

**Research Project: New and Ambiguous Nation-Building Processes
in South-Eastern Europe**

Working Paper Series

REBUILDING THE INSTITUTIONAL RUINS:
“ATTACKS”, “RESISTANCES”, AND POST SOCIALIST INSTITUTIONAL
CHANGES IN NATION BUILDING
PROCESSES IN REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Ermis Lafazanovski

http://www.oei.fu-berlin.de/nation-building/resources/wp/lafazanovski_02

The project is funded by the Volkswagen Foundation and the Austrian Science Fund (FWF).



Rebuilding the institutional ruins: “Attacks”, “resistances”, and post socialist institutional changes in nation building processes in Republic of Macedonia

Ermis Lafazanovski

Analyzing the historiography and the political continuity in Macedonia before and after 1991 Stefan Troebst wrote:

“Adequate to the further exceptionally strong interweaving of politics and historiography, It can be concluded that there exists a clear institutional and personal continuity in the scientific area. Thus, more than ten years after independence was announced, the Institute for National History still has the same name – it has not changed, for example, to the Institute for History of Macedonia. Also, the Institute for Macedonian Language “Krstev Misirkov” has not been renamed the Institute for Languages of Macedonia; or the great historiography project – the six-volume publication of the whole history, which is in the process of realization, is called in the same way as its predecessor that dates from 1969, “History of the Macedonian people”, and not “History of Macedonia”. “Macedonian people” in a legal sense is not defined as a constitutional nation, but unanimously ethno-national, thus explicitly excluding the non-Macedonian part of the population with its history”. (Troebst 2003, 20)

This quotation can be the starting point for deeper elaboration of few of the most discussed issues in the recent Macedonian history: the questions of nation and nationality, nation building processes, and politics of culture, in the context of institutional continuity and institutional change after 1991. Therefore, considering this remarks made by Troebst which are contested by the contemporary Macedonian historiography, we will try, through theoretical and empirical research, to reach not only the micro structural reasons for “attacks” and “defends” on Macedonian *national identity* but also the macro structural, political, cultural and cognitive frame, in which this arguments took place.

Taking the *concept of institutions* as a theoretical framework for researching the problem of contested national identity and national building processes in Republic of Macedonia, we will try to approach the problem from the point of view of “outsiders”, as well as from the point of view of “insiders”, which are two of the most used word in the nowadays nationalistic narratives in context of *resistance movement* connected to the defense of the national identity. But putting apart the nationalistic narratives and talking with democratic and universalistic language, the word “outsiders” is in fact metaphor for an attempt to stress the need of changes in the domain of national (nationalistic) institutions according to the multicultural and multiethnic character of the contemporary Macedonian society, despite of the “insiders” which are showing an implicit and explicit resistance and repudiation of this changes, arguing that they are dangerous interventions within Macedonian national identity.

This kind of distinction may lead to a kind of introduction in the deeper understanding of the problems which arise from the effort of implementation and institutionalization of western universalism and modernization processes among Macedonian institutions.

*

The understanding of the theoretical parameters of the concept of institutions which include the processes of institutionalization and institutional changes, is deeply connected with the understanding of the social changes in the society. This kind of interpretation, or rather model of interpretation, can bring us more closely to the understanding of the ambiguity of national building processes, in such complex societies as those from the South Eastern Europe. The ambiguity of the national building processes in some of this countries as for example Macedonia, Montenegro, and Bosnia is closely connected with a national, individual and collective crisis of identity. The *crisis of identity* is kind of new sociological term defining the societies which are going through the process of ideological, political, economical, or cultural transformation or transition. In 19th and 20th century through crisis of identity have passed almost all countries which where connected with building the nation on basis on multicultural and multicultural identities. Even America according to Huntington, nowadays is passing through a national crisis of iden-

tity which is shaped by the events from 11.09. (Huntington 2004). But despite of the American crisis of identity which is not connected whit the transformation of the politics and ideology, the transformational crisis which occur in the Balkan states are more or less connected with a struggle between the new and the old ideology. Researching the crisis of identity in changing Southeastern Europe, some of the scholars come to the conclusion that one of the most important reasons for the crises is the transitional problems which appears because of the clash between two political and ideological concepts: *communism* and *democracy*. On institutional level such crisis of identity is defined and questioned by the relations between universalism and particularism, new and old institutionalism, formal and informal institutions and so on. (Sterbling 2005).

The analysis of this relations can lead to some answers not only toward questions posses by Treobst, but also to the answers about national and nationalistic resistance to the western modernization and western model of universalism with tools of simulated changes, and continuity of informal organizations.

The starting point to this approach is the understanding that the implementation of just copied western democratic and economic models and pasted to the neo-traditionalistic state models with ethnic based social relations can not be successful institutionalized on short time base, and that there is a need for a kind of *middle scale* institutional approach which will include both the democratic western models and eastern mentality. The best way to do this and face the problems is researching the concept of formation and changes of institutions in Balkans, not only from the historical point of view as done by Sundhausen researching the institutional change made in 19th century Serbia, (Sundhausen 1994) but, also from the contemporary anthropological approach which include micro structural level of *event of transformation*, which for example can include also the event of revolutionary change of communist societies from Eastern Europe into democratic ones.

What kind of problems arise from institutional changes; what are the consequences; in what kind of relations are new institutionalism and national building processes; what happens when the existing institutions have to be replaced by the new one; how and why the old one loss their credits; which conditions and events give rise to the institutional innovations? This are just few of the questions which will be opened further

with the aim of better understanding some contemporary institutional situations in the states in transition from south Eastern Europe, underlining the specific Macedonian case.

Theoretical approach to the conceptual models: modernization, formal institutes and new institutionalism

The theoretical concept of *modernization*, which has been applied in the theoretical analyzes of the transitional processes in East Europe, is opposed to the *host* term *traditionalism* or *neo-traditionalism*, and it shows the ideological turn, through which has to pass each of the Eastern European countries. That's meant from communistic, traditionalistic, folkloristic and conservative world view, to the new western or democratic one. *Modernization* as conceptual term has been often criticized, for being synonym with the term of *westernization*. The theoretical implementation of the concept of modernization in Eastern and especially in Southeastern Europe which last from mid of 20th century, not only as an ideology but as an culture paradigm to, has shown more paradox situations which are related not only with the ideological meaning of the term but also with the semantic one. For example in textbooks of history of civilizations the term modernization is often used as a synonym for industrialization. Nowadays it is used to define the institutional changes in Eastern Europe. That means that the Eastern countries have never before been modern?

The problem appears *with* or *in* the beginning 1950s when this concept was representing an American ideology with primary goals to spread the concepts of globalizations as modernization processes in the countries of the Eastern Block (Latham 2000). But from the cultural point of view this concept has more specific philosophical, anthropological and social roots which are going deep into the cultural soul of Europe. One can find for example that the notion of modernization not only emerge from the term of *modern* as a art movement from beginning of 20th century, but it goes deeper at the beginning of creation of the modern societies. For example Weber has show that modernization is an sociological concept, and it appears as institutionalization of rationality. According to Habermas, who used Weber's rationality as a key for his philosophical conclusions of modernism and modernization: "Modernization was introduced as a technical term only in the 1950s. It is a mark of a theoretical approach that take up Weber's problem but

elaborates it with the tools of social-scientific functionalism. The concept of modernity refers to a bundle of processes that are cumulative and mutually reinforcing: to the formation of a capital and mobilization of resources; of production and increase in the productivity of labor; to the establishment of centralized political power and the formation of national identity” (Habermas 1987)

All these values are deeply rooted in the western civilization, but it is a fact that American historians and anthropologists took this concept in order to speed the ideology of American democracy. As Latham shows in the process of establishing the term of modernization as an ideology, the most powerful was sociology which has elaborated the political relevancy of this concept (Latham 2000). However the concept of modernization finds its places in the newly born East European democracies in form of bundle of institutional changes made in the sphere of political democratization of societies and in the domain of neo liberal market. But even that the official formal institutions in the new democracies accept the changes which bring the concept of modernizations of western ideology, there are still a informal traditional and neo-conservative structures and organizations that are showing a kind of *resistance* to modernizations. According to anthropologist and historians this kind of resistance is often leading to conflicts between old structures and new institutions. One can say that the conflict between modernization and traditionalism, can be viewed as a conflict between formal and informal institutions. So one of the most obvious problem which appears in the process of modernization of South Eastern European states is the implementation of western modernity to the eastern traditionalism. Placed within traditional literature on nationalism that ‘s mean implementation of “civic West” values, to the “ethnic east” tradition. This seems to be a long term project, because we are facing according to Brubaker what a “nationalizing states” in Eastern Europe which are creating nationalism (Brubaker 1996). But from historical point of view *nationalizing* is not a East European invention, and all civic western states have ethno-cultural cores (Kuzio 2001).

That’s mean that just one of the problems is the fact that the process is blocked between ethno-cultural nationalistic defense from westernization, and repudiated by the anti-western discourses (Sundhausen 2005). The other problems arise from growing nationalistic movements in countries which are already civic and western, and nationalistic

in the same time. That is for example the case of Greece who not recognized the rights of minorities.

This are only few issues which according to the implementation and rejection or repudiation of modernization in the sphere of cultural politics and nation building processes are examples of struggle between a kind of eastern particularism and western universalism. “Such countries seems to resist modernization despite successive government pledges and decades of modernization policies. They do not develop modern bureaucracies. Their peasant do not turn into citizens but remain dependent on local power holders”(Pipidi 2005, 49)

*

The resistance against modernization and definitely implementation of democratic institution in particular nation building society spheres depend also from the conflict between formal and informal institutions.

The starting point of contemporary theory about formal and informal institutions (Dauglas 1990,Offe 1996), is historical institutionalism (Tili 1983) which as an sociological science tend to give more concrete social explication about the rise of institutions and institutionalization. But putting the accent *mostly* or *only* on the formal institutions, and avoiding the meaning of informal institution, has alienated historical institutionalism for being more analytical toward formation of institutions and institutional changes. That's no mean that the contemporary institutional concept of research should keep attention only on informal organization connected for example with human psychology or cultural habits, but more, to a kind of comparative approach to institutions as a containers of objective and subjective organizations or structures, which as a consequence formed a specific social construction of reality. With the comparative approach we can discover the mechanisms according to which the implementation or repudiation of a specific (western universalism) kind of formal institutions which are connected to the issues of nation building in societies took places.

The are few characteristics of informal institutions from East Europe as being seen from the western institutionalism. First of all in domain of nation building processes those are institution connected with tradition, religion, language, and folklore. Second, they are charismatic by meaning and are totally different from the rational legitimacy of

western institutions, based on trust and social capital (Fucujama 1997). Shortly, informal organization are based on convention rather than rules (Weber 1968). On the Balkans the informal organization are very strong and they are a kind of obstacle on the path of transition.

“Informal institutions might be so strong because they work where inappropriate formal ones do not: their proliferation may be a rational compensation for the poor performance of formal institutions. Informal institutions are not necessarily hindering the transformation of society as they can coexist in parallel to formal ones; however, widespread informal or particularistic behavior, deviant from the formal, universal and legally established norms of conduct does affect the modernization and bureaucratization of society, as it subverts the rule of law.”(Pipidi, 2005, 51) One can see that the base of the East European informal institutions is the particularism or local power bearers. In such societies some individuals are more privileged than others on the informal organizational level.

We can add here that the concept of modernization, of formal and informal organization in the literature is often call *new institutionalism*

(Stenimo 2001) which is a kind of definition for the theoretical approach to the reform, transition processes, and social changes which occur in the Eastern Europe. From this point of view the new institutionalism offers the sole theoretical vision able to meaningfully capture the complexities of the transition process.

Institutional “attack”: The western institutional concepts, and the challenges to the Macedonian national identity

In the recent anthropologic, sociologic, and ethnologic literature dealing with Southeastern Europe *nation building* processes from the socialistic and post socialistic times, there is no specific *institutional concept* approach, or it occurs only the historical institutionalization of political or culture political institution. We have already indicate on the Sundhaussen's work about the institutions and institutional change in Southeastern Europe from historical point of view, which is dealing with the institutionalization in the 19th century Serbia but with conclusions which can be drown to the recent contemporary post socialistic situation.(Sundhaussen 1994). The main conclusion shows the possibility

or impossibility for implementation of western institutional models to the eastern traditional mentality and culture. "The shock therapy of institutional changes bring up a process of furtherer alienation: the shock worked but the therapy not. The changes of mentality has not kept the tempo of institutional changes. The result was a kind of

Disfunctionality of institutions. Beyond the *fasade* of outside modernity, the traditional structures, were still existing. The result was a kind of Balkan-West European syncretism of state institutions (Sundhaussen 1994, 54) Comparing this 19 century situation with contemporary one, we can easily say that we faced the same problems with attempts to change the traditional Balkan institutes in the universal western one. The result is not just *syncretism* but more, a kind of *crisis of institutions* especially when the changes are trying to be implemented in the institutions which are connected with the national character of the state.

Institutional crisis was most obvious in the era of breaking down of Yugoslavia and creation of the new states, around 90es of 20th century . The new states became independent units whit western democracies and market oriented economy. That means from one side total collapse of the old institutions and formation of new ones, based on the western universal ideology. Tat was more than state of shock not only for the institutes which constituted ex Yugoslavian economy and political systems but also for the institutes which have to promote the continuity of the nation and state. This was and is still obvious if we take the example of the Republic of Macedonia.

The process of national building, which from the point of view, of historical institutionalism, begin in Yugoslavia (1944), received an unexpected *shock* after independences of Macedonia in 1991. The transitional processes which begun in the same time with the other East European postcolonial states, has affect not only the state policy, ideology, and economics, which have to be modernized by the western democratic examples, but compromised the identity of the state, on several institutional levels: name of the state, people, nation, language and religion. From one side all of identity issues were questioned from outside nationalisms and ideologies which came from the neighboring countries. From the other side it was very hard for ethnic based nation state formed in ex Yugoslavia, to accept the multi ethnicity and multi culturality. The special case was and still is the Albanian minority claiming for their rights taken by the newly established Ma-

cedonian state after 1991. There is a huge literature about the political situation in Macedonia after 1991, especially about the problems with Greece, Bulgaria, and Serbia (Troebst 1992, 2003, Voss 2005, Danforth 1995) as well as about the conflict between Macedonians and Albanians. All these problems were and still are the basis for the further institutional crisis.

Despite these problems, one of the main reasons for *slow motion* type of institutional changes, which are taking and still take place in Macedonia, were and are the discordance between *new institutionalism* and the *post traditional* or *post conservative* institutions which are ruling the development and implementation of the western laws. One can say that despite of the changes which have been already done in the sphere of economic transformation (privatization), in the sphere of national identity questions such as state identity, national identity and collective identity, there is an additional resistance, or repudiation from the local national and nationalistic structures.

We can start searching for the reasons for such social *behavior*, in complex relations between *formal* and *informal* institutions. More, searching for the informal levels of organization, communication and structures in this case is the most relevant issue for describing the social change and the social situation. To be more precise, in the transitional societies from Southeastern Europe and especially among ex-Yu. states, there is a web of informal structures which are more powerful than the formal and they can prevent or repudiate the normal democratic development of formal ones. In such context there is a kind of virtual implementation of the democratic and universalistic patterns in contemporary institutions, while under the virtual, the unknown structures and social webs are increasing the power.

"Governments pretend to govern, and citizens pretend to follow, but, in practice, informal economies thrive, taxes are only partially collected, policies, whether good or bad, are seldom implemented and informal order balances the formal one, rendering statistics for poor instrument in describing society" (Pipidi 2005, 49).

Applying the knowledge about formal and informal institutions in discovering the mechanisms of formation, continuity and durability of national identity inside nationalis-

tic movements, and national building processes, is one of the most important task in institutional research. More than obvious is that there are strong connection not only between informal social organizations and institutions but also between formal and informal one especially when the questions of national and ethnic identity are in front place.

Back to Troebst, we can say that is not enough, claiming for the change of names and structures of institutions in terms of multi culturality and multi ethnicity, but it is very important to discover the informal reasons for such situation. For example one side of the informal repudiation of changes can be the production of knowledge made by the scientist dealing with the national identity in the socialist period which are fighting for continuity (Brunnbauer 2005) but also the production of new knowledge coming from generation of new nationalists, which build their national consciousness always as an answer to the outside cultural aggression or outside nationalism.

The institutional "resistance": folklorism, language and religion

One of the most accentuated social differentiation in societies is the division build on the principles of trust (western civic societies) or on principles of ethnic solidarity (eastern traditional societies). The first one is known as a positive social capital and arise when "a community shares a set of moral values in such a way as to create regular expectations of regular and honest behavior" (Fukuyama 1995:153). Speaking in terms of nationalistic ideology the ethnic solidarity is based on the same issues as the ethnic identity: language, religion, and territory. (Smith 1991). Many of the scholars have applied this theoretical terms when analyzing the Southeastern European societies in terms of national identity researches. We can find for example huge literature dealing whit building of national identity in Macedonia¹. From part of this literature we can see that the Macedonian

¹ Balalovska, Kristina 2004: Between 'the Balkans' and 'Europe': A Study of the Contemporary Transformation of Macedonian Identity. In: Journal of Contemporary European Studies, Vol. 12/2: 193-214. Brown, Keith 2002: Contests of Heritage and Politics of Preservation in The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. In: Lynn Meskell (ed.): Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East. London, New York: Routledge. Brown, Keith 2000: A Rising to Count On: Ilinden Between Politics and History in Post-Yugoslav Macedonia. In: Victor Roudometof (ed): The Macedonian Question: Culture, Historiography, Politics. Boulder: East European Monographs. Brunnbauer, Ulf (ed.) 2002: Umstrittene Identitäten. Ethnizität und Nationalität in Südoesteuropa. Frankfurt am Main: Lang. Danforth, Loring M. 1995: The Macedonian conflict: ethnic nationalism in a transnational world. Princenton: Princenton University Press. Danforth, Loring M. 1993: Claims to Macedonian Identity: The Macedonian Question and the Breakup of Yugoslavia. In: Anthropology Today, Vol. 9, No. 4: 3-10.

nationalism, which has developed during the 19th century as well as during the socialism period, recently after 1991 has spread also as answer to the inside multi culturality and multi ethnicity processes, has influenced a lot the nation building processes, in the informal way.

The institutionalization of the institutions connected with nationalism and with the sense of social and ethnic belonging, and formation of the institutes of *national interest* during the period of communism, was the first step in formalization of the informal relations among the people shearing the same national identity composed by religion, language and tradition.

That's why we will try further to detect the informal structures and relations which have produced not only the formalization of the national identity during Yugoslavia, but also the continuity and ambiguity of those structures after 1991 in independent Macedonia. The best way to do that it seems to be if we look at the roots of national identity structures, such as folklore, language and religion, from the perspective of the institutional concept, because institutionalization of folklore language and religion, where the most important events in the process of building and keeping the national identity.

*

It is not an anachronism, if we try today to find a connection between national building processes and ethnology, ethnography and folklore in the context of institutional change, globalization and neo liberal western ideology, knowing that this kind of relations were "popular" in communist societies. Post communist societies from South Eastern Europe have also in context of creation of independent postcolonial states, used this basic

Dimova, Rozita 2006: "Modern" Masculinities: Gender, Power and Emancipation in contemporary Macedonia. In: Nationalities Papers, 34, 3: 305-320. Pichler, Robert 2008: Die Bildung der Nation. Geschichtswissenschaft und Bildungspolitik in der Republik Makedonien (1991-2007) (in print) Roudometof, Victor 2000: Culture, Identity, and the Macedonian Question: An Introduction. In: Victor Roudometof (ed.): The Macedonian Question: Culture, Historiography, Politics. Boulder: , Schramezer Klaus 1977: Makedonien: Friedlichkeit, Maß und Vernunft mit balkanischem Charme. In: Südosteuropa 46, 661-694. Thiessen, Ilka 2007: Waiting for Macedonia: Identity in a Changing World. Toronto: Broadview Ethnographies & Case Studies. Troebst, Stefan 1992: Makedonische Antworten auf die "Makedonische Frage" 1944-1992: Nationalismus, Republikgründung, nation-building. In: Südosteuropa 41, 7-8: 423-442. Troebst, Stefan 2003: Historical politics and historical "masterpieces" in Macedonia before and after 1991. In: New Balkan politics, 6-7:15-32. Troebst, Stefan 1999: IMRO+100=FYROM? The Politics of Macedonian historiography. In: The New Macedonian Question, Basingstoke: 60-78. Troebst, Stefan 1997: Bugarsko-jugoslovenskata kontroverza za Makedonija, 1967-1982). Skopje: Institut za nacionalna istorija. Voss, Christian 2005: Makedonische Identitäten und die Parameter Sprache, Ethnos und Nation. In: Südosteuropa Mitteilungen 2: 52-66

national sciences, in context of national building processes in the similar way. So, we can also speak here about a kind of continuity of instrumentalisation of folklore, ethnology and ethnography, with national and nationalistic purposes.

From the ideological point of view it is important to look back at the time when during the Yugoslavia period, *ideology in culture*, was obvious fact (and here we should stress the ideology in the traditional culture, ethnology, folklore) and compare it with nowadays situation when the *culture as ideology*, shows a kind of epistemological turn. Bout of ideologies have the role of increasing the national building processes.

We can follow this *ideological* transformation taking as an example the traditional culture i.e. folklore.

There is a term in European folklore science which is much older than *invention of tradition* but with the same meaning: *folklorismus*. Folklorismus means fake lore or false folklore. We can learn more about this term from the 1969 issue of the German journal of folklore "Zeitschrift für Volkskunde", where use of this term in everyday life was the main topic.

We can follow few short definition of folklorismus or with folklorismus related issues: "*konstruierende und spielerische Volkstümerlay*" (Hans Moser 1964, 10); "Fakelore falsifies the raw data of folklore by invention, selection fabrication and similar refining processes. (American Folklore 1959, 4); "Fakelore" is presentation of spurious and synthetic writings under the claim that they are genuine folklore" (Dorson, 1969, 60)

Among other questions one of the leading German folklorists Herman Bausinger in the same issue have stressed the role of the academic institutes in formation of *folklorismus* (Basusinger 1969) and in the similar way Dragan Antonievik, said that in Yugoslavia all folkloristic phenomenon's were related or strong connected with some institutes: *The Institute of Ethnography at the Serbian Academy of Science in Belgrade, the Institute of folklore from Zagreb, ethnographic institute from Ljubljana and Institute of folklore from Skopje*. (Antonievic 1969). Those institutes were in one way basis for national identity strategies in domain of national culture, and following their development path we can say that in the new born countries from ex Yugoslavia they keep a kind of continuity in their tasks. From the new institutionalism and institutional changes point of view the old fashioned folklore institutes are not in the *line* whit modernization of states.

Therefore, they have to be changed not only in their structure but also in their human resources. Folklore as well as folklorismus being connected with nationalistic and ethnic based identity, can be praxis that is obstructing the modernization where the education through modern knowledge and culture is the main task. "Education can be thought through culture not through folklore" (Gelner 1983, 65). This Gelner's statement is once again improving that old fashioned folklore was a spot of ideology, but today's culture itself is ideology which as an idea we can follow toward other scholars of nationalism (Gelner 1983, Herzfeld 1987, Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983, Smith 1991). So, the new folklore movements in South Eastern Europe, as well as in Macedonia have to have another research task as for example the connecting the *folklore*, whit national building processes, which include collective and individual identity, politization, nationalism, separatism and so on. From other side *folklorismus* which is increasing his power after 1990es, should be one of the most important research topic, considering that *folklorismus* is a kind of informal institution, which have wide web of creators and consumer. Those kind of informal folklore institutions, are the reasons of growing nationalism and national consumerism, showing the deep connection between folklore and constructed or formatted identity. (Lafazanvski 2002). We can give many examples of isntrumentalization of folklore in Macedonia especially after 1991, when folklore was a word from the vocabulary of every nationalistic speech given by the politicians. We can just mentioned the widespread of the legends and stories about Alexander the Great which replace the myth of King Marco, which was most popular narrative in the time of Yugoslavia (Kaser, Halpern 1998), and their influence not only the everyday symbols of Macedonian national identity, but also the historiography and political myths in Macedonia after 1991 (Brunnbauer, 2005). Recent example is the renaming by the political authorities, of the airport Petrovec in Aleksandar the Great, which was followed with the great medium coverage.

The way in which informal folklore structures are working below formal ones is showing the next example.

In 2004 Alexandar Donski have published a book whit the title: "*The Descendants of Alexandar the Great of Macedon – the arguments and evidence that today's Macedonian are descendants of the ancient Macedonians*" whit the subtitle: *First book in English*

presenting scientific evidence about the relation between present day and ancient Macedonians.

First very interesting fact is that the promotion of this book was lead by the eminent Macedonian folklorist working whit the Institute of folklore “Marko Cepenkov” from Skopje d-r Trpko Bicevski (at that time Direktor of the institute). Second, few of the argument from this book have *folklorismus* approach to the argumentation of some folklore evidence about todays Macedonians and Alexandar: “ In one folklore song about Alexander the Great of Macedon recorded in the 19th century, mosquitoes (malaria) have clearly been identified as the reason for Alexander’s death even though it has been scientifically proven that mosquitoes carry the malaria disease in the early 20th century“²

*

The relations among formal and informal institution in national building processes in Macedonia are most obvious in the domain of language and religion. The formal institutionalization of the Macedonian orthodox religion³ and Macedonian language⁴ in the

² (www.historyofMacedonia.org/ConciseMacedonia/donski.html)

³ Right before the end of the war, in 1944, in the village of Gorno Vranovci, an Initiative Board for Organisation of the Macedonian Orthodox Church was formed. In March, 1945, in Skopje, a Resolution to restore the Archdiocese of Ohrid as Macedonian Orthodox Church was made at the First Clergy and Laity Assembly. This decision was submitted to the Holy Synod of the Serbian Orthodox Church, since before World War II several dioceses in Macedonia were under the United Orthodox Church of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians, known later as Serbian Orthodox Church. The Synod of the Serbian Orthodox Church did not accept this decision, which resulted in the following actions of the Initiative Board: instead of as an autocephalous, the Board insisted on the Church being recognised as autonomous. This request was also rejected. In 1958, the Second Clergy and Laity Assembly was held in Ohrid and the proposal for restoration of the Ohrid Archdiocese of Saint Clement as a Macedonian Orthodox Church was accepted and Dositheus was appointed the first archbishop.

The Holy Synod of the Serbian Orthodox Church agreed with the decisions of the Macedonian Clergy and Laity Assembly in the resolution AS. No 47/1959 and 6/1959, minutes 57 of June 17/4, 1959. As a sign of agreement, a Liturgy was concelebrated with the Serbian Patriarch German, on July 19, 1959, in Skopje, in the church of Saint Menas. At the same time, Clement was ordained the bishop of Prespa and Bitola. This meant that the Holy Synod of the Serbian Orthodox Church gave autonomy to the Macedonian Orthodox Church, which remained in canonical unity with the Serbian Church under their Patriarch. Few days later, in the church of St. Nicholas in Štip, H.E. Nahum was ordained the bishop of the diocese of Zletovo and Strumica. The Holy Synod of the Macedonian Orthodox Church was established together with other administrative bodies in the Archdiocese and the dioceses in conformity with the Constitution of the Macedonian Orthodox Church

⁴ The existence of an official Macedonian language was proclaimed in August 1944, when a provisional government run by the Anti -Fascist Assembly for the National Liberation of Macedonia (ASNOM) declared the Macedonian Republic. It should be noted, however, that there are some attempts on standardizing the Macedonian language prior to this date. As pointed out by Friedman, the proclamation of 1944 is a symbolic act which marks the beginning of the period in which the standard was implemented. The Macedonian language was proclaimed the official language of the Republic of Macedonia at the First Session of the Assembly for the National Liberation of Macedonia, held on August 2, 1944. The first official Macedo-

time of Yugoslavia, is continuously challenged by some anthropologist and historians. Some of them are denying the natural “evolution” of this two component of national building, saying that they are “revolutionary “product of communism and most of them are belonging to the neighbor countries historians of language and religion. More liberal scholars are considering the ethno genesis of this phenomenon (Voss 2005). However on the formal institutional point of view this two institutionalization moments, are continuing to be the key elements of further development of the Macedonian nation building processes. The most important reasons for a kind of national resistance concerning the outside aggression again Macedonian national identity are informal structures and organizations which are shaping ad reshaping the formal ones.

This web of informal organizations and structures, consist of the web of knowledge constructed not only by scholars as sociologist, anthropologist and historians working with formal institutes, but organization of peoples which have a knowledge “apart” of the institutionally accepted one. And in the relation between this two kind of informality the ambiguous identity not only of the nation, but of the culture and history appears. We can depict three types of informal relations among intellectuals dealing with national building processes.

- First there are informal relations among scholars from formal institutes which are keeping the continuity of Macedonian identity established in ex Yu as Institute of history, of folklore, old Slavic culture and Macedonian language, rejecting the multicultural changes.

- Second there is an informal organization lead by *Protocronists*. Such organizations are nationalistic *par excellence*, and they are dealing with the continuity of Macedonian culture from the antics until today, They have wary huge influence on the public opinion and with their “historic”, “linguistic” and “folkloristic” researches, among ordinary people *created* a sense of belonging to the antic history of Macedonia.

nian grammar was developed by Krume Kepeski. One of the most important contributors in the standardization of the Macedonian literary language was Blaze Koneski. The first document written in the literary standard Macedonian language is the first issue of the "Nova Makedonija" newspaper in 1944.

- Third there is also a web of informal organizations which are denying the official existence of the contemporary Macedonian language history and religion considering as being part of Bulgarian, Serbian, Greek or Albanian history.

“National character” of institutional changes

On the political level one of the first task of institutional change in Macedonia, was implementation of multi ethnic and multi cultural character of the state, which included minority issues. The most important minority issue was the Albanian minority question in Macedonia, which from the one side was a basis for creation of multiethnic constitution and from the other side from the nationalistic elites was conceived as a possible danger for the ethnic based Macedonian national character of the state Macedonia and Macedonians as a titular nation. This situation on the political level resulted with conflicts on the political and civil level. The best known is the conflict from the 2001 which from our perspective was a conflict which include the issues of modernization of national identity of the state (Oslis 2003).

In the Ohrid agreement document were incorporated more rights for the Albanians from the point of view of usage of the Albanian language and taking part in state administration. From the institutional point of view with this agreement the government has guarantee the institutional approach in expressing the Albanian culture and nationality. But the realization of institutional changes which should considered Albanians requests, and the request of modernization of institutes, are moving very slow. Few of those attempts in the previous period were failed. I will give just an example regarding the attempt for institutional changes among national institutes which as Troebs says, have excluded the non-Macedonian part of the population .

In 1993 The Government of Republic of Macedonia through his ministry Georgi Efremov, has initiated transformation of the national institutes in one big union of institutes. After a long debates this project failed because the scientific elite from the institutions (mainly directors) were perceived this act as an abolition of the national character of institutions. The reason for rejection of the initiative, was the danger of losing the *name* of institution which is equal with losing the national identity of Macedonians. This was a

kind of informal resistance to the formal suggestion for modernization of institutes with new historical moments which have to include the history, folklore and language of the minorities especially of the Albanians. With other words they insist on the preservation of the post communist continuity. As a compensation for defending the national character of institution few Albanians received posts in institutes (two in institute of folklore, one in institute of literature, one in institute of history). I have to make here just one remark that the attempts for changing the character of institution were made even in the late 80es but with other mostly “organizational purposes”, which was the formal explication.

Here we can add few remarks about inclusivity and exclusivity of scholars belonging to the minorities before and after 1991. In ex Yugoslavia the exclusion of scholars belonging to the minorities in institutions was more than obvious, especially for those which works in the domain of cultural heritage or folklore. For example there was just one institute of folklore in Yugoslavia whose character was multicultural: institute of folklore from Skopje. This institute had (and have) specific organizational structure. Among the other department there was also a Department of the Folklore of Minorities, which included one researcher of Turkish folklore, one of Valaks, one of Albanian and one of Roma folklore. The Albanian folklorist was ethnic Macedonian with knowledge of Albanian language. This micro structural situation is an example how on macro structural level Yugoslavia was rejecting nationalism by creating multinational societies within the separate republics. So the “multiculturalism” was nothing else but a way to amortized to much nationalism.

After Ohrid Framework Agreement, which means that the state institutions have to reflect the ethnic composition of the Macedonian society, there was also try to reform the institutes of national character by make a kind of unity of institutions. This attempt is now in procedure, but the changes were going again wary slow just because of the the informal institutional structures.

As a result of bad institutional changes, in the domain of institutes of Macedonian national interests, after formation of Albanian universities in West Macedonia, there is a new wave of creation of Albanian institutes in Macedonia. I will give just few examples. Recently Albanians in Macedonia argued about the fact that they are not equally included

in the Academy of science and in other institutes of Macedonian national interest and that the Macedonian governments do not make institutional changes which will include Albanians as constitutive civilians in national identity of Macedonian state. In 2007 the Institute of Albanian culture in Macedonia was open as an institute which will do cultural and historical research of Albanians in Macedonia. DPA (Democratic Party of Albanians) made a statement that the Institute of the cultural heritage of Albanians in Macedonia is only forehead of the planed academy of the Albanian arts and science in Macedonia. “The government opened this institution besides the warnings of experts that this is the official institutionalization of the parallel institutes in Macedonia.⁵ Recently there was also a dispute about the new Macedonian encyclopedia (ed. by Mi-an publishing). Albanians are not agree whit contents of this encyclopedia because as they says the historical facts about Albanians in Macedonia are false and that Albanians in Macedonia are planning to publish separate Albanian Encyclopedia with real facts about Albanians in Macedonia.⁶

This kind of institutional separation or institutional parallelism, means that again and again we are lead by the definition “separate but equal” instead of equal and together which for some politicians is the nearest way to federalization. So, what should we do if it is not to late? New institutes? New designs? The old ones whit new structures? Parallel institutes?

Conclusion

Searching for the answer toward successful institutionalization of changes in national building processes in Macedonia we can say that it seems that there are two main possibilities for reaching “the end” of endless transition process.

1. The firs one is building of new institutes which will be compatible with the western modern and universalistic concept of understanding the state nation and collective. This is not a new idea, but it is however one which have to be a part of the new turn. It is one of the sociologist, economist and other scholars idea, about the institutional changes in East Europe from the very beginning. For example we can meet one of this

⁵ Dnevnic 28.05. 2008 (www.dnevnic.com.mk)

⁶ Dnevnic 28.05. 2008 (www.dnevnic.com.mk)

ideas in Claus Offe's work about designing new institutions in East European Tradition : "Moreover, the creation of institutions, or the building of new and "better" social, political, and economic institutions is generally considered to be the central practical problem that societies confront as they emerge from their thoroughly discredited past, such as post authoritarian and, in particular, post communist societies" (Offe 1996, 199). The new institution is something which will lead to better understanding the societies and the social relations among people living in Macedonia but also will help toward creation of better open minded citizens which in context of definition of the state, nation and nationalism, will act according to European Union.

"(...) thus good citizens make good institutions, and good institutions are "good" to the extent they generate and cultivate good citizens or the "better selves" of the citizens, who at least get "used to" and "feel at home" in those institutions, develop a sense of loyalty, and come to adopt the cognitive expectations and moral intuitions from which the institutes themselves derive. The "perceptorial" or hegemonic" function that (successful) institutions perform is most importantly a negative one: they encourage the self imposition on the part of social actors, of behavioral disciplines that "curb" "opportunistic" modes of action. At the same time the institutions provide actors with socially validated standards as to what preferences and goals are licensed and can be expected to meet with approval. The presence or absence of both of these operative feedback loops – discipline and license – is the first test by which we can determine whether a given social arrangement is an institution or not." (Offe 1996, 199)

2. The second one could be, rebuilding of the old institutes to a "new" "middle structured institution". As we already see it is impossible just to take and institutional model from the West and applied it among the traditionally based institution. There are a lot of traditional based behaviors and mentality patterns which are not suitable for quick changes, and which have the central role in keeping the national character of some institution. So, the new institution have to have from one side the formal organizational structure of an well organized universalistic concept, and from the other side it have to "approve" and understand the informal institutional and social relations. This is close with Sundhaussen term "Intermediated institutions" which understand the institution not only

as being on the half way between micro and macro level on hierarchic organizational system but, it will have to have a middle function between “from up” and “from below” applied functions.

This two kind of suggestions for new institutionalism in Macedonian political economical and cultural structures, can be a good solution for further development of institutes bearers of ethic identities as well for those which are connected with collective civic identity, as part of state building processes.

Literature

1. Aligica Paul, 1999 Institutions, culture and transition process: an alternative approach to past-communist social dynamics, South East Europe Review
2. Anderson Benedict, 1991 Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, Verso, London, New York
3. Андерсон Бенедикт 1998 Замислени заедници, Култура, Скопје
4. Antonievic Dragoslav 1969 Folklorismus in Jugoslawien, in Zeitschrift für Volkskunde , p. 29 -40
5. Bausinger Herman 1969 Folklorismus in Europa, Zeitschrift für Volkskunde, p 189
6. Berger Peter, 1966, The Social construction of Reality, New York
7. Brubaker Rogers 1996, Nationalizing states in the old “New Europe” and the new, in Ethnic and Racial Studies 19(2) 411-437
 - 1996(b) Nationalism Reframed. Nationhood and the National Question, in the New Europe, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
8. Brunnbauer Ulf 2005, Ancient nationhood and the struggle for Statehood: Historiographic myths in the Republic of Macedonia in Myths and Boundaries in south-Eastern Europe, Pol Klosto (ed.) p262-297
9. Castoriadis Cornelius 1998: The Imaginary Institution of Society. (trans.:Kathleen Blamey) MIT Press, Cambridge.
10. Danforth Loring M. (1995) the Macedonian conflict: ethnic nationalism in a Transnational world. Princenton, NJ

11. Dorson M. Richard “Fakelore”, *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 1969 1
12. Elster Jon, Offe Claus, Preuss K. Ulrich (ed.) 1998 *Institutional Design in Post-communist Societies*, Cambridge University Press 199-226
13. Fukuyama Francis, 1995, *Trust. The social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. Hamish Hamilton, London
14. Fukuyama Francis, 1997, *Sudar Kultura*, Beograd
15. Gellner Ernst 1983 *Nations and nationalism*, Cornell University Press New York
16. Гелнер Ернст, 2001 *Нациите и национализмот*, Култура, Скопје
17. Godin E. Robert (ed.) (1996), *The theory of institutional design* (Cambridge University Press)
18. Habermas Jürgen 1988, *Filozofski diskurs moderne*, Zagreb
19. Huntington P. Samuel 2004: *Who are We? The Challenge to America’s National Identity* , Simon & Schuster New York
20. Tko smo mi? Izazovi americkom nacionalnom identitetu, in *Europski Glasnik*, 9, Zagreb 2004 221 -275
21. Jack Knight 1992 *Institutions and Social Conflict*, Cambridge, Cambridge, University Press
22. Kaser Karl, Joel Halpern 1998: *Historical Myth and the invention of political folklore in contemporary Serbia*. *AER*, Spring, Volume 16, Number 1
23. Kuzio Taras, 2001, “Nationalizing states” or nation-building? A critical review of the theoretical literature and empirical evidence, in *Nations and Nationalism* 7 (2) 2001, p 135-154
24. Latham E. Michael 2000 *Modernization as Ideology* North Carolina Press
25. Lafazanovski Ermis 2002 : *Antropoloski dijalozi*, Magor, Skopje
26. March, James , Olsen Johan 1984 *The new institutionalism, Organizational Factors*, in *American Political Science Review* vol. 73, p. 734-749
27. Marcus E.George, Fischer J.M. Michael, 2003 *Antropologija kao kritika culture*, Zagreb

28. Moser Hans 1964, Der Folklorismus als Forschungsproblem, de Volkskunde. In: Hessische Blätter, f. Volkskunde 55. s. 9-57
29. North C.Douglass, 1990 Institution, institutional change and economic performance, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
30. Offe Claus 1996 Designing Institutions in East European Tradition in Institutional Design in Post-communist Societies in Godin E. Robert (ed.) (1996), The theory of institutional design (Cambridge University Press
31. Oschlis Wolf 2003 Typisch Balkan? Wie in Mazedonien aus Volksgruppen Feinde wurden, Politikinformation Osteuropa Nr.113
32. Pichner Robert 2006 Die Bildung der Nation. Geschichtswissenschaft und Bildungspolitik in der Republik Makedonien)1991ß2007=, in Inklusion und Exklusion auf dem Westbalkan) 45. Internationale Hochschulewoche der SüdosteuropaßGesellschaft in Tutzing9.ß13.10.2006, Verlag Otto Sagner, p 107 129
33. Pippidi Mungiu Alina 2005 Deconstruction Balkan Particularism: The Ambiguous Social Capital of Southeastern Europe, in Southeast European and Black Sea Studies vol 5, no 1, January p. 49-68
34. Smith D.Anthony (1991) National identity
35. Sterbling Anton 2005 Aktuelle Identitätsprobleme in Südosteuropa, in Südosteuropa Mitteilungen 02, 45. Jahrgang p 7 15
 - 1993, Strukturfragen und Modernisierungsprobleme Südosteuropäische gesellschaften, Hamburg
36. Stenimo Sven, 2001, the new institutionalism, in Bary Clark and Joe Fowarker, eds., the encyclopedia of democratic Thought, London
37. Sundhaussen Holm 1994: Institutionen und institutioneller Wandel in Südosteuropa in historische Perspektive, in: Institutionene und institutioneller Wandel in Südosteuropa. Ed. bz J.C Papekas, München, 35-54
38. Südosteuropa -Mitteilungen 32 (1992), 264 -274
39. Sundhaussen, Holm 2005: Pro- und anti-westliche Diskurse und Identitäten in Südosteuropa. In: Südosteuropa-Mitteilungen, 2,45: ??.
40. Taleski Dane, 2006 Minderheiten und Merheiten in Makedonien;Sichtweisen und Auffasungen der Bevölkerung, in Inklusion und Exklusion auf dem Westbalkan Internationale Hochschulewoche der Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft in Tutying9.ß13.10.2006, Verlag Otto Sagner, p 263ß280

41. Tilly Charles 1983, Big structures, large processes, huge comparisons, University of Michigan
42. Troebst Stefan (1992): Makedonische Antworten auf die "Makedonische Frage" 1944-1992: nationalismus, Republikgründung, nation –bildung. In: Südosteuropa 41: 7-8. 423-442
 - (2003) Historical politics and historical "masterpieces" in Macedonia before and after 1991, in New Balkan politics, vol 6-7 2003, p.15-32
43. Voss Christian (2005) Makedonische Identitäten und die Parameter Sprache, Ethnos und Nation, Südosteuropa Mitteilungen, 02 , 2005 p.52-66
44. Weber Max 1968 On Charisma and Institution Building, Chicago IL, University of Chicago Press
45. Wendel R. Janine 1998 Informal relations and institutional Change How Easter European Cliques and States Mutually Respond East European Anthropology group spring, volum 16 Number 1.