THE MULTIETHNIC COEXISTENCE ON THE BALKANS

Strasko Stojanovski PhD,[1]
Jovan Ananiev PhD,[2]
Jadranka Denkova PhD,[3]
[1,2,3,] Faculty of Law, University "Goce Delcev"- Shtip, Republic of Macedonia

Abstract: The present perception of dialectic discourse of "conflict" and "permanent peace building" is creating a vision of two opposite, not just as dialectic but and by their content, and it presuppose that they cannot, or they should not exist together in the same time, on the same place. The post conflict stage aim is to erase every aspect of the conflict (the reasons, differences, and the consequences). But does the permanent, sustainable peace building mean to forget, neglect, or suppress the factors of conflict? And further more: Can, or should the concepts of conflict and peace exist together?

The case of SFR Yugoslavia had shown that the attempt to create permanent peace, after World War two, through brotherhood and unity (bratstvo i jedinstvo) by forgetting and suppressing the conflict reasons, in times of increase political exploitation, like in 1990-ties, the "forgotten" conflict can escalate. From the other side in multicultural communities on the Balkan countries were developed mechanisms of permanent negotiating and conflict solution. The origin of semi-institutional, or non-institutional collective bodies created on local level[1] comes from the multicultural pre-national heritage of this region. The methods of conflict solution don't mean to forget, but to forgive. So, to have sustainable peace, there is no need to suppress the conflict rather to negotiate and to solve the problematic issues. On the Balkan having permanent conflict creates condition of being aware of differences in existing communities. This awareness helps to make a compromise, to create mutual respect and to create permanent and sustainable peace.

Key words: Balkan, Western Balkan, ex-Yugoslavia, nationalism, conflict, multiethnic coexistence, building substantial peace

Basic principles of coexistence: Constructive conflict solution and building sustainable peace

As we already mentioned differences between individuals, groups, nation-states and even the civilisations are fundamental, grounded in their bases, indicating for the basic principal of necessity for inter human coexistence. Fragmentation on political unites is facing both, modernity of globalization processes and traditional concepts of national sovereignty. In this type of rapid transformation world of traditional family values, used before as a base for solidarity building, as well the lack of security, produce tendency as a species toward prejudice, egocentrism, and ethnocentrism (Hammburg, 1998: 27). Every human society includes differences between *in* and *out* groups. They are easy to adopt and learn, but hard to forget. But yet always there is possibility for minimising of those tendencies. People should focus on their mutual goals on the only world, whit priority on the global problems over the local ones, ore regional ones. The civilization level of conflicts, clearly express the intention of the present, as everything else, the conflict to be generalized too. The position of the Balkans people over these civilisational dividends seems to be unclear. Even are closest to the West, they have cultural and civilization specifics, which together with the historical heritage, creates perception of this region, at least partly similar to the Islamic Orient.

---

[1] They are including local political and religious leaders, and often senior members of community

The power and relevance of the social actuality (language, ethnicity, race, religion, territory and tradition) and the new primordial sentiments for social organisation and identification, it s not constant from one place to another, from one time to another, or from one group to another (Emminghaus, Kimmel and Steward, 1998: 140). The invention of national heroes and construction of the vision of the past, are reason of cultural loaning, which in the Balkan context is radar reason for conflict then for cooperation (Karakasidou, 1997: 85, 86). Destructive usage of primordial feelings leads to confrontation, arrogance and violence between individuals and groups. The primer violence is best described as a result of balans distribution and integration of "*time produced activities*"- live protection, production and building of living in socially produce couture (Emminghaus, Kimmel and Steward, 1998: 147).

There are more factors of influence of course and time lasting of the conflict. There are factors are essential for overcoming of that conflict. The first is orientation of both sides on confrontation or clash. The mutual concern is a model of motivational orientation for taking care or self and the other. The cooperation is connected with high care of the other; adaptation with low care for self and high for the other; competitiveness, with high for self and low for the other; and the conflict, is marked with avoidances and low care for itself and for the other. There are three basic tips of motivational orientation through the conflict:

- Cooperation-sides have positive acting interests through the other and itself;
- Individualistic-sides take care for their acting, but they are not interested for the good sake of the others;

- Competitive-sides have interest to perform better than the other and as more is possible for their own good (Ibidem, 200).

Often it happens sides to intensify conflicts whit investing in them. Those ho gain power, profit, prestige, knowledge, or some skills during the conflict, may proclaim un satisfaction of it s ending. There are more significant questions on the elaboration the course and time lasting of the conflict. Those questions can be directed does the conflict is for resources, believes, values, or is caused by the nature of the relations. Some questions are more leading for conflict solution than the others. Also one of characteristics of the conflict is the tendency of growth and escalation. All this leads to conclusion that is easier to solve smaller than larger conflicts (Ibidem, 204).

The ethnocentrism, as well constructing stereotypes as relation whit the other are one of the main reason for misunderstandings and conflicts on the Balkan. For their and overcoming of inter group prejudice and discrimination, there are more different approaches, ass: intergroup contacts, information, education, workshops for sensitivity and conflict solving training and solving, leaders negotiation and cooperation procedures. For successful implementation there is significant influence and necessity for two conditions. First is cooperation approach; and the second, the third side influence, which is carrier of some authority (Ibidem, 207). When some conflicts are marginalised and forgotten, others are malign tumour of social coexistence. And for conflict status there are more factors, such as: anarchy in the society; win-louse, or competitive orientation; inner group conflicts are often expressed as inter group conflicts; cognitive rigidness, bad perception and easement; situation of game, which is out of reality and other factors (Ibidem, 207,208). In any

71

case is better to prevent, than to solve conflict.

Post conflict stage does not mean that on some strange way the conflict has disappeared. The conflict radar gain new changing shape. On this stage the attention is on building peace process, and identification of problems and dilemmas. Also, this process has its own architecture and design. Short term solutions, so called action, often are leaded by the crises, and have its equivalent in the term crises managing. This approach can be related with the conflicts in Bosnia, Kosovo and Macedonia, where there was necessity for emergency solution and mediation intervention. The preparation is evolving in more long term process of several years of realisation of stabilisation projects and solutions. And on the end there id long term process of overcoming the post conflict stage and building sustainable peace. For Leaderach, there are three key issues important for this type of paradigm: the first, suggest that the different activities related with peace building in the framework of acting demands different unites of time; the second, time units are connected, and cannot be percept as isolated; and third, its crucial the development of capacity for operational thinking, to connect short term preparation and action with the long term goals and changes (Leaderach, 1998: 238). By the organic perspective building peace and politics in post conflict stage must be seen as open, accessible system which is grounded on participation base. In this context it shouldn't continue with systematic approach of forgiving and forgetting, but the challenge is in capability of remembering and accepting the change (Ibidem, 242).

The Coexistance in the Balkan region

Starting with the theses that it's not enough the only claming for existence of differences between the individuals, groups, nation-states and even the civilisations, but those differences are fundamental and grounded in there base, implies of the need for the basic principal of interethnic coexistence. The coexistence as that, presuppose "to exist together, in the same time, on the same place"(Weiner, 1998: 14). Talking about multiethnic coexistence in the framework of the Balkan context, we should make a clear distinction on two periods: First, belongs to the history and covers the period to the mid nineteen century, and includes the two great empires (the Ottoman, and Habsburgien), in which there is no clearly expressed national conscious, and the conflicts can not be characterised like "multiethnic" in today's modern sense. In this period subjects as a identification level and identity by it self, has created good base for building positive economic, inter linguistic, inter religious and above all inter cultural relations between groups. Right here we can locate the base of coexistence which "doesn't have nether historic, no cultural roots on West" (Ibidem, 16); and The Second period which is related with the process of creation of modern nation-states. This last period creates preconditions for multiethnic conflicts in the real sense of the word. That what Weber defines as power of legitimate authorities (reed national authorities) for social forcing (Weber, 1976: 37) is used in direction for fulfilling the theories for creating moonlit race and creating homogenised states of one nation.

Interethnic conflicts have become synonym for the Balkan, marking as well the beginning and the end of twentieth century. In this period peoples of the Balkan had passed through the processes of

national building and creating national identities, crossing the communist ideology, and regaining new nationalistic weakening, mixed with implementation of democracy and the processes of globalisation as Western innovations, which are equally proportional on that which is offered by the same West in the mid nineteen century in the face of nation-state ideology. The last, in bigger or smaller measure, has created identity confusion and preconditions for creating new borders and promotion of interethnic clashes as a concept for implementation of there national goals.

The birth of nations and nationalism on the Balkan is related with the creation of stereotypes for its population developed by the rest of the world. Category attribution is focused on the aspects that ethnic attributes are always product of significant acts of the other groups. From here, the way we are acting through "the others" depends from our perception of those "others". Prejudges, as well the fear from outsiders, often are taken as subject of aggressive treatment (Scarry, 1998: 40-42). Whatever, because of its historical, political and economic power, the process of collective defining of the Balkan has privileged the West as a standard, opposite of which are defined all "The Others" (Todorova, 1997: 89).

In southeastern Europe doesn't rule the climbing that the nation has created independent state, as were the romanticist nationalists were dreaming. As a matter a fact, the leaders of new states were forced to create the nation from the peasant society and the world view of their "*non legitimate Ottoman past*" (Mazower, 2000:122). The beginning of twentieth century has promoted the great national concepts of the Balkan states. In the search by there own identity, the Balkan nations tried to define there national frameworks on ethnic based idea for the nation and with strong linguistic core (Todorova, 1997: 240). So

defined, they entered in fight for the lefts of Ottoman heritage. That what in this period leaded to the euphoria of "racial hygiene", to the end of twentieth century gets it's equivalent in the term "ethnic climbing" (Djencins, 2001: 19).

The end of the First World War has redefined the Balkan borders of Serbia, which together with Croatians and Slovenians build new triple identity, later evolved in Yugoslovenism. On the south, the new created conditions in Greece forced searching for solution for "the problem" of so called "Slav-Macedonian" minority. After the peace treaties of Sever, Nej and Lozano, under the cover of voluntary exchange of population, were conducted forced exchange between Greece, Bulgaria and Turkey. In the same time on the east corner of the Balkan, was born the concept of Ataturk for modern Turkish nation. In this light, dilated try for creation of youth-Turkish Ottoman identity based on citizenship from the beginning of twentieth century, was utopia and experiment from its start doomed of fallier. The Christian nations on the Balkan understood each other with the language of nationalism, rather there attitude versus Muslims stayed in the domen of non defined discourse between the religious communities. On the other side the Balkan Muslims couldn't adapt on national code, which in practice exclude them from the process of national integration with there linguistic Christian brothers (with exception of Albanian example), keeping their fluid conscious for long time manifested with millet-mentality as Ottoman heritage in this region (Todorova, 1997: 260,261).

Interethnic conflicts during the period of the Second World War are related with existence of marionette fascist state creations, and liberation movements. In this war, as a result of genocide conducted by the fascists, the Balkan has lost most of its Jewish population. Opposite of this, after

73

the war, under the cover of punishing the collaborationist, many Germans flied Vojvodina, and the Albanian Chami were forced to leave Greek part of Epirus. Using the civil war, Greece tried to eliminate the remains of Macedonian minority, forcing more then 25 000 Macedonian children to leave there homes.

In the 1970-ties there is a new wave of nationalism manifested with the Christianizing of Muslim Pomacs and later, in the mid 80-ties and the Turks in Bulgaria, as well and nationalistic and liberal movement in SFR Yugoslavia. The last one resulted with official recognition as new nations of Macedonians, Montenegrins and Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the three republics had gain the right to become carriers of their own sovereignty (Poulton, 1994: 39).

With the end of the Cold War period, on the Balkan were actualized three national questions, under which the last decade of twentieth century was marked with rise of collective emotions and growth of nationalisms. The first question is the Serbian, related with the space of ex SFR Yugoslavia, where the Serbian communities were used for lunching of the Great Serbian idea. The same question today is related to the political status of Serbian entity Republic of Srpska in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the status of Serbian population in the enclaves in Kosovo. We should point that the priority which has been given to this question in 1990-ies on the territory of Croatia, after the forced migration on the Serbians from Kninska Kraina, today lost from its actuality; The second question which leaded to waking of nationalism is the Albanian question, connected with the final solution of the status of Kosovo and the status of Albanians in Macedonia, together united with the radical idea of creation a Great Albania; and as third is the Macedonian question. The last one is significant by the

basic differences versus previous two in the fact that is not connected with the Great national idea of Great Macedonia, but is manifested by cultural and historical clash with Greece, connected with the differences of the name issue and the recognition of Macedonian minority in Greek Macedonia, non recognizing of Macedonian Orthodox Church by the Serbian Orthodox Church and the differences of reading the history with Bulgaria. All together, those problems are united around none recognizing Macedonian national identity as separate and independent.

The last tendencies of integration of the countries of South-East Europe in EU and NATO, had promoted the West Balkan, as imaginative region which is uniting, and on that way ghettoize previous three mentioned questions. But the transferring of the pejorative perception from the Balkan, to the term and the region of Western Balkan, doesn't offer quick solution for the existing problems and integration into European Union institutions in any near future. Right opposite, this type of isolation only increases the danger of creating new conflicts. The manifest expression of this kind of potential conflict situation is expressed by the intentions of radical nationalisms so the Balkan nations use this situation of created historical vacuum for there own interest, but on behave of there neighbors.

On the base on previous context there is Western perception for the Balkan and Adriatic's (today transferred on the Western Balkan) as "last line for control and defense against the Muslim East" (Noris, 2002: 18). From this stand of view Western Balkan as continues on the Ottoman Empire is related with the Turkish integration into European institutions. Also we can expect after closing the final status of Kosovo and finding final political solution accepted by the Security Council and International community, Serbia will

take the primate and become a leader on the Western Balkan region.

Summary:

The multiethnic coexistence on the Balkan origins from it's collared cultural and historical context. When we are talking about conflict between people who are living in this region, we should start from the present differences, which are stimulated and putted in favour and function on the Balkan nation-states. The fundament of those differences implies for the basic principles on necessity for interethnic coexistence. The constructive solution of the conflicts on the Balkans and creating preconditions for building permanent peace are bonded with the process of permanent institutional integration of the countries on Western Balkans into the European Union and NATO.

Interethnic conflicts become synonyms for the Balkan, marking the beginning and as well the end of XX century. In this period the Balkan people has passed thru out the processes of national building and creating there national identity, cross the communist over national ideology, to the last national waking mixed with implementing the democracy and globalization as western innovations. The appearance of nation and nationalisms on the Balkan is connected with the stereotypes developed by the rest of the world for its people. Because of it's historical, political and economical domination and power, the process of collective defining on the Balkan, has privileged the West as a standard, versus which are defined all "*The others*".

That what in the beginning of XX century leads to the euphoria's connected with "the racial hygiene" and "the final solution", on the end of the same century gets his synonyms in the term "ethnic climbing". In this context the Western Balkan is imagined regional creation on the West, which is uniting, the pejorative meaning of the region of the region of the Balkan, the most of it's Muslim population as remains of the Ottoman heritage, and ghettoize the three open national questions: The Serbian question-connected with the status of Serbian minorities on the territories of ex Yugoslavia; second is the Albanian question-connected with the final status of Kosovo and the status of Albanian population in Macedonia, Monte Negro and South Serbia; and the third is the Macedonian question, connected with the problem of the name with Greece, identity and history problems with Bulgaria, and the problem of status on Macedonian Orthodox church, and it's relation with Serbian Orthodox church.

The best way to solve conflict situations on the Balkan is to prevented before it starts. The most secure prevention in this moment is not isolation but integration into Euro-Atlantic associations. The ethnocentrism and building of stereotypes are the main reason for misunderstandings and conflict situations on the Balkan. The solution lays with inter group contacts, communication, education and cooperation. Post conflict period of the Western Balkans countries includes transformation on conflict stages into process of permanent peace building. The short time solution includes managing the crises. The preparation is longer term process of a few years period, in which there is realisation of projects of stabilisation. The outcome includes a long term plan for overcoming the post conflict period and creating preconditions for building substantial peace. For Weiner, the people will always raise the one most important, crucial question: *How to change for the better of our children, but not to forget the sacrifices of our parents?*

Bibliography

1. Veber, Maks. (1976). *Privreda i drustvo*, tom prvi. Beograd: Nasa kniga.
2. Deutsch, Morton. (1998). Constructive Conflict Resolution: Principles, Training, and Research. In Weiner, E. (ed.), *Interethnic Coexistence*. New York: An Abraham Fund Publication.
3. Dzenkins, Richard. (2001). *Etnicitet u novom kljucu*, Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.
4. Emminghaus, Wolf, B., Kimmel, Paul, R. and Steward, Edward, C. (1998). Primal Violence: Iluminating Culture's Darc Side. In Weiner E. (ed.), *Interethnic Coexistence*. New York: An Abraham Fund Publication.
5. Hamburg, David, A. (1998). Preventing contemporary violence. In Weiner E. (ed.), *Interethnic Coexistence*. New York: An Abraham Fund Publication.
6. Karakasidou, Anastasia. (1997). *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
7. Lederach, John, Paul. (1998). Beyond Violence: Building Sustainable Peace. In Weiner E. (ed.), *Interethnic Coexistence*. New York: An Abraham Fund Publication.
8. Mazower, Mark. (2000). *The Balkans, A Short History*. UK: Weitfwld & Nikolson.
9. Noris, Dejvid, E. (2002). *Balkanski mit, Pitanja identiteta i modernosti*. Beograd: Geopoetika.
10. Poulton, Hough. (1994). *The Balkans, Minorities and States in Conflict*. London: Minority rights publications.
11. Todorova, Maria. (1997). *Imagining the Balkans*. inc. New York: N.Y. U.S.A. Oxford Universety press.
12. Weiner Eugene. (1998). Coexistence Work: A New Profession. In Weiner E. (ed.), *Interethnic Coexistence*. New York: An Abraham Fund Publication.

77