



ЮГОЗАПАДЕН УНИВЕРСИТЕТ НЕОФИТ РИЛСКИ  
ФАКУЛТЕТ ПО ИЗКУСТВОТА

ГОДИШНИК ТОМ III

**КУЛТУРНИТЕ ПРАВА  
В ЕВРОПЕЙСКА  
ПЕРСПЕКТИВА**

Благоевград, 2005

**КУЛТУРНА ИДЕНТИЧНОСТ И ЕВРОПЕЙСКА ИНТЕГРАЦИЯ**

- Културните права като инструмент за конструиране на граници и идентичност  
*Иван Кабаков* /173/
- Правото на културно и религиозно самоопределение-големият проблем и големият шанс пред бъдеща Европа  
*Лъчезар Антонов* /176/
- Неформалното образование чрез изкуството, като възможност за отстояване правото на културна идентичност. Международните младежки обмени по програми на ЕС в този контекст  
*Добрин Спасов* /179/
- Културните права между "Културната демокрация" и "Демократизацията на културата" - българският опит  
*Юри Вълковски* /179/
- Предизвикателствата към българската културна идентичност  
*Кристина Жечева* /180/
- Християнските ценности и обединена Европа  
*Диана Банкова* /183/
- Интеркултурата-фактор за интеграция  
*Sabaudin Zhuta* /185/
- Култура и комуникация - като функция на човешкото развитие  
*Снежана Мирасчиева* /186/
- Процесът на социална категоризация при формиране на етническата идентичност  
*Зорница Ганева* /187/
- Устойчивост на българската културна идентичност в контекста на обединяваща се Европа  
*Светлана Александрова* /190/
- Съвременна визия за европейска интеграция  
*Красимила Василева* /192/
- Дизайнът - активно средство за запазване и утвърждаване на националната ни идентичност в процеса на присъединяване към ЕС  
*Илия Филипов* /195/

**КУЛТУРНИТЕ МАЛЦИНСТВА В НОВА И СТАРА ЕВРОПА**

- Мисли за традициите и съвременност в българската музика  
*Николай Кауфман* /198/
- Реализиране на правото на културна идентичност на деца от етническите малцинства чрез извънучилищни форми на възпитание  
*Силва Налбантян* /1101/
- Музикалният гурбет - пътуване от и към Европа  
*Лозанка Пейчева* /1103/
- Етническите турци в България: багра в палитрата на балканското културно наследство  
*Сибел Пашаоглу* /1109/
- Образи на циганска музика от България или бай Ганьо и бай Мангал: етюд върху променящи се идентичности в европейска перспектива  
*Венцислав Димов* /1110/
- Проблемът за музикалната самоидентификация на приазовските българи от втората половина на 18 и началото на 20 век  
*Татяна Мартынюк* /1116/
- Дейности за запазване на културната идентичност на бежанците в България  
*Сийка Чавдарова-Костова* /1119/
- Българските емигранти и мястото им във формиращата се нова европейска идентичност  
*Виолета Секиранова* /1123/
- Културните малцинства в Европа: постигане на признание (интертекстуално-интерпретативни вариации върху лужишко сербски мотиви)  
*Розмари Стателова* /1127/
- Четири етноса - един общ музикален език  
*Димитрина Кауфман* /1132/

**КУЛТУРНИТЕ ПРАВА В И ЧРЕЗ ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ**

- Ателиа "Културните права на децата"  
*Вяра Гюрова* /1137/
- Етническо разстояние и етническа толерантност в училищата на Р Македония  
*Владо Петровски, Емилия Горжвеа, Блаже Китанов* /1140/

ИНДЕКС НА АВТОРИТЕ

- Александрова Светлана – културолог на свободна практика  
 Алтароци – Университет “Ла Спиенца”, Италия  
 Ангелов Ставри – докторант, ЮЗУ “Н. Рилски”, Благоевград, катедра “Музика”  
 Атанасоска Татяна – д-р, Педагогически факултет, Битоля, Македония  
 Атонов Лъчезар – докторант, ЮЗУ “Неофит Рилски”, катедра “Културология”  
 Банкова Диана – докторант, СУ “Св.Климент Охридски”, София, Философски факултет  
 Белецкая Марина – доцент, д-р, ДПУ, Мелитопол, Украйна  
 Бижева Антоанета – докторант, ЮЗУ “Н. Рилски”, Благоевград, катедра “Културология”  
 Божилова Ваня – д-р, СУ “Св. Климент Охридски”, София, Педагогически факултет  
 Братанов Пламен – доцент, д-р, ЮЗУ “Неофит Рилски”, катедра “Връзки с обществеността”  
 Бъчварова Ваня – доцент, д-р, Чукурова университет, Адана, Турция  
 Василева Красимира – докторант, СУ “Св.Климент Охридски”, София, Факултет по педагогика  
 Врачар Милан – Фондация “Култура Нова”, Сърбия и Черна гора  
 Вълкова Мария – доцент, д-р, ЮЗУ “Неофит Рилски”, катедра “Културология”  
 Вълковски Юри – докторант, СУ “Св.Климент Охридски”, София, катедра “Културология”  
 Гаврилова – Иванова Цветанка – ст.ас., ЮЗУ “Н. Рилски”, Благоевград, катедра “Хореография”  
 Ганева Зорница – докторант, СУ “Св.Климент Охридски”, София, Философски факултет  
 Георгиева Албена – ст.н.с., д-р, Институт по фолклор, БАН  
 Горжева Емилия – д-р, Факултет по педагогика “Гоце Делчев”, Щип, Македония  
 Гуз Владимир – ст. Преп., ДПУ, Мелитопол, Украйна  
 Гурова Вяра – доцент, д-р, СУ “Св. Климент Охридски”, София, Педагогически факултет  
 Димитрова Диана – докторант, СУ “Св. Климент Охридски”, София  
 Димов Венцислав – ст.н.с. II ст., д-р, Институт по изкуствознание, БАН, София  
 Жечева Кристина – докторант, СУ “Св.Климент Охридски”, София, Философски факултет  
 Жута Сабаудин – професор, Факултет “Св. Климент Охридски”, Скопие, Македония  
 Здравев Георги – професор, д-р, Битоля, Македония  
 Зидарич Винко – Фондация “Интеркултура”, Загреб, Хърватска  
 Иванова Александра – докторант, докторант, СУ “Св. Климент Охридски”, София, катедра “Педагогика на изкуствата”  
 Йорданова Гергана – докторант, ЮЗУ “Неофит Рилски”, катедра “Културология”  
 Кабаков Иван – д-р, СУ “Св.Климент Охридски”, София, катедра “Културология”  
 Картени – Университет “Ла Спиенца”, Италия  
 Кауфман Димитрина – професор, д-р, ЮЗУ “Неофит Рилски”, катедра “Музика”  
 Кауфман Николай – академик, БАН, София  
 Китанов Блаже – д-р, Факултет по педагогика “Гоце Делчев”, Щип, Македония  
 Китова Ирина – ст.ас., ЮЗУ “Неофит Рилски”, катедра “Телевизионно и киноизкуство”  
 Колева Нели – д-р, БУ “Проф.д-р Асен Златаров”, Бургас  
 Костадинова Светлана – докторант, ЮЗУ “Неофит Рилски”, катедра “Връзки с обществеността”  
 Краев Георг – доцент, д-р, НБУ, София  
 Кръстанова Красимира – д-р, Пловдивски университет “П. Хилендарски”  
 Лесовиченко Андрей – доцент, д.н., ДПУ, Новосибирск, Русия  
 Мартинюк Анатолий – професор, д-р, ДПУ, Мелитопол, Украйна  
 Мартинюк Татяна – професор, д.н., ДПУ, Мелитопол, Украйна, р-л на катедрата по музикално възпитание и хореография  
 Мелтев Михаил – доцент, д-р, НБУ, София  
 Метлицкая В. – доцент, д-р, ДПУ, Мелитопол, Украйна  
 Миращиева Снежана – д-р, Факултет по педагогика “Гоце Делчев”, Щип, Македония  
 Митев Георги – доцент, АМТИИ, Пловдив  
 Михайловски Владимир – Македония  
 Михайловски Игор – Македония  
 Мота – Университет “Ла Спиенца”, Италия  
 Налбантян Силва – Министерство на културата  
 Попкостадинов Христо – д-р, художник-реставратор, Благоевград  
 Обрешкова Нонка – ст.ас., ЮЗУ “Неофит Рилски”, катедра “Телевизионно и киноизкуство”  
 Павлов Емил – доцент, д-р, ЮЗУ “Неофит Рилски”, катедра “Културология”  
 Пейчева Лозанка – ст.н.с. II ст., д-р, Институт по фолклор, БАН, София  
 Петровски Владо – Факултет по педагогика “Гоце Делчев”, Щип, Македония  
 Пидварко Татяна – преп., ДПУ, Мелитопол, Украйна  
 Попова Невелина – докторант  
 Потеров Румен – професор, д.н., ЮЗУ “Н. Рилски”, Благоевград, катедра “Музика”  
 Проданова – Велянова Радка – д-р, НМУ “Л. Пипков”, София

III. Understanding, rationalization and going through the problematic

III.1. Culture and culture rights (Култура и културни права)

- Self-assessment – handout “beliefs, customs, norms, values.
- Group work “Cultural behaviour” (handout)
- Culture of children and culture of adults – is there any differences?
- Group work – dramatization on personal scenario – “cultural” conflict between a child and an adult

III.2. Playing child

- Brainstorming “Play/playing”);: Essay (optional text) – “The little playing man/woman – 3 key words/ notions)
- Net of notions – conditions of a full value play
- Motor/motive play – “Trust”, Cooperativeness”
- Plays of adults and plays of children - handout
- Discern the play - mimic/pantomimic play
- Summary – Importance of play as a universal way of expression

IV. Right to play and relaxation

- Group work – normative/law’s protection of the right to play and relaxation – work with documents/laws

**ETHNIC DISTANCE AND ETHNIC TOLERANCE IN SCHOOLS IN THE REPUBLIC MACEDONIA**

**VLADO PETROVSKI, EMILIJKA PETROVA GORGEVA, BLAZE KITANOV**

Nowadays when the whole world is merely a “global village” we can state that many countries in the world are heterogeneous in the ethnic and cultural sense, and they cope with the problem of people of different nationalities living together. The problems resulting from the multiethnic and multicultural character of the population living in various countries in the world are differently identified and different policies for their overcoming are applied. A universally applicable and thoroughly satisfactory solution to the problems resulting from this context has not been found yet anywhere in the world.

The issue of living together is a very complex one and it should be faced by every society that is multiethnic and multicultural. One of the possible ways of dealing with this problem is to put the man as an individual into the focus of attention through highlighting his basic rights and freedom, equality and social inclusion as the principles for the preliminary frame of any discussion or decision, a frame that will not depend on people’s cultural, racial and religious background. Another way is to face those rights as a member of a respective collectivity, in this context an ethnic one.

If we look back on the history of the Balkans, the minority problem on the Balkans is too specific, and it creates concrete minority problems, i.e. it creates more history than it can bear. The Republic of Macedonia is a part of the Balkans and this interethnic ambient, which means that these interethnic tensions have not passed it by. For the Republic of Macedonia essential was the fact that through history there were no interethnic conflicts, which facilitated the co-existence of the Macedonian and other ethnic communities. This represented an important factor in the reduction of interethnic tensions from time to time, but the last events in the course of 2001 between the Macedonian majority community and the most numerous Albanian minority community greatly made the complex interethnic relations even more complex, and these are very fragile in Macedonia today.

In order to understand the level of mutual distance, i.e. tolerance of ethnic communities in Macedonia (ethnic distance), in our research, that was conducted with the aim to find out the influence of the ethnic factor as a factor of motivation for education in the Republic of Macedonia, we have included a block of questions whose aim was to establish the factual situation in this context.

*It is necessary that the members of ethnic communities in Macedonia study in ethnically clean schools* and the alternative answers are identical for the other three statements also, and they are: 1) I completely agree; 2) I agree; 3) I am not decisive; 4) I do not agree; 5) I do not agree at all. We will analyse their attitudes toward this statement by analysing the answers systematized in the following two tables.

The tables will be analysed by classifying them from the aspect of the answers frequency, but, as it involves a scale of the Likert’s type, we will give the agreement coefficient the value of which moves from 1 (complete disagreement) to 5 (complete agreement).

**Table No. 1**

**It is necessary that the members of ethnic communities study in ethnically clean schools**

	1	2
should pupils study in ethnically clean schools	N	%
I agree completely	272	32,77
I agree	209	25,18
I am not decisive	131	15,66
I do not agree	164	19,76
I do not agree at all	54	6,51
Total	830	100

The agreement coefficient: 3,55%

The table shows that the attitudes of the pupils who prefer ethnically clean schools dominate, or more concretely, most pupils answered that they completely agree that schools should be ethnically clean, and together with those stating they agree about studying in ethnically clean schools they are 57,95%, which is more than half of the interviewed pupils. Among the rest of the pupils, the number of those stating they are not decisive about which schools they prefer is not small (15,66%), and generally viewed 26,21% stated they do not prefer ethnically clean schools. The following table will show the concrete attitudes of pupils from different ethnic communities related to this question.

Table No. 2

**It is necessary that the members of ethnic communities study in ethnically clean schools, according to their ethnic membership structure**

	1	2	3	4	5	6
should pupils study in ethnically clean schools	M	A	T	R	V	O
I agree completely	31,80	42,48	3,84	-	10	37,5
I agree	26,09	29,18	7,69	-	10	-
I am not decisive	16,19	11,58	26,92	38,88	20	12,5
I do not agree	18,85	12,87	46,15	55,55	55	25
I do not agree at all	7,04	3,86	15,38	5,55	5	25
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

The agreement coefficient:

- Macedonians 3,57%
- Albanians 3,94%
- Turks 2,38%
- Romans 2,33%
- Vlachs 2,65%
- Others 3%

The analysis of the concrete attitudes of pupils belonging to different ethnic communities about this issue show two crystallized and very obvious positions of the two ethnic communities, i.e. Macedonian and Albanian community, that in greater percentage prefer the attitude that the pupils should study in ethnically clean schools, but the number of those disagreeing with this is not small, or they cannot decide which schools to prefer, as is shown concretely in the table. The second position regarding this question is taken by the pupils belonging to the Romans, Turkish and Vlach community who prefer the attitude I do not agree and I do not agree at all that pupils should study in ethnically clean schools; however, even in this group we can see some contradictory attitudes regarding this issue, but in a considerably smaller scale than with the members of the Macedonian and Albanian community.

We must state that the attitude about this question largely depends on the ethnic structure of the population in those regions, i.e. on the concentration of the respective ethnic community in them.

So we have the situation that the pupils Albanians, from Gostivar and Skopje where there is a greater concentration of this ethnic community, prefer ethnically clean schools, as well as the pupils Macedonians living in the regions where they are the majority. But pupils Macedonians who live in regions where they are the minority, for example in Gostivar in considerable percentage (38,93%), either do not agree or do not agree at all that pupils should study in ethnically clean schools, and 14,15% do not have a definite attitude about this issue, which, in any case, makes us conclude that the concentration of a respective ethnic community in a region has an essential influence on the building of attitudes regarding this question, but on the greater flexibility in preferring one or another kind of schools as well.

The following question from this block should uncover the attitude of pupils whether ethnically clean schools lead to closing of the members of ethnic communities into their own ethnic borders.

Table No. 3

**Ethnically clean schools lead to closing of the members of ethnic communities into their own ethnic borders.**

	1	2
Do ethnically clean schools lead to forming ghettos	N	%
I agree completely	148	17,83
I agree	235	28,31
I am not decisive	220	26,51
I do not agree	178	21,45
I do not agree at all	49	5,90
Total	830	100

Agreement coefficient: 3,31%

This table gives us a divided attitude of pupils regarding the issue of the question whether

ethnically clean schools lead to a sort of ghetto forming, i.e. closing the members of ethnic communities into their own borders. From the total number of questioned pupils 46,14% said that they agree, i.e. agree completely that ethnically clean schools lead to forming ghettos (maybe too harshly said but not tendentiously) for respective ethnic communities, most of all meant about the members of the Albanian community, because, as the next table will show, the attitude of the members of other ethnic communities that are minorities in the Republic of Macedonia is completely different from the attitude of the Albanian and Macedonian community. Nevertheless, although the number of pupils who do not agree with this extreme attitude is not small, the number of pupils who say they are not decisive about this question is fairly big. i.e. they still do not have a formed attitude about this issue.

Table No. 4

**Ethnically clean schools lead to closing of the members of ethnic communities into their own ethnic borders - according to their ethnic membership structure**

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	M	A	T	R	V	O
Do ethnically clean schools lead to forming ghettos						
I agree completely	21,52	8,58	11,53	38,88	15	25
I agree	34,28	13,30	42,30	11,11	45	25
I am not decisive	29,14	21,45	30,76	27,77	10	25
I do not agree	11,04	47,21	11,53	5,55	25	12,5
I do not agree at all	4	9,44	3,84	16,66	5	12,5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Agreement coefficient:

- Macedonians 3,58%
- Albanians 2,64%
- Turks 3,46%
- Romans 3,50%
- Vlachs 3,40%
- Others 3,34%

Unlike the previously mentioned attitude that pupils from the Albanian and Macedonian community prefer ethnically clean schools, this table gives us completely different, i.e. opposite attitude of pupils from the mentioned communities.

More pupils Albanians think that ethnically clean schools do not lead to closing of ethnic communities into their own ethnic borders (56,65%), but the number is also large of the pupils who still do not have a defined attitude to this issue and of those who agree that such a form of education can produce some unwanted consequences for the future of Macedonia.

Macedonian pupils, on the contrary, have a completely opposite attitude from Albanians. More of them think that ethnically clean schools lead to the closing of members of ethnic communities into their own borders (speaking of members of the Albanian community) and the percentage is 55,80%.as for the members of the Macedonian community, observed individually, most of them said they are not decisive, i.e. they do not have a clearly defined attitude to this issue - whether ethnically clean schools will lead to ethnic segregation and ghettos.

The attitudes of the pupils from other ethnic communities to this issue are very different, but in any case, as the data in the table shows, at least half of the pupils think that ethnically clean schools represent a potential danger of isolation of ethnic communities into their own borders.

The next attitude we wanted to discover was if ethnically clean schools lead to disintegration of the Macedonian society, i.e. if, in their opinion, this form of education will reflect negatively on the building of the future civic and multiethnic society in the Republic of Macedonia. The pupils' attitudes are shown in the following two tables.

Table No. 5

**Ethnically clean schools lead to the disintegration of the Macedonian state**

	1	2
	N	%
do ethnically clean schools lead to disintegration		
I agree completely	154	18,55
I agree	222	26,75
I am not decisive	208	25,06
I do not agree	186	22,41
I do not agree at all	60	7,23
Total	830	100

Agreement coefficient: 3,27%

The table shows many different pupils' attitudes to this issue, but the smallest is the number of those who said they do not agree or they do not agree completely, even though there is a percentage (not small), as the table shows, of those who think that ethnically clean schools lead to the disintegration of the

Macedonian state. Greater is the number of those who think that ethnically clean schools can lead to ethnic segregation of the Macedonian state, and of those who still are not capable of defining their attitude to this issue.

Table No. 6

**Ethnically clean schools lead to the disintegration of the Macedonian state, according to ethnic membership structure**

	1	2	3	4	5	6
do ethnically clean schools lead to disintegration	M	A	T	R	V	O
I agree completely	24,19	3,86	19,23	61,11	5	12,5
I agree	32,19	11,58	57,69	11,11	35	25
I am not decisive	25,90	23,60	7,69	22,22	50	12,5
I do not agree	13,71	44,63	11,53	5,55	10	50
I do not agree at all	4	16,30	3,84	-	-	-
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

The agreement coefficient:

- Macedonians 3,59%
- Albanians 2,42%
- Turks 3,77%
- Romans 4,24
- Vlachs 3,35%
- Others 3%

The concrete attitudes in the table show us contradictory opinions about this issue with the members of the Albanian community as the most numerous minority community, but which is in majority in certain parts of Macedonia, and the majority Macedonian community that is a minority in certain regions, compared to the Albanian community.

Members of the Macedonian community prefer the attitude that ethnically clean schools lead to a potential disintegration of the Macedonian state, while Albanian pupils think that ethnically clean schools are not a danger for the unity of the Macedonian state and its unitarian character, and how all this will be reflected in the future life of future generations in the Republic of Macedonia, remains to be seen in time.

Pupils from the Roman and Turkish community greatly think and support the attitude of the Macedonian pupils, that ethnically clean schools will lead to the disintegration of the Macedonian state, which is not the case with the members of the Vlach community who do not have a clearly built attitude about this question; this is a little surprising if we bear in mind that members of the Vlach community support the attitudes of the Macedonian community about many issues, including this one. i.e. they have very few opposite attitudes.

At the end we asked the question connected with the attitude whether ethnically mixed schools, unlike ethnically clean schools, lead to building mutual confidence among members of different ethnic communities that live in Macedonia, The following tables give the answer to this.

Table No. 7

**Ethnically mixed schools lead to building mutual confidence among members of different ethnic communities**

	1	2
Do ethnically mixed schools build mutual confidence	N	%
I agree completely	152	18,31
I agree	215	25,90
I am not decisive	161	19,40
I do not agree	206	24,82
I do not agree at all	96	11,57
total	830	100

The agreement coefficient: 3,15%

As the ones before it, this table also shows many different pupils' attitudes regarding this statement. The greatest percentage is of those who do not agree with the attitude that ethnically mixed schools are a better solution than the ethnically clean schools in relation to the building of trust among ethnic communities in Macedonia (44,21%), but the percentage of those pupils who do not support this attitude is not small (36,39%), as well as of those who still cannot clearly define their attitude to this issue, i.e. if they should prefer one or the other type of schools connected with building better interethnic relations.

In the end, let us ask the question if only the different forms of education are the main reason for the fragile interethnic relations in our country. Our answer is no. However, we should not neglect the great possibilities of education for influencing in this field, because basic communication among young people is

established in schools, and if this stops, we think that it will have very bad effects on the ethnic co-existence in the Republic of Macedonia.

**Table No. 8**

**Ethnically mixed schools lead to building confidence among members of different ethnic communities, according to their ethnic membership structure**

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Do ethnically mixed schools build confidence	M	A	T	R	V	O
I agree completely	17,14	14,16	38,46	44,44	50	12,5
I agree	31,42	11,15	42,30	38,88	20	25
I am not decisive	18,09	24,46	7,69	11,11	15	25
I do not agree	23,80	31,75	7,69	5,55	10	25
I do not agree at all	9,52	18,45	3,84	-	5	12,5
total	100	100	100	100	100	100

The agreement coefficient:

- Macedonians 3,23%
- Albanians 2,71%
- Turks 4,04%
- Romans 4,22%
- Vlachs 4%
- Others 3%

Concrete attitudes of pupils from the Albanian and MMacedonian community are different in relation to the statement if advantage should be given to the ethnically mixed schools, connected with the building of greater confidence in mutual relations.

A greater percentage of Albanians (50,10%) accepted the attitude that they do not agree with the statement that ethnically mixed schools will lead to building better interethnic relations, but there is a noticeable number of those pupils who agree with the fact that in ethnically mixed regions advantage should be given to ethnically mixed schools, because they will lead to building greater mutual confidence and communication; the number of those pupils who, like in the analysis of the previous attitudes about the influence of ethnically clean schools on building interethnic confidence, cannot make up their mind, i.e. do not have a defined attitude about this issue is not small, which leads us to the fact that we need a fairly long period of time to clearly view the advantages, either of ethnically clean or ethnically mixed schools, and all this in the context of building interethnic climate and ambient in the Republic of Macedonia.

Pupils Macedonians in greater number support the attitude that advantage should be given to ethnically mixed schools, but there is also a great number of pupils who do not agree with this attitude, as well as those who do not have a clearly defined attitude to this issue, which leads us to the fact that we emphasized previously, that in the country there is not a defined attitude among pupils about which schools should be given advantage to in ethnically mixed regions, in order to build much more harmonious relations among ethnic communities in Macedonia; these, we must admit, at the moment are not on a satisfactory level in all the segments of Macedonian society, including education.

Unlike pupils from the Macedonian and Albanian communities who do not have a clearly defined attitude to ethnically mixed schools and their influence on interethnic climate, pupils from the Roman, Vlach and Turkish communities prefer ethnically mixed schools and think that they will create a much better interethnic climate, unlike ethnically clean schools.

At the end of this analysis, we cannot avoid emphasizing that the greatest ethnic distance and the greatest difference in attitudes is found between pupils from Albanian and Macedonian community, and that this distance is not present at members of Roman, Vlach and Turkish community.

As for the preference of ethnically clean or ethnically mixed schools during building of a global educational strategy, we are of the opinion that advantage should be given to ethnically mixed schools in ethnically mixed regions, because that is a foundation for an elementary interethnic communication. Ethnically mixed schools would also prepare the climate for additional changes in the school curriculum that will be in the function of preparing the population to face the states which condition the legal measures of bilingualism.

#### **ETHNIC DISTANCE AND ETHNIC TOLERANCE IN THE SCHOOLS OF REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA**

**VLADO PETROVSKI, EMILIJA P.GORGEVA, BLAZE KITANOV**

*This paper deals with the ethnical distance of members of ethnical communities in the Republic of Macedonia. The research investigates the influence of the ethnical factor on the education in Macedonia. The data analysis has showed that ethnically mixed schools would prepare the climate for changes of the curriculum that would be in the function of preparing the population for facing the conditions influencing the legal regulations of bilingualism.*