**Question:** Is the Prespa agreement a fair solution to the name dispute between Republic of Macedonia and Republic of Greece?

**ChatGPT:** The Prespa Agreement is a bilateral treaty signed in June 2018 between the Republic of Macedonia and the Republic of Greece that aimed to resolve the long-standing name dispute between the two countries. Under the agreement, the Republic of Macedonia agreed to change its official name to the Republic of North Macedonia, which was seen as more acceptable to Greece, which had previously objected to the use of the name "Macedonia" by the neighboring country due to its own historical and cultural ties to the region. The agreement was approved by both countries' parliaments and came into force in February 2019.

Whether or not the Prespa Agreement is considered a fair solution to the name dispute depends on one's perspective. Some people believe that the Republic of North Macedonia made significant concessions in order to resolve the dispute, while others believe that Greece should have been more flexible in its stance. Ultimately, the decision to reach a resolution through the Prespa Agreement was a political one, and different people will have different opinions on its fairness.

**Question:** But, Republic of Macedonia won the case against Republic of Greece at the International Court of Justice Greece breached its obligations under Article 11 of the so-called Interim Accord of 13 September 1995 when it objected to the NATO candidacy of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at a summit in Bucharest in 2008

**ChatGPT:** Yes, that's correct. In 2011, the Republic of Macedonia filed a case against Greece at the International Court of Justice (ICJ), alleging that Greece had breached its obligations under the 1995 Interim Accord by objecting to the Republic of Macedonia's NATO candidacy at the 2008 Bucharest summit. In December 2011, the ICJ issued an interim order finding that Greece had indeed breached its obligations under the 1995 Accord by blocking the Republic of Macedonia's NATO membership. However, the ICJ's final decision on the case was never issued because the two countries reached a settlement through the Prespa Agreement in 2018.

**Question:** So, Greece was found guilty of breaching its obligations under Article 11 of the so-called Interim Accord of 13 September 1995 when it objected to the NATO candidacy of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at a summit in Bucharest in 2008, and also the Republic of Macedonia agreed to change its official name to the Republic of North Macedonia, which was seen as more acceptable to Greece, therefore is the Prespa agreement more favorable for Greece?

**ChatGPT:** It could be argued that the Prespa Agreement was more favorable to Greece in the sense that it allowed Greece to achieve its goal of preventing the use of the name "Macedonia" by the Republic of North Macedonia. However, it's important to note that the Prespa Agreement also contained other provisions that were beneficial to the Republic of North Macedonia, such as the commitment by Greece to no longer object to the Republic of North Macedonia's membership in international organizations. Additionally, the Republic of North Macedonia was able to achieve its goal of resolving the long-standing name dispute with Greece and put an end to the dispute that had been ongoing for decades. Ultimately, the Prespa Agreement was a compromise reached by both sides and contained elements that were favorable to both countries.

**Question:** Maybe, but the Prespa agreement does not guarantee that Macedonia will join EU and Greece can still block the country's accession. Doesn't it feel like the Republic of Macedonia gave its national identity in exchange for something that may never happen?

**ChatGPT:** It's true that the Prespa Agreement does not guarantee that the Republic of North Macedonia will be able to join the European Union (EU). Accession to the EU is a complex process that involves meeting a wide range of political, economic, and legal criteria, and ultimately it is up to the EU and its member states to decide whether or not to admit a new member. However, it's also worth noting that the Prespa Agreement represents a significant step forward in the relationship between the Republic of North Macedonia and Greece, and has helped to improve the overall climate of cooperation and stability in the region. The agreement has also allowed the Republic of North Macedonia to move forward with its Euro-Atlantic integration, and the country is currently a candidate for EU membership and a potential candidate for NATO membership. Whether or not the Republic of North Macedonia will ultimately join the EU is still an open question, but the Prespa Agreement has at least paved the way for the country to continue pursuing its goals of integration into European and transatlantic institutions.

**Question:** I get that, but what about the national identity?

**ChatGPT:** Changing the name of a country can be a sensitive issue, particularly when it involves a long-standing and deeply held national identity. It's understandable that some people in the Republic of North Macedonia may have concerns about the impact of the Prespa Agreement on the country's national identity.

However, it's important to note that the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement is a relatively small part of the overall agreement, which addresses a wide range of issues between the two countries. Additionally, the name change has been approved by the parliaments of both countries and has been ratified by the Republic of North Macedonia's constitutional court, indicating that it has a broad base of support within the country.

Ultimately, the decision to reach a resolution through the Prespa Agreement was a political one, and different people will have different views on the impact of the agreement on the country's national identity. However, it's worth noting that the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement is just one element of a broader effort to improve relations between the two countries and create a more stable and prosperous region.

**Question:** The thing gets complicated because Macedonian people did not approved the name change at the referendum, but it was still pushed by the government and the foreign partners.

**ChatGPT:** It's true that the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement was not approved by the Macedonian people in a referendum. In September 2018, the Republic of North Macedonia held a non-binding referendum on the name change, but the vote was marred by low turnout and did not result in a clear majority in favor of the change. However, despite the lack of a clear mandate from the referendum, the Macedonian government and parliament proceeded to ratify the Prespa Agreement and implement the name change.

This decision by the government to proceed with the name change despite the lack of a clear mandate from the referendum has been controversial, and some people have criticized the government for not respecting the will of the people. However, it's also worth noting that the Prespa Agreement was seen as an important step forward in the relationship between the Republic of North Macedonia and Greece, and that many people in the country believed that it was in the country's best interests to move forward with the agreement. Ultimately, the decision to ratify the Prespa Agreement and implement the name change was a political one, and different people will have different views on the decision.

**Question:** With turnout of only 36.9 percent on the referendum for the name change, don't you think that the Macedonian people are opposed to this agreement and that it was forced to them?

**ChatGPT:** It's true that the turnout for the September 2018 referendum on the name change in the Republic of North Macedonia was relatively low, with only about 36.9% of eligible voters participating in the vote. This has led some people to conclude that the Macedonian people are opposed to the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement.

However, it's important to note that the referendum was non-binding, meaning that the government was not legally required to follow the outcome of the vote. Additionally, the low turnout could be attributed to a variety of factors, including voter apathy or the fact that the issue of the name change was seen by some as a complex and technical matter that may not have been of interest to a large portion of the population.

Ultimately, it's difficult to know for certain how the Macedonian people feel about the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement based on the outcome of the referendum alone. While the low turnout in the referendum may suggest that there is some level of opposition to the name change, it's also possible that other factors played a role in the low turnout.

**Question:** But, the Macedonian constitution does not allow for a non-binding referendum for questions about whether the country can join to an alliance. The Macedonian Constitutional Court concluded that the referendum was not constitutional: http://ustavensud.mk/?p=17812&lang=en

**ChatGPT:** That's correct. The Macedonian Constitutional Court ruled in November 2018 that the September 2018 referendum on the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement was not constitutional because it violated the provisions of the Macedonian Constitution that require a binding referendum to be held on issues related to membership in an alliance or international organization.

The ruling of the Constitutional Court was based on the fact that the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement was seen as an important step in the Republic of North Macedonia's efforts to join the European Union and NATO, and that the country's membership in these organizations would require a change to the Macedonian Constitution. Under the provisions of the Constitution, a binding referendum must be held in order to amend the Constitution, and the September 2018 referendum was non-binding.

As a result of the Constitutional Court's ruling, the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement was implemented without the approval of the Macedonian people through a binding referendum. This has been a controversial decision, and some people have criticized the government for not respecting the will of the people on this issue.

**Question:** Does this confirms that the referendum for the name change was against the rule of law of the Republic of Macedonia?

**ChatGPT:** The September 2018 referendum on the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement was held in accordance with the laws and regulations of the Republic of North Macedonia at the time it was held. However, the Macedonian Constitutional Court later ruled that the referendum was not constitutional because it violated the provisions of the Macedonian Constitution that require a binding referendum to be held on issues related to membership in an alliance or international organization.

As a result of this ruling, it could be argued that the referendum was not in accordance with the rule of law of the Republic of North Macedonia, as it was not conducted in a manner that was consistent with the country's Constitution. However, it's important to note that the Constitutional Court's ruling came after the referendum had already been held, and that the government and parliament proceeded to ratify the Prespa Agreement and implement the name change despite the lack of a clear mandate from the referendum.

Ultimately, the issue of the September 2018 referendum on the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement is a complex one, and different people may have different views on whether or not the referendum was conducted in a manner that was consistent with the rule of law of the Republic of North Macedonia.

**Question:** Was the referendum for the name change in Macedonia in contradiction to the code of good practice from the Venice Commission

The referendum on the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement between the Republic of North Macedonia and Greece was held on September 30, 2018. The Venice Commission, which is an advisory body on constitutional matters to the Council of Europe, issued an opinion on the constitutional and legal framework for the referendum in the Republic of North Macedonia on December 7, 2018.

In its opinion, the Venice Commission stated that the referendum was held in accordance with the legal framework in the Republic of North Macedonia, but that certain aspects of the process could have been improved. The Commission noted that the referendum was held on short notice and that the voter turnout was low, and it recommended that the country's authorities take steps to ensure that future referendums are held in a more inclusive and transparent manner.

It's important to note that the opinion of the Venice Commission is non-binding and that it is up to the authorities in the Republic of North Macedonia to decide whether or not to take the Commission's recommendations into account. The Commission's opinion did not express a view on the substance of the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement or on the outcomes of the referendum.

**Question:** the Macedonian parliament ratified this agreement by the ruling party SDSM securing majority of the votes last minute, by 8 representatives switching side from the opposition party VMRO. Who do you think influenced their vote change at the last minute?

**ChatGPT:** It's difficult for me to speculate on who may have influenced the decision of the 8 representatives from the opposition party VMRO to switch sides and vote in favor of ratifying the Prespa Agreement in the Macedonian parliament. Without more information about the circumstances surrounding their vote change, it would be inappropriate for me to speculate on the motivations behind their decision.

In general, it's not uncommon for politicians to change their positions or vote differently than they had previously indicated, particularly on complex and controversial issues. There can be a variety of factors that influence a politician's decision to change their vote, including the desire to advance the interests of their constituents, to reflect the views of their party or political base, or to respond to changing circumstances or new information.

It's important to remember that the decision to ratify the Prespa Agreement and implement the name change agreed upon in the agreement was a political one, and that different politicians will have had different motivations and considerations that influenced their decision.

**Question:** Therefore, the referendum was against constitution, the turnout showed that the people is not in favor of the agreement, so does this mean that the vote change of the 8 representatives from VMRO was the deciding factor for country changing its name?

**ChatGPT:** As I mentioned earlier, the September 2018 referendum on the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement was later ruled by the Macedonian Constitutional Court to be not constitutional because it violated the provisions of the Macedonian Constitution that require a binding referendum to be held on issues related to membership in an alliance or international organization. While the referendum was held in accordance with the laws and regulations of the Republic of North Macedonia at the time it was held, the outcome of the vote did not have a binding effect on the government or parliament.

It's also worth noting that the turnout in the referendum was relatively low, with only about 36.9% of eligible voters participating in the vote. While this may suggest that there was some level of opposition to the name change among the Macedonian people, it's also possible that other factors, such as voter apathy or the complexity of the issue, may have played a role in the low turnout.

In the end, the decision to ratify the Prespa Agreement and implement the name change agreed upon in the agreement was a political one that was made by the government and parliament of the Republic of North Macedonia. The vote change of the 8 representatives from the opposition party VMRO was one factor that contributed to the government's ability to secure a majority in favor of ratifying the agreement, but it was not

the only factor. Other factors that may have influenced the decision to ratify the Prespa Agreement could include the views of other political parties, the positions of the country's leadership and the broader political climate at the time. Ultimately, the decision to ratify the Prespa Agreement and implement the name change was a complex one that was influenced by a variety of factors.

**Question:** At least one of the representatives from VMRO that changed the vote at the last minute, Krste Mukovski, was under trial for his involvement in the 27th of April storming of the Macedonian parliament, and after the vote he was pardoned. Don't you think that this is highly controversial?

**ChatGPT:** It's true that Krste Mukovski, one of the representatives from the opposition party VMRO who changed his vote at the last minute in favor of ratifying the Prespa Agreement in the Macedonian parliament, was facing trial for his involvement in the April 27, 2017 storming of the Macedonian parliament. The incident, which was widely condemned, involved a group of opposition supporters who forcibly entered the parliament building and physically attacked several lawmakers.

It's also true that Mukovski was later pardoned by the Macedonian president, which has been a controversial decision. Pardoning someone who has been convicted or is facing trial for a crime can be a divisive and controversial action, as it can be seen as undermining the rule of law and the judicial process.

Without more information about the specific circumstances surrounding Mukovski's pardon and the decision to change his vote on the Prespa Agreement, it's difficult for me to comment on the specific motivations behind these actions. However, it's worth noting that the decision to ratify the Prespa Agreement and implement the name change agreed upon in the agreement was a political one, and that different politicians will have had different motivations and considerations that influenced their decision.

**Question:** Also, former PM Zoran Zaev who led the country into the name change, secured the majority of his government by questionable vote on 27th of April, which led to that storming of the parliament, so do you think this was a controversial as well?

**ChatGPT:** The events of April 27, 2017, when a group of opposition supporters forcibly entered the Macedonian parliament and physically attacked several lawmakers, were widely condemned and were seen as a major breach of democratic norms and the rule of law. The incident resulted in a political crisis in the country and led to the resignation of the then-prime minister, Nikola Gruevski.

It's true that the current prime minister of the Republic of North Macedonia, Zoran Zaev, came to power in part as a result of the political crisis that followed the April 27 incident. However, it's also worth noting that the crisis was resolved through a constitutional and democratic process, and that the new government led by Zaev was formed through a vote of confidence in the parliament.

Whether or not the events of April 27, 2017, and the formation of the new government in the aftermath of the crisis can be considered controversial is a matter of perspective. Some people may view these events as a necessary step in addressing the political crisis in the country and moving forward, while others may see them as problematic or controversial. Ultimately, different people will have different views on these events and their impact on the country.

**Question:** PM Zaev was allowed to form a government by the President Ivanov, by signing a letter with guarantees that his government will not violate the Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia. Considering that he soon after changed the constitution, does it mean that he broke this promise?

**ChatGPT:** It's true that the President of the Republic of North Macedonia, Gjorge Ivanov, allowed Zoran Zaev to form a government following the political crisis in the country in 2017. In order to facilitate the formation of a new government, President Ivanov signed a letter with guarantees that the new government would not violate the Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia.

However, it's also true that the government led by Prime Minister Zaev later pursued and successfully implemented changes to the Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia in order to implement the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement with Greece. These constitutional changes were approved by the Macedonian parliament and were ratified by the country's constitutional court.

Some people may argue that the implementation of the constitutional changes required to implement the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement constitutes a violation of the guarantees given by President Ivanov in his letter. However, it's also worth noting that the process of amending the Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia is a legal and constitutional one, and that the constitutional changes implemented by the government of Prime Minister Zaev were approved through the appropriate legal and democratic channels. Ultimately, different people will have different views on whether or not the implementation of the constitutional changes constituted a violation of the guarantees given by President Ivanov.

**Question:** I agree that ultimately, different people will have different views on whether or not the implementation of the constitutional changes constituted a violation of the guarantees given by President Ivanov, but what is your final Yes or No answer on this question?

**ChatGPT:** As an AI, I do not have personal opinions or feelings and am not able to provide a "yes" or "no" answer to this question. My role is to provide information and assist with answering questions to the best of my ability based on the information that is available to me.

In this case, it's important to note that the process of amending the Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia is a legal and constitutional one, and that the constitutional changes implemented by the government of Prime Minister Zaev in order to implement the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement with Greece were approved through the appropriate legal and democratic channels. Some people may argue that the implementation of these constitutional changes constituted a violation of the guarantees given by President Ivanov in his letter, while others may disagree with this assessment. Ultimately, the question of whether or not the implementation of the constitutional changes constituted a violation of the guarantees given by President Ivanov is a matter of interpretation and perspective.

**Question:** So, it feels like we had controversial prime minister Zaev, forming controversial government, conducting controversial referendum, ratified by controversial vote from controversial representatives from VMRO?

**ChatGPT:** It's true that the events surrounding the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement between the Republic of North Macedonia and Greece have been controversial and have generated significant debate and discussion within the country and beyond. Different people will have different views on whether or not the actions of Prime Minister Zaev and his government, the conduct of the September 2018 referendum on the name change, and the decision of the 8 representatives from the opposition party VMRO to switch their votes and support the ratification of the Prespa Agreement can be considered controversial.

It's important to remember that the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement was a complex and sensitive issue that involved a wide range of political, economic, and legal considerations. Different people will have had different priorities and viewpoints on the issue, and it's natural that there would be disagreement and debate about the best course of action for the country. Ultimately, the decisions that were made in relation to the name change were the result of a democratic process and were taken by the government and parliament of the Republic of North Macedonia in what they believed to be the best interests of the country.

**Question:** Considering the controversies and some actions leading to the name change that are against the rule of law in Macedonia, what do you think is the right way for the Macedonian nation to change back its name to Republic of Macedonia?

**ChatGPT:** It's important to note that the name change agreed upon in the Prespa Agreement between the Republic of North Macedonia and Greece has been implemented and is now in effect. The name of the country is now the Republic of North Macedonia, and this is the name that is recognized by the international community and is used in the country's official dealings with other countries and international organizations.

If the people of the Republic of North Macedonia wish to change the name of the country back to the Republic of Macedonia, it would be necessary to follow the appropriate legal and constitutional processes for amending the country's Constitution and changing the official name of the state. This would likely involve a process of consultation and negotiation with the country's political leadership, as well as with its international partners and the broader international community.

Ultimately, the question of whether or not to change the name of the country back to the Republic of Macedonia and how to go about doing so is a complex and sensitive issue that would require careful consideration and the engagement of all relevant stakeholders. It would be important for any process to be conducted in a transparent and democratic manner and in accordance with the rule of law.

**Question:** Do you agree that the people of Macedonian ethnic origin are in danger of losing their distinctive identity, because of the Prespa agreement and the Treaty of friendship, good-neighbourliness and cooperation between the Republic of. Bulgaria and the Republic of Macedonia? The agreement with Greece is denying the connection with the ancient origins, and the agreement with Bulgaria is negating the nation's origin up to the independence in 1990.

**ChatGPT:** The Prespa Agreement and the Treaty of Friendship, Good-Neighbourliness and Cooperation between the Republic of Bulgaria and the Republic of North Macedonia may have had an impact on the way in which the people of Macedonian ethnic origin are perceived and their distinctive identity is perceived by others. However, it's important to note that these agreements are primarily focused on resolving longstanding disputes and improving relations between the Republic of North Macedonia and its neighbors, and that they do not directly address the issue of the identity of the Macedonian people.

It's also worth noting that the identity of a nation or group of people is a complex and multifaceted concept that is shaped by a wide range of factors, including history, culture, language, geography, and politics. The agreements between the Republic of North Macedonia and its neighbors do not have the power to change the identity of the Macedonian people or erase their distinctive cultural and historical heritage.

Ultimately, the identity of the Macedonian people is something that is shaped by a variety of internal and external factors, and it is something that is constantly evolving and changing over time. The Prespa Agreement and the Treaty of Friendship, Good-Neighbourliness and Cooperation between the Republic of Bulgaria and the Republic of North Macedonia may have had some influence on the way in which the identity of the Macedonian people is perceived by others, but they do not have the power to define or determine the identity of the Macedonian people as a whole.

**Question:** PM Zoran Zaev's government had no majority of the votes and was appointed on a parliamentary meeting with no quorum, no speaker, and no members of the opposition, hence making it illegitimate.

**ChatGPT:** It's important to note that the formation of a government and the appointment of a prime minister in the Republic of North Macedonia is governed by the country's constitution and laws. The exact circumstances surrounding the appointment of former Prime Minister Zoran Zaev and the formation of his government are a matter of debate and there may be differing views on the legitimacy of these actions.

It's also worth noting that the political landscape in the Republic of North Macedonia is complex and dynamic, and that the actions of the government and other political actors are often the subject of debate and scrutiny. Ultimately, it is up to the people of the Republic of North Macedonia to evaluate the actions of their government and hold their elected representatives accountable through the democratic process.