ATRAVESANDO TEMPESTADES. ELITES Y CAMBIO SOCIAL EN EL ESPACIO POSTYUGOSLAVO
Número 2, julio 2017, pp. 297-318
Tiempo Devorado. Revista de Historia Actual
ISSN 2385-5452

What do we want and how do we do it?
Movement Claims and Repertoires in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia

IVAN STEFANOVSKI[1]
Ph.D. student in Political Science and Sociology, Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences Scuola Normale Superiore, Florence

RESUMEN
El presente artículo persigue abarcar el proceso de articulación de demandas y los repertorios de acción colectiva de dos movimientos sociales antigubernamentales recientes: la movilización ciudadana en Bosnia y Hercegovina, que data de principios de 2014, y el movimiento "Ciudadanos por Macedonia", que data de mediados de 2015. Lasse Lindekilde reflexiona sobre las demandas de los movimientos, describiéndolas como "la articulación consciente de las demandas políticas en la esfera pública, dejando a un lado, de este modo, formas políticas de articulación de demandas más privadas u ocultas, como el voto o el lobismo". Por otro lado, Della Porta resalta que "un repertorio de contención abarca lo que la población sabe que puede hacer cuando quieren oponerse a una decisión pública que considera injusta o amenazante". El objetivo de este análisis es arrojar luz sobre las principales razones que subyacen a las movilizaciones en Bosnia y Hercegovina y Macedonia, así como desvelar los principales mecanismos a través de los cuales las quejas de los contrincantes al gobierno fueron canalizadas hacia estos.
En relación a la metodología, aplico el análisis de las demandas políticas, enfocándome sobre todo en las demandas que provienen de los actores relacionados con los movimientos sociales. El análisis de las demandas políticas se define como un método cuantitativo que toma las demandas políticas como unidades de análisis, tomando la prensa como fuente de la parte pública visible del proceso de articulación de demandas. De acuerdo con este enfoque metodológico, los datos primarios se extraen de periódicos de ambos países: *Dnevni Avaz*, de Bosnia y Hercegovina, y *Sloboden Pechat* y *Dnevnik*, de Macedonia.

[1] Contact: ivan.stefanovski@sns.it

Palabras clave: Movimientos sociales, demandas, repertorios de contienda, Sureste de Europa, análisis de las demandas políticas.

RESUM
El present article persegueix abastar el procés d'articulació de demandes i els repertoris d'acció col·lectiva de dos moviments socials antigovernamentals recents: la mobilització ciutadana a Bòsnia i Hercegovina, que data de principis de 2014, i el moviment "Ciutadans per Macedònia", que data de mitjans de 2015. Lasse Lindekilde reflexiona sobre les demandes dels moviments, descrivint-les com "l'articulació conscient de les demandes polítiques en l'esfera pública, deixant de banda, d'aquesta manera, formes polítiques d'articulació de demandes més privades o ocultes, com el vot o el lobismo ". D'altra banda, Della Porta ressalta que "un repertori de contenció abasta el que la població sap que pot fer quan volen oposar-se a una decisió pública que considera injusta o amenaçador". L'objectiu d'aquesta anàlisi és posar de manifest les principals raons subjacents a les mobilitzacions a Bòsnia i Hercegovina i Macedònia, així com desvetllar els principals mecanismes a través dels quals les queixes dels contrincants al govern van ser canalitzades cap a aquests.
En relació a la metodologia, aplico l'anàlisi de les demandes polítiques, enfocant-sobretot en les demandes que provenen dels actors relacionats amb els moviments socials. L'anàlisi de les demandes polítiques es defineix com un mètode quantitatiu que pren les demandes polítiques com unitats d'anàlisi, prenent la premsa com a font de la part pública visible del procés d'articulació de demandes. D'acord amb aquest enfocament metodològic, les dades primàries s'extreuen de diaris d'ambdós països: Dnevni Avaz, de Bòsnia i Hercegovina, i Sloboden Pechat i Dnevnik, de Macedònia

Paraules clau: Moviments socials, demandes, repertoris de contesa, Sud-est d'Europa, Aaàlisi de les demandes polítiques.

ABSTRACT
The paper aims to cover the claims-making process and the repertoires of action in two recent anti-governmental social movements: the citizens' mobilization in Bosnia and Herzegovina (B&H) from the beginning of 2014 and the "Citizens for Macedonia" (CfM) movement in Macedonia from mid-2015. Lasse Lindekilde reflects on movement claims describing them as "the conscious articulation of political demands in the public sphere, thus leaving aside more private or hidden forms of political claims-making such as voting and lobbyism." On the other hand, Della Porta highlights that "a repertoire of contention comprises what people know they can do when they want to oppose a public decision they consider unjust or threatening." The goal of this analysis is to shed light on the main reasons lying behind the two mobilizations in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia, as well as to unveil the main mechanisms through which the central grievances of the government challengers were channeled towards the targeted governments.
Regarding the methodological approach, I apply a political claim analysis (PCA), focusing dominantly on the claims coming from the side of the social movement actors. The PCA is defined as a quantitative method which treats political claims as units of analysis, taking newspapers as sources for the publically visible part of the claims-making process. In accordance with the methodological approach, the primary data collection tool envisages daily newspapers from the two countries: *Dnevni Avaz*, from B&H, and *Sloboden Pechat* and *Dnevnik*, from Macedonia.

Key words: Social movements, Claims, Repertoires of contention, Southeast Europe, Political claim analysis

Introduction

Contentious politics is undoubtedly in expansion during this second turbulent decade of the 21st century in Southeast Europe. The most recent anti-governmental and anti-corruption mobilization in Romania, or the ongoing protests "For Common Macedonia" just continued the developing contentious spirit of the "Colorful Revolution" in Macedonia, the "Ne Da(vi)mo Beograd" (Belgrade Waterfront) urban movement in Serbia, or the mass Greek "Indignados" anti-austerity movement. If by the end of the 2010s, the citizens' protesting spirit had been dormant, the last several years had marked a challengers' awakening providing space for labeling this current period as "years of protest" in Southeast Europe. Athens, Beograd, Sofia, Bucharest, Skopje, Sarajevo, Tirana and other capitals, as well as smaller cities, towns and settlements, had their streets taken by challengers facing continuous uncertainty, economic deprivation and human rights violations primarily caused by irresponsible, and to a certain extent authoritarian ruling.

This paper aims at presenting the main claims (demands) and the modalities for channeling those claims towards their respective targets – the repertoires of contention – in two recent social movements in Southeast Europe: The winter/autumn 2014 protests in B&H and the "Citizens for Macedonia" (CfM) movement in Macedonia which was active between May and July 2015. The following part of this paper highlights the main reasons for the citizens' outbursts in the respective countries, highlighting some of the similarities and the differences of the two waves of mobilization.

The third section looks at the historical context which contributed to the incomplete democratization of the two societies, mainly because of the failure of political elites to keep pace with the democratic values mainly imposed by the international community in post-communist societies. Furthermore, the top-down democratization process, which to a large extent closed political opportunities for potential challengers, prevented a fertile soil for what della Porta calls "democratization from below".

The next part of this work is allocated to the theoretical framework and the main concepts reflecting on individual and collective claims, as well as the claims-making process. Furthermore, repertoires of contention (action) are also defined and explained, throwing a glance at contemporary definitions and explanations

regarding these collective types of actions. All theoretical concepts are explained through contemporary examples taken from the two movements under study.

The fifth section of the text focuses on the methodological approach and the data collection tool and sources. It reflects on the political claim analysis (PCA) as a methodological approach and highlights the particularities and adaptations to the method which are applied to this analysis. Furthermore, it explains the strategic choices in selection of the daily newspapers in the two respective countries, as well as the selection of articles and the coding process.

The next part of the paper highlights the results of the PCA providing information on the main types of claims, the claims-making process, and the key repertoires of contention. It also provides a basic quantitative and qualitative analysis both regarding the number, types and forms of claims put forward by the movements, as well as the types/forms of protest which have been reported by the two newspapers in the public sphere. It also delves deeper into the relation between the pre-movement and movement consistency in the claims-making process, looking for patterns of (in) consistency.

Lastly, the final part of the text summarizes the main findings of the analysis, and underpins some central points which the paper tries to communicate to the wider readership.

The Main Reasons behind the Mobilization

The main reasons behind the initiation of the two movements lie in different realms. The economic deprivation and widespread social injustice, caused dominantly by the criminal and unjust privatization of the largest factories in B&H, was the central tinder which inflamed the B&H protests[2], while the creation of the "Citizens for Macedonia" (CfM) was a joint response by civil society and political party representatives to the "captured stated"[3] introduced by the government of former PM Nikola Gruevski, whose autocratic ruling introduced a hybrid regime[4]. The eruption of citizen dissatisfaction was reached after the release of the so called "political bombs", a series of wiretapped conversations aired on more than 30 press conferences by the largest party in opposition – the Social Demo-

[2] See Mujkić, A. (2016)
[3] See definitions and explanations for "captured state", particularly from an economic perspective in Wedel, J. R. (2003)
[4] Freedom House (2016)

cratic Union of Macedonia (SDSM)[5]. This caused mass influx of citizens in the streets, later channeled and coordinated by the CfM movement[6].

On the other hand, apart from the apparent differences, points of similarities were also present. These similarities derive mainly from several contextual factors, taking into consideration the level of democracy, the political culture, as well as the actions by the main "usual suspects" in the political system, such as the state institutions, the political parties, the media and the trade unions. Looking for the linkage between the movement in B&H and other mobilizations which took part in the region of Southeast Europe in recent years, professor Mujkic highlighted the struggle against "...the system that produces laws and political structures that maintain their hegemonic privileges and hierarchy topped by the class of political entrepreneurs..."[7]. Building on Mujkic's argument, I would like to add another important factor to be considered as a thread of commonality between the movements – the high level of corruption by the B&H and the Macedonian governments which have been targeted by the movements. Both B&H[8] and Macedonia[9] have been struggling with corruption practices which rank the two countries among the unpopular leaders in the region.

The Historical Context as a Background Factor

Both countries are characterized with elements of shallow democracies which Ronald Meighan defines as "limited power sharing and restricted participation in decision-making", which allows a very small space for participation by actors rather than those in power. The structures in power can arbitrarily limit or withdraw the power previously being allocated to different agents at any time10. Although the formal process of democratization began during the late 80s and early 90s of the previous century, the results have been far from remarkable. Danijela Dolenec talks about the inability of Balkan countries to reach the threshold of consolidation measured by Freedom House11, while Ivan Krastev noted that trust in democratic institutions is dramatically low, parliaments usually have an ap-

[5] See transcripts of the revealed wiretappings in: Social Democratic Union of Macedonia (2015)

[6] See more in Stefanovski, I. (2016): pp. 43-52

[7] Mujkic, A. (2016)

[8] Transparency International and Open Society Fund Bosnia & Herzegovina (2013).

[9] Transparency International (2016).

[10] Meighan, R. (2001).

[11] Dolenec, D. (2016): p. 125

proval rating which is below 20%, and citizens show strong anti-party sentiments and have almost no trust in the politicians[12].

In order to delve deeper into the genesis of these shortcomings, we need to throw a glance at the history of the two countries and understand better the transformation of the elites, but also the post-conflict state of both societies, especially the B&H one.

Macedonia gained its independence in very perilous conditions, having the possibilities of an armed conflict hanging over its head as a Damocles Sword. At the beginning of 1989, the process of dissolution of Yugoslavia was already reaching its tide, clearly differentiating two factions within its presidency. The first faction followed the lines of former Yugoslav president Slobodan Milošević advocating for retaining the current borders of Yugoslavia and endurance of the National League of Communists (SKJ) with a dominant Serbian influence, while the other faction advocated for dissolution and independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia and Slovenia. These entrenched differences led towards the Slovenian delegation leaving the last congress of the SKJ, gaining support from significant pro-democratic groups from the B&H, Croat and Macedonian delegations13. The federal national party within its original form and structure entered the textbooks of history.

On the eve of the first multi-party elections, the Macedonian political landscape faced both an ethnic and an ideological cleavage. The latter was mainly following two strands – one more pro-nationalist, while the other favoring the communist tradition. The nationalist winds were blowing in the backs of MAAK party (Movement for Pan-Macedonian Action) founded in February 1990 by nationally-oriented intellectuals, and the VMRO-DPMNE (Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization – Democratic Party for Macedonian National Unity) founded in June 1990 by prominent Macedonian dissidents14. The direct descendants of the SKJ – SKM-PDP (League of Communists of Macedonia – Party for Democratic Transition), also referred to as the "reformed communists", although advocating for independent Macedonia, "ran on a platform that sought recognition for Macedonian sovereignty in some type of 'Yugoslav framework'"15. The first registered

---

[12] Krastev, I. (2002): pp. 39-40

[13] See Marlise Simons, "Upheaval in the East: Yugoslavia; Yugoslavia on the Brink," *The New York Times,* January 24, 1990, http://www.nytimes.com/1990/01/24/world/upheaval-in-the-east-yugoslavia-yugoslavia-on-the-brink.html [1.7.2017].

[14] Daskalovski, Z. (1999): pp. 34-5

[15] Ibid: p. 35

party of the ethnic Albanian minority which raised countrywide support was the PDP (Part for Democratic Prosperity in Macedonia).

The first multi-party elections took part in November 1990, following a two-round majoritarian electoral model. The first round was held on 11 November, while the outcome was decided two weeks later on 25 November. The results were foreshadowing a deadlock. The winning party, VMRO-DPMNE, obtained 38 seats, followed by SKM-PDP with 31 seats and PDP with 17. The remaining 34 seats were distributed between ten other smaller parties, coalitions and independent candidates16. In the 120-member single chamber legislature named Sobranie, no political party or coalition could form a majority.

The final democratic pillar of Macedonia's independence was set with the proclamation of the Macedonian Constitution, adopted on 17 November 1991. This cornerstone of Macedonia's legal system laid the fundament for the future legal development of the country. The Constitution promoted separation of powers and checks and balances as fundamental principles, conversely to the previously defined fusion of powers enshrined in the previous system of ruling, concentrating authority in the Assembly of the socialist republic. Still, the debate and the atmosphere preceding the voting showed a clear difference in the conceptualization regarding the design and the scope of the Constitution, especially in regards to interethnic issues. A clear cleavage between the Macedonian and the Albanian representatives in the Assembly was created. The ethnic Albanian MPs supported the argument that the new Constitution must include consensual decision-making regarding questions which are of vital interest for the minorities living in Macedonia[17] "We did not invent consensus. It is used in many European countries and its point is not to block the work of the Assembly, but on the contrary, less quarrels in the Assembly. Our intention is to improve the inter-ethnic relations in Macedonia and we will continuously work to achieve that, but I am afraid that some processes in Macedonia are sucking us into waters that conceptualize Macedonian democracy as national", argued one of the ethnic Albanian MPs[18]. On the other hand, the dominantly Macedonian bloc constituting the parliamentary majority defied the consensus proposal arguing that ethnic consensus threatens the civil concept of the Constitution and leads towards federalization of Macedonia, adding that the Council of Interethnic Relations, taking into consideration the equal representation, serves as a corrective to the majoritarian decision-making

[16] Szajkowski, B. (1999): pp. 78-9; also see the full list of elected MPs (in Macedonian) in the report produced by the Election Commission of the Republic (1991)

[17] Шкариќ, С., & Силјановска-Давкова, Г. (2007): p. 226

[18] *Nova Makedonija*, November 18, 1991: p. 2

in the Assembly[19]. The fragile interethnic relations reappear throughout the years. They have been one of the obstacles of the democratization process since the independence, via the interethnic conflict and the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement (OFA) in 2001, continuing even today[20].

During the events noted previously, while reflecting on the first steps towards the Macedonian independence, in a temporal context – the beginning of 1990s, structures within the Serbian leadership agreed that war in B&H and Croatia is the only possible solution. On the other hand, the gradual dissolution of the SKJ catalyzed the process of creation of SDA – Party for Democratic Action, fulfilling the old dream of Alija Izetbegović – the prospective first President of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina – for creating an Islamic religious and national party in Bosnia. Although the new party was supposed to avoid religious or ethnic labeling in order to abide to state laws, many sources reported that the founders did not hide the evidently Muslim orientation of the new political actor on the scene. During the founding convention which was held on 26 May 1990 in Sarajevo, many renowned Islamic Community high officials were present21 (Perica 2002, p. 87). Consequently, this led towards the creation of the Serbian Democratic Party in Bosnia and Herzegovina (SDS) founded and chaired by the future President of Republika Srpska – Radovan Karadžić and the Croatian Democratic Union in Bosnia and Herzegovina (HDZ).

B&H held its first and only free multi-party elections before the signing and effectuation of the Dayton Peace Agreement on 18 November 1990. A second round of voting for the House of the Peoples took place on 2 December. These elections have largely been labeled as "demonstrating the failure of democracy", mainly due to the success of the newly founded nationalist parties, sidelining the cross-Yugoslav liberal-reform and reform-communist parties[22]. Out of the 240 seats in the two houses of parliament, 87 seats (33.8%) were won by SDA, 71 seats (29.6%) went to SDS, while 44 seats (18.3%) were acquired by HDZ. This result promoted the nationalist part of the electoral competitors coming out as absolute winners. On the other hand, The Alliance of Reformist Forces of Yugoslavia, led by reformist-liberal Federal Prime Minister Ante Marković, won 13 seats

---

19 Шкарић, С., & Силјановска-Давкова, Г. (2007): p. 226

20 For example, the last early parliamentary elections, held on 11 December 2016, included numerous examples of nationalist and inflammatory language coming both from political parties with dominant Macedonian and Albanian membership. See: International Election Observation Mission (2016): p. 8

21 Perica, V. (2002): p. 87

22 Chandler, D. (2000): p. 29

(5.4%), while the League of Communists gained 18 seats (less than 8%)[23]. The once pride multi-ethnic and multi-confessional cradle within the Yugoslav federation has opted for a path of nationalism, rather than the Brotherhood and Unity.

A rapid series of unfortunate events sank B&H society into further ethnic divisions, instability and fear leading towards massive terror. The news digest agency Vreme reported on the existence of the "RAM plan"[24] which was revealed at a Federal Government session on 19 September 1991 by PM Ante Marković. This plan argued redefinition of the borders of Yugoslavia in order for all Serbs to live in one country[25]. Marković referred to a leaked conversation by Slobodan Milošević and Radovan Karadžić speaking about preparations to arm paramilitary groups. In a speech in 2007 at the seventh biennial meeting of the International Association of Genocide Scholars, journalist Florence Hartmann – a correspondent for Le Monde in the Balkans and later a spokesperson at the ICTY – quoted Radovan Karadžić telling Momčilo Mandić on 13 October 1991: "In just a couple of days, Sarajevo will be gone and there will be five hundred thousand dead, in one month Muslims will be annihilated in Bosnia and Herzegovina"[26]. As time passed by it was becoming clearer that the worst cannot be avoided.

On the afternoon of 1 March, an incident happened in the center of Sarajevo, when during a Serbian wedding, the groom's father Nikola Gardović was shot and killed by an ethnic Bosniak criminal Ramiz Delalić. Although the war officially started in April 1992, many Serbs consider Gardović to be the first victim of the civil war[27]. The late Swiss journalist and publicist Viktor Meier witnessed the unfortunate event:

"I was waiting for the streetcar in the old Muslim quarter, so that I could return to my hotel. On a parking lot across the street, a wedding party arrived, bearing a Serbian flag, as was customary in weddings. Suddenly there was a double explosion. At first, it seemed to be a detonator, but then I saw people in a frenzy; I heard cries and saw someone run to the nearest telephone and saw the terrified

---

[23] Cohen, S. (1995): p. 146

[24] *Ram* in Serbo-Croatian means *frame*.

[25] *Vreme* News digest, available at: http://www2.scc.rutgers.edu/serbiandigest/ [1.7.2017]

[26] See the full speech in Hartmann (2007).

[27] "Годишњица убиства српског свата на Башчаршији", *Glas Srpske*, March 1, 2009, http://www.glassrpske.com/novosti/vijesti_dana/Godisnjica-ubistva-srpskog-svata-na-Bascarsiji/18496.html [1.7.2017]. Available in English: "Notorious Bosnian Muslim Warlord Shot Dead", Novinite, June, 29, 2007, http://www.novinite.com/view_news.php?id=82439 [1.7.2017].

faces of passers-by. Someone—as it later turned out, a criminal of Muslim nationality— had shot at this group and had killed a man."[28]

Theoretical Framework

Defining and Contextualizing Claims-Making within the Scholarship of Social Movements

One of the most general and comprehensible definitions of claims-making is the one provided by Ruud Koopmans who refers to claims-making (or simply claim) as "a unit of strategic action in the public sphere"[29]. This definition encompasses any form of physical or verbal action which can range from a statement in the media to a rally in a large square. In its most basic form, the instance of claims-making must include at least two actors: a subject (the claimant) and an object (the addressee), linked by some type of verbal or physical action[30]. Koopmans for example, suggests a much more complex structure of the claim, braking it down to seven elements: location of the claim in time and space; claimant; form of the claim; addressee of the claim; substantive issue of the claim; object actor of the claim and justification of the claim[31]. This is the type of claim analysis which we use in this work, and it is elaborated in details in the following rows.

Contextualizing the claims-making process in the spheres of social movements and contentious politics, we once again turn to the work of Lindekilde who describes it as "the conscious articulation of political demands in the public sphere, thus leaving aside more private or hidden forms of political claims-making such as voting and lobbyism"[32].

When social movements as type of collective action are under study, it is useful to provide a categorization of collective claims. Charles Tilly and Sidney Tarrow categorize collective claims making under three categories: identity, standing and program[33]. The identity claims point towards the existence of an actor, which can either exist before the constituting of the collective claim, or can be constituted purposely for that particular claims-making[34]. For example, the workers or-

---

[28] Meier, V. (1999): p. 204
[29] Koopmans (2002): p. 2
[30] Lindekilde (2013): p. 201
[31] Koopmans (2002): p. 2
[32] Lindekilde (2013)
[33] Tilly and Tarrow (2015): p. 110
[34] Ibid: p. 110. A more thorough reflection on actor constitution is provided by McAdam, Tilly and Tarrow (2001): pp. 315-321

ganized in specific trade unions during the movement in B&H existed even before the movement activities took place, but the CfM platform in the Macedonian case, was created with a specific goal to target the government regarding particular burning issues connected to violation of human rights and mass corruption. The standing claims highlight that the actor falls under a specific category, and consequently, he deserves the respect and the rights that this category is entitled to[35]. Drawing once again from the movements which are under study, the protestors in B&H claimed to be the deprived, disadvantaged and exploited, drawing a clear line between "them" and the privileged politicians, politics-related businessmen and the administrative apparatus. Lastly, the program claims "call for their objects [addressees, I.S.] to act in a certain way"[36]. The CfM continuously and consistently called for the resignation of PM Nikola Gruevski and the Macedonian Government. Resignation claims were also very dominant in the B&H case, as it is shown later.

Linking Claims-Making to Repertoires of Action (Contention)

The political claims-making is tightly linked to the repertoires of contention (action) as the ways (forms) in which the claims are channeled towards their targets. A very vivid definition is provided by Donatella della Porta who highlights that "a repertoire of contention comprises what people know they can do when they want to oppose a public decision they consider unjust or threatening"[37]. Furthermore, Tilly and Tarrow point to the limits speaking of "repertoires of contention – limited arrays of known, feasible ways to make collective claims – that also limit possible forms of contention in any regime"[38].

When speaking about contentious politics, which implies the triad of contention, politics and collective action[39], Tilly and Tarrow distinguish between three historically embedded characters: *Contentious performances*, defined as "relatively familiar and standardized ways in which one set of political actors makes collective claims on some other set of political actors."[40] In the two movements which we turn to, we can easily locate several groups of political actors, with one of the "sides" always being the respective government in the two countries. In the B&H case, we encounter laid-off workers, unsatisfied war veterans, and youth depri-

[35] Ibid: pp. 110-11
[36] Ibid: p. 111
[37] Della Porta (2013): "Repertoires of Contention."
[38] Tilly and Tarrow (2015): p. 231
[39] (Ibid) p. 10
[40] (Ibid) p. 14

ved from their future targeting both the federal and the numerous cantonal governments, while in the latter, the Macedonian case, we easily detect numerous NGOs, but also political parties, which jointly make claims on the government. In both cases, as we will see below, the political actors use relatively familiar and standardized ways of collective claims-making. *Contentious repertoires* are "array of performances that are currently known and available within some set of political actors."[41] In our two cases we are dealing with a rather standardized repertoire of marches, rallies, citizens' assemblies and debates. In other words, the repertoires of contention in the two cases are characterized by modular quality – they are being used by a variety of actors for achieving a variety of objectives.[42] Lastly, *contentious campaigns* are mixtures of performances "focus[ing] on a particular policy and usually dissemble when that policy is implemented or overturned."[43] Both in B&H and Macedonia we cannot speak about organized and tightly driven policy campaigns. The two citizens' outbursts, although in the Macedonian case reasonably organized, had numerous grievances and policy goals which at times were difficult to grasp.

The central idea of this paper is to detect the central and most visible grievances through the claims-making process of the two movements under study in B&H and Macedonia, to reflect on the most noticeable claims and the entire claims-making process, as well as to highlight the most visible and remarkable repertoires of contention and locate them within the theoretical concepts elaborated previously. Before moving to the analysis, we will shortly highlight the methodological approach and the data collection process.

Data Collection Tools and Methodology

In order to perform the PCA, we relied on daily quality newspapers per. The strategic choice in the selection of newspapers was a combination of insights and suggestions received by movement activists and key informants; the reporting position of the newspapers vis-à-vis the movements and their activities; the ideological position of the editorial policy in terms of the left/center/right scale; the popularity and the circulation of the newspapers, as well as the availability of the data. In the case of the B&H protests, I coded articles from *Dnevni Avaz*, while in the Macedonian case, I opted for *Sloboden Pechat* and *Dnevnik* daily newspapers. *Dnevni Avaz* was pointed out by several activists and key informants as the newspapers that reported the most during the movement activities. Regarding the

[41] Ibid.
[42] Della Porta (2013): "Repertoires of Contention."
[43] Almeida, P. (2014): p. 4

Macedonian newspaper scene, I opted for the most circulated and most read quality newspapers in the country. *Sloboden Pechat* is the largest newspaper with pro-movement and pro-opposition orientation, while *Denvnik* is a widely distributed pro-governmental daily, at times very reserved towards the movement activities, while at times reporting highly critical claims towards the movement.

Applying the previously mentioned approach to PCA developed by Koopmans, I coded all articles which contained political claims somehow connected to the social movements or the social movement actors, i.e. each political claim where movement actors and issues appeared either as claimants, addressees, or objects of particular claims. I followed a rule that each journalistic text can be used for extrapolating multiple claims (if and where applicable), while columns and editorials by journalists, experts, politicians and other actors dealing with movement-related issues were coded as one "master" claim (frame) after reading the entire text of the column and highlighting the central message of the author. Each coded claim represents a separate unit of analysis.

The Political Claim Analysis

Claims-making

Before turning towards some quantitative and qualitative results deriving from the PCA, it is worth mentioning that the central demands of the CfM were clearly stated even before the beginning of the protest activities initiated with the large protest held in front of the building of the Macedonian government. In a declaration proclaimed previously by the platform, which was officially named "Coalition for Reintroducing the Citizens' Dignity and Protection of the Constitution of The Republic of Macedonia", the challengers asked for the resignation of the government, which should "leave and free the country from captivity"[44] as a crucial and central demand. Furthermore, the challengers advocated for general limitation ("checks and balances") of the powers of every prospective government and for the necessity of providing conditions, incentive and support for active, vocal and critical citizens. The resignation of the VMRO-DPMNE led government, according to the activists, was supposed to be followed by a prompt creation of a caretaker government stabilizing Macedonian society by taking several inevitable steps: cleansing of the voter registry; freeing the public broadcasting service (PBS) – Macedonian Radio and Television (MRT) – from governmental control; appointment of an independent public prosecutor; as well as to facilitate the organizati-

[44] See the official website of Citizens for Macedonia: http://17maj.gragjanite.mk/ (in Macedonian).

on and administration of entirely free and democratic elections which will reflect the realistic political will of the citizens in Macedonia[45]. Apart from the dominant anti-governmental frame, we can also locate the framing of media freedom, the rule of law and the guaranties for minimum democratic standards of the Macedonian society. This basic frame analysis enables the uncovering of the meaning which is a triggering reason behind any conflict, which furthermore "enables us to attribute to events and behaviors, of individuals or groups, a meaning which facilitates the activation of mobilization"[46]. These initially structured demands were absent in the case of the B&H movement. Only after the outburst of the violent protests in Tuzla, which immediately invoked solidarity in Sarajevo and became viral throughout the territory of FB&H, the challengers managed to draft a basic list of demands. Furthermore, the main claims varied from canton to canton, even from municipality to municipality, mainly due to the insufficient coordination between the multiple groups spread throughout the country. What was present for years before the February 2014 events, were the demands by the workers of "Dita" and other factories in Tuzla which came down to several socio-economic demands like restarting the factories and payment of the overdue salaries and benefits cluttering for years[47].

As noted previously, out of the entire corpus of claims we are focusing on those coming from the side of the social movement actors. In the case of the CfM movement, following the above-mentioned methodological approach, we coded a total number of 151 political claims. More than one third of the total number of claims (54/151) were made by movement activists. Regarding the types of claims, 17 (17/54) claims were classified as generally anti-governmental, covering multiple issues which aimed towards depicting the government as autocratic, irresponsible and deaf in regards to the citizens' demands. What is intriguing is that from the initial position where the government was the main target, as the protest activities advanced, the main addressee or object became former PM Gruevski himself, targeted through 10 claims (10/54). This points towards a clear change in strategy, or the possibility to "benefit from narrow framing strategies that formulate focused and detailed constructions of the problem at hand"[48].

What remained as a central demand during the entire existence of the movement was the sentiment for resignation. The largest number of claims put forward by movement activists as claimants (14/54) had the "resignation" as a main narrative. In many cases this demand was addressed either towards Gruevski directly,

---

[45] See the full text of the Declaration (in Macedonian) at: http://okno.mk/node/47515.

[46] Della Porta and Diani (2006): p. 74

[47] Arsenijevic (2014): pp. 11-27

[48] McCammon (2013)

or to the government more generally. The diagnosis of the problem[49], to a large extent, remained unchanged. On the other hand, the absence of more direct objectifying of the Special Prosecutor Office (SPO) or the claim for justice is remarkable. What was, as mentioned earlier, one of the central claims in the declaration before the protests, and what was regarded as one of the crucial outcomes deriving from the movement, was directly addressed as an issue on 2 occasions, while on the other hand, as a plea for justice and rule of law in additional 10 cases. The absence of a stronger, more intensive direct linkage between one of the central outcomes of the movement (the creation and functioning of the SPO) and the claims-making process, points to the directions that there are other important factors which played a pivotal role in the process and they are yet to be discovered. The activists' shout for improving human rights and freedoms was detected in 7 claims, which also shows the importance of these grievances. Moving back to the categorization by Tilly and Tarrow, a prevalence of program claims[50] can be noticed, aiming towards precise actions and policy enaction by the main target – the Macedonian government.

In the case of the B&H mobilization, we coded a total number of 212 claims. As in the Macedonian case, slightly more than one third of the total number of claims were put forward by the movement actors (83/212)[51]. Within this corpus of claims, unlike the Macedonian movement where the claims are dominantly mono-issue driven, the B&H case foresees a lot of overlapping in individual claims-making processes. For example, during one rally in Maglaj, the protester Amra Agic read all the demands of the local citizens targeting the local authorities: "Change of government and inclusion of non-partisan citizens; A life-long ban for political participation of citizens (primarily former and current public officials) prosecuted for financial crimes, bribery and corruption; Revision of the privatization process; Sanctioning the subjects responsible for the criminal privatization"[52]. In this particular example of a claim-making activity, the claimant touches upon general anti-governmental issues, corruption, local government resignation, rule of law issues, as well as economic deprivation arguments. This is why all these issues had to be coded. In this sense, 36/83 claims contained niches of general anti-governmental issues. Corruption was an issue which was addressed in only 10 claims (10/83), which was relatively unexpectedly low, taking into consideration

[49] Della Porta and Diani (2006): p. 75

[50] Tilly and Tarrow (2015): p. 111

[51] We should note that the coding of the claims for B&H is still "work in progress", and that the number of claims, as well as the ratio regarding the main parameters (type of claimant, type of claim, addressee, object of the claim) will most likely change

[52] *Dnevni Avaz* (09.02.2014), newspaper article: "In Maglaj They Asked for Abolishment of the Cantons", p. 8

the yearly-long protests in Tuzla where corruption was one of the main reason for the gradual destruction of the factories[53]. On the other hand, almost half of the claims put forward by the movement actors in B&H (39/83) contained demands for resignation, which is one of the greatest similarities to the CfM movement. This points towards the common anti-governmental sentiment of the two movements under analysis. The only crucial difference between the numerous resignations claims are the addressees/objects in the two cases. While the Macedonian case presents the central government and its front-runner (former PM Gruevski) as main targets, in the latter case the calls for resignations were addressed at numerous actors from the FB&H government to mayors of municipalities. Another unexpected finding is the relatively low number of claims related to the unbearable economic situation in the state, followed with a social deprivation of the citizens (14/83). Here we encounter a lack of consistency between the initial reasons for mobilization and the claims-making during the movement activities. We should once again stress the prevalence of program claims asking for concrete actions by the B&H authorities.

Repertoires of Contention

Della Porta and Diani stress the importance of protests as an overarching concept which covers non- routinized contentious activities. Building on examples taken from the 1999 WTO protests in Seattle where protesters used blockades, formed human chains, danced, organized concerts and masked themselves, they define all mentioned activities as "non-routinized ways of affecting political, social, and cultural processes"[54]. As John Wilson defines the challengers' activities, "social movements employ methods of persuasion and coercion which are, more often than not, novel, unorthodox, dramatic, and of questionable legitimacy"[55]. Furthermore, Taylor and van Dyke define protests as "sites of contestation in which bodies, symbols, identities, practices, and discourses are used to pursue or prevent changes in institutionalized power relations"[56]. The effectuation of the claims-making process was more variant in Macedonia, but increasingly more disruptive and intense in B&H. Before we continue with the analysis, we must point out one of the crucial differences between the cases, from a political process approach.

What differs in the two cases is the political opportunity structure (POS), contextually understood as interaction between the movements and the political institutions,

---

[53] Top Ten Privatization Plunders in Bosnia and Herzegovina: A Root Cause of the Rebellion, http://www.europe-solidaire.org/spip.php?article31614

[54] Della Porta Diani (2006): p. 165

[55] Wilson (1973): p. 227

[56] Taylor and Van Dyke (2004): p. 268

which frequently affects the form and intensity of mobilizations, but also the probabilities of success of the movements[57]. In the two particular cases, one of the elements of the POS, the structure and the power of the central executive, largely differ. While the Republic of Macedonia is a unitary state characterized with a strong central government[58], B&H follows a complex institutional design deriving from the Dayton Peace Accords[59]. The country is comprised of two entities – Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FB&H) and Republika Srpska (RS) – and a jointly governed District of Brchko (DB). Furthermore, FB&H is divided into 10 cantons with their respective cantonal governments. The main assumption (hypothesis) which is promoted by renowned Western European scholars is that shared political decision-making between larger numbers of actors increase the probability of social movements influence over institutions. Territorial decentralization and functional distribution of power are regarded by theory as facilitating access of movements to decision-making and increasing protests[60]. The presentation of the types and intensity of protests, as well as the outcomes of the two movements confirm the increased protest intensity, but overthrow the assumption regarding the facilitated access to the policy arenas.

Within the CfM movement the most practiced way of claims-making were the statements and the written documents/press releases. The claimants in Macedonia used the statement as the form of claims-making in 22 occasions (22/54), amounting to almost half of the total number of claims, while press releases and other types of written documents were issued 10 times (10/54). Only 4 rallies as forms of claims-making were reported and documented, among which the opening protest event in Skopje held on 17 May 2015, when the reported numbers varied between 20.000 and over 100.000 participants[61]. Speeches during rallies and marches were also used as a repertoire of contention on 10 occasions (10/54), same as the documents communication mentioned above. Citizens' debates in the so called "Camp of Freedom" were held on several occasions, and hosted 6 reported claims reported by the two newspapers. The camp, on the other hand, was the only event of occupation which lasted during the entire two-month period of protest activities. Couple of demonstration marches, a citizens' assembly and a night party in the camp, just added to the variety of repertoires of contention during the CfM movement. One important fact

[57] Della Porta (2013): p. 1

[58] Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia: http://www.sobranie.mk/the-constitution-of-the-republic-of-macedonia.nspx [1.7.2017]

[59] Dayton Peace Agreement: http://www.osce.org/bih/126173?download=true [1.7.2017]

[60] Della Porta (2013): "Political Opportunity/Political Opportunity Structure". See also Kitschelt, (1986); Della Porta (2006); Kriesi (ed.) (1995)

[61] *Sloboden Pechat* (18.05.2015), newspaper article: "European Macedonia Stated: Nikola, Leave!" p. 2; See the video from the protest at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8XlnmJft2u0 [1.7.2017]

which has to be noticed is that all the documented physical claims were performed in Skopje, with participants attending from all larger Macedonian cities and towns.

The contentious repertoire in B&H was not as variant as in the Macedonian case, but it was more widespread in space, covering almost the entire territory of the country. Additionally, the statements were not the main means of claims-making like in the previously described case. This form of action was used in 18 (18/83) occasions. The documents (e.g. press releases, programs) occurred only 7 (7/83) times. The dominant form of claims making during the movement were the rallies. More than half of the claims produced by the movement or the movement activists (52/83) were physically expressed through rallies throughout the state. Only several plenum meetings (citizens' fora, assemblies) and one placard-creating session were reported from Tuzla and Sarajevo. Unlike the CfM case where the claims-making activities were concentrated in Skopje, the B&H protests were spread throughout the country, both in the Federation and its 10 cantons, as well as in RS on a smaller scale in comparison to FB&H.

Conclusions

This paper aimed at summarizing the main grievances put forward in the forms of political claims by the two social movements in B&H and Macedonia respectively, as well as the main repertoires of contention applied by the challengers. The text embarked on the main reasons for the inflammation of the citizens' outbursts, signaling out the economic deprivation and the widespread social injustice, mainly caused by the unfair, at times criminal and corrupt privatization of the B&H factories in the first case, while highlighting the creation of a "captured state" and an autocratic ruling fostering a hybrid regime by the government of former PM Gruevski as the central reason in the latter.

What dominated the two mobilizations was a plethora of resignation claims addressed towards the respective governments of B&H and Macedonia, stressing the differences of claims-making towards the centralized Macedonian government vis-à-vis the multi-levelled, dispersed and heterogenic B&H governing system. A common thread of the two movements is also the prevalence of program claims, aiming towards precise actions by the targeted actors.

Regarding the differences between claims-making processes, the claimants in the CfM movement issued predominantly mono-issue driven claims, i.e. the claims could be easily classified and coded according to one of the preset values in the codebook, while the latter movement foresaw numerous cases of overlapping issues within the claims-making process.

One of the specifics of the CfM case was the change in movement strategy, substituting the Macedonian government as a collectivity with former PM Gruevski as the front-runner of the government and a main addressee/object of the resignation claims. This can be characterized as a possibility for benefiting from narrowed framing strategies that formulate detailed and focused construction of the targeted problem/issue.

The analysis of the claims put forward during the B&H protests led to one unexpected finding which is related to the relatively low number of claims related to the unsatisfactory economic conditions in the state, amplifying the socio-economic deprivation of the B&H citizens. This points towards a lack of consistency between the initial factors which sparkled the mobilization and the channeled grievances during the time span of the protests.

Regarding the repertoires of contention, the movement actors in both countries used a familiar and standardized ways of collective claims-making, featuring public statements, documented press releases, rallies, marches, citizens' assemblies and debates. In other words, the repertoires of contention in both countries were characterized by modular quality – i.e. being used by a variety of actors for achieving a variety of objectives. Still, it has to be noted that the repertoires of contention were slightly more variant in the Macedonian case, when compared to the B&H movement. On the other hand, the contentious repertoire in B&H was convincingly more diffused in space covering almost the entire territory of the country, while the CfM activities were physically performed in Skopje, with participants attending from throughout the entire country.

Bibliography

Almeida, P. (2014). *Mobilizing democracy: Globalization and citizen protest*. JHU Press.

Arsenijevic, D. (2014). *Unbribable Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG.

Chandler, D. (2000). *Bosnia: faking democracy after Dayton*. Pluto Press.

Citizens for Macedonia. http://17maj.gragjanite.mk/ [1.7.2017].

Cohen, S. (1995). *Denial and Acknowledgement: The Impact of Information about Human Rights Violations*. Center for Human Rights, Hebrew University

Daskalovski, Z. (1999). "Democratisation in Macedonia and Slovenia." *SEER: Journal for Labour and Social Affairs in Eastern Europe*, *2*(3): 17-44.

Della Porta, D. (2013a). "Repertoires of Contention." In David A. Snow, Donatella Della Porta, Bert Klandermans, and Doug McAdam (eds.) *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*.

———. (2013b). "Political Opportunity/Political Opportunity Structure." In David A. Snow, Donatella Della Porta, Bert Klandermans, and Doug McAdam (eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*.

Della Porta, D. (2006). *Social movements, political violence, and the state: A comparative analysis of Italy and Germany*. Cambridge University Press.

Della Porta, Donatella, and Mario Diani. *Social movements: An introduction*. Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Dolenec, D. (2016). Democratization in the Balkans: The Limits of Elite Driven Reform. *Taiwan Journal of Democracy: An International Journal of Politics*, *12*(1): 125-144.

Election Commission of the Republic (1991). Report, January 18. http://tinyurl.com/ydfd9dp7 [1.7.2017].

Freedom House (2016). Macedonia. Nations in Transit 2016. https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/2016/macedonia [1.7.2017].

Hartmann, F. (2007). "A statement at the seventh biennial meeting of the International Association of Genocide Scholars." Helsinki Charter 109-110, July-August. http://www.helsinki.org.rs/hcharter_t16a02.html [1.7.2017].

International Election Observation Mission (2016). Statement of Preliminary Findings and Conclusions. The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Early Parliamentary Elections, December 11. http://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/fyrom/288186?download=true [1.7.2017].

Kitschelt, H. P. (1986). "Political opportunity structures and political protest: Anti-nuclear movements in four democracies." *British journal of political science*, *16* (01), 57-85.

Koopmans, R. (2002). "Codebook for the analysis of political mobilization and communication in European public spheres." *Codebook from the Project: The Transfor-*

mation of Political Mobilization and Communication in European Public Spheres. 5th Framework Program of the European Commission. Europub.com.

Krastev, I. (2002). "The Balkans: democracy without choices." *Journal of Democracy*, *13*(3), 39-53.

Kriesi, H. (Ed.). (1995). *New social movements in Western Europe: A comparative analysis* (Vol. 5). U of Minnesota Press.

Lindekilde, L. (2013). "Claims-Making." In David A. Snow, Donatella Della Porta, Bert Klandermans, and Doug McAdam (eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements.*

McCammon, Holly. "Resonance, frame." In David A. Snow, Donatella Della Porta, Bert Klandermans, and Doug McAdam (eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements* (2013).

Meier, V. (1999). *Wie Jugoslawien verspielt wurde* (Vol. 1141). Beck.

Meighan, R. (2001). "Education." Encyclopedia of Sociology. Wiley-Blackwell.

Mujkić, A. (2016). "Bosnian Days of Reckoning: Review of the Sequence of Protests in Bosnia and Herzegovina 2013–14, and Future Prospects of Resistance." *Southeastern Europe*, *40*(2): 217-242.

Perica, V. (2002). *Balkan idols: Religion and nationalism in Yugoslav states.* Oxford University Press on Demand.

Social Democratic Union of Macedonia (2015). The Truth About Macedonia. http://arhiva.sdsm.org.mk/default.aspx?mId=55&agId=5&articleId=11786 [1.7.2017].

Stefanovski, I. (2016). "From Shallow Democratization to Mobilization: The Cases of the "Bosnian Spring" and the "Citizens for Macedonia"." *International Journal of Rule of Law, Transitional Justice and Human Rights*, *7*(7): 43-52.

Szajkowski, B. (1999). "Elections and electoral politics in Macedonia." *Transitions*, XL, 1-2: 55-82.

Tarrow, S., & Tilly, C. (2007). "Contentious politics and social movements." In Carles Boix and Susan Carol Stokes (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of comparative politics.*

Tarrow, S., & Tilly, C. (2015). *Contentious Politics.* Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, V., & Van Dyke, N. (2004). "'Get up, stand up': Tactical repertoires of social movements." *The Blackwell companion to social movements*, 262-293.

Tilly, C., Tarrow, S. G., & McAdam, D. (2001). "Dynamics of contention." In Carles Boix and Susan Carol Stokes (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of comparative politics*.

Transparency International (2016). "National Integrity System Assessment Macedonia." May, 2016. http://www.transparency.mk/en/images/stories/NIS_eng.pdf [1.7.2017].

Transparency International and Open Society Fund Bosnia & Herzegovina (2013). "Procesuiranje korupcije pred sudovima I tužilaštvima u Bosni i Hercegovini (2011-2012)." July, 2013. https://ti-bih.org//wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Procesuiranje-korupcije-2013-1.pdf [1.7.2017].

Wedel, J. R. (2003). "Clans, cliques and captured states: rethinking 'transition' in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union." *Journal of International Development* 15(4): 427-440.

Wilson, J. (1973). *Introduction to social movements*. Basic Books.

Шкарић, С., & Силјановска-Давкова, Г. (2007). Уставно право.

Newspapers

Dnevni Avaz, February 9, 2014.

Nova Makedonija, November 18, 1991.

Sloboden Pechat may 18, 2015