

ON MULTI-ETHNICITY, MULTILINGUALISM AND LANGUAGE POLICY IN
THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Şirin TUFAN*

Abstract:

In this paper we focus on the multi-ethnic and multilingual reality in the Republic of Macedonia (henceforth RM). Special emphasis is given to the implementation of language policies in the RM. The RM as a multi-ethnic and multilingual state is home to Slav Macedonians, Albanians, Turks, Vlachs, Roma and many other communities. Language rights in the RM have always been regulated by law. Ohrid framework agreement (henceforth OFA), signed in 2001, is a language agreement according to which language rights are based on the majority principle where about languages other than Macedonian spoken by at least 20 per cent of the inhabitants of a municipality can also serve as official languages in local self-governments. This study elaborates on the pros and cons of the OFA and comes with possible solutions by emphasising the multiculturalism and multilingualism in RM as a basic ground and common source for integration of all the various communities in the country.

Keywords: multi-ethnicity, multilingualism, language policy, OFA, Macedonia

MAKEDONYA CUMHURİYETİ'NDE ÇOK KÜLTÜRLÜLÜK, ÇOK DİLLİLİK VE DİL
POLİTİKASI ÜZERİNE

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada Makedonya Cumhuriyeti'nin çok etnikliğe ve çok dilliliğe dayalı yapısı ele alınmaktadır. Özellikle de dil politikaları üzerinde durulmaktadır. Slav kökenli Makedonlar, Arnavutlar, Türkler, Ulahlar, Romanlar ve daha başka grupların ülkesi olan Makedonya'da, dil kullanım hakları her zaman yasayla belirlenmiştir. 2001 yılında yürürlüğe giren Ohri Dil Antlaşması bu ülkede yaşayan halkların dil haklarını çoğulculuk ilkesi üzerine belirlemiştir. Antlaşmaya göre; Makedonca'nın dışındaki dillerin, yerel öz yönetimlerin resmi dili olarak kullanılmaya hak kazanmaları için, nüfuslarının genel nüfus içindeki oranının yüzde yirminin üzerine çıkması gerekmektedir. Bu çalışmada Ohri Antlaşması'nın olumlu ve olumsuz yönleri irdelenmektedir. Çok kültürlülük ve çok dillilik kuramları bu doğrultuda incelenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çok kültürlülük, çok dillilik, dil politikası, Ohri Çerçeve Antlaşması, Makedonya Cumhuriyeti.

1. Introduction

The population of the Republic of Macedonia (henceforth RM) has always been of a multi-ethnic, multicultural and multilingual character. The ethnic and cultural diversity in this part of the Balkans has been of a pivotal importance for not only today, in fact for over centuries. It is not coincidental that the name of a salad made of many various ingredients is given after the name of this territory in many languages, such as “Macedonian salad” in English, “Salad Macedoine” in French, “Macedonia” in Italian, “Macedonia de frutas” in European Spanish etc. The usage of the word “Macedonia” as a metaphor for “mixed” in many European languages serves as an indicator for the perception of this territory as a “mixture”. Indeed, it is a mosaic of ethnicities, cultures and languages that as much as it brings diversity and ebullience, also comes with its complexities.

The name of the Republic itself has been a matter of dispute. The Greek authorities, in fact, Greece as a country, objected to the name ‘Republic of Macedonia’ which was given when RM declared itself as a sovereign and independent state on 8 September 1991, the time when it officially severed from the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in which it had been constitutionally one of the six republics. Greece’s disapproval of the name has historical reasons. Even though RM is a relatively young state, the name ‘Macedonia’ is in fact an oldest surviving name of a country in the Balkan Peninsula. Archaeological evidence shows that old European civilization flourished in Geographical Macedonia between 7000 and 3500 B.C. Geographical Macedonia was a multi-ethnic and multicultural territory located in the centre of the Southern Balkans, north of ancient Greece, east of Illyria and west of Thrace. Needless to say, the borders of today’s RM have very little sustained of the ancient Macedonian territory. Hence, it is very unlikely, to think of a possible succession with the ancient land. However, the Greek phobia is rooted in an imaginary annexation of the northern part of today’s Greece where a Slavic Macedonian community still resides. A conceivable unification of the Macedonian speaking Slav Macedonians, living mainly in the Greek cities such as Florina, Edessa and Kastoria, with those of today’s RM cannot go far beyond from just being an obsession for the Greeks. The Macedonian-Greek question is far beyond the scope of this study, however, we have just touched upon the issue, since it is only one of the many “ingredients” of complexities in this “mixture”. The aim of this study is to focus on the multi-ethnic reality of today’s RM and elaborate the present situation in the context of multiculturalism and multilingualism. The RM is home to Slav Macedonians, as the largest ethnic element, followed by the

Albanians as the second largest group, the Turks as the third largest segment and minor groups such as Roma, Serbs, Bosnians, Vlachs etc.* Peaceful co-existence of these diverse ethnic groups in such a small piece of land requires implementation of well-planned policies that would protect the rights and needs of every citizen in this society.

2. Multi-ethnicity and ethnic rights in the Republic of Macedonia

Ethnic rights in this territory have always been guaranteed by the constitution. The three constitutions, the 1963 and 1974 Constitutions of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia (henceforth SRM) as a constituent republic of SFR Yugoslavia, and the 1991 Constitution of the independent RM (effective on 20 November) regulated the position and the rights (such as language use, schooling, etc.) of the ethnic groups in the country. In accordance with the 1963 and 1974 Constitutions, SRM was defined as a nation-state of the ethnic Macedonians, as the majority and a constituent nation (official term: narod) of SFR Yugoslavia, and also a state of Albanians and Turks as its national minorities /nationalities (official terms: nacionalni malcinstva / narodnosti). The official language of SRM was Macedonian, but also Albanians and Turks had a right to use their own languages within the school system and the media. Although the ruling system was communist, religious freedom was allowed. Christians, Muslims, Catholics, Protestants, Jews and other religious communities could maintain their organizations and temples. Hence, each ethnic community could freely use its language and practice its culture and religion. Yet, Slav Macedonians were proclaimed as titular nation and the Macedonian language was the language of the state (administration, media, etc.). Albanians and Turks were declared as national minorities / nationalities of SRM, while the other ethnic groups such as Vlachs, Roma, Serbians and the others were not overtly mentioned in the Constitutions; yet, they were granted equal rights with the two major minority groups. Albanians and Turks had their daily-published (three times a week) newspapers (“Flaka e Vllaznimit” and “Birlık” respectively). Primary and high school education was in both Albanian and Turkish, however there were no universities with language of instruction in these languages, apart from language departments within the Macedonian national university teaching Turkish Language and Literature and pedagogical language departments preparing the future teachers of Albanian and Turkish. Those students who wished to pursue their university life in an Albanian university continued their education in Kosovo, where the University of Prishtina had Albanian as language of instruction. Thus, according to the SRM’s 1963 and 1974 Constitutions, Macedonia was a nation-state

BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ

*On Multi-ethnicity, Multilingualism and Language Policy in
The Republic of Macedonia*

Şirin TUFAN

Volume 8 (2) 2015, 75-89

of the Macedonian people, along with its national minorities “narodni malcinstva” / nationalities “narodnosti” the Albanians and the Turks. Albanians and Turks according to 1963 Constitution were regarded as national minorities “narodni malcinstva”, a term, later in 1974 Constitution, was replaced with a newly formed word nationalities “narodnosti”. The 1991 Constitution of the independent Republic of Macedonia, on the other hand, was a citizen constitution, putting the “citizen” in central position. Amendment IV of the new constitution goes as follows:

“The citizens of the Republic of Macedonia, the Macedonian people, as well as citizens living within its borders who are part of the Albanian people, the Turkish people, the Vlach people, the Serbian people, the Roma people, the Bosnian people and others, taking responsibility for the present and future of their fatherland, aware of and grateful to their predecessors for their sacrifice and dedication in their endeavours and struggle to create the independent and sovereign state of Macedonia.”

Thus, in the statement above we see that all the peoples living in RM are viewed as citizens. Differently from the previous constitutions where the Macedonians are a nation and Albanians and Turks are nationalities. The new constitution adds to the list also the other people living in RM (Vlach, Serbian, Roma, Bosnian etc.), an attempt that is rather complementary. However, it requires to be pointed out that the Amendment IV of 1991 Constitution was a replacement of the very first sentence used in the initial publication of the Constitution where the term ‘citizen’ was used alongside with “nation” referring to the Slav Macedonians and “nationality” referring to the Albanians, Turks, Roma, Serbians, Bosnians and Vlachs. It is still striking to see that even though the term ‘citizen’ opted to be used, yet the all three terms exist in the Constitution. Furthermore, the term “communities” instead of ‘nationalities’ was introduced, slightly different but yet contrastive. Article 48 from the 1991 Constitution with the statement “members of nationalities have a right freely to express, foster and develop their identity and national attributes” is replaced by Amendment IX where “The Republic guarantees the protection, promotion and enhancement of the historical and artistic heritage of Macedonia and all communities in Macedonia and the treasures of which it is composed, regardless of their legal status”.

From the above given statements of the 1991 Constitution (Article 48, Amendments IV and IX) it could be overtly concluded that a rather blurred usage of the term “citizen” is in question, also that, even

though it is supposedly a citizen constitution, the Slav Macedonians as an entity are still put in a titular position, and the others (Albanians, Turks, Vlachs, Serbians, Roma, Bosnians etc.) as the followers. It is inevitable to say that such a rather opaque usage of the terms ‘citizen’, ‘nation’, ‘nationality’ serves as a reflection of a blurred policy that would always lead to obscurity in the positioning of the ethnic groups in RM.

Hence, in order to have a clearer understanding of the treatment of the ethnic groups according to the new 1991 Constitution we should also have a look at the political regime that is applied and the rights given in it. According to the new Constitution, articles 1, 2:

“The Republic of Macedonia is a sovereign, independent, democratic and social state. The sovereignty of the RM is indivisible, inalienable and non-transferable. In the RM sovereignty derives from the citizens and belongs to the citizens. The citizens of RM exercise their authority through democratically elected Representatives, through referenda and through other forms of direct expression”

Hence, articles 1 and 2 from the constitution show that model of democracy is applied in RM, ruled by democratically elected Representatives. However, in a multi-ethnic state, as RM is, one of the major points in question is “Whether a proportional electoral principle of minority representation is envisaged by law?” Sadly, the model of democracy, in accordance with 1991 Constitution of RM, in principle is majoritarian, as expressed in items 1 and 2 of Amendment X that replaces article 69:

1. The Assembly can take a decision if its sitting is attended by a majority of the total number of Representatives. The Assembly makes decisions by a majority vote of the Representatives attending, but no less than one-third of the total number of representatives, save where a different type of majority is provided by the Constitution.

2. For laws that directly affect culture, use of language, education, personal documentation, and use of symbols, the representatives attending, within which there must be a majority of the votes of the Representatives attending to communities not in the majority of the population of Macedonia. Any dispute regarding the application of this provision is resolved by the Committee on Inter-Community Relations.

Thus, many elements from a consensual democracy (where the majority’s oppression over minorities is avoided) are not represented in the Macedonian model of democracy. Instead of a proportional electoral principle, a majoritarian electoral system is applied, which causes marginalisation of some smaller political parties and ethnic groups from the power.

Furthermore, “there is no element of a minority representation, which means that the representatives of the ethnic minority groups in the Assembly could always be outvoted (Tufan 1995:25).

This rather confusing picture led to dissatisfaction in the minority groups, particularly in the Albanian political league.

3. The Ohrid Framework Agreement (OFA)

In 2001 the Albanian Liberation Army (UÇK) was in an armed ethnic conflict with the Macedonian security forces, mainly dominated by ethnic Macedonians. The culmination of the conflict came when high-scale fighting occurred at the outskirts of the town Tetovo (30 km away of the capital Skopje) and in one of the biggest villages near Skopje, Aračinovo. At first, the Macedonian Government attempted to halt the rebel group through a use of force. As this was at times unsuccessful, the Macedonian state began to “shake” internally as parts of the territory were controlled by the UÇK (Bliznakovski 2013:10). A fear of spreading such a conflict to a larger interethnic battle, led to an urge of a necessary step towards the resolution of the conflict. A National Unity Government was created in which all major political forces entered*. The leaders of the ethnically divided parties, from the Macedonian (VMRO-DPMNE and SDSM) and Albanian (DPA and PDP) bloc were engaged in negotiations that resulted in a document, named the Ohrid Framework Agreement (henceforth OFA). OFA was prepared between the two largest ethnic communities in the country with an engaged mediation from the US and EU’s special envoys.

The overall aim of OFA was not only to end the interethnic conflict between the two major groups in RM, but in fact, to create a solid foundation for the Macedonian Constitution that would serve as an instrument for effective integration of the minority groups towards the development of RM as an integrated multiethnic society.

Thus, the 2001 Ohrid Framework Agreement transformed the very essence of the Macedonian State. It ended hostilities between the state and the armed groups within its Albanian community and established the basis for constitutional amendments and modifications of the legal system which transformed Macedonia from a polity conceived as a nation-state of the Macedonian people to a multi-ethnic one (Spasovska 2012:1) However, the question arises than as to what extend the multi-ethnicity is covered in accordance with the framework agreement? Does the agreement give an answer to an equally represented multi-ethnic society, in our case, more specifically multilingual management and exercise of power, or it rather preserves the rights of a bilingual context whereupon Macedonian and

Albanian are the languages of administration only. Is it rather just a promotion of the Albanian language and an attempt to outpace the viability of the other minority languages such as Turkish, Romani, Vlach, Serbian, Bosnian and the others. Hence, the use of official language/languages, position of the languages spoken in local self-governments, the use in education and public spheres, require a solid assessment.

Thus, we quote Article 7, paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 from OFA:

(1) The Macedonian language, written using its Cyrillic alphabet, is the official language throughout the Republic of Macedonia and the international relations of the RM.

(2) Any other language spoken by at least 20 per cent of the population is also an official language, written using its alphabet, as specified below.

(3) Any official personal documents of citizens speaking an official language other than Macedonian shall also be issued in that language, in addition to the Macedonian language, in accordance with the law.

Article 7, paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 lay us in fact a clear picture of the treatment of the languages spoken in RM. It is based on two fundamental criteria: demography (based on majoritarian principle) and law. Any ethnic group that creates the majority or at least 20 per cent of the population gains equal rights. Knowing the distribution of the ethnic groups throughout the Republic of Macedonia (look at footnote 1 of this study) it is inevitable to see that firstly the Macedonian, and, right after it, the Albanian population would easily outstand all the other ethnic groups in the society.

Nevertheless, ever since the passing of the constitution in 1991, the Preamble was a major point of contention for the Albanians because they demanded equal status as the second constitutive people of the Republic. Eventually they agreed on the civic concept. The Agreement laid out also includes changes to some other articles of the constitution which previously had given the Macedonian people preferential treatment. The new wording of the constitution does not use the terms ‘Macedonian people’, ‘nationalities’, and ‘minorities’, but rather speaks of ‘majority population’, ‘communities’ and ‘communities not in the majority’. The OFA met the Albanian demands with regard to establishing the official status of the Albanian language. Languages other than Macedonian, which are spoken by at least 20 per cent of the inhabitants of a municipality will, however, also serve as an official language in local self-government. In fact, only Albanian fulfils this condition. Furthermore, the government will henceforth have to provide university education for language communities, which speak another official language than Macedonian. This way the protracted ‘Albanian university’ issue, which has been a cornerstone of the

Albanian political activism in Macedonia since early 1990s, should finally be put to rest (Brunnbauer 2002:5).

The Albanian bloc demanded Albanian to be treated equally with Macedonian. In other words, both Macedonian and Albanian to be the official languages of the Republic.

After a few phases of negotiations, the Agreement along with its amendments were agreed from the both sides and released to implementation. We would also point that the whole process of negotiating and implementing the OFA went through an external monitoring and occasional intervention from the international mediators. As a result, Macedonian and Albanian today function as official languages of the Macedonian state, even though, OFA does not overtly say that Albanian is a second official language, yet it is clearly understood. Both Macedonian and Albanian are languages of the Parliament, spoken by Macedonian and Albanian politicians respectively. When abroad, politicians use their mother tongues (either Macedonian or Albanian) as an official language. As for the education, Universitet Tetovas “Tetovo University” was founded, a state university with Macedonian and Albanian as languages of instruction. There are also a few private universities that hold the education in both Macedonian and Albanian, such as Stul in Skopje and Tetovo, Ut in Skopje and Tetovo, International University of Struga in Struga etc. Thus, due to OFA the status of Albanian has ultimately raised from a position of a follower to a titular position shared with Macedonian. It is a rather notable achievement.

4. Theoretical assessment

In the so far outlook of the multi-ethnic situation in Macedonia we tried to give a vivid picture of the transitions and the transformations the Macedonian community went through with respect to the treatment of multi-ethnic, multicultural and multilingual issues in the society within the last 50 years. The discussion was held by giving reference to the laws by which changes were envisaged and employed.

However, in this part of the study we would try to discuss the essence of a multicultural and multilingual society in general and see how well RM fits in it.

Multiculturalism has been discussed in many various ways. In this paper we would take Giroux’s definition and try to base our analyses on it.

Multiculturalism doesn’t simply mean numerical plurality of different cultures, but rather a community which is creating, guaranteeing, encouraging spaces within which different communities are able to grow at their own pace. At the same time it means creating a public space in which these communities

are able to interact, enrich the existing culture and create a new consensual culture in which they recognize reflections of their own identity (Parekh, 1989:24). In the hitherto analysis we have seen that multi-ethnic and multilingual issues in the RM have been envisaged by law. Demography has been taken as a starting point, so that instead of consensual approach, majoritarian principle has always been preferred. Both the RM constitution and the OFA instead of initiating consensual culture, admittedly have recognized the plurality of cultures (ethnicity and language), but yet proposed realization of ethnic rights grounded on majority basis. At present, only Macedonian and Albanian, as they are the two largest demographic segments, are used as the languages of the Parliament, public spheres, etc. They are main languages of many municipalities, except a very few where the population is over 20%.

It is a well-known fact that RM is a multilingual society, however, attention should be drawn to the difference between multilingual state and multilingual populace. Not all multilingual societies have necessarily multilingual speakers. Multilingualism in an ideal sense of the word is considered when all regional languages are considered national (Kloss, 1966). In this respect, RM cannot be considered as ideal multilingual state, since languages such as Turkish, Roma, Serbian, Bosnian, Ulach (akin to Romanian) are not considered as national languages, furthermore, not every speaker of this society has equally distributed active and passive command of a particular language in both register and/or repertoire.

Thus, it is more likely that OFA in Kloss sense serves more as a document that envisages bilingualism as predominant, more precisely bilingualism in the government where Macedonian and Albanian are considered as national languages.

Yet, not all the speakers of Albanian have solid knowledge of Macedonian and vice versa. Therefore, by law every speaker of RM is supposed to know Macedonian, since it is taught as a second language at those schools that the languages of instruction are Albanian, Turkish, Romani, Serbian, Ulach etc. Hence, the Albanian scholars criticized this implementation and asked to equal distribution, where the Macedonian students should also learn Albanian as a second language (Xhaferri 2014:31).

It has always been difficult to classify language policies and arrange them along a continuum. The policy rarely fits the situation without problems of various sorts. There is no general language policy that can be applied to all multilingual polities, since each society creates a unique case. Furthermore, Shiffman (1996:2) states what is usually evident is the discrepancy between the stated policy (the official, de jure or the overt policy) and the policy as it actually works at the practical level (the covert, de facto or gross-roots policy)

In this respect, the language-use regime and the actions of political actors do not indicate acceptance of multilingual values over issues of language policy (Bliznakovski 2013). However, in reality the people of the country, on the contrary, in their multilingual repertoires show evidence of language convergence (Tufan 2010). Regardless of the number of speakers of each language community, either being Macedonian, Albanian, Turkish or the others, each language shows traces of multilingualism it. There are mainly Turkish borrowings in Macedonian, Macedonian and Turkish borrowings in Albanian, Macedonian and Albanian borrowings in Turkish, many words from Macedonian, Turkish and Albanian origin in Romani, as well as in Ulach, Serbian etc.

Well planned policies for a mutually respectful multicultural society in RM could only be successful if they base their grounds on the already existing sources, which are the already integrated culture of each separate ethnic community, the common grounds of each language reflected in language convergence. Anthropologically speaking RM with its various but well integrated cultures, different but still converging languages is an ideal place for multiculturalism, as long as the ideology of nationalism does not prevail in the formulation of laws, such as the constitution, implementation of language policies, such as OFA etc.

The model of the Macedonian language-use regime combines linguistic rights with both personal and territorial logic to logic to promote the use of minority languages in the public sphere. This feature is coupled with clear intention in the legal framework to keep a demarcation between the language of the titular group and all others in two important dimensions: scope of use and symbolic importance (Bliznakovski 2013). Furthermore, we would add that the framework (OFA) in fact paves a way to accentuation of only two languages (Macedonian and Albanian) congratulatory to the others (Turkish, Roma etc). Instead of envisaging multilingualism and multiculturalism, OFA lays the foundations of bilingualism only, where just Macedonian and Albanian are fundamental, while the other minority languages (Turkish, Roma etc.) are left peripheral.

Thus, OFA could be viewed under the context of promotion-oriented policies towards linguistic diversity. OFA could be characterized by changes in the regime and by redefinition of the cleavage of the two largest linguistic groups (Macedonian and Albanian) over language (Bliznakovski 2013:25).

The Macedonian Constitution of 1991 was based on a nation-state model, whereupon the ethnic-Macedonian population was the main constitutive element, and the Republic of Macedonia was defines as a 'national state of the Macedonian people'. Albanians, Turks, Vlachs, Romanies and other nationalities .

living in the Republic of Macedonia were assured to be given 'full equality as citizens and permanent co-existence with the Macedonian people' .

The OFA even though seems to protect the rights of all the languages spoken in RM, its manifestation and implementation looks more like an outstanding of two largest linguistic groups (the Macedonian and the Albanian). In this respect, language-use regime in RM, from a nation-state model, with emphasis on the language of the majority as the main language and the others as the languages along with it, turns into a two nations - state model, or linguistically speaking, a bilingual model with two focal languages (Macedonian and Albanian) and the others following. Rather than promoting multiculturalism and linguistic diversity, where in Parekh's sense all cultures and languages of a country are equal, OFA offers privileged position and rights for the two major linguistic groups. A case in which, the speakers of the two languages are in a prestigious position in comparison to the others. It is more like a nationalistic view, where an attempt is to focus on one's own language rather than a consensual approach where each language is treated equally. Bliznakovski (2013:29), also comes with the assumption that the two linguistic groups in question (the Macedonian and the Albanian) have defended nationalist attitude over language use and that this has contributed to the current 'shape' of the language-use regime.

Therefore, OFA seems to be rather an ad hoc declaration than a systematically well planned document. Since it is very difficult to come up with a language policy that can operate for every linguistic situation. It is closely related with the socio-political and linguistic culture situation of the country in which it operates. Language policy cannot be seen as a phenomenon that has an independent character, it is always developed in accordance with the authentic situation of a particular country. Since each country has different levels and types of inter-ethnic relations, multilingualism and multiculturalism, the implication of a very same policy regardless of all these differences would lead to different aftereffect. As Conversi (1997:1) says, "no country's politics exists independently of its culture". What is ostensibly the "same" policy may lead to different outcomes, depending on the situation in which it operates (Romaine 2002)

An adaptation of a particular language policy and agreement (document) to go with it, in some cases, particularly in the case of OFA is seen as a political instrument used as a prevention of a military struggle between the two most populous communities in the RM, Albanians and Macedonians. Albanian part insisted on the equal representation of Albanian, alongside with Macedonian since the Albanian population is the second most numbered in the state. Carrington's view (1997:88) on language policy as "a

political instrument to neutralize those pressing for recognition of their language by reducing the rallying power of their cause” very much identifies the idea of the OFA.

Language policy is seen roughly as “decision-making about language” and it is inextricably connected to linguistic culture, which is defined as: The sum totality of ideas, values, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices, myths, religious structures, and all the other cultural “baggage” that speakers bring to their dealings with language from their culture. Linguistic culture also is concerned with the transmission and codification of language and has bearing also on the culture’s notions of the value of literacy and the sanctity of texts. (Schiffman, 1996).

The OFA is interpreted differently by the Macedonian bloc on one hand, and the Albanian bloc on the other. The Albanian parties decipher it in the favour of the position of the Albanian language among the other languages of the country. Xhafferi (2014,30) says that OFA clearly stated that, in addition to the Macedonian language and its Cyrillic letters, the official languages are obliged to include the language of any other ethnicity that makes up more than 20% of the total population of the country. Based on this agreement, the Albanian language and its Latin letters, which is the language of 25% of the total population in the Republic of Macedonia, is an official language of the country. In my opinion, the language policy of Macedonia should regard Macedonian and Albanian equally.

No matter, which view prevails, it is obvious that minority rights are elaborated in a wider scale, but it is inevitable to say that the rights of the Albanian minority are honoured in comparison to the ones of the other minorities such as Turks, Serbs, Roma, Vlachs etc. It seems that the agreement rather than increasing the rights of the other minority languages and treating them on equal terms decreases their usage in the public sphere indeed. In the Ohrid Agreement marginalization of other minorities seems to be rather disregarded.

5. CONCLUSION

Thus far, analyses have explicitly shown that the RM as a multi-ethnic state requires a model of consensual democracy with a Constitution including such acts as minority representation and a proportional electoral principle, according to which minor national units, e.g. Turks, Roma, Vlachs, Serbs, Bosnians etc. will be adequately represented. Even though the constitution of 2001 is a citizen constitution, where the term citizen is used instead of national and ethnic group OFA goes a step backward and puts an emphasis on the ethnicity by using two criteria: demography and law. Language rights are regulated by law that is based on the majority principle according to which languages other than

Macedonian spoken by at least 20 per cent of the inhabitants of a municipality can also serve as official languages in local self-governments.

Thus, there is a limitation in terms of equal representation of language rights. In ideal terms of the citizen rights, Macedonia as a multicultural state should rather envisage multicultural political democracy in Marable's (1992:13) sense where the country is not build by and for only one or two groups, does not have only one or two languages, or only one or two religions, or only one or two philosophies. Multicultural democracy means that the leadership with a society should reflect the richness and diversity in the lives of its people.

Since cultures, languages, traditions, cuisines are so interwoven into one another. It is hard to talk of cultural purity or language purity in Macedonia. Macedonia along with its community is, in fact, an act of hermetic/hermeneutic endeavour. Every single item holds a holistic relation with every other: cooking sarma or musaka in a Macedonian household, eating ajvar in a Turkish household and having Turkish coffee in an Albanian home. Thus, Macedonia should be viewed in Parekh's sense as a multicultural society that doesn't simply mean numerical plurality of different cultures, but rather a community which is creating, guaranteeing, encouraging spaces within which different communities are able to grow at their own pace. At the same time it means creating a public space in which these communities are able to interact, enrich the existing culture and create a new consensual culture in which they recognize reflections of their own identity.

In this sense, we suggest that language policies for a mutually respectful multicultural society as Macedonia could only be successful if they are based on the existing sources, such as already integrated culture of each separate ethnic community and language convergence. Anthropologically speaking RM with its various but well integrated cultures, different but still converging languages is an ideal place for multiculturalism, as long as the ideology of nationalism does not prevail in the formulation of laws, such as the constitution, implementation of language policies, such as OFA.

Bibliography

Bliznakovski, J. 2013, Jezikovna Politika v Makedoniji - Language Policy in Macedonia, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Unpublished master thesis.

Brunnbauer, U. 2002, The Implementation of the Ohrid Agreement: Ethnic Macedonian Resentments. In Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe. Issue 1/002. CSBSC: University of Graz, Austria.

Carrington, L. 1997. "Creoles and other tongue in Caribbean development".
Journal of Pidgins and Creole Languages 8: 125-35.

Census of the Population, Housholds, Apartments, and Agricultural Enterprises in 1991. General Data on Population by Communes. Definitive Results. Statistički Pregled, 226. Skopje: Republički Zavod za Statistika, 1992.

Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia. 1963.
(www.cecl.gr/RigasNetwork/databank/REPORTS/r1/Fyrom_R1_cvetkovski.html)

Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia. 1974. Official Gazette
(www.crwflags.com/fotw/flags/yu_fy-mk.html)

Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia. 1991.
(www.constitution.org/cons/macedoni.htm)

Conversi, D. 1997. The Basques, the Catalans and Spain. London:Hurst.

Giroux. H. A., 1997. Insurgent Multiculturalism and the Promise of Pedagogy in Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader. Ed. By David Teo Goldberg. Blackwell: Oxford UK and Cambridge USA.

Kloss, H. 1996. "German - American Language Maintenance Efforts" in J. Fishman (ed.) Language Loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.

Marable, M. 1992. Black America: Multicultural Democracy. Westfield, NJ: Open Media. p.13.

Ohrid Framework Agreement, Skopje, Macedonia, 13 August 2001.
(<http://www.ucd.ie/ibis/filstore/Ohrid%20Framework%20Agreement.pdf>)

BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ

*On Multi-ethnicity, Multilingualism and Language Policy in
The Republic of Macedonia*

Şirin TUFAN

Volume 8 (2) 2015, 75-89

Bibliography

Parekh, B. & Bhadha, H. 1989. "Identities on Parade" in *Marxism Today*, June 1989, pp. 24-29.

Romaine, S. 2002. The Impact of language Policy on Endangered Languages. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, Vol.4, no.2. UNESCO.

Schiffman. H. 1996. *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. London: Routledge.

Spasovska, Lj. 2012. Report on Macedonia. EUDO Citizenship Observatory, European University Institute. San Domenico di Fiesole (FI), Italy.

Tufan, S. 1995. Self-Determination and the Viability of Macedonia as an Independent State. The University of Westminster, unpublished MA thesis. London, UK.

Tufan, S. 2010. *Language Convergence in Gostivar Turkish*. Lambert Academic Publishing: Saarbrücken, Germany.

Xhaferri, G. 2014. Language Policy and Language Learning in Macedonia. *Linguistik online* 64, 2/14. ISSN 1615-3014