

PROJECT ON ETHNIC RELATIONS

The **Project on Ethnic Relations (PER)** was founded in 1991 in anticipation of the serious interethnic conflicts that were to erupt following the collapse of Communism in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. PER conducts programs of high-level intervention and dialogue and serves as a neutral mediator in several major disputes in the region. PER also conducts programs of training, education, and research at international, national, and community levels.

PER is supported by the Starr Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Government of Switzerland, the Government of Romania, the Government of Great Britain, the Government of Sweden, the Balkan Trust for Democracy, the Council of Europe, the People Technology Foundation, Inc., and the Alfred and Carol Moses Family Fund.

Individuals and institutions wishing to receive PER publications should write to:

**PROJECT ON
ETHNIC
RELATIONS**



**15 Chambers Street
Princeton, New Jersey 08542-3707, USA
Telephone: (609) 683-5666
Fax: (609) 683-5888
E-mail: per@per-usa.org
Web Site: www.per-usa.org**

R e p o r t

JUNE 10-11, 2005



MAVROVO, MACEDONIA

**MACEDONIA: ON THE ROAD
TO BRUSSELS**

**PROJECT ON
ETHNIC
RELATIONS**



**MACEDONIA: ON THE ROAD
TO BRUSSELS**

MAVROVO, MACEDONIA

JUNE 10-11, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	1
Note on Terminology	3
Introduction	4
Local Elections	4
Equitable Representation	6
EU Accession	8
Opposition Concerns	11
Intra-Coalition Relations	13
Kosovo	14
List of Participants	16
Other PER Publications	18

PREFACE

In June 2005, the Project on Ethnic Relations (PER) and the Embassy of Switzerland in Macedonia organized the fifth roundtable in the so-called “Mavrovo Process” series. These roundtables are an occasion for members of the Macedonian governing coalition (the Together for Macedonia coalition headed by the Social Democratic Union of Macedonia (SDSM) and the Democratic Union for Integration (DUI)), the parliamentary opposition and representatives of the international community to assess the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement (OFA) and evaluate the coalition’s progress. The discussions also provide a forum for honest and open communication—off the record—among all parliamentary parties.

The Mavrovo roundtables are always important events in Macedonian politics. They provide a forum wherein difficult and sometimes contentious issues of Macedonia’s daily politics can be discussed in a neutral space, free of everyday political pressures. In fact, coffee breaks, lunches and dinners between the sessions often turn out to be just as important as the plenary sessions themselves, as these provide chances for the participants to continue their discussions and build the trust necessary for reaching compromises.

The Mavrovo series has also become a major channel for the political parties of Macedonia’s smaller ethnic communities. They use this unique opportunity to present their case to the other coalition members and to receive a sympathetic hearing.



Participants in the roundtable.

The June roundtable took place after a difficult and sometimes bitter local election. Assessment of that election was a major part of the roundtable. Other issues at the meeting included the question of equitable representation of different ethnic groups in government administration and the public sector, and Macedonia's plan for European Union accession.

We express our deepest appreciation to the participants for their stimulating discussions and for their frank analyses of Macedonia's future. PER is also grateful to the Embassy of Switzerland in Macedonia and the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (EDA), and especially to Ambassador Thomas Füglistler, Armin Rieser, Mimoza Angelovska, and Albert Hani for their support in making this event possible.

The meeting was chaired by Allen H. Kassof, PER president emeritus and senior adviser.

The weekend's discussions featured participants from the senior-most levels of the Macedonian government and opposition as well as senior representatives of the international community. Their exchanges are documented in this report.

Steven L. Burg, a professor at Brandeis University and a member of PER's Council for Ethnic Accord, who was also a conference participant, is the author of the report. PER Director for Western Balkans Alex N. Grigor'ev, also a participant, contributed as well.

Except as otherwise noted, participants' statements are without attribution, following PER's practice of encouraging frank and open discussion.

The participants have not had the opportunity to review the text of this report, for which PER assumes full responsibility.

Livia B. Plaks, *President*

Princeton, New Jersey
September 2005

NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

In this report, the spelling of the name "Kosovo" is used (rather than "Kosova," the spelling preferred by Albanians, or "Kosovo and Metohija" or "Kosmet" preferred by Serbs) because that is the spelling most commonly used in the English-speaking world. For the same reason "Pristina" is favored over "Prishtina," etc. Except as otherwise noted, the term "Albanian" is used to refer to ethnic Albanians living in Macedonia.



From left to right: Vlado Buckovski, Allen Kassof, Livia Plaks, Musa Xhaferri, and Ilika Mitreva.



From left to right: Marjan Dodovski, Slobodan Casule, and Agron Buxhaku.

INTRODUCTION

The fifth round of Mavrovo discussions continued to provide opportunities for governing and opposition parties in Macedonia to discuss issues of national concern, as well as points of difference and contention between them. The discussions in June addressed issues raised by competition in the recent local elections between parties in the ruling coalition, and the equitable representation of smaller minorities. The issues surrounding Macedonia's efforts to gain EU candidacy status also were discussed, including especially the importance of defining the use of national (ethnic) symbols by the minorities. Representatives of the opposition parties raised a number of policy questions for the government, and members of the governing coalition discussed the state of relations within the coalition. Participants took only brief notice of the recent U.S. initiative on Kosovo.

LOCAL ELECTIONS

A senior ethnic Albanian member of the governing coalition began the discussion by noting that the recent change in municipal boundaries resulting from the new law on municipalities had produced an increase in local interethnic tensions. Yet, he pointed out, "it is important to note the stability of the government throughout this period. There has been no danger of any spillover of tensions." As far as the recent local elections are concerned, he acknowledged that "there were still irregularities that

Improving mutual confidence within the coalition on central and on local levels is very important.

must be corrected. So we still have not met international standards and expectations, but we have made progress in comparison with the past." He called for an analysis of the elections to identify deficiencies in the electoral process itself, and expressed "concern" about "smaller parties feeling abused and prevented from participating in the government." His party, he argued, had "no conflicts of interest with smaller parties, yet smaller parties suffered from competition among the larger parties." He recognized a need to "find some way to ensure that these [smaller] parties gain representation at the local level." This was a theme addressed by leaders of several of the smaller, ethnic minority parties in the governing coalition.

A leader of the coalition's strongest party suggested that the success of the last elections is in the fact that interethnic tensions were not the source of irregularities during the voting process.

Some participants expressed their explicit concern about the situation in Suto Orizari, a majority Romani sub-municipality in Skopje where ethnic Albanian parties won a majority in the local municipal council. A leader of a small ethnic party argued that as a result of the electoral outcome, Suto Orizari's local administration ceased to function. He blamed local activists of the ethnic Albanian coalition party for this outcome. He called for strengthening the atmosphere of mutual cooperation among all coalition partners and especially with the ethnic Albanian party. He said that the coalition overall should consider how to resolve the present situation in Suto Orizari and make it functional again.

Whatever the arrangements, people should feel a sense of fairness, that justice is being done.

A U.S. participant suggested that during his long career of dealing with similar issues in Eastern and Southeastern Europe, problems in such situations are of a double nature: some are technical and some are political. International experts can help to improve the technical side of the matter, but there must be a political agreement among the coalition partners on how to make sure they share electoral goals for the next election.

A representative of the ethnic Albanian ruling party agreed that improving mutual confidence within the coalition on central and on local levels is very important. The parties should make this a priority as they prepare for the 2006 national elections.

Another U.S. participant suggested that a big part of building that mutual confidence is to show that things improve in localities where the local majority population is an ethnic minority on the national level. "Can majority Albanians show their generosity toward minority Macedonians in the municipalities that they govern?" he asked. His senior colleague seconded him by adding, "Whatever the arrangements, people should feel a sense of fairness, that justice is being done," he said.

A leader of the ethnic Albanian ruling party agreed that it was important to show that in municipalities where Albanians take power there is no

discrimination against other ethnic groups, but he also said that the process of increasing the proportion of Albanians employed in the local administrations will be tough and painful.

EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION

One leader of a small, ethnic minority party suggested there was a significant “communication problem” between the smaller and larger parties in the coalition. As a result, the interests of the smaller parties are not taken into account. He especially stressed the lack of communication between the smaller minority parties and the ethnic Albanian coalition party. In fact, he said, communication between them goes through the largest Macedonian governing coalition party. He called for establishment of direct communication between the ethnic Albanian coalition party and the smaller ethnic minority parties. This is important since, according to him, the larger parties are not as concerned with the issues of the small ethnic minorities as they are with overall political problems. Only parties of ethnic minorities consider these issues their priority.

This party leader also suggested that the failure of smaller parties in the recent local elections could be attributed in part to electoral fraud, to the stuffing of ballot boxes, and suggested that one of the larger coalition parties was at fault. A senior member of the ethnic Albanian party in the government coalition responded by suggesting that “when someone is losing or does not fulfill expectations it is natural that they seek to blame others rather than themselves.” But the leader of the smaller party interjected that “I would not be angry if we had lost by a democratic process.” The leader of another party in the coalition suggested that the ethnic Albanian party in the coalition “did not participate in the [local elections] campaign in support of coalition candidates.” This was a reflection of a more general problem in the coalition, he argued. “The coalition is not characterized by agreement in advance on salient issues,” he reported, and therefore “does not campaign in support of common positions.” The leader of another small ethnic minority party argued that “we should allow minorities to vote for their own candidates to represent them.” He reported a readiness to support the interests of the Albanian community, but that the ethnic Albanian party in the coalition had used its resources to defeat candidates from his minority party in the recent elections. He also suggested that this effort had included illegal means, such as the stuffing of ballot boxes and the “intimidation” of minority voters. Later

in the discussion he proposed that “big coalition parties should put certain limits on themselves and on local levels should encourage their people to respect smaller, partner parties.”

An official of the largest Macedonian party in the coalition responded to this discussion by suggesting that “everyone can present his own personal interpretation of the elections. But the result and regularity of the elections are clear.” Moreover, the elections “were closely monitored by the international community...and there were many fewer irregularities than in the past.” With respect to relations among the coalition parties, he suggested that these were “proper” and that “involvement in the campaign was appropriate in proportion to the resources of the parties.” He summed up his position by declaring that “if we win [as a coalition] we are satisfied.”

One leader of a small minority party suggested that the principle of “equitable representation” required some measures to ensure representation for those groups who constitute less than twenty percent of the population. Decentralization and reorganization of municipalities, he argued, “will introduce a need to balance local minorities and majorities.” Another minority leader called for “guaranteed positions, according to the proportion of the population, at the national and local levels” as a means “to eliminate competition for votes.” A third minority party leader suggested that all four small minority parties [Serb, Bosnjak, Turk, and Roma] were in agreement on this issue. One minority party leader pointed out that an early model of decentralization had included municipalities set up specifically for smaller minorities, but this approach was later abandoned.

Decentralization and reorganization of municipalities will introduce a need to balance local minorities and majorities.

A leading member of the coalition’s ethnic Albanian party acknowledged that “as the largest minority, over twenty percent, we should be sensitive to smaller minorities and what we have implemented at the national level should be implemented at the local level.” He later went on to suggest that leading or management positions in major economic enterprises, as well as decision-making positions at the national and local levels should be allocated among groups in approximate proportion to their share of the population, while at the same time “avoiding ethnic discrimination.”

He described this approach as “power-sharing.” But a leading member of the coalition’s largest party cautioned that “at the local level, while it is important to consider the consultative role of party headquarters, relations [between groups] emerge locally spontaneously.” Another, ethnic Albanian participant noted that “local elections are often a reflection of local personalities and local interests. These are not always subject to central influence, let alone control.”

Nonetheless, several participants from several different parties supported the idea that coalition parties should designate common candidates in municipalities where there is intergroup cooperation. One participant suggested that such candidates would be attractive to voters, and identified Skopje, Tetovo, Gostivar, and Struga as municipalities in which such an approach would likely be successful. A member of the ethnic Albanian coalition party cautioned, however, that “the process of cooperation between parties is a process of building trust, which must also take place at local levels.” One minority political leader was more sanguine about this, however. He observed “many years will pass before it is possible to have common candidates. The game is played more from personal than from common perspectives.”

Several participants emphasized that ethnic relations were greatly affected by resource questions, and by the tension between implementing the principle of equitable representation and ensuring the capabilities/qualifications of office-holders. A leading member of the largest coalition party observed that the discussion left one with “the impression that we are talking about discrimination...[but] it is a question of resources... and qualifications. Ethnic solidarity still overwhelms other issues.” A parliamentary leader of the same party, while acknowledging that “the question of financing municipalities also is important,” expressed confidence that “the issue of ethnicity at the local level will give way to job performance.”

EU ACCESSION

Much of the discussion at Mavrovo was devoted to the implications of the recent negative votes in French and Dutch referenda on the European constitution. These results cast a pall over the prospect of further enlargement of the EU, including the eventual accession of Macedonia. Representatives of the EU and senior Macedonian govern-

ment officials agreed, however, that the efforts already underway to bring Macedonia into alignment with European standards must continue. A senior representative of the EU pointed out that within the EU there is a powerful policymaking/foreign policy norm that “commitments must be honored.” “There is every reason to believe,” he argued, “that existing commitments to enlarge are now a matter of honor, and enlargement to the Western Balkans is of such strategic importance that the recent ‘no’ will mean at most, ‘delay.’” Another EU representative pointed out that “Macedonia will do itself best by continuing to implement reforms that bring it into alignment with European standards.” This view was supported by a senior Macedonian government official, who argued that “regardless of EU uncertainties, Macedonia must complete the tasks associated with the accession process so that we will be ready when the EU turns again toward enlargement. European orientation is the only path forward for Macedonia.”

The recent “no” will mean at most, “delay.”

Members of the governing coalition parties noted that successful implementation of the reforms required to achieve accession might have negative political consequences for the government. “We are aware,” one political leader observed, “that governments in Eastern Europe that implemented necessary reforms with long-term positive effects paid the price in the short term.” He noted that “some are afraid of voter reactions,” but said “we are prepared to face such an outcome.”

Two issues connected to EU accession drew the most attention at Mavrovo: regulation of the use of national symbols, and regulation of the status of languages. Discussion of national symbols focused on the use of the Albanian national flag, which is at the same time the state flag of the Republic of Albania. Use of this flag by ethnic Albanian populations in western Macedonia has generated controversy, as some Macedonians interpret this use as a challenge to Macedonian state sovereignty. This sensitivity was reflected in comments by one of the participants from an opposition party, who warned that “we must be exceptionally careful about content. There will be an effort to accommodate minorities, but in the end the majority will pass the law.” The linkage between this issue and the question of Macedonian state sovereignty and even identity was evident in his reference to “our territory, our abbreviated territory, which the sun flag symbolizes.” But, as a senior member of the ethnic Albanian

coalition party put it, “the Albanian people all over the world have only one flag, which is 600 years old.” An official of one of the coalition parties admitted that he did “not expect the law on symbols to go easily.”

We are aware that governments in Eastern Europe that implemented necessary reforms with long-term positive effects paid the price in the short term.

He pointed out that “symbols unify the opposition and will be used by them to build their standing.” His own party, he observed, “will find it hard to support the law as drafted by the government.” Nonetheless, a senior member of the government reported that the law on symbols would be submitted to parliament before the end of the month, and

would call for the display of the Macedonian state flag simultaneously with the display of a national (ethnic) flag. Another coalition member pointed out that if the draft law is accepted there will also be municipalities flying the Turkish and Romani flags. A senior EU representative pointed out that the law would have to be adopted before August 1, 2005 if it is to have a positive impact on the EU decision on Macedonian candidacy.

One leader of an ethnic Albanian opposition party questioned the status of the Albanian language in Macedonia. He complained that “Albanian is not treated as an official language in parliament,” noting that Macedonian MPs boycott the use of the Albanian language by chairs of parliamentary committees. The leader of another ethnic Albanian opposition party underscored the language issue, arguing “while Macedonians say that the Ohrid Framework Agreement does not require adoption of a law on languages, this is nonetheless necessary.”

An EU representative pointed out that the issue of symbols was only one of several outstanding matters concerning Macedonia’s qualifications for candidacy. He suggested that there was “concern” in Europe about Macedonia’s ability to meet OSCE standards for elections, about the need for police reform, and about implementation of decentralization, as well as about symbols and the status of languages. In order to resolve all these issues in time to affect the EU decision on candidacy, Macedonian leaders would have to “compromise.”

A leader of an ethnic Macedonian coalition party suggested that the government should be concerned with the population seeing positive

outcomes of the implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement. “It is absurd that the opposition wins in some areas that have benefited from the OFA implementation,” he said. The government should spend some time explaining to the people what it is doing and what benefits have been brought by its work. His colleague added that with implementation of the OFA, Macedonia could become a model and source of interethnic peace in the Western Balkans.

Showing that Macedonia is just a normal, quiet European country is the challenge, a cabinet member said. “Macedonia should finally stop being dependent on international institutions,” she said. The country should become self-sufficient in creating its own internal security. “Every member of the government, she added, should do everything in order to make Macedonia’s candidacy for the EU possible.”

OPPOSITION CONCERNS

Representatives of the parliamentary opposition parties participating in the discussion directed attention to the question of the economic performance of the government. One leader of an ethnic Macedonian opposition party suggested that the “economy is stagnating since the violence.” He identified “corruption,” and a “lack of transparency” in government work as particular problems. A participant from another opposition party was more harsh, characterizing the economy as “bankrupt.” Another member of this party emphasized their support for efforts to enter the EU, and, in a move that was unprecedented in Macedonia’s antagonistic political climate, praised the government’s efforts to meet EU requirements as “the most organized, most effective” part of the government. At the same time, however, he pointed out that the economy and the standard of living are the issues most important to the population and questioned not only the performance, but the “competence” of the government in this area. A participant representing a different ethnic Macedonian opposition party called for further reform of the electoral process, singling out the need to define the role of the state election

Municipalities should not be given competencies without finances.

commission more clearly. He criticized the commission’s performance in the last local elections. He also suggested the need to define more clearly the election monitoring process and the role of political parties in

that process. Another member of this opposition party suggested that “we have to stop manipulating the ethnic issue and start resolving the problems that make the ethnic issue particularly important. Other than this issue, there are actually few differences, few ideological differences between the parties.”

A leader of an ethnic Albanian opposition party added reform of the judicial system, the status of the Albanian language in parliament, the absence of bilingual signage “even in areas where the population is more than twenty percent Albanian,” and “continued inequality of employment of Albanians in public jobs” to this list of problems. He complained “no resources have been devoted to creating new positions,” and warned that “membership in the EU will not by itself solve any of these problems.” Another leader of this party argued for more implementation of decentralization and empowerment of municipalities. “Municipalities should not be given competencies without finances. State property should be divided with the municipalities.” He suggested that “we need to encourage investment and job creation in the municipalities, and this requires some reform of laws on land use and construction.” Leaders of the small ethnic Albanian opposition parties expressed frustration over their inability to influence the policies of the governing coalition. In response, a senior member of the ethnic Albanian coalition party suggested “all parties that deal with nationalist, patriotic issues are becoming marginalized.”

A leading member of one ethnic Albanian opposition party reported that his parliamentary group had boycotted parliament for the past two months because “our positions were being ignored. We did not, by our presence,” he argued, “wish to contribute to a quorum.” This argument

Elected officials...are not representatives of their party, but of the people.

was opposed by a senior Macedonian official, who argued that “elected officials should participate in parliament in order to represent citizens who voted for them. They are not representatives of their party, but of the people. One should not cry over the inability to have one’s proposals adopted.” This was met with a sharp retort from the ethnic Albanian opposition leader, who declared “participation is fruitless and we do not need to be lectured by the government.”

INTRA-COALITION RELATIONS

In a separate session for governing coalition parties, members of the governing coalition discussed a number of issues that affect relations among them. The organization and operation of the Ministry of Interior drew considerable attention. An ethnic Albanian leader of one of the coalition parties suggested that this ministry was the “source of difficulties” within the government in the past six months. These difficulties needed to be addressed in order to move forward. “The tradition of open and sincere cooperation of this coalition has not been operative here,” he argued. “There has to be special treatment of this ministry.” He reported “more than one thousand Albanians and other non-Macedonians have been employed by the ministry in response to the Ohrid Agreement.” But, he suggested, there is a “lack of communication and cooperation” between the [ethnic Macedonian] minister and [ethnic Albanian] deputy minister. He also reported that “there are now a great number of complaints by police chiefs in Tetovo and Gostivar in response to efforts by the minister to establish dictatorial rule by the center. Local chiefs are reacting to arbitrary decisions by the minister.” In addition, “there is anger among employees of the ministry, among ethnically mixed units of reservists who have been put at risk in implementing decisions. It is not the prime minister’s cabinet that is at question, it is the ministry.” In response, a Macedonian senior government official suggested “there are different views of the functioning of this ministry.” He pointed out that the ministry has been “very successful in the fight against crime and corruption.” “Some problems are due to the political inexperience of the minister, but some are due to the need to adopt a new law on police reform.” He acknowledged that “personal relations between the minister and deputy minister may be a problem,” but suggested that “the solution is not to be found in personnel.”

This issue, and others, have been the focus of regular meetings of the coalition leadership, including party leaders who do not hold government portfolios. A Macedonian senior government official reported that “most of the problems [discussed at these meetings] are not due to intolerance.” A senior member of the ethnic Albanian coalition party suggested that the minister of interior, just as the minister of defense, should be a civilian. This would prevent “extreme behavior” toward Albanians and other minorities. He also suggested that the “heads of municipality police units should be elected” rather than appointed by the ministry.

This perspective was supported by the head of the ethnic Albanian coalition party, who argued that “without a politically appointed civilian minister it will be difficult to address problems.” He cited the example of the incident in Kondovo, a village where political leaders who understood that the presence of unsanctioned ethnic Albanian paramilitary forces was “a provocation,” took control over police action and ended the crisis without escalation.

KOSOVO

A brief discussion was devoted to the U.S. initiative on Kosovo, announced by U.S. Undersecretary of State Nicholas Burns around the same time as the Mavrovo session. (Burns asserted in a briefing to Congress that the Bush administration, its European partners and the United Nations “hope to launch a process to determine Kosovo’s status” in 2005.) An ethnic Albanian leader of one of the Macedonian coalition parties declared “this issue should be resolved between Belgrade and Pristina. We are not concerned, whatever the outcome, even independence.”



From left to right: Musa Xhaferri and Thomas Fuglister.



From left to right: Nezet Mustafa and Gajur Sarac.



From left to right: Risto Penov and Stevco Jakimovski.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

(English alphabetical order)

Democratic League of Bosnjaks in Macedonia

Rafet Muminovik, President

Democratic Party of Serbs in Macedonia

Ivan Stoilkovic, President

Democratic Party of Turks in Macedonia

Gajur Sarac, Member, Parliament of Macedonia

Democratic Party of Albanians

Iljaz Halimi, Vice President

Imer Selmani, Vice President

Democratic Union for Integration

Ali Ahmeti, President

Agron Buxhaku, Vice President

Ermira Mehmeti, Spokesperson

Aziz Pollozhani, Minister of Education and Science of Macedonia

Musa Xhaferri, Deputy Prime Minister of Macedonia

Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization-Democratic Party of Macedonian National Unity

Silvana Boneva, Head, VMRO-DPMNE Parliamentary Group, Parliament of Macedonia

Vlatko Gjorcev, Member, Executive Board

Mile Janakievski, Chief of Cabinet of the President

Trajko Slaveski, Vice President

Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization-People's Party

Slobodan Casule, Member, Parliament of Macedonia

Marjan Dodovski, Member, Executive Committee

Liberal Democratic Party

Risto Penov, President

Zoran Shapurik, Minister of Environment and Spatial Planning of Macedonia

National Democratic Party

Basri Haliti, President

Party for Democratic Prosperity

Xhelil Bajrami, Spokesperson

Abduladi Vejseli, President

Ismet Ramadani, Member, Parliament of Macedonia

Social Democratic Union of Macedonia

Vlado Buckovski, President; Prime Minister of Macedonia

Nikola Kurkchiev, Secretary General

Jani Makraduli, Head, SDSM Parliamentary Group, Parliament of Macedonia

Ilinka Mitreva, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Macedonia

Lindita Sakiri-Atanasova, Member, Presidency

United Party of the Roma of Macedonia

Nezdet Mustafa, President

European Union

Vassilis Maragos, Acting Head, Delegation to Macedonia, European Commission

Michael Sahlin, Ambassador; Special Representative in Macedonia

Jesper Thomsen, Senior Adviser to the Special Representative in Macedonia

Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe

Angela Bargellini, Election Expert, Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje

Andreas Raab, Head, Political/Reporting Unit, Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje

Phillip Stiel, Head, Public Administration Reform Unit, Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje

Project on Ethnic Relations

Steven Burg, Rapporteur; Professor, Brandeis University

Alex Grigor'ev, Director, Western Balkans

Allen Kassof, President Emeritus and Senior Adviser

Livia Plaks, President

Swiss Confederation

Mimoza Angelovska, Assistant to the Ambassador, Embassy in Macedonia

Romain Darbelley, Deputy Chief of Mission, Embassy in Macedonia

Thomas Füglistner, Ambassador to Macedonia

Albert Hani, Collaborator, Embassy in Macedonia

Armin Rieser, Peacebuilding Adviser in Kosovo, Macedonia, and Serbia and Montenegro, Embassy in Macedonia

United States of America

Steve Hubler, Chief, Political/Economic Section, Embassy in Macedonia

Paul Wohlers, Chargé d'Affaires, Embassy in Macedonia

OTHER PER PUBLICATIONS

- *Romanian-American Symposium on Interethnic Relations* (1991)
- *The Romanies in Central and Eastern Europe: Illusions and Reality* (1992)
- *Nationality Policy in the Russian Federation* (1992)
- *Interethnic Relations in Serbia/Yugoslavia: Alternatives for the Future* (1993)
- *The Media of Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union: Reporting on Interethnic Relations* (1994)
- *Managing Ethnic Conflict: The Kona Statement* (1994)
- *Countering Anti-Roma Violence in Eastern Europe: The Snagov Conference and Related Efforts* (1994)
- *Ethnonationalism: Fears, Dangers, and Policies in the Post-Communist World* (1995)
- *Slovakia Roundtable in the United States* (1995)
- *Democratic Processes and Ethnic Relations in Yugoslavia* (1995)
- *Russia and Eastern and Central Europe: Old Divisions and New Bridges* (1996)
- *Second Slovakia Roundtable* (1996)
- *Ethnic Relations: A Selected Bibliography* (1996)
- *Reporting in a Post-Conflict Environment: Bosnian and Croat Journalists Meet* (1996)
- *The Media and the Roma in Contemporary Europe: Facts and Fictions* (1996)
- *The Roma in the Twenty-First Century: A Policy Paper* (1997)
- *Prevention of Violence and Discrimination Against the Roma in Central and Eastern Europe* (1997)
- *Enhancing Regional Security: Russian and Central European Perspectives* (1997)
- *The New York Roundtable: Toward Peaceful Accommodation in Kosovo* (1997)
- *Images and Issues: Coverage of the Roma in The Mass Media in Romania* (1997)
- *Self-Government in Hungary: The Gypsy/Romani Experience and Prospects for the Future* (1997)
- *Political Leaders on Interethnic Relations and Regional Security in Central Europe: A Roundtable* (1998)
- *Interethnic Relations in the Balkans: New Generation, New Politics* (1998)
- *Schools, Language, and Interethnic Relations in Romania: The Debate Continues* (1998)
- *The Roma in Bulgaria: Collaborative Efforts Between Local Authorities and Nongovernmental Organizations* (1998)
- *Baltic-Russian Relations in the New Geopolitical Framework* (1998)
- *Political Participation and the Roma in Hungary and Slovakia* (1999)
- *Building Romanian Democracy: The Police and Ethnic Minorities* (1999)
- *Catastrophe in the Balkans: Serbia's Neighbors and the Kosovo Conflict* (1999)
- *State Policies Toward Romani Communities in Candidate Countries to the EU: Government and Romani Participation in Policy-Making* (1999)
- *Montenegro on the Brink: Avoiding Another Yugoslav War* (2000)
- *Roma and the Law: Demythologizing the "Gypsy Criminality" Stereotype* (2000)
- *Vojvodina: The Politics of Interethnic Accommodation* (2000)
- *The Year 2000 Elections in Romania: Interethnic Relations and European Integration* (2000)
- *The Roma in Hungary: Government Policies, Minority Expectations, and the International Community* (2000)
- *Toward Community Policing: The Police and Ethnic Minorities in Hungary* (2000)
- *Albanians and Their Neighbors: Unfinished Business* (2000)
- *Roma and the Government in Slovakia: The Debate Over Migration* (2000)
- *Roma and Statistics* (2001)
- *Albanians as Majorities and Minorities: A Regional Dialogue* (2001)
- *State Policies Toward the Roma in Macedonia* (2001)
- *Parliamentary Representation of Minorities in Hungary: Legal and Political Issues* (2001)
- *Political Will: Romania's Path to Ethnic Accommodation* (2001)
- *Yugoslav Roma Face the Future* (2001)
- *Leadership, Representation and the Status of the Roma* (2002)
- *Yugoslavia at the Crossroads* (2002)
- *The Bulgarian Ethnic Experience* (2002)
- *Political Extremism and Interethnic Relations in the New Millennium* (2002)
- *Roma and the Question of Self-Determination: Fiction and Reality* (2003)
- *Roma in Multiethnic Communities in Serbia* (2003)
- *The Romani "Mahalas" (Neighborhoods) of Southeastern Europe: Politics, Poverty and Ethnic Unrest* (2003)
- *Albanians and Their Neighbors: Is the Status Quo Acceptable?* (2003)
- *Macedonia's Interethnic Coalition: The First Six Months* (2003)
- *Macedonia's Interethnic Coalition: The First Year* (2004)
- *Albanians and Their Neighbors: Moving Toward Real Communication* (2004)
- *Women in Governance and Interethnic Relations* (2004)

- *Macedonia's Interethnic Coalition: Solidifying Gains* (2004)
- *Roma and EU Accession: Elected and Appointed Romani Representatives in an Enlarged Europe* (2004)
- *Kosovo 2005: Assuring Security for the Neighborhood* (2005)
- *Macedonia: The Next Stage* (2005)
- *Central and East European Governments and Cooperation with the Hungarian Communities: Efforts, Accomplishments, Failures* (2005)