historical contestation of various aspects of the identity of the state by the neighboring countries additionally complicated the overall progression of democracy.[4] Nation building aspirations, resulting from Macedonia's first historic encounter with complete independence accompany the state building process and further complicate its democratization and inter-ethnic cohabitation. Nation building projects serve as an important point of departure between the two main ethnic groups in Macedonia due to their diverging interests resulting in ethnic homogenization instead of a shared multicultural identity. Consequently, democratization becomes a secondary process to state and nation building during the period of transition in Macedonia.[5]

Moreover, the pre-conflict Macedonian democratization endeavor undoubtedly needed to incorporate efforts for development of a functioning multicultural model and identity that accommodates "national and ethnic differences in a stable and morally defensible way."[6] Therefore, a multicultural identity such that will "be able to establish unity and communication

---

[1] Zhidas Daskalovski, "Democratic Consolidation and the 'Stateness' Problem: The case of Macedonia," The Global Review of Ethnopolitics, Vol. 3, no. 2, January 2004, <www.ethnopolitics.org>

[2] Zhidas Daskalovski, "Democratic Consolidation and the 'Stateness' Problem: The case of Macedonia," The Global Review of Ethnopolitics, Vol. 3, no. 2, January 2004, <www.ethnopolitics.org>

[3] N.J.Rengger in Geoffrey Pridham,, Eric Herring, and George Sanford, ed., Building democracy? The international dimension of Democratization in Eastern Europe (New York: St.Martin's Press, 1994), 72.

[4] The Macedonian identity is contested by its neighbors with respect to different aspects (Greece – name issue; Bulgaria-language; Serbia – church).

[5] Jan Zielonka, ed., Democratic Consolidation in Eastern Europe (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2001),417.

[6] Amy Gutmann quoted in Will Kymlicka, Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Right, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 18.

between separated cultural constellations" needed to be fostered.[7] Given the history of living in ethnically diverse communities not only for Macedonia, but the Balkans as well, multiculturally constructed culture is manageable but it has to grow out of interaction as it is constantly in the making.[8] Hence, intellectuals can act as bridge across communities by creating debates and acting as "interpreters" thus "facilitating communication between autonomous (sovereign) participants."[9]

The peaceful image of multicultural cohabitation among the ethnicities in Macedonia was shattered by the internal crisis that disrupted the overall process of democratization and posed the threat of a full scale conflict in 2001. The factors leading to the dispute between the two main ethnic groups in Macedonia, the Macedonians and the Albanians were multifaceted and combined both internal and external influences. Yet, the separate state-building processes of the two largest ethnic communities accounted for the aggravation of inter-ethnic relations and their subsequent homogenization.

However, a civil war was avoided due to the successful resolution of the dispute among the four major political parties (SDSM, VMRO – ethnic Macedonian; PDP, DPA – ethnic Albanian) and the extensive mediation and engagement of the international community (the EU and USA). Hence, the Ohrid Framework Agreement was signed on August 13, 2001 among the concerned parties to serve as the novel foundation for the peaceful development and resuming of democratization efforts in Macedonia. Before embarking upon analyzing the significance of the Agreement in the post-conflict period from the point of view of public intellectuals and their efforts in building a democratization and multicultural discourse, the definition of the term public intellectual and the determination of its role in society are to be undertaken.

III. THE ROLE OF PUBLIC INTELLECTUALS IN BUILDING PRO-DEMOCRATIC AND MULTICULTURAL DISCOURSES IN POST CONFLICT MACEDONIA

III.1 Definition of the term

---

[7] Nick Stevenson, "Cosmopolitanism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship" Sociological Research Online, vol. 7, no. 1, (2002) <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/7/1/stevenson.html>.
[8] Bhikhu Parekh, Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory, (Oxford:Pelgrave, 2000), 220.
[9] Zygmunt Bauman, In Search of Central Europe, 5.

Intellectuals are defined "[as those] prepared to intervene in the public sphere of politics and to protest in the name of Justice," associated with the Dreyfus Affair tradition.[10] This characterization is expanded by the argument that an intellectual is "anyone who takes a committed interest in the validity and truth of ideas for their own sake."[11] Furthermore, Said underlines that "the true intellectual is an outsider living in self-imposed exile and on the margins of society. He speaks to and for a public, necessarily in public and is properly on the side of the dispossessed, the unrepresented and the forgotten."[12] Two separate camps of theorists differently conceptualize the role of public intellectual in relation to politics. While the first camp argues that there is a gulf separating intellectuals from politicians and thus an intellectual should retain his/her autonomy,[13] the second camp favors direct engagement of the intellectuals in politics.[14] Nonetheless, Havel's viewpoint of the intellectual as the *spectateur engagé,* a position juxtaposed in the middle ground between the two schools of though, seems to be the most acceptable for post-communist countries that "should look at politics not as a dilemma to be shunned but as an opportunity to be embraced."[15]

Intellectual engagement in Central and Eastern European politics has been the rule rather than the exception during the communist as well as the post-communist period.[16] Intellectuals have "played a major role in the legitimation and equally the delegitimation of the old [communist] system."[17] The intellectuals from this region "were, from its inception, confronted with the task of constructing a political body capable of effective action instead of merely converting the existent machinery to its rationalizing purposes."[18] Moreover, the post-communist period illustrates a general split in the dominant discourse of intellectuals' elites in Central and Easter Europe. Whereas the intellectual elites from Central Europe (Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia) embarked upon "articulation of an ideology of civil society"[19] and 'Return to

---

[10] Jeremy Jennings and Anthony Kemp-Welch, ed. Intellectuals and Politics: From Dreyfus Affair to Salman Rushdie, (London: Routledge, 1997), 7.

[11] Alan Montefiore quoted in Jeremy Jennings and Anthony Kemp-Welch, ed. Intellectuals and Politics: From Dreyfus Affair to Salman Rushdie, 10

[12] Edward Said quoted in Jeremy Jennings and Anthony Kemp-Welch, ed. Intellectuals and Politics: From Dreyfus Affair to Salman Rushdie,1.

[13] Barbara J. Falk, The Dilemmas of Dissidence in East-Central Europe: Citizen Intellectuals and Philosopher Kings, 360.

[14] Barbara J. Falk, The Dilemmas of Dissidence in East-Central Europe: Citizen Intellectuals and Philosopher Kings, 361.

[15] Barbara J. Falk, The Dilemmas of Dissidence in East-Central Europe: Citizen Intellectuals and Philosopher Kings, 362.

[16] Michael D.Kennedy, "Eastern Europe's Lessons for Critical Intellectuals," Intellectuals and Politics: Social Theory in a Changing World, (London: Sage Public Times,), 94.

[17] George Schopflin, Politics in Eastern Europe. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers,1993), 260.

[18] Zygmunt Bauman, In Search of Central Europe, (New Jersey: Barns & Noble Books, 1989), 75.

[19] Michael D.Kennedy, Intellectuals and Politics: Social Theory in a Changing World, 94.

Europe', their counterparts in some former Yugoslav countries (e.g. Serbia, Croatia) generated the revoking of nationalistic discourses due to the absence of democratic legacies thus leading to the consecutive blood-baths.[20] Consequently, intellectuals in South-Eastern Europe run the risk of engaging in the public and political sphere as advocates of primordial and nationalistic rather than democratic values.

III. 2 Role of Public Intellectuals in Post-Communist Societies

The dismantling of the Iron Curtain opened the road towards democratization processes and the 'Return to Europe' in the countries from Central and Eastern Europe. Intellectuals' activism in opposition to the system significantly contributed regime changes while promoting democratic ideas in Central and Eastern Europe. Public intellectuals acted either through direct political engagement or through involving in the emerging civil societies in the region. Such activism on the part of intellectuals contributed the fostering of "greater openness in the first phase of the transition by restructuring public discourse, and more generally, the public realm as a whole, as well as by launching social movements, writing programs, and establishing political parties."[21]

The advancement of democratization, particularly in the Central European countries where it proceeded with a successful pace, posed questions connected to the necessity and the role of intellectuals in the new political system. Some theorists deemed "the spiritual leadership offered by intellectuals [as] unnecessary in a democratic society."[22] However, democratization remains an uncompleted endeavor in most Central European countries notwithstanding the progress achieved. Hence, other theorists stress the necessity of critical and independent intellectuals who have to "provide society as a whole with mechanisms needed to make democratic choice and opinion-making possible."[23] Such intellectuals are especially needed in the South Eastern European region due to the persistence of nationalistic ideologies disseminated by political elites under the banner of democracy. In some South Eastern European countries public participation of intellectuals took a different turn and exacerbated the construction of ethnic nationalism by political elites instead of promoting democratization and liberal values.

---

[20] Nenad Dimitrijevic, "Words and Death: Serbian Nationalist Intellectuals", Intellectuals and Politics in Central Europe, 126.

[21] Andras Bozoki, ed., Intellectuals and Politics in Central Europe,. (Budapest, Central European University Press, 1999), 5.

[22] Marian Kempny, "Between Tradition and Politics: Intellectuals after Communism," Andras Bozoki, ed., Intellectuals and Politics in Central Europe,. (Budapest, Central European University Press, 1999), 159.

[23] Andras Bozoki, ed., Intellectuals and Politics in Central Europe,. (Budapest, Central European University Press, 1999), 162.

The socialist framework, peculiar to the Yugoslav model, allowed "limited but significant scope for intellectual independence," and "a certain amount of leeway within which ideas could be articulated without the direct ideological or administrative control of the party-system."[24] Nevertheless, intellectual elites within the former Yugoslav federation were generally in conformity rather than in opposition to the socialist system. Those individuals and intellectuals who opposed the socialist system "necessarily mark[ed] themselves out as enemies of the regime" and hence were exiled.[25] The approval of the regime by intellectual elites' public discourses continued as a practice in some of the newly emerging countries after the dissolution and "war had been both provoked and tailored by intellectuals who had not directly participated in power" (i.e. Serbia, Croatia).[26] The disbanding of Yugoslavia brought about the development of the constituent states as independent and sovereign entities that undertook the venture of democratization that translated into balkanization and interethnic conflicts occasionally enhanced by intellectuals' activism, as well.

The process of democratization includes the establishment of two parameters conditional for its flourishing – civil society, which creates the arena and the actors, and constitutionalism as the formal parameter within which communities exist and have their being.[27] Conversely, most of the Yugoslav republics embarked upon construction of nationalistic ideologies that translated into devastating ethnic conflicts ravaging their territories and evolving from the unraveling vacuum (that needed to be filled) due to the regime change in post-communist societies.[28] As a result, democratization processes were undermined and the development of all-inclusive multicultural identities was rendered an illusion. Currently, Macedonia encounters the same reality. Although the country evolved from similar premises and was confronted with same challenges as the other former Yugoslav states, public intellectuals refrained from initiating and supporting nationalistic discourses in order to mobilize civil support. At the same time, they refrained from any kind of more organized engagement in the name of liberal and democratic values.

---

[24] Andras Bozoki, ed. Intellectuals and Politics in Central Europe, (Budapest, Central European University Press, 1999), 126.
[25] Andras Bozoki, ed. Intellectuals and Politics in Central Europe, (Budapest, Central European University Press, 1999), 123.
[26] Andras Bozoki, ed. Intellectuals and Politics in Central Europe, (Budapest, Central European University Press, 1999), 123.
[27] N.J Rengger. "Towards a culture of democracy?," Geoffrey Pridham,, Eric Herring, and George Sanford, ed., Building democracy? The international dimension of Democratization in Eastern Europe (New York: St.Martin's Press, 1994), 79.
[28] George Schopflin, "The Functions of Myth and Taxonomy of Myths." Myths and Nationhood. ed. Geoffrey Hosking and George Schopflin. (New York: Routledge. 1997), 27.

III. 3 Analysis of Discourses Initiated by Public Intellectuals

In the transitional period prior to the 2001 conflict, intellectuals' participation in public discourse creation was either completely marginalized or was directly involved in party politics and thus supportive of regime discourses. Klincarova argues that intellectuals were interested in assisting democratic discourses in the early phases of transition; however, due to the ideological continuity of a single party regime, many became compromised by the parties thus loosing their critical capacities (both Macedonians and Albanians).[29] Conversely, those engaged in non-governmental organizations and foreign foundations, mostly due to honoraria, promoted cosmopolitanism that was unfamiliar to the context because it lacked identification with the 'home address' of the country in order to be effective.[30] Hence, the virtual non-engagement of intellectuals or their participation as supporters of the regime in the first decade of Macedonian independence could be considered as implicit assistance to the failures of democratization and even towards the exacerbation of nationalistic sentiments.

Public intellectuals' discourse in post-conflict Macedonia is more pronounced and the same gravitates around similar open issues related to the process of democratization and concurrent processes. However, the ideas proclaimed by public intellectuals are divergent or completely opposing. Public intellectuals generally agree upon the existence of historical foundations in Macedonia which have contributed toward the avoidance of full scale conflicts and eruption of extreme nationalistic sentiments due to the traditional culture of openness and communication among all ethnicities present on the territory of the country.[31] On the other hand, while acknowledging the underlying past traditions, most public intellectuals ascribe transitional developments to the mismanagement of political elites translating into the disfunctionality of the overarching political regime in the country up until reaching the "consensus on national level" through the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement

---

[29] Snezana Klincarova, interview with this author
[30] Snezana Klincarova, interview with this author
[31] Ljubomir Frckovski, Ferid Muhic, interviews with this author. Branislav Sarkanjac, "Mega Interview," Macedonian Sun, no. 504, 27 February 2004, p.9. Available at: <www.makedonskosonce.com> Branislav Sarkanjac is a Professor at the Faculty of Philosophy in Skopje, Macedonia. He is a philosopher, writer, intellectual.

Most public intellectuals agree on the relevance of the Agreement in achieving the termination of hostilities and prevention of a civil war in Macedonia.[32] Moreover, there is a consensus on the role of the international community in enforcing the peaceful resolution of the conflict with the signing of the Agreement[33] as well as in their performance as the "soft third arbiter" assisting the creation of a fair foundation and a procedural consensus as the only solution which can be achieved in ethnically heterogeneous societies such as Macedonia.[34] The agreement is viewed as resulting from "the complex operation through which the 'peacemaking' foreign factor sat the parties involved" to negotiate in a State with endlessly long metastases and even more criminalized political elites.[35]

Particular emphasis is placed upon the enforcement aspect of the Agreement by the international factor while acknowledging its significance by public intellectuals.[36] Hence, an inherent weakness is recognized in the compulsory nature of the Agreement.[37] Additionally, the Agreement is viewed as an artificial creation for regulating relationships between certain communities which should have been a natural process evolving from the premises of their reality and leading towards coexistence, cooperation and mutual specificities in Macedonia.[38] Some public intellectuals engage in exclusively mere criticism of the Framework Agreement. While some intellectuals stress the obligatory nature as the reason for the lack of legal validity and legitimacy of the Agreement[39] others disapprove the description of political identities as 'ethnic' and the emphasis of "the collective worth of individual citizens" in the Agreement, resulting in absence of "just solutions to problems in multiethnic societies" such as Macedonia.[40] Vankovska seriously criticizes the Agreement in view of the role of the external factors as well as the role of domestic participants in the process by stipulating that "the crucial paradigm '*peace*

---

[32] Ljubomir Frckovski, Snezana Klincharova, Kim Mehmeti, Ferid Muhic, Robert Alagjozovski, Zhidas Daskalovski, Gjuner Ismail, interviews with this author.
[33] Kim Mehmeti, Ljubomir Frckovski, Ferid Muhic, Ismail Gjuner, interviews with this author.
[34] Ljubomir Frckovski, (Procedural consensus means an agreement is reached with regard to the manner of addressing the conflicts, but a value consensus is lacking and may never be achieved because people may not believe in the 'same truths' as is the case with many societies all over Europe.)
[35] Gjuner Ismail, "On the Eve of the Years to Come", Multiethnic Forum, Special Issues of Search for Common Ground, no. 8, (July 2` 002).
[36] Ljubomir Frckovski, Ferid Muhic, Kim Memeti, Gjuner Ismail, interviews with this author.
[37] Ferid Muhic, interview with this author.
[38] Ferid Muhic, interview with this author.
[39] George Marjanovic, interview with this author.
[40] Neboja Vilic, Zhidas Daskalovski, interviews with this author.

and democracy' in Macedonia signifies '*peace or democracy*'[41] as well as that "the not so successful democratization is replaced with political elites in a semi-protectorate and with agreement on ethnic grounds between the elites, whole legitimacy is mostly derived from abroad."[42] Nevertheless, most public intellectuals support the implementation of the Agreement and promote public acceptance of the agreement as an imperative condition for future coexistence in Macedonia.

The elitist political frame of transitional and democratizing processes as well as the fragile civil society is an additional factor which inhibits the consolidation of democracy in Macedonia, according to a number of intellectuals.[43] Accordingly, professor Sarkanjac understands this as a problem evolving from the general lack of theoretical establishment capable of initiating normative debates in place of individual analyses.[44] The need to develop a context specific model of democracy which should grow naturally from within and not to be enforced or pressured from abroad is another important point of convergence in the discourse of public intellectuals. The context specific model of democracy incorporates the building of a context specific multicultural cohabitation model in the Republic of Macedonia which would not mean importation of multicultural models from divergent and inadequate contexts (i.e. Canada, USA, etc.) In fact, the debates of some public intellectuals in the country incorporate complete reservation towards the enforced multiculturalism as a reference model and they propose alternative models which are based in the domestic background.

The division based on ethnic fault lines and the syndrome of parallel coexistence came out on the surface in 2001 in Macedonia. Kim Mehmeti argues that "we have lived together for more than four decades, but only side by side, without feeling any need to know each other better and to become closer to each other."[45] After the signing of the Agreement which marked the end of the conflict, the foundation was laid down not only for building a common 'truth' of the different entities in Macedonia, beside the criticism directed towards the Agreement, but also due to the need of dialogue and debates on the type of model that was being built and whether it was

---

[41] Biljana Vankovska. "The Role of the Ohrid Framework Agreement and the Peace Process in Macedonia." The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research. Available at: <http://www.transnational.org/forum/meet/ 2006/Vankovska_ Macedonia_Check.pdf> стр. 13

[42] Ibid, 13.

[43] Ѓунер Исмаил, Ѓеорѓи Марјановиќ, Роберт Алаѓозовски, Жидас Даскаловски, Небојша Вилиќ интервјуа со авторот

[44] "The end of History has not come to Macedonia", Forum interview with Branislav Sarkanjac, July, 2001. Available at: <www.forum.com.mk>

[45] Kim Mehmeti quoted in Robert Hislope, "State of Mind and State of War: Public Attitudes and Ethnic Violence in Macedonia," Conference Paper, October, 2003. Working paper of the Institute for Democracy, Solidarity, and Civil Society in Skopje, Macedonia shared with this author.

functional. In such a frame, the notion multiculturalism gains undivided attention, but at the same time it is subject to discussion whether it is compatible with the specificities of the Macedonian context. Moreover, public intellectuals understand the necessity of not only discussing but also defining the possible multicultural model. Postcolonial theory defines the concept and provides different viewpoints on multiculturalism, but it does not devote the necessary attention to the antecedent factors (ex-ante) and it omits the significance of the context which could be of crucial importance for the development of a functioning multicultural identity in a society.

There is a consensus among intellectuals regarding the tradition of multiculturalism in the Macedonian historical context which been immediately associated with openness and "sedimentary culture"[46] as well as with the persistent multicultural identity within the Yugoslav federation[47] which in the Macedonian context is the main premise on the basis of which the inadequacy of the multiculturalism imported from abroad.[48] Conversely, Ilo Trajkovski criticizes the 'labeling and stigmatizing' of the enforced multiculturalism and the insisting on the fact that we are forgetting our multicultural tradition – as useless in the case when there is no benchmark of our position vis-à-vis those from outside.[49] Hence, public intellectuals generally agree that the defining of the model is imperative not only because of the contextual specificities but also due to the need to position ourselves in order to be able to evaluate the imported processes that are arriving from the outside.

Sarkanjac understands the gap "between the theory that arrives from outside and should be implemented and the practice from within which does not produce theory" and he connotes that "the understanding of the lack of that complex exchange between theory and practice puts forwards the need of dialogue between those which are inside in order to deliberate on reality."[50] In that sense, having in mind the worn-out context of the concept of multiculturalism,[51] its expired date of use as a political discourse,[52] and the understanding of the same as a system of varieties,[53] some of the public intellectuals underline the need of deconstructing multiculturalism

---

[46] Snezana Klincharova, Ljubomir Frckovski, and Ferid Muhic, interviews with this author. Also see, Branislav Sarkanjac, "Mega Interview," Macedonian Sun, , no. 504, 27 February 2004, 11. (Translated by this author)

[47] George Marjanovic, Gjuner Ismail, interviews with this author.

[48] Елизабета Шелева, Небојша Вилиќ, Бранислав Саркањац, "Дискусија", Komşi kapicik, култура и политика (уметноста и дефицитот на сетилноста)," (Скопје: 359°, 2000), 115.

[49] Ило Трајковски, Дискусија", Komşi kapicik, 120.

[50] Бранислав Саркањац, "Комши-Капиџик: Уводник" Komşi kapicik, 37.

[51] Ферид Мухич, "Отаде мултикултурализмот" Komşi kapicik, 23.

[52] Бранислав Саркањац, "Комши-Капиџик: Уводник" Komşi kapicik, 36

[53] Небојша Вилиќ, Дискусија", Komşi kapicik, 120.

with the aim of critically reassessing the same[54] and in order to find common ground for constructing a lasting vision and to postulate it on the basis of an independent functional model.[55] Therefore, a general consensus exists among public intellectuals that the Balkans, and Macedonia in particular, is the region where multiculturalism has great chances of succeeding if fostered from bellow (the grassroots level – the people) and not from above (internationally implemented "success" models).[56] The multicultural identity will have to grow naturally and timely and until then the different communities can just live next to each other without the need to love each other.[57] Apparently, the analysis stipulates that the general postulates of the discourse generated by public intellectuals individually in post-conflict Macedonia are oriented towards fostering democratization and a multicultural model despite the differences in their viewpoints.

IV. IS THERE A DISCOURSE CREATED BY PUBLIC INTELLECTUALS IN POST-CONFLICT MACEDONIA AND HOW SIGNIFICANT IT IS?

The previous analysis on the role of public intellectuals in the building of discourses which contribute democratization and multiculturalism in post-conflict Macedonia demonstrate the existence of such a discourse. Nevertheless, an additional question which inevitably follows is what is the meaning of that discourse? Is this discourse sufficiently loud to be heard by the public or is it only a cacophony of individual voices that are unable to create a discourse which will encourage thoughts and actions designed to improve the mentioned processes?

The Macedonian case differs from the general Central and Eastern European trends in terms of public intellectuals' behavior due to several factors. The context specificity and deeply divided state structure into ethnic fault lines can be exhibited in intellectual elite circles. Moreover, the lack of communication among public intellectuals notwithstanding their ethnic background and the absence of public debates among intellectuals is a concurrent problem. Such a relationship

---

[54] Небојша Вилиќ, Дискусија", Komşi_kapicik, 120.
[55] Ферид Мухич, "Отаде мултикултурализмот" Komşi_kapicik, 24
[56] Небојша Вилиќ, Ферид Мухич, интервјуа со авторот.
[57] Snezana Klincharova, Ljubomir Frckovski, Nebojsa Vilic, interviews with this author. Also see, Branislav Sarkanjac, "Mega Interview," Macedonian Sun, , no. 504, 27 February 2004, 11 (Translated by this author) and "Citizens are conscious about living in a Common State," Forum interview with Emilija Simoska, March. 2004. Available at: <www.forum.com.mk> (Translated by this author)

denotes the absence of intellectuals capable of unifying their message which for at least a part of them is based upon the ethnic code and as such it represents a 'different truth' from the truth of the other. Rather, an intellectual should transcend such categories of identity while remaining "the guardian and possessor of independent judgment owing loyalty to truth alone."[58]

An additional weakness of the intellectual elite in Macedonia is the absence of public debates which currently is decreased to the level of individual initiatives "rather than organized systematic or structural action."[59] In addition, even if these debates take place, generally they remain closed within intellectuals' circles and the discussions do not get down to a more real surface[60] – closer to the common people! Hence, the role of intellectuals needs to be augmented through encouraging open debates that will facilitate communication (in order to escape the label – "conversation of the deaf") among them and strengthen the effect of their public discourses in the Macedonian society.[61]

The nature of the political regime and the reluctance on the part of political elites to cooperate with public intellectuals is an additional impediment circumventing the relevance of intellectual discourses in the Macedonian context. Intellectuals carry moral and verbal weight which can be appealing to citizens but have disproportional operative power to impact societal processes as compared to decisions taken by political elites in the political realm in any society.[62] Moreover, the "'pure intellectual' who opposes power as such in the name of absolute values such as truth and justice" poses a threat to the political regime in advocating anti-regime discourses.[63] Serious implications for intellectuals attempting to question and confront the official political model are a general occurrence.[64]

Hence, intellectuals are left with the choice of either initiating public discourses in support of the policies of political elites or remaining on the margins of a respective society. While a

---

[58] Julien Benda quoted in Jeremy Jennings and Anthony Kemp-Welch, ed. Intellectuals and Politics: From Dreyfus Affair to Salman Rushdie, 1.
[59] Nebojsa Vilic, Interview with this author
[60] Горан Јанев, Дискусија", Komşi kapicik. –125.
[61] Nebojsa Vilic, Robert Alagjozovski, Ljubomir Frckovski, George Marjanovik, interviews with this author. Also see. Branislav Sarkanjac, "Mega Interview," Macedonian Sun, , no. 504, 27 February 2004, 11. (Translated by this author).
[62] Ferid Muhic interview with this author
[63] Croce quoted in Jeremy Jennings and Anthony Kemp-Welch, ed. Intellectuals and Politics: From Dreyfus Affair to Salman Rushdie , 38.
[64] Ferid Muhic interview with this author

general consensus exists in Macedonia regarding the right of intellectuals to party affiliation, the ability to objectively observe and criticize is a mandatory element that needs to be preserved in their prospective political engagement.[65] Foundational truths cannot be subjects to different political prisms although each intellectual has the right to political attitude not necessarily including political ambition.[66]

Some intellectuals believe that intellectuals are already compromised as a result of their pursuit for financial security.[67] Others view the compromise made by intellectuals resulting from their engagement in the political realm that has different premises and a unique reference system excluding the one where intellectual projects are realized.[68] Nevertheless, intellectuals should involve in public debates about the political regime while retaining objectively critical positions.[69] Such engagement will necessitate a better definition of the intellectuals and their role in the Macedonian context in order to achieve successful realization of the same.[70] Thus, public engagement of intellectuals as generators of criticism towards the political regime currently exists but is seriously impeded by the non cooperation of political elites as well as the insufficient power or the lack of enthusiasm for greater involvement on the part of public intellectuals.

Consequently, it can be concluded that although the intellectual elite in Macedonia creates discourses assisting consolidation of democracy and the creation of a multicultural identity and support for the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement, their impact remains minimal. At present, the significance of their discourse is modest and it should serve as a reference point for future more pronounced efforts for greater involvement of public intellectuals in the ongoing processes. The general trend of advancing democratic oriented and non-nationalistic discourses of intellectuals in Macedonia in the post conflict period should be elevated to the level of more constructive public criticism and counterbalance to political mismanagement. Public intellectuals should also put forward strategies and recommendations for demystifying nationalistic forces in the society and should contribute the consolidation of democracy.

---

[65] Nebojsas Vilic, interview with this author. Also see: "Citizens are conscious about living in a Common State," Forum interview with Emilija Simoska, March. 2004. Available at: <www.forum.com.mk> (Translated by this author)
[66] "The Road to Chaos is Clear, it Only Needs to be Undertaken," Forum interview with Dejan Dukovski,(a dramaturge and playwright), November, 2003. Available at: www.forum.com.mk
[67] George Marjanovic, interview with this author
[68] Ferid Muhic, Ljubomir Frckovski, Gjuner Ismail, Snezana Klicharova, Robert Alagjozovski, Nebojsa Vilic, interview with this author
[69] All interviewees of this research (for their profiles please refer to ANNEX I)
[70] Gjuner Ismail, interview with this author

The present day events related to the mezmerisation of masses by ruling political elites with regard to the name issue and inter-ethnic questions seem to open yet another dilemma concerning the role of public intellectuals. However, that is a topic for a separate analysis.

SUMMARY

The paper analyzed the role of public intellectuals in fostering democratization and building of a multicultural identity in the post-conflict Macedonian setting. The study attempted to discern the role and the impact of public intellectuals in the post Ohrid Framework Agreement context and the extent to which they could be viewed as a counter balance to political elites in power which are responsible for the failing democratization endeavors.

The findings of the research imply that public intellectuals' discourses contribute the ongoing democratization processes and the fostering of multiculturalism but their impact and role remains minimal due to multiplicity of factors. The context specificity and the lack of dissident culture in the communist era, the division of intellectual circles on ethnic fault lines, the lack of communication among intellectuals, the absence of public debated initiated by them as well as the nature of the political system in Macedonia, all inhibit the impact of public intellectuals in the mentioned processes. Hence, it could be concluded that public intellectuals' discourse should be further strengthened in order for them to act as the correctors of the system in view of lingering pro-nationalist political forces in the contemporary Macedonian context.

Bibliography

Bauman, Zygmunt Legislators and Interpreters. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.

Daskalovski, Zhidas "Democratic Consolidation and the 'Stateness' Problem: The case of Macedonia," The Global Review of Ethnopolitics. Vol. 3, no. 2, January 2004,   Available at: <www.ethnopolitics.org>

Dimitrijevic, Nenad "Words and Death: Serbian National Intellectuals," Intellectuals and Politics, András Bozóki ed., (Budapest: CEU Press 1999)

Falk, Barbara J. The Dilemmas of Dissidence in East-Central Europe: Citizen Intellectuals and Philosopher Kings Budapest, Central European University Press, 2003.

Hislope, Robert. "State of Mind and State of War: Public Attitudes and Ethnic Violence in Macedonia," Conference Paper. October, 2003. Working paper of the Institute for Democracy, Solidarity, and Civil Society in Skopje, Macedonia shared with this author.

Ismail, Gjuner. "On the Eve of the Years to Come." Multiethnic Forum. Special Issues of Search for Common Ground, no. 8, July 2002.

Jennings, Jeremy and Anthony Kemp-Welch, ed. Intellectuals and Politics: From Dreyfus Affair to Salman Rushdie. London: Routledge, 1997.

Kennedy, Michael D. "Eastern Europe's Lessons for Critical Intellectuals," Intellectuals and Politics: Social Theory in a Changing World. London: Sage Public Times.

Kymlicka, Will. Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Right, Clarendon Press Oxford, 1995.

"Мега интервју," Македонско Сонце, со Бранислав Саркањац бр. 504, 27 Февруари 2004, стр.9. <www.makedonskosonce.com>

Parekh, Bhikhu. Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory. Oxford:Pelgrave, 2000.

Pridham, Geoffrey, Eric Herring, and George Sanford. Ed. Building democracy? The international dimension of Democratization in Eastern Europe. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.

Саркањац, Бранислав. приредил. Komşi kapicik, култура и политика (уметноста и дефицитот на сетилноста). Скопје: 359° Books, 2000.

Schopflin, George. Politics in Eastern Europe. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers,1993.

Stevenson, Nick. "Cosmopolitanism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship," <u>Sociological Research Onlin.</u>, vol. 7, no. 1, (2002). Available at: <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/7/1/stevenson.html>.

Vankovska, Biljana. "The Role of the Ohrid Framework Agreement and the Peace Process in Macedonia." The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research. Available at: < http://www.transnational.org/forum/meet/2006/Vankovska_Macedonia_Check.pdf>

 "Крајот на историјата сеуште не е дојден во Македонија," <u>Форум</u>, Интервју со Бранислав Саркањац, Јули, 2001. <www.forum.com.mk>

"Ѓраѓаните се свесни дека живеат во Заедничка Држава," <u>Форум</u> интервју со Емилија Симоска, Март. 2004. <www.forum.com.mk>