

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Summer University for Democracy

2-6 July 2007, Strasbourg

Projects for Europe

SYNTHESIS OF PLENARY SESSIONS AND CONFERENCES

Yulia Kochneva, Groupe de sociologie politique européenne,
The Robert Schuman University, Strasbourg

Directorate General of Democracy and Political Affairs
Council of Europe, Strasbourg

The opinions expressed in this work are the responsibility of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Council of Europe.

All requests concerning the reproduction or translation of all or part of the document should be addressed to the Public Information and Publications Division, Directorate of Communication (F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex or publishing@coe.int). All other correspondence concerning this publication should be addressed to the Directorate General of Democracy and Political Affairs.

Contacts at the Council of Europe:

Jean-Louis Laurens
Director General of Democracy and Political Affairs
E-mail: jean-louis.laurens@coe.int
Tel.: + 33(0)3 88 41 20 73

François Friederich
Project Co-ordinator
E-mail: francois.friederich@coe.int
Tel.: + 33 (0)3 90 21 53 02

Claude Bernard
Administrative and Financial Assistant
E-mail: claud.bernard@coe.int
Tel.: + 33 (0)3 88 41 22 75

Natalia Vassioukova
Project Assistant
e-mail: natalia.vassioukova@coe.int
Tel.: + 33 (0)3 90 21 49 54

website: www.coe.int
www.coe.int/Schools-Politics

Table of contents

I. Introduction: the European project, a project for the future	5
II. European strategies and national policies: drawing together a common space	7
A. The genesis of the common European project.....	7
B. The process of European integration and construction of a European political space	9
C. The challenges of the common European project	11
III. Identity, nationality and citizenship in a democratic society	15
A. Citizenship and nationality: what implications for a democratic society?	15
B. Between national identity and European identity: what future for the European project?.....	18
IV. Conditions for a democratic society: how can we construct a culture of democracy shared by all European countries?	23
A. Democracy and political culture	23
B. Civil society: an essential condition for the existence of a democratic society	24
C. Means of constructing a lasting democratic culture.....	26
V. Fifty years after the Treaty of Rome: where is the European project?	29
A. From the economic project to political Europe	29
B. The priorities for tomorrow's Europe.....	30
VI. Rethinking the concept of “open society”: the importance of truth in a democratic society	33
VII. Conclusion: The future of the European project: a common future for all Europeans	35
Annex I: Programme of the Summer University for Democracy	41
Annex II: List of Participants.....	53
Annex III: Final Declaration.....	73

I. Introduction: the European project, a project for the future

For the second year running the Council of Europe held the Summer University for Democracy, bringing together all the schools of political studies, from 2 to 6 July 2007. The opening session afforded an opportunity for the platform speakers to take stock of the state of democracy on the European continent. Terry Davis¹ recalled the central role played by the Council of Europe in spreading human rights, democracy and the rule of law. The Council of Europe is a truly European organisation, in terms both of its geographical scope and of the values it upholds. The relationship between the European Union and the Council of Europe is often presented as one of competition, but the Secretary General of the Council of Europe does not share that view: “The European Union is about the standard of living: the Council of Europe is about the quality of life”.

The Strasbourg organisation has a number of tools at its disposal for this purpose. First come the treaties which make it possible to set legal standards to protect Europeans in their everyday lives. Luisella Pavan-Woolfe² emphasised that the recent setback over the constitutional treaty reflected the importance of discussing the implications of constructing a common European space supported by democracy and engaged citizens. But there is no ideal form of democracy, as Göran Lindblad³ pointed out; each country develops its own version. So the European organisations have a part to play in harmonising and levelling up democratic standards in Europe.

Göran Lindblad observed in this connection that the Council of Europe works hard to keep these standards high. There can be no democracy without human rights, and no democracy or human rights without the rule of law. Today there are countries where the rule of law is not always upheld. The European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms is a reference text in this sphere.

The European Court of Human Rights is the second basic tool at the Council of Europe’s disposal. The court’s success is now firmly established, and if technical problems do arise from day to day, according to Terry Davis that is also, and indeed above all, proof that Europeans have adopted the Strasbourg court.

However, these legal tools must not cause us to forget that human rights are the result of political decisions. If “human rights are highly political, it is because they are the product of agreements between governments, because they are central issues in political debate and because the violation of human rights can be combated only through political decisions”, as Thomas Hammarberg⁴ pointed out. In this connection, the schools of political studies are a significant instrument in the work of the Council of Europe. The Strasbourg Summer University is the culmination of the work done throughout the year by the fifteen schools of political studies. This year’s contribution by Oliver Dulic,⁵ who attended last year as a participant, is testimony to the dynamism and activity of the Council of Europe not just in Strasbourg but throughout Europe.

It is the testimony of the Head of State of a country where democracy is still young, and where the sense of freedom has yet to be explored that President Boris Tadic⁶ brought to Strasbourg. Serbia still has some way to go, especially where human rights are concerned. But joining the European

1. Secretary General of the Council of Europe.

2. Representative of the European Commission to the Council of Europe.

3. Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe.

4. Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe.

5. Speaker of the Parliament of the Republic of Serbia, alumnus of the Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence.

6. President of the Republic of Serbia.

democratic area and being a member of the European Union are now openly declared ambitions: “Serbia declares its intention of becoming a full member of the European Union without relinquishing its territorial integrity... The European Union is incomplete without Serbia and the western Balkans”.

Serbia wants to be a spearhead of regional stability, prosperity and the democratisation of South-Eastern Europe. This must first of all mean the ongoing promotion of human rights and principally the rights of minorities, lasting peace, tolerance and reconciliation. “Without reconciliation democracy is impossible”, said Boris Tadic. A question from the Skopje school gave the Serbian President the opportunity to say that his country would have to carry out crucial reforms – the most important in its history” – and also to co-operate with the Hague Tribunal in resolving the case of Ratko Mladic and the other war criminals who are still at large.

The question of Kosovo stands in the way here, and the Serbian President did not dodge it. According to Boris Tadic, the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Republic of Serbia must be preserved in accordance with Resolution 1244 of the United Nations Security Council. In parallel, the Serbian President believes that there must be negotiations with Pristina to arrive at a compromise, a solution acceptable to all the parties at the negotiating table. Independence for Kosovo could jeopardise the stability of the region – a condition *sine qua non* for the agreement of the Balkan states. Democratic values must serve as a guide when dealing with Kosovo, as well as a path to follow toward Serbia’s European integration. The nationalist heritage is unquestionably an obstacle to the accession of the Balkan states to the European Union today. According to Boris Tadic, the solution lies in the distinction that must be drawn between each state’s legitimate interests and nationalism that can only end in war.

This Summer University for Democracy was an opportunity to discuss citizenship, the need for informed individuals to be actively engaged in a democratic society, and the relationship between political community and national identity. Boris Tadic suggested approaches drawn from his own experience as a democratically elected politician. In his view, democracy entails increasing responsibility derived from personal involvement in public affairs. Individuals with a knowledge of public affairs at local and national, or even international level, are people who cannot be manipulated. They will vote in elections, play a part in community life and not remain indifferent to the general well-being and needs of the community in which they live; “Indifference is the slow death of democracy”. For this reason, the democratic citizen must be active and constructive, but also critical. He must combat the democratic deficit and be watchful in detecting alienation and bureaucratic abuse. Civil society has an undeniable role to play. When questioned about the role that falls to it in the process of democratisation in the western Balkan states, Boris Tadic laid special emphasis on the work done to protect children and Roma. The transition of the Balkan states from dictatorship to a legitimate democratic society has created a climate conducive to the development of civil society. Finally, national identity in the Balkan states was forged on an ethnic, religious and linguistic basis, which in fact does not presuppose the idea of democratic citizenship rooted in civil rights, human rights and fundamental freedoms.

“Making Europe our Europe” was the banner under which the Summer University for Democracy opened.

II. European strategies and national policies: drawing together a common space

“Europe will not come about all at once, or as a set piece. It will come about through tangible achievements which first create de facto solidarity. ... The coming together of European nations requires an end to the age-old stand-off between France and Germany.”

(Robert Schuman, 9 May 1950)

Is the construction of Europe achieving the aims set since its foundation some fifty years ago? What area is political Europe to cover? Half a century after the founding fathers voiced their aspirations, Europe has never been so much a subject of debate as today. Yet many questions remain about the nature, aims and *raison d'être* of the European project. Klaus Schumann⁷ defined it as the will “to move forward stage by stage in the building of a common space shared by all the peoples of the continent, to replace the divisions, conflicts and human sufferings of the past through common guarantees of freedom, human rights and justice, and lead us to live together in peace and promote economic and social well-being”.

Today the European project seems to be just ticking over. The referendum on the constitutional treaty in France and the Netherlands in May 2005 saw two founding states express misgivings about the deepening of European integration. Moreover, new member states have taken up positions hostile to the delegation of national powers to Europe. The European project is no longer self-evident: it is being challenged and called into question by governments and by peoples themselves.

By returning to the origins of the European project, by highlighting the issues facing it today such as enlargement or the implementation of a common foreign policy, and by taking up the challenges ahead, the participants at the second Summer University were able to glimpse the nature of the European project, between transnational strategies and national policies.

A. The genesis of the common European project

Reconciliation as the origin of the common project

The history of Europe is made up of warring empires. So European unity cannot be conceived of just as the victory of one European power over all the others. It was such self-centred rivalry that led Europeans to confront each other in two global conflicts during the 20th century which were to annihilate the continent. Thanks to the determination and political courage of a group of men, the founding fathers, the continent's leaders, beginning with the French and Germans, came to realise that they had to abandon confrontation in favour of co-operation and unification. Europe is the first continent where states that had made war on each other for centuries have come together to create a supranational structure to which they delegate part of their sovereignty in order to pursue common policies.

Though some people see the European project now as a tool for controlling globalisation, or as a means whereby Europeans can make their voices heard in the international political arena, the fact remains that reconciliation was the origin and the driving-force of the European adventure we have known for somewhat over fifty years. Klaus Schumann emphasised in his address that it was possible for reconciliation to come about because of the “recognition of errors and war crimes,

7. Former Director General of Political Affairs of the Council of Europe.

but also because of the political willingness of democratic regimes to bring peaceful coexistence to the European continent”.

At the end of the Second World War, a great many European and world political leaders wanted to build a partnership among democratic nations, to forestall further nationalistic temptations and ward off totalitarianism. Bringing together leaders and peoples who were still enemies a short time previously, in the framework of European institutions, was the solution chosen by the founding fathers to promote dialogue and mutual understanding and establish what Robert Schuman called “de facto solidarities”.

The institutional construction of the European project

The political will to prevent further conflicts and establish a lasting peace took concrete form on 5 May 1949 with the foundation of the Council of Europe. Outlining the history of European construction, Jack Hanning⁸ sees it as the first response to the dream of European federalism: “For the first time in history, states came together to accept international guarantees of human rights”.

The Council of Europe laid down obligations in keeping with democratic values safeguarding human rights and the rule of law, which the member states must meet. The aim is to create a greater union between the member states through joint action in numerous spheres of activity.

Since then, the Council of Europe has adopted several instruments which enable it to anticipate situations of national or bilateral conflict, and even of political impasse. Klaus Schumann stressed in particular the importance of the European Convention on Human Rights and the texts adopted by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in the field of prevention of torture, inhuman treatment, and protection of minorities, to mention only the best known of them.

Ratification of these conventions is a precondition for membership of the Council of Europe. Candidate states have to satisfy meaningful criteria – construction of democratic institutions, free and transparent elections, the rule of law, in particular an independent judiciary, freedom of expression and of the media, protection of national minorities and, lastly, respect for the principles of international law; all these are fundamental principles which every candidate state must observe.

At the same time as the Council of Europe, other organisations have laid down obligations with regard to democratic values. In 1993 at the Copenhagen Summit, the European Union defined the accession criteria for applicant states. According to Jack Hanning, they echo the Treaty of London setting up the Council of Europe in 1949.

There is a synergy between the Council of Europe and the European Union in the promotion of democracy, respect for human rights, respect for minorities and the rule of law. It is a guarantee of democratic stability on the continent. As for the activities of the OSCE, they are increasingly similar to those of the Council of Europe. Co-ordination is therefore necessary, and it has to begin with states. At the Council of Europe Summit in Warsaw in 2005, the heads of the two organisations called for better co-ordination between national administrations. Klaus Schumann observed that this “co-ordination between organisations is necessary in order to find effective responses. The heads of state and government confirmed their commitment to stepping up joint efforts in the building of Europe without dividing lines”.

The European project was born in the aftermath of war in a Europe that was devastated but also divided in two. For more than forty years the plan of the founding fathers for a Europe of peace was pursued exclusively in the western part of the continent. Enlargement to the east produced a surprise set of problems which caught the European institutions unawares in the early 1990s. Jack Hanning said in this connection that “the reality of today’s Europe took shape following the fall of the Berlin Wall”. That event marked the starting point for the process of reunification of the

8. Former Director of External and Multilateral Relations of the Council of Europe.

European continent. Before 1989 the movement towards European integration appeared logical, but remained slow because prospects for enlargement were slight. The picture has changed today: deepening has become essential and urgent if enlargement is to be a success, not a failure that would prove extremely painful for all Europeans. So deepening and enlargement are the two goal-posts which the European project must keep in its sights from now on.

B. The process of European integration and the construction of a European political space

Finding a balance between deepening and enlargement

During the past half-century, a wide range of differing countries have joined the European Union. As further countries have acceded, the European Union has pursued the integration process, often under the stimulus of the crises or new challenges generated by their accession. The southward enlargement of the Community in the 1980s encouraged the creation of the single market and fostered policies of cohesion as well as substantive regional policies. The single currency was introduced following the accession of the Scandinavian countries and Austria in the 1990s, and further changes took place in terms of common security policy. The ten new states of central Europe joined in 2004, followed in recent times by Romania and Bulgaria. From then on the European Union has had to face sizeable new problems, in particular energy. How can co-operation between Russia and the European Union be ensured when their interests are different? How can dependence on Russian energy resources alone be avoided? These questions were high on the agenda at this Summer University for Democracy.⁹

Since the last two enlargements, the balance between deepening and enlargement that existed prior to the fall of the Berlin Wall has changed. Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul¹⁰ explains this by the very nature of that last enlargement, the size of which was “unprecedented”. Membership of the European Union did indeed rise from 15 to 25 member states in May 2004. One consequence was to raise the question of the European Union’s frontiers, a question never before posed. As she said, “Today the European Union can no longer move forward by trying to strike a balance between deepening and enlargement. The enlargement factor has become very important”.

According to Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul, there are two major attitudes towards enlargement of the European Union. One is the most widely held view that Europe’s frontiers need to be defined: one or two more enlargements are conceivable, but it has to stop somewhere. The other idea is that, in order to be stronger and become an economic and political power, the European Union needs all the states that wish to join. Good-neighbour policies then serve as the first step towards enlargement. For it to succeed, states have to meet the economic and democratic criteria set by the European Union. Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul called for a free-ranging public debate to generate some new thinking on how far the European Union can go in opening itself up to further states.

The question of the European Union’s frontiers was widely discussed by the participants in the Summer University for Democracy. At the heart of the debate was the issue of European Union enlargement to include Turkey: should Europe be a Christian club?

The question of Turkey’s membership of the European Union is not new and remains highly polemical. But speakers were all of the same opinion on the question: Europe is rooted in democratic values, peace and solidarity. Whether Turkey should join the European Union or not depends on how the country meets those criteria. Turkey has set very important reforms in place since accession talks began, but the fact remains that there are still problems over human rights and the rights of minorities in that country. It seems undeniable that Turkey cannot become a member of the European Union until such time as it satisfies the Copenhagen criteria.

9. A workshop was also held on the energy question under the title “Energy policies to guarantee safe and sustainable energy resources”.

10. Secretary General of the *Notre Europe* think tank, Paris.

But Klaus Schumann asked participants not to settle for a stereotyped debate: “The question of religion is a nonsense”. Jack Hanning said that “the European identity cannot be defined in terms of religion”. Europe is based on diversity and cultural dialogue; Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul believed that “the next challenge to Europe will be to show public opinion that it is not a Christian club, and that it is able to serve as a reference framework for intercultural dialogue”.

Enlargement will continue to be the main challenge to the European Union in the years ahead. The idea that enlargement impedes the process of further integration is very widespread. In addition, there is a certain hostility to enlargement since some new member states have shown themselves to be lacking in a sense of European solidarity and the desire to move beyond the antagonisms of war. “Populist rhetoric from European leaders is unacceptable”, said Jack Hanning.

Talk about limiting the frontiers of the European Union has lifted a taboo by opening up a debate on Europe’s religious and ethnic identity. If a European identity exists, it must embody the continent’s diversity and be based on our shared values which reject any form of discrimination, whether rooted in ethnic, religious or racist considerations.

At the same time, enlargement has raised questions about the frontiers of the European Union. It is an issue that may well bring dangerous ideas to the forefront, promoting isolationism and rejection of others. So enlargement must be a success: the future of the European continent, the legitimacy of the democratic system and the rule of law depend on it. Many tools will be needed to achieve this, one of them being an efficient system of administration in the member states.

The civil service in member states: an essential tool for the success of European integration

After the collapse of the former Soviet Union, the countries of the former Soviet bloc found themselves facing major economic and political reforms. In such a context, the emergence of a bureaucracy, that is to say a competent administration capable of implementing a programme of political, social and economic reforms, is crucial. That administration should also be a stable one. In other words, it should not be replaced at every parliamentary election with the political parties putting their own militants in influential posts. This analysis by Christopher Cviic¹¹ was amplified and confirmed by François-Gilles Le Theule,¹² for whom experience teaches that a state possessing a stable, powerful administrative structure is more effective when it comes to Community negotiations and integrating European standards at the national level. The General Secretariat of European Affairs which reports to the Office of the French Prime Minister is an example of this.

Summer University participants took note of this need for an effective administration. However, some questions remained: what can be done in countries where the proportion of the population with qualifications is small, as in the Balkans following the war? Creating “think tanks” and schools of public administration were among the tools suggested during debates. But one question remains unanswered: how can qualified people be kept in the service of the state when they could be earning a much better living in the private sector or elsewhere in Europe?

This debate found echoes in the workshop on “Reform of public administration: between ethics and effectiveness”.

Successful enlargement, requiring the emergence of a stable, impartial and effective civil service, is a necessity for the future of Europe. However, almost a century after the outbreak of the First World War and at a time when the world is beset by numerous dangers such as climate change and terrorism, Europe needs a common foreign policy more than ever before.

What strategy for what common foreign policy?

The need for a common foreign policy is a question that has been discussed ever since the European project was born at the end of the Second World War. Rivalry between the eastern and western

11. Senior Political Counsellor, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, London.

12. Director of the Strasbourg Centre for European Studies.

blocs conditioned international policy until the start of the 1990s. Today, the emergence of terrorism on the international stage, failure to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, tensions in Korea and Pakistan, and often the powerlessness of the United Nations to deal with these situations, require us to take stock of present world disorder. The war in Iraq has seen European countries at odds with each other. A great many statistical studies show that setting a common foreign policy in place has long been a major expectation of Europeans.

The European Union has to find several answers before it can hope to establish a common foreign policy. The first is of an institutional kind. The European Union needs a Minister of Foreign Affairs. And there is a glaring lack of strategy at the present time. For reasons of energy dependence, the question of the nature of the relationship with Russia is now unavoidable. But relations with the United States, China and India must not be forgotten. In order to tackle these issues, Istvan Gyarmati¹³ offered three scenarios. First, prefer authoritarian regimes where Muslim fundamentalists might seize power. Secondly, maintain a minimum of relations with countries which fall short of European democratic standards. Lastly, seek to appease countries which are not democratic but are unavoidable on political and economic grounds.

Nicolae Chirtoaca¹⁴ added to this analysis the fact that European integration must be an incentive for neighbouring countries. The European Union must leave the door open to countries that are European historically, culturally and geographically, in order to avoid fresh divisions arising between the new member states and their neighbours. With reference to the good-neighbour policy, the fact that the Belarus school of political studies was present for the first time must not be overlooked. That country's progress to democracy was abundantly debated at this conference. The fact that it lags behind the other ex-Soviet states was underlined. Civil society is probably the key in bringing the country level with the rest of Europe.

Implementation of a common foreign policy is indispensable. Like enlargement, it is a condition *sine qua non* of the European Union's ability to meet the challenges of the common project in the coming years.

C. The challenges of the common European project

Faced with globalisation and national protectionism, what European project?

The construction of Europe today is having to face a global environment transformed by the phenomenon of globalisation. The European continent has lost its place as the only player on the world stage and now has to defend its role and its position in a world marked by multi-polarisation. Europe today is confronted by new challenges and threats that demand effective, concerted responses from all European states. According to Klaus Schumann, those responses are part of the action plan of the European organisations: fighting terrorism, corruption and organised crime, combating human trafficking and cybercrime, strengthening human rights in the information society, managing migratory movements, promoting intercultural dialogue.

On this subject, Jack Hanning observed above all that widespread fear of globalisation has generated a trend towards protectionism, together with the resurgence of an often perverted sense of national identity. In some countries this has inevitably set national interest deriving from the concept of national sovereignty at odds with the need for collective European responses in tackling global dangers and the uncontrollable power of multinational companies which escape any form of democratic control. "Globalisation has encouraged the resurgence of nationalism at a time when, on the contrary, collective approaches are required".

National sovereignty alone will not bring solutions to common problems. On the contrary, a measure of unity must be displayed when tackling shared problems. Common values and principles, political and legal construction consolidate the European standard and provide a basis for common responses

13. Director of the Centre for Euro-Atlantic Integration and Democracy, Budapest.

14. Ambassador of the Republic of Moldova to the United States, Washington.

to tomorrow's challenges. The European project has reached the stage of a "single Europe, a Europe without frontiers which has never existed before", says Klaus Schumann. Nevertheless, this project for a united Europe is fragile. Europe has rules, legal texts and practical experience, but it still lacks active, courageous and convincing governance able to use these instruments, and adapt them if need be, for a better common future. As Jack Hanning said in this connection, "National sovereignty is a prerogative of the peoples of the member states, but where sovereignty is shared or held in common it is not relinquished. On the contrary, it is a far more effective means of exercising that sovereignty in a globalising world".

Reconciling public opinion with the European project: towards "good governance"

The European project as we know it today is the product of long years of effort by some of the political elites who have succeeded, despite national differences, in bringing about the monetary and economic union of European states. So this Europe is first and foremost the result of multiple decisions taken by political leaders. However, it is hard to imagine its construction without the approval of the peoples concerned. The European Union cannot just be an institutional framework desired by Europe's technocrats: it has to be legitimised by the people of Europe. Citizen participation is vital today, and we find it in the notion of good European governance, meaning "the rules, processes and behaviours which influence the exercise of powers at European level, especially from the standpoint of openness, participation, responsibility, effectiveness and coherence".¹⁵

Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul, analysing the state of European public opinion, finds that 50% of Europeans are in favour of their country's membership of the European Union.¹⁶ She also questions the positive findings and high estimates drawn from these results by the European Union, especially as the figure is constantly falling. One possible reason for the unpopularity of the European Union is that the European project is backed mainly by elites, that is to say highly educated and professionally successful people. The European project is an elitist one, but the point is underestimated by political leaders, and this is a real problem. Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul wondered "how the European Union could move forward with the support of only 50% of the population".

Speakers brought a mixed response to this question. The democratic deficit of the European project applies first of all to the European Union's institutions. The limited power of the Members of the European Parliament, and the unanimous vote required in crucial fields, are the most glaring examples. But the democratic deficit that is intrinsic to the European Union is not only manifest at the institutional level. There is a real democratic deficit present above all at the national level. Political leaders and domestic media do not talk to their citizens much, or indeed at all, about European issues. Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul quoted the example of the referendum campaign on the constitutional treaty in France: "There was a lot of debate about European problems, it was a real democratic moment. But when did the last debate on European questions take place in France before that? Twelve years previously, at the time of the Maastricht referendum. And it is a real problem: you cannot expect people to fall in love with a project they have heard nothing about for twelve years".

Klaus Schumann agreed, adding that national governments, political parties and the media often used Brussels as a scapegoat to cover their own mistakes.

The role of the media is important here, but they often tend to treat Europe in the same way as politicians do. Jack Hanning emphasised that they ought to play a different role, that of developing "European civic awareness".

François-Gilles Le Theule, referring to the French example, said that the French Government had initiated a process of reflection after the referendum on the constitutional treaty. The purpose was to see how to get the media, the private sector and citizens to share a similar vision of Europe. A

15. White paper on European governance, European Commission.

16. Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul referred in her speech to Eurobarometer studies.

European school for elites, namely members of parliament, journalists, and representatives of the private sector and NGOs, had been established for this purpose.

The Moldovan school of political studies also found that work needed to be done with entire populations in order to explain the political situation to them. One Summer University participant said: “We want democracy, but we have to prepare our people for it. Moldova is a country with a large rural population. We tend often to focus on the urban population who already know quite a lot about the political context. But we ought to concentrate on people living in the countryside, who do not have access to information and do not always understand the political issues”.

So public opinion is not always in favour of the European project because it does not see the ideas underlying its inception and regard the project as elitist. It is therefore necessary to bring Europe closer to the individual and make it more transparent. In this context, European public opinion is of major importance as the link between the Union’s political institutions and its citizens. The shaping of public opinion on a European scale would make it easier for individuals to participate in decision-making processes and help strengthen the Union’s political legitimacy. Greater solidarity among the member states would also be a way of boosting European-mindedness on our continent.

The roots of the European project lie in a desire to avoid conflict and establish peace on the continent of Europe. Today it constitutes a complex reality that impinges on many areas of public activity. These were listed by Ivan Vejvoda¹⁷ as including the economy, trade, administration, democracy and human rights, foreign policy, security and regional co-operation. Nonetheless, problems remain: lack of political leadership and good governance and genuine European solidarity. Finally, there can be no denying that some states have doubts about the development and consolidation of the European project. The European Union has been politically stalled for some years. The rejection of the constitutional treaty by France and the Netherlands “cast doubt on the hope, the dream of a different and united Europe demonstrating common solidarity, free from historical stereotypes”.¹⁸ The intergovernmental approach pursued by certain European states during joint negotiations is at odds with the essence of the project desired by the founding fathers.

Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul believed that this approach must be discarded, and European interests must not be reduced to national ones. The balance that has to be struck between European strategies and national policies is the key to ensuring that the European project lasts and evolves. Member states should ask themselves more often what they can do to advance the common project. Jack Hanning concluded with a strong statement: “We should not be asking what Europe can do for us, but what we can do for Europe”.

The European project has a twofold challenge facing it today. First, enlargement since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the war in the former Yugoslavia. Secondly, globalisation and the resulting economic competition among states which damages the principle of European solidarity. These two factors also underlie a danger which Europe will have to face in the years ahead: the resurgence of self-interest and nationalistic reflexes. In this context, what European model should be favoured between identity, nationality and citizenship in a democratic society?

17. Executive Director of the “Balkan Trust for Democracy”, Belgrade.

18. Klaus Schumann.

III. Identity, nationality and citizenship in a democratic society

“The republic, as we call it, is the thing of the people; a people is not just any assembly of men coming together by chance, but only a society formed under the protection of the laws and for a purpose of common utility. What above all leads men to come together is less their weakness than the pressing need to find themselves in the company of like men”.

(Cicero, On the Republic, Book I [1,25] XXV (39))

Identity, nationality, citizenship: three concepts we often turn to when it comes to discussing democratic society. The second Summer University for Democracy could not ignore these unavoidable concepts. What do they really mean? When people say they are French, German, Polish, even European, are they talking about their rights and duties as citizens, their nationality or their culture of origin?

These issues are a topical subject of discussion today, when the concepts of nationality and identity are returning to the political debate throughout Europe. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet bloc, there has been renewed debate about identity and the nation in eastern Europe and the Balkans. Moreover, frontiers that are permeable to terrorism, and the harmful effects of economic globalisation, are causing part of the population and political circles to lean towards autarky.

The debate which took place during the conference and the workshops sought to arrive at a better definition and understanding of the meaning of these concepts and the differing interpretations of them in European states. Placing the subjects of identity, nationality and citizenship on the agenda of the second Summer University for Democracy was essential, and fruitful exchanges ensued. The subject generated massive interest, demonstrating that Europe’s future political leaders will require and expect debate on these issues.

A. Citizenship and nationality: what implications for a democratic society?

Untangling “citizenship” from “nationality”: a necessary conceptual debate

At European-level meetings where questions of citizenship and nationality arise, participants sometimes have difficulty in understanding each other because each country may have a different conception of the two notions. Although equivalent words for “citizenship” and “nationality” exist in the various European languages, the concepts may sometimes be used interchangeably. For our present purposes it seems important that we try to dissociate the two.

Hans-Peter Furrer¹⁹ spoke of a certain “competition” between the concepts of citizenship and nationality. Zarko Puhovski²⁰ agreed with his analysis. The two concepts are perceived and understood in different ways in the eastern and western regions of the European continent. In the Anglo-French tradition, “nationality” is closely akin to citizenship. The two concepts merge into each other. A French “citizen” is a member of the French “nation”. Furthermore, as Klaus Schumann pointed out, the Council of Europe officially uses the word “nationality” as the legal term instead of political “citizenship”. The European Convention on Nationality of 1997, which deals with harmonisation of national rights in the framework of the acquisition and loss of “nationality” gives

19. Former Director General of Political Affairs of the Council of Europe.

20. President of the Helsinki Committee for Human Rights, Zagreb.

the following definition: “Nationality” means the legal bond between a person and a State and does not indicate the person’s ethnic origin” (Article 2). By contrast, in the central and eastern European tradition “nationality” refers rather to the fact of belonging to an ethnic group, while “citizenship” of a state subtends civic rights and duties. The emergence of these different approaches may be explained in part by the differing historical development of European states. This may also on occasion cause a certain degree of misunderstanding. For example, in the Croatian constitution, to take Zarko Puhovski’s example, “national minorities” means “ethnic minorities”, while the concept of “national security” is given the Anglo-French meaning.

Citizenship as a social and political link between individuals in a democratic society

Citizenship creates the social and political link between individuals in democratic societies. Being a citizen first of all means being a part of the political corpus of a state. In a democratic society, citizenship offers every citizen the possibility of political participation, making him or her a decision-making member of the political community through the right to vote which it confers. It guarantees individual liberties and social protection, but it also imposes a number of duties to the whole community of citizens, in particular compliance with the law and payment of taxes.

While the notion of “citizenship” has a mainly legal meaning, the citizen is not merely a legal subject. Dominique Schnapper²¹ demonstrated in her speech that citizenship also represents the **principle of political legitimacy**, the citizen owning a part of political sovereignty. In a democratic society, therefore, all the citizens acting together as a political community or “community of citizens”, to use Dominique Schnapper’s term, choose their leaders and control and sanction the government resulting from the election. Modern democratic regimes are characterised by unprecedented political forms based on the principle of representation. Modern democrats have invented political institutions by which this representation is effected – elections, parliaments, responsibility of governments to their citizens or representatives, participation of social groups and, in particular, political parties in organising competition for power. The purpose of all these political institutions mentioned by Dominique Schnapper is to organise representation. True, the institutional framework is important in building a democratic society; nevertheless, as Zarko Puhovski observed, it has its shortcomings. According to him, only “activist citizens” are able to build democracy, because “if an individual is not motivated to know his rights and how to use them and take advantage of them, he will be manipulated”. So citizenship relates to citizens’ active and responsible involvement in the governance of the society in which they live and which they help to construct.

Citizenship is not limited to the political legitimacy dimension: it is also the **source of the social bond**. As Dominique Schnapper said, in a democratic society the bond that unites people is no longer religious or dynastic but political: “Living together no longer means sharing the same religion, or being subjects of the same monarch, or being subject to the same authority: it means being citizens of the same political organisation”. Thus, the social bond between the members of a community is above all political; it is the expression of political participation both within the family and at the local, regional, national or even European level.

This definition of citizenship has evolved over time and continues to do so. However, according to Dominique Schnapper there is one feature of modern citizenship that is common to all democratic nations: its **potentially universal dimension**. Since Hume the city of antiquity founded on the distinction between free men and slaves, and excluding de facto the great majority of the population from democratic practice, has been criticised. Political rights have been successfully extended from rich to poor, from men to women; specific rights have been granted to minorities. Modern societies have gradually devised, and then enshrined in their institutions, the universal status of citizenship, in particular by introducing universal suffrage. Hans-Peter Furrer also observed that

21. Member of the Conseil Constitutionnel, Paris.

this extension of participation to all citizens is invariably the major feature of the process of democratisation in the eastern European “countries in transition”. And it continues to be a concern in all European states in their efforts to “keep democracy alive”, for example when faced with growing abstentionism.

Present-day discussion of citizenship often centres on cases of dual nationality. This Summer University has considered, among other things, the example of the countries of former Yugoslavia. At the time of the Federation its inhabitants had dual nationality – Yugoslav and republican. The latter was of no great importance, because only the former afforded access to the social protection system. With the dissolution of the Federation and the emergence of the new states, the old republican citizenship was not incorporated into all official documents. This created many problems for some new states, for example Slovenia. By contrast, Croatia recognised citizenship even in the case of Croats living in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

National allegiance as an identity-based dimension of citizenship

Nationality expresses the individual’s attachment to a specific political state entity, ie primarily a given territory and to the authority in charge of it. It is a passive allegiance, acquired by birth (“*ius solis*” or “*ius sanguinis*”) or obtained by a so-called “naturalisation” process and granted by states under certain conditions in accordance with their own “nationality code”.

In this sense, nationality simply means belonging to a nation, and so is often distinct from state “citizenship”. According to Hans-Peter Furrer, the nation is the link uniting the “community of citizens”. Generally speaking, this concept relates to the individual’s origins and place of birth. Hans-Peter Furrer took the history of the emergence of the French nation in the 1789 Revolution to illustrate his point: “When the people rose up against the king, the nobility and the clergy, some leaders and intellectuals immediately made the connection between the political instant and the reference to Gaul, to the Celts as common ancestors and to France as their homeland”. The nation thus links individuals living in a given territory and sharing a common tradition. It represents the feeling of union, of belonging to a territory “over and above the fact of all living together”.

In the countries of eastern Europe, for example, even today the word “nation” carries mythological significance. According to Hans-Peter Furrer, national mythology, like primitive ancient mythology with its talk of gods, heroes and the creation of the world, offers a series of stories about the birth of the nation, national heroes and their deaths. Only part of these stories can be proved historically: most of them are just pure legend. Almost all of them are the invention of writers, poets and even historians seeking to promote “national cohesion” or even hostility towards other nations. Everywhere in Europe “nationalism” has become a tool for those manipulating domestic and foreign policy, with all the disastrous consequences we have seen throughout history. Quoting Croatia as an example, Zarko Puhovski nonetheless stressed the importance of national allegiance: “We shall have a normalised situation once the population of Serb origin is able to say: “I am a Croat with Serb roots” and vice versa.

So nationality defines an individual’s belonging to a state or nation, all the more so as a passport gives it tangible form. The rules governing the grant or acquisition of nationality are the legal instrument which determines inclusion in, or exclusion from, the political community. This question has real consequences for the constitution of the state. The fact of legally belonging to a state raises the question of conditions and procedures for the acquisition of nationality, for example in the case of immigrants and asylum-seekers. There is nowadays a protectionist, restrictive tendency operating in the interests of the “identity of the traditional community”. The highly selective immigration policies pursued in several European states impose naturalisation conditions in terms of “integration” (relating to the length of stay in the country, learning the language, sharing values, assimilating political traditions). All this exists, according to Hans-Peter Furrer, “in order to secure real loyalty to the state, including participation in collective defence, contribution to the wealth and development of the state and its public services, and preservation of the national identity of

future generations”. In the course of his speech he took the example of the Baltic states to illustrate this. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, these countries began to restore nationality on the basis of the situation prior to annexation. Consequently, citizens of the Soviet Union who had lived in the territory of these countries during the Soviet era did not acquire their citizenship automatically. They were given the opportunity of naturalisation on request, subject to very strict conditions, especially regarding fluency in the country’s language.

Legislative frameworks set the criteria and determine access to nationality and citizenship, but in the last analysis each individual is likely to come to his own understanding of the two concepts, and to assimilate political participation and allegiance to a state in his own way, in order to forge his own identity.

B. Between national identity and European identity: what future for the European project?

From personal identity to collective identity

Over and beyond the political project and objective allegiances, the notion of identity entails personal choices and so-called subjective references. The individual seeks to situate himself socially and culturally and contributes to building his own destiny by drawing on all the references available to him. The concept of identity is very variable in this context and can be analysed through a different prisms. Thus it is possible to discover several dimensions of identity by comparing the approaches of different speakers.

For Hans-Peter Furrer, for example, identity represents “the intentional feeling of being a person with a set of specific characteristics”. In this context it takes on a personal dimension, embracing such notions as self-awareness and self-perception.

The social dimension of identity encompasses everything that makes it possible to identify the person from the outside and relates to the features which the latter shares with other members of different groups (gender, age, occupation). The cultural dimension of identity includes everything that is held in common with the other members of the group, ie the rules, standards and values which that person shares with his community.

According to Zarko Puhovski, what determines a person’s identity is the combination of these dimensions in that person – cultural factors such as environment and religion, and also factors of a personal kind, ie parental origin, marriage, etc. Thus one may define oneself simultaneously as a man or a woman, as a Croat or a Frenchman, as a Catholic or a Muslim, etc. Miljenko Dereta²² stressed the fact that choice of identity is a crucial question.

So it must not be forgotten that personal identity is constructed through the interplay of identifying factors claimed by a person on the basis of personal choices and identifying factors attributed by others on the basis of external elements. Miljenko Dereta provided a quotation from the famous 19th century Irish author Oscar Wilde: “Most people are other people. Their thoughts are the opinions of somebody else...” This proves, according to Miljenko Dereta, that most people accept the ideas and attitudes of others. But that does not mean that a person does not construct his own identity.

All these constructions of identity are undeniable multi-dimensional to the extent that what is cultural is also social, sexual, religious, occupational, family-determined, relational and political, and that these dimensions are caught up in a dynamic of interaction. The identity references mentioned are likely to change over time with the events of individual and collective life. Every person can define himself in different ways via these dimensions. Miljenko Dereta raised an important question in this connection: Why and how, then, does group identity assume such considerable proportions?

22. Director of the *Civic Initiatives*, Belgrade.

From national identity to nationalist excess

Collective identity, for example national identity, is much more problematic than personal identity. Since nations in the modern sense of the term have been created, that is to say since the early 19th century, and since the development of political mythology, the notion of national identity has come into its own. The political myths referred to by Hans-Peter Furrer in his speech are one form of expression of political and social imagination. They may manifest themselves through political rituals and ceremonies, flags and national anthems. They are also found in poetry and so-called “patriotic” art, and in the commemoration of a nation’s “great men” and “heroes”. All these things help to build up a national group identity. Miljenko Dereta gave the example of the national anthem which cites the names of famous people who played an important part in the founding of the nation, and observed in this connection that “the Macedonian national anthem talks of Macedonia, but not of its citizens; the only anthem which mentions citizens is the *Marseillaise*”.

Hans-Peter Furrer remarked, on the subject of national identity, that: “The obsession with national identity leads to self-centredness and self-satisfaction, which are backward-looking and defensive and not at all creative, or even to self-hypnosis (as in Nazi Germany or the former Yugoslavia), born of violence and breeding violence”. Miljenko Dereta spoke of the resurgence and expansion of Yugoslav identity as it had existed at the time of the Federation. When Yugoslav identity became illegal, secret groups of Yugoslavs called “Yugo-nostalgics” had been seen to emerge.

Consequently, too often for Hans-Peter Furrer’s liking, an insistence on identity and above all on collective identity means in reality the designation and rejection of somebody else or another people: “I cannot help thinking that this is what is happening in the European Union. I cannot join in the rejoicings over discussion of a “European identity”, which must be explained almost exclusively as an attempt to exclude. It justifies the exclusion of Turkey from future accession. And who knows which country will be the next target of identity talk in Europe!”

So what are we to think of the recent creation of a new Ministry of National Identity in France? What are we to think of the dominance of the political concept of ethno-national state in Ukraine? What are we to think of identity-based slogans which exclude, such as the “Faith, Fatherland, Language” slogan used by an opposition party in Georgia? These thorny questions prompted Hans-Peter Furrer to say that constructing a political platform on the basis of national identity may create real dangers.

Zarko Puhovski, however, observed that nationalism can be a motivating force for a community in which at certain periods democracy has been introduced in the absence of democratic means. Using somewhat the same argument, the Ukrainian School of Political Studies offered another view of “nationalism” in the framework of the construction of new states: “There are countries like Ukraine or Belarus where, if they started to avoid nationalism, a different major, unique identity would emerge – the identity of the south-east. In this case nationalism becomes a means of self-protection”. Dominique Schnapper believes that the fact of one people not being subject to another is what the democratic project means. Legitimacy comes from within the people. Democracy is born at the same time as nationalism. Whenever democracy spreads, it is linked to a set of national claims. On the theoretical or moral level, all nationalistic claims are justified.

The case of Ukraine gave rise to heated debate at the Summer University for Democracy, in particular regarding the national language and the elimination of Russian. Dominique Schnapper said it was obvious that there is a history, a tradition and difficult relations with the neighbouring state, a political tradition justifying national claims in that country. However, there was no escaping the history of relations between a big state and a smaller one, or the fact that national movements as part of a democratic society may stray into excess. Hans-Peter Furrer in turn noted that, while these countries did need to assert their own character, “Ukrainian must not be regarded as

the dominant language; it must not be made so dominant that it ousts Russian, which is spoken as the mother tongue”.

The question of national identity and the attendant risks of nationalistic excesses is one that has to be tackled cautiously. However, the Summer University for Democracy showed once again that these are quite complex concepts to which different meanings are attached in eastern and western Europe.

Yet one question remains: how can Europeans, given the diversity of their history and their present situation, recognise themselves sufficiently in an identity embodied by a viable democratic institutional project? Is it possible to construct a political project free of any group identity but based on belonging to the political community?

Is it possible to speak of a European identity?

Identity, as we have demonstrated, can be defined as a sense of belonging to a united community. In every country of the European Union or greater Europe citizens relate to the nation, to the country, to a particular culture. Throughout the process of European unification, the question of a European identity has lain at the heart of the debate. Does a European identity really exist? Is it necessary to the construction of the European political project?²³

Hans-Peter Furrer believes that “Europe has no identity, if we reason in terms of a single, unique identity”. He went on to say that it is the very essence and nature of Europe to accommodate different identities: “Europe is the home of a plurality of identities, coexisting and interacting. It means identity in difference, in diversity”. The European project, because it is based on the fundamental principles of democracy (the rule of law and human rights), makes that possible. These principles stem from recognition of the intrinsic dignity of every human being: everyone not only has rights, but also participates in governance and management of public authority and enjoys protection from arbitrary and discriminatory treatment.

He concluded with a reference to the Council of Europe’s “Link diversity” programme in the framework of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, the aim of which was to create effective links between the majority and the representatives of minorities via intercultural dialogue: “It is all we need on our path to a Europe still more common to all”.

So the European political project does not require a European identity that would supplant national and regional identities, but should ensure ongoing European diversity in a context of globalisation that encourages cultural standardisation. Unity in diversity, the watchword of the European Union, illustrates this wish for political union on a continent seeking to exert influence, to protect its citizens from world disorder, while promising that this union will not destroy the plurality of European cultures and identities.

The European project has now reached a point where thinking is needed on citizenship, identity and nationality. In parallel, the consequences of the collapse of the eastern bloc and permeability of frontiers render that reflection highly topical.

More than ever before, nations appear weakened in their role as historical subjects. The emergence of democratic supra-national public authorities is a necessity if the challenges of the 21st century are to be tackled. What kind of support can citizens give the European project? What should the foundations of European citizenship be? The idea of “constitutional patriotism” put forward by Jurgen Habermas seems an essential avenue to explore. It rests mainly on European citizenship based on acceptance of the rule of law and human rights, and detached from any allegiance to a culture, a language or national history.

23. These questions were also discussed in the workshop on “European and national identities”.

The exposure of national democratic societies to ethnic and religious conflicts, to economic and social inequalities, to growing claims to identity seeking public recognition, lays down numerous challenges to the continuance of democratic systems.

Modern democratic society is in a fragile condition. How then can we construct a democratic society and culture shared by all European states?

IV. Conditions for a democratic society: how can we construct a culture of democracy shared by all European countries?

“Democracy is the government of the people, by the people, for the people”

(Abraham Lincoln, Gettysburg address)

Democracy today faces many challenges, both in the manner of its application and in its theorisation. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the communist bloc, we have seen the rebirth of notions such as “democratisation” and “democratic transition” within the lexical field of political science. The concepts of “political culture” and “democratic culture” have also been restored to the centre ground of research.

The subject of democracy is paramount in the Council of Europe. It is a pillar of its activity, its *raison d’être*. From the 1990s onwards the Council of Europe has turned its attention to the countries of eastern Europe, and among all the essential principles of democratic discourse, civil society has become one of the most important. The emergence of talk about the role of civil society in the processes of democratisation in these countries is largely accounted for by the intellectual debate that has taken place around this subject.

Today, more than fifteen years after the disappearance of the eastern and western blocs, the debate about democracy, democratic culture and civil society as one of its conditions is just as lively and topical. The participants at the Summer University for Democracy came together at this last conference to consider the conditions and means of building a democratic culture shared by all European states.

A. Democracy and political culture

From the conceptual debate about “democracy”...

Democracy is a word that is debased in the political lexical field, to such an extent that all governments and even tyrannical and authoritarian regimes claim to be democratic. There is no universally agreed definition of democracy. Some people talk of law, others of elections, and yet others of the exercise of power. These divergences are also explained by the fact that everyone sees democracy through the prism of the national history of his country of origin. Since Athenian democracy, the concept has followed a process that has evolved throughout history. By comparing the different approaches to democracy adopted by the Summer University participants, we may arrive at a more or less complete picture of the concept.

Democracy may be defined as a **set of duties and rights**. According to Julian Popov,²⁴ having the right to vote and being able to choose among the various political parties are evidence that one is living under a democratic regime. But democracy can also be taken to mean a **mode of government**. According to Arcadie Barbarosie,²⁵ “democracy is the government of the people, by the people, for the people”, to quote Abraham Lincoln’s famous words. The Oxford Dictionary conveys the same idea when it refers to power for the people exercised by the people either directly or indirectly, through a system of representation including free elections at periodic intervals. These definitions do not envisage democracy through the prism of the law and the rule of law, respect

24. Chairman of the Board of the Bulgarian School of Politics, Sofia.

25. Executive Director of the Institute for Public Policy, Chisinau.

for human rights, the rights of minorities and freedom of expression, to mention only those aspects. However, Arcadie Barbarosie believes that these values are a direct consequence of the above definitions. For Henri Pigeat,²⁶ democracy is indeed the **practice of a certain number of values**, namely the European values shared by all the Council of Europe's member states. Lastly, democracy is also based on liberty. According to Loïc Tribot la Spière²⁷ “there is no real democracy without recognition and acceptance of the liberty inherent in every human person”.

It must nevertheless be observed that, despite the existence of democratic institutional structures, the actual exercise of power may be largely or totally undemocratic. This is why democracy must not be “an exercise in passive citizenship”, to use Loïc Tribot la Spière's expression: “Representing does not mean excluding the people one represents. The delegation of powers accorded at election time is not a blank cheque”. But what about the role assigned to citizens and civil society in a democratic society? In order to answer that question, we have to circumscribe the notion of democratic culture which is vital to the continued existence of such a system.

... to understanding the notion of “democratic culture”

The participants at the second Summer University for Democracy tackled the concept of “democratic culture” by defining the notion of “culture” itself. Generally speaking, when talking of the great composers, writers and artists one refers to the “culture” of this or that country. Thus culture is often associated with art. However, according to Julian Popov and Arcadie Barbarosie, the two concepts have to be distinguished: composing an opera is not culture, it is art, but going to the opera regularly is an element of culture. So culture refers to something one does repetitively. Arcadie Barbarosie defines it as a “complete set of socially transmitted configurations, behaviours, beliefs, institutions, practices and norms”. This definition of culture therefore refers to behaviour that is repeated over time. Arcadie Barbarosie offered the example of culture in his own country: “In Moldova, when anyone comes to my house I serve them a glass of wine. It is part of my culture. It is an automatic reaction”.

In this case, “democratic culture” is an everyday thing. It is the behaviour of citizens, organisations, and political parties in a given country and is reflected in election results, protests and demonstrations, among other things. Julian Popov mentioned the case of Russia in this connection. In Russia, where the government is taking over the economy, the media, and control of the country in general, an “immediate and massive” cultural reaction is indispensable. In his view, then, culture is a mass phenomenon, not confined to the influence of a country's elites. Citizen participation therefore seems to be necessary for a democratic culture to really exist.

B. Civil society: an essential condition for the existence of a democratic society

The need for an organised, active civil society

Those who have studied contemporary democracy, from A. de Tocqueville to R. Putnam via H. Eckstein, recognise that the existence of a viable, lively civil society exerting pressure on the authorities and drawing their attention to its rights, interests and causes makes a positive contribution to the longevity and the quality of democracy, and not only in western Europe or the United States.

Speakers at the second Summer University saw civil society as one of the essential conditions of democracy. History has many examples to show that universal suffrage is not in itself enough to ensure that democratic society lives on. Julian Popov observed in this connection that Adolf Hitler was elected democratically and that the construction and continuance of a democratic regime calls for something else: “I do not think that one can have a true democracy unless one has active citizens,

26. President of the Training Centre for Journalists, Paris.

27. General Delegate, Centre for Strategic Studies and Forecasting (CEPS), Paris.

unless one has what is now called “civil society”. Without active citizens true democracy is not possible”.

From Russia to Albania, statements by participants from the schools of political studies suggested that these countries have a large number of NGOs. Nevertheless, a significant number of them are fairly inactive. One question that rose was how to render civil society more active and more effective. According to Annelise Oeschger,²⁸ it is important to show ordinary citizens that they have control of things, that they hold power. The President of the INGO Conference observed in particular that from the time of its inception the Council of Europe had attached great importance to the work done with civil society. As long ago as 1951 the Council of Europe had marked the start of relations with the international NGOs by according them consultative status. As the relationship evolved, consultative status became participative status. Moreover, she was proud to note that the Council of Europe’s INGO Conference now carried the same weight within the organisation as other structures such as the Committee of Ministers and the Parliamentary Assembly. Thus the INGO Conference was genuinely involved in defining Council of Europe policies. “We maintain our independence and work with civil society”, said Annelise Oeschger.

While civil society represents one essential condition for the establishment of a democratic society, it is necessary to qualify that analysis. The other components needed for a democratic society must not be underestimated. It is by examining the relationships between political parties and civil society that we shall be able to decide more precisely the point at which the latter is crucial to the rise of a democratic society.

Civil society and political parties: complementarity or competition?

Not all the Summer University participants took the same view of civil society. The reservations expressed by some of them were linked to the relationship between political parties and civil society. Whether complementary or competitor, civil society is no longer regarded as the sole, indispensable condition for the rise of a democratic society, as we have already seen. Loïc Tribot la Spière still has doubts about the influence of civil society, which he describes as “significant”. But: “Are the organisations actually listened to? In every case it is the function of civil society to join the public debate, and little by little it will gain influence”. He also recognised that in France efforts are being made to take the NGOs into account, but that points of contact are non-existent whether with the French Government or with parliament, and there is no real consultation with civil society. “Civil society was for a long time considered an exotic beast, and listened to just from time to time. Our democracies are starting to take account of this important factor. I also stress that NGOs sometimes carry much more weight in the nascent democracies than in the old-established ones. But that will change”, said Loïc Tribot la Spière.²⁹

Basing himself on his experience of the transition to democracy in Bulgaria, one participant observed that at the start of that process international society had focussed mainly on the construction of a civil society based on non-governmental organisations. That was quite natural, since he believed democracy to be impossible without a “vital, dynamic civil society”. However, it tended to be forgotten that “political parties have an even more important part to play in establishing a lasting democracy”. Julian Popov does not believe that political parties are at the heart of democracy, but regards them rather as “tools, instruments following the democratic desires of the citizens”. According to him, without active citizens it is difficult to develop political parties representative of the population: “The one cannot exist without the other”. The problems which nevertheless continue to arise in Bulgaria are due to the fact that there is not yet any really active civil society. If political parties cannot create a genuine civil society, they can contribute to its development.³⁰

28. President of the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe.

29. The workshop on “How to engage civil society in the deliberative process” contributed greatly to this debate on the role of civil society in democratic society.

30. This question was also discussed in the workshop on “Parties and civil society organisations”, with the participation of representatives from the Skopje and Sofia schools of political studies.

Political parties offer a platform for expression and a place for public life to proceed. Nevertheless, according to Loïc Tribot la Spière, this role is less and less pronounced, and the trend is unlikely to be reversed because public opinion has “substantially matured”. It needs (and feels that need much more strongly than before) to intervene and to play a different part in political life.

Civil society is essential to the emergence of a democratic society. Nonetheless, even if its importance and its role will be increasingly decisive in democracies in the future, it cannot alone sustain and improve the democratic process. Such practices as regular, fair elections, the balance of powers, the rule of law, an independent judiciary, competition between political parties and a free, diversified press are necessary to the construction of a lasting democratic society.

C. Means of constructing a lasting democratic culture

Pluralist and independent media

The role of the media is crucial to the construction of a democratic society. According to Henri Pigeat, it is a means of expressing ideas for political leaders, but also a means of maintaining contact with public opinion. The media must be independent of government, because they have to enable the opposition to express its views. By way of example, Julian Popov observed that it is difficult to talk of genuine democracy in Russia at the present time “not because the right to vote does not exist or because there is no choice between political parties, but because Vladimir Putin communicates via the main TV station and the opposition does not have the same access to it”.

For elections to be truly free, citizens have to be informed in order to take informed decisions. Arcadie Barbarosie stressed the importance of access to information for all voters and all candidates: “Pluralist media representing a range of opinions and positions are necessary”. But it sometimes proves difficult to ensure that independent media survive. Arcadie Barbarosie quoted the example of Moldova. Opinion polls show that for 80% of the Moldovan population national television, considered by law as a public television station, is the only source of information. Yet today it is wholly government controlled, though other social protagonists cannot express their views in this medium. That being so, elections cannot be regarded as entirely free since the opposition party does not have access to the media in order to get its message over to the electorate.

The question of government funding of the media, as in Albania, poses a real problem of independence. The media are controlled by politicians, and it is very hard to find an independent newspaper. Arcadie Barbarosie also emphasised the importance of “journalistic solidarity” in a democratic society: “When a journalist publishes something on corruption, why is it not taken up and further investigated by other journalists?”

The media do indeed represent one essential means of constructing a democratic society.³¹ They enable engaged citizens to be informed. However, without education, is information enough to make a person an enlightened citizen? The answer seems obvious: no. For a voter to be able to distinguish between information and propaganda, education stands as a vital rampart. It is therefore another necessary part of building a democratic culture.

Building democratic culture through education

“There cannot be democracy unless those who are asked to choose are capable of doing so in an enlightened way. The preservation of democracy depends on education”. This quotation from Franklin Roosevelt, provided by Julian Popov, sums up the gist of the interventions on this topic. However, it is not simply by establishing a powerful system of education that the state will ensure the development of a democratic culture in the population. For example, the countries of the former Soviet Union possessed a strong education system, based mainly on the teaching of mathematics and science. Arcadie Barbarosie believes that this was a shortcoming: “ Even if education in the

31. The role of the media in the democratic process was also discussed in the workshop on “*Media: how can they favour the democratisation of democracy?*”

countries of the former Soviet Union was of high quality, people were still not trained to develop a critical sense". Teaching people to develop their free will, tolerance and respect for the opinions of others was paramount after the dissolution of the former Soviet Union. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the democratisation of education came to be a central political issue. Julian Popov believes that intelligent politicians realise how fundamental education is to modern democratic society. In England, where the education system works well, former Prime Minister Tony Blair came to power with the single slogan "Education, education, education". It must become a central element in a state's public policies. The European Union encourages its member states to make efforts to that end. However, the difficulty of implementing the Lisbon strategy, whose purpose is to make the European Union a knowledge-based economy by the year 2010, seems to show that such measures are as yet mere pipe dreams.

Education and freedom of the media, two means of developing a democratic society, are not sufficient to maintain it. Democracy is a fragile plant which has to cope with many challenges in order to endure. Here we shall focus on three of the challenges mentioned by participants – the "forgetfulness syndrome", abstentionism and corruption.

The "forgetfulness syndrome", according to Julian Popov, presents a major challenge to modern democratic society. Even in those democratic states where civil rights are respected, where the media are free and independent, forgetfulness is a real danger. It affects not only events that happened one or two generations ago. People must bring their memories into play when voting at election time: "The development of true democracy in countries such as Bulgaria and many other states entails the exercise of political memory on the citizen's part." Forgetfulness is probably one of the worst things that can happen in democratic societies.

Abstentionism is also a serious pitfall for democracy: "Democracy is made for the people by the people. Low turnouts due to high levels of abstentionism can have a major impact on democracy". The people must remain a pillar of the democratic process, according to Arcadie Barbarosie; the credibility of the system is at stake.³² A democracy in which the people (demos) chooses not to express its opinion loses all meaning.

Corruption, part of the political culture in certain countries of eastern and South-Eastern Europe, is another danger to democratic society. When those in power yield to the temptation of dishonesty of any kind, democracy is invariably under threat, whether in eastern or western Europe.

³². The workshop on "Good practices in the field of civic participation: how to reverse the decline of turnout?" also covered this question.

V. Fifty years after the Treaty of Rome: where is the European project?

On 25 March 1957 in Rome, the foreign ministers of the six founding states signed the treaty setting up the European Economic Community (EEC), and then the treaty setting up the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom). The EEC, or Common Market, which envisaged the gradual phasing-out of internal customs duties and a common external tariff, was not just a free trade area but provided for real tariff protection of the signatory states vis-à-vis third parties. Those who negotiated the Treaty of Rome intended to break with three centuries of protectionist tradition, as the opening sentence of the treaty shows: “to lay the foundations of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe”.

Signing the Treaty of Rome was the first step towards the construction of an institutional Europe. In accordance with the functionalist theory of “spillover”, institutional Europe did not begin with a political construct. It was the economic project, intended to create de facto solidarities, which ought to have led inexorably to political Europe. Fifty years after the Treaty of Rome, has that goal really been attained? The rejection of the constitutional treaty by France and the Netherlands might suggest the contrary.

The Treaty of Rome now constitutes the essential legal foundation of the European Union. It finally established this system of supranational integration that is unique in the world and in history. Today the Treaty of Rome is fifty years old – half a century of building a Europe of peace, half a century of building an ambitious and vulnerable Europe. What results can be chalked up after fifty years of European construction and integration? Where does the European project stand today?

A. From economic project to political Europe

The signing of the Treaty of Rome following the creation of the European Coal and Steel Community marked the start of economic integration in Europe. The economic success of the European Union fifty years later is not to be under-estimated. Jean-Dominique Giuliani³³ reminded us that the European Union is the wealthiest place in the world: European citizens have the highest standard of living in the world and the biggest consumer market in the world, with the most powerful companies seeking to invest in Europe.

However, Europe’s economy faces several challenges today, and this poses numerous questions. What role is the European economic project to play in view of globalisation? How can it stand up to the dynamism of the United States and China, an emergent world economic power? These questions, debated at the round table, have major implications for the European Union. However, participants at the Summer University believe that Europe still has a part to play on the world stage. True, China is one of the main markets and a major exporter stimulating the American economy. It is also a country faced with considerable problems in respect of the management of its territory, the environment, competitiveness and poverty. Jean-Dominique Giuliani believes that Europe is the only region in the world where “wealth is shared and the economic future is bright”.

While the economic factor is very important in European construction, it must not be forgotten that the European project is above all a political one. Jean-Dominique Giuliani underlined the fact

33. Chairman of the Robert Schuman Foundation, Paris.

that the European unification movements which arose at the end of the Second World War sought to promote a political project embodying a vision of Europe based on human rights, the rule of law and – the most important right of all individual rights – the right to live in peace and be respected in every sphere of life. For Jean-Dominique Giuliani, the core of the European political project is “believing in collective and individual rights, believing in freedom and solidarity”. According to Daniel Tarschys,³⁴ European values are essentially universal ones. The principle of European integration must be spread worldwide. Political Europe has no frontiers.

This seems like an ideal picture of Europe, but the reality of the European project is far more complex. There are differing perceptions of Europe. On the one hand there are those who wish to continue with Europe’s political integration, and on the other hand those who are satisfied with the economic results and see no need to pursue integration further. The question of identity, already raised on several occasions, is important in this context. National identity is certainly necessary to a reasonable degree for a state to function. However, nationalist excesses are a real threat to European unification. National consciousness has to be preserved without drifting into hostile, chauvinist, xenophobic and aggressive patriotism.

Replying to Jan Peter Balkenende, the Netherlands Prime Minister, and all those who claim that loss of national identity inevitably leads to loss of the people’s control over the state, Adrian Severin³⁵ emphasised that in reality such leaders “are afraid of losing control over the people ...we live nowadays in a post-Westphalian order in which we have to assimilate a new view of the world: transnational democracy in which nation-states share some of their sovereign powers, in particular with local authorities”. The world order today is organised on three levels: local, national and transnational, and unless we take these into account we cannot tackle the challenges facing Europe at present. Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that even Eurosceptics are part of Europe’s political space; while questioning some aspects of European integration, they help to promote the process.

“Peace, freedom and prosperity”. That is the result of fifty years of European integration, summed up in three words by Luisella Pavan-Woolfe. When we examine the development of the economy and civil society, “we have a great feeling of togetherness, of belonging to a common European project”, said Jean-Dominique Giuliani. Several European countries which previously lived under dictatorships are now prosperous democracies. The chance to travel freely throughout Europe today is an opportunity for exchanges, especially for students. The vitality of the European project is manifest not only in the political activity that takes place in Strasbourg and Brussels, but also throughout civil society, consumers, producers, students. European integration, even if it did begin with economic and social constructs, needs a political project and institutions in order to ensure the stable development of Europe. The speakers at this Summer University for Democracy saw the balance-sheet of the last fifty years as positive. Promotion of the European project is necessary to its continued existence.

B. The priorities for tomorrow’s Europe

In a globalised world, Europe must reposition itself and redefine its priorities. Rainer Steckhan³⁶ stressed the need in coming years to give greater importance to solidarity in the European project, in particular towards Africa, the poorest continent on the planet. Africa had emerged fifty years ago; Europe could not ignore this partner and must develop its support programmes further.

Another priority for Europe’s leaders must be better social cohesion within Europe itself. There is still a difference between the east and west of the continent, between rich and poor. Much work is needed to even out these inequalities. There should be more initiatives such as the activities of the Council of Europe Development Bank, in Rainer Steckhan’s opinion.

34. Former Secretary General of the Council of Europe.

35. Member of the European Parliament, Romania.

36. Chairman of the Administrative Council of the Council of Europe Development Bank.

However, the most important challenge remains the spreading of European values throughout Europe and beyond its frontiers. According to Luisella Pavan-Woolfe, these values must not be “imposed” but “proposed”. Broader co-operation with the countries bordering on the European Union is importance in this regard. That cannot happen unless a common foreign and security policy is implemented. Daniel Tarschys believes that “we need to invest more effort, energy and creativity in working out a foreign and security policy in order to promote our common aim. Europe needs a seat and must speak with one voice in the United Nations Security Council and in other international organisations”.

The result of fifty years of European construction is not just the Single Market, said Luisella Pavan-Woolfe: it is also to be seen in the triumph of peace and freedom on the European continent. Today, as she sees it, the Council of Europe is a natural, complementary partner for the European Union in maintaining peace, prosperity, stability and solidarity. The two institutions must work hand-in-hand in the years ahead to bring together and strengthen the fundamental values of the European integration process.

However, the European Union is bound to undergo reforms if the European project is to move forward. The European Union’s biggest budget at present is the agricultural budget. The Union’s own resources need to be increased and redirected to education, research and culture. Moreover, establishing a common standard-setting space is a task that must be pursued in both Strasbourg and Luxembourg.

Finally, a new stage in the European project will be reached when regional and transfrontier co-operation are increased. Countries will have to work together to meet tomorrow’s challenges more effectively, and this must extend beyond rigid national frontiers and practices. In this connection, Yavuz Mildon³⁷ pointed to the work done by the Council of Europe in this field in conjunction with the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities. Regional players were becoming more and more important, and so it was necessary for these incipient structures to be democratic. Initiatives such as the Madrid Convention or the work of the Euroregions in the field of cultural exchanges, intercultural dialogue and further economic co-operation should be encouraged. These reforms were urgent and necessary if European citizens were to adopt and welcome the European project.

The picture of Europe painted by participants at this round table is very different from what Europe was ten years after the Second World War when the Treaty of Rome was signed. The question of peace in Europe is less worrying for present generations than it was fifty years ago. The Europe we know today is more diverse: it encompasses more countries, more minorities, more languages, religions and beliefs.

It is equally difficult to foresee what picture Europe will present in five, ten or fifteen years’ time. Provided the education system is reformed, that efforts are devoted to research, sustainable development, the environment and social cohesion, Europe will continue to be a world power and a most agreeable region of the world in which to live. There remains one unknown factor: the political will of European leaders. Tomorrow’s Europe is being prepared today.

European states share a common past today, but must continue to work together on their common future. The European unification process that was launched half a century ago proves that nations which used to be enemies can work together while respecting each other’s diversity. Over the past fifty years, much has been done to build a political Europe. It would seem that all those years were just a beginning on the long road to European integration.

37. President of the Chamber of Regions of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe.

VI. Rethinking the concept of “open society”: the importance of truth in a democratic society

Representative democracy constitutes a fundamental principle in most European countries. Nevertheless, some states such as Belarus do not have a democratic regime. Having democratic institutions and holding free elections are essential, but not sufficient to constitute a democracy. Democracy is a culture that must touch all a society's strata. The aim of the schools of political studies is to help new democratic elites emerge and encourage the training of engaged citizens able to take responsibility in their own countries.

At the time when the Soviet Union collapsed, many observers thought that the “closed” society was about to disappear and give way to an “open society” in which reason and individual liberty would prevail. In practice that meant establishing the rule of law, democratically elected governments, respect for human rights and minorities, the introduction of a market economy and the development of an active civil society. The goal has not been wholly attained even today. Foundations such as the Open Society Institute still have a part to play and it is vital that they receive support. The philosophy underlying the campaigns waged by these organisations must not be forgotten eighteen years after the fall of the Berlin Wall. To quote George Soros,³⁸ “the task has not been accomplished”. The fact is that the crumbling of the Soviet system was not followed everywhere by the introduction of an open society. Looking at the former Soviet bloc area, we find that Russia has not really managed that transition successfully: even in Poland worrying trends can be observed.

However, there is something more worrying still: not only has it not proved possible to establish an open society in all the former Soviet states, but the underlying principles are in real danger even where it is well established, for example in the United States. This fact has prompted George Soros to reconsider the concept of “open society”, basing himself on our possibly imperfect understanding of the reality. Searching for the reasons why our perception of reality is insufficient has led to the concept of “reflexivity”. First, according to George Soros, each individual tries to understand the world in which he lives: this is called the “cognitive function”. But we also wish to have an impact on the world, to change it: this is what George Soros calls the “participative function”. In an ideal world these two functions should be kept separate, but that configuration is impossible in the real world. At the same time as we endeavour to apprehend the world, our everyday actions change it. That is why our understanding of the world is imperfect.

The participative function now occupies a dominant position in the political sphere. Leaders prefer to disguise reality rather than submit to the hard work of understanding and telling things as they are. Public weariness, leading to lack of vigilance, fosters political manipulation. In this context, it is obvious that the establishment of an open society is more than ever compromised. The ease with which politicians are able to disguise reality has been facilitated by systematic recourse to marketing and advertising. Modern political professionals have learnt to appeal to the emotions. One of the most spectacular examples of political manipulation is to be found in George Orwell's “1984” and the propaganda purposes to which it was put in the United States. The way in which the fear generated at the time was exploited reflected the desire to rally the population round the president. Freedom of speech, separation of powers and free elections are necessary but insufficient conditions for modern democratic societies: “Preference must also go to the cognitive function,

38. Chairman of the Open Society Foundation.

which implies concern for truth. This tendency to distort truth in political discourse must be rejected and resisted”.

Under the Soviet system, a fair proportion of the people were aware of the distortion of reality of which they were the victims. According to George Soros, the people wanted freedom of speech, freedom of thought, democracy. Today the countries of the former Soviet bloc, but also all other democratic regimes, “must pursue this search for truth”.

Rethinking the concept of open society begs many questions which Summer University participants did not fail to raise. When asked which geographical areas his foundation should target in its work, George Soros said that Europe ought to be the organisation’s principal focus. European states must play an increasingly meaningful role in constructing a new world order and not leave the United States in sole charge of international policy. “The priority for Europe today must be to implement a common foreign policy”, the primary aim of which will be to reconstitute the international community. The latter will be required to state its views on such important issues as global warming, pacification of the Near and Middle East, and nuclear non-proliferation. So the stakes are high, and the countries of the former Soviet bloc must play an increasingly leading part in European politics. However, Europe cannot remain inward-looking. It must look outwards to the world and play its part in spreading the “open society” concept beyond the frontiers of the European continent.

VII. Conclusion: The future of the European project: a common future for all Europeans

The second Summer University for Democracy provided the six hundred participants from 15 schools of political studies with an opportunity to compare their conceptions and experience of citizenship, national and European identity, press freedom, social cohesion and governance and so together to rethink the common European project fifty years after its inception.

The integration of European states into the atypical supranational institutions of the Council of Europe and the European Union has been a crucial factor in the democratisation of the eastern and south-eastern regions of the European continent since 1989. At its inception, as the product of post-war reconciliation, the European project began by creating a common economic space before opening up to the former Soviet states. The future of the European project will involve the construction of a political Europe able to punch its weight within the international community and to develop by reducing the disparities between western and eastern Europe.

Although the European project has made important progress since 1957, the dangers of resurgent nationalist tendencies of the most extreme kind must not be under-estimated. The debates on European national identity and citizenship were an opportunity to point out that national interests are legitimate but can, when misused, lead to hatred and rejection of others. Active citizenship must guard against this pitfall.

The absence of a democratic tradition, the glaring consequence of decades of totalitarian and authoritarian regimes, made the process of transition begun in the early 1990s a complex one. Democracy implies and requires that all citizens are responsible. It is essential to respect other human beings, other cultures, religions and languages. This notion of responsibility operates not only at the individual level but must be extended to that of the state. The aim must be to set in place a reliable public administration capable of listening to individuals and acting responsibly. On the other hand, individuals' hostility and indifference to politics, and in particular to political parties, presents a real danger to emerging democracies.

Present-day democratic societies are evolving, and perceptions of democracy with them. Public attitudes to democracy are different from what they were a few decades ago. Yet governments, political parties, civil society and individual citizens must continue to play their part.

The subjects discussed at this Summer University represent the prime challenges to all European democracies, whether recent or older. This proves that democracy is not just a legally complex, but also a socially real, institutional system. This is both its strength and its weakness. For this reason Fabienne Keller,³⁹ in her closing address to the Summer University, called on everyone to "remain vigilant, denounce shortcomings and find places for dialogue and regulation within our countries and states".

Europe will have to face the challenges intrinsic to our age, in particular global warming and organised crime. But it will also fulfil its purpose by keeping faith with its original project, promoting the establishment of lasting peace and defence of the rule of law and democracy.

According to Oliver Dulic, the project awaiting Europe today is the same as fifty years ago. Taking his own country as an example, he said it was essential for a country like Serbia, the product of a

39. Senator and Mayor of Strasbourg.

post-conflict society and a state comprising a large number of national minorities, to respect other nations: “Only intensive interaction can ensure optimum co-operation among us”. He sees understanding of other people’s motives and positions as the stoutest rampart against any future conflicts. The European project helps to improve relations between neighbours: “Our region is realising that you cannot be a good European and a bad neighbour. It is remarkable to observe the extent to which this realisation is slowly but surely transforming relations in the region, from competition, mistrust and even open conflict towards partnership for progress with the accession process”.

For Alexandre Milinkevich,⁴⁰ the European project cannot be indifferent to the future of Belarus, the last dictatorship in Europe; its authoritarian, liberticide regime keeps the Belarusian population under control through fear. The people are so deceived by propaganda that values and ideas which might facilitate the emergence of a democratic society cannot be spread. “Belarus is a laboratory-state where experiments are done on a return to the past”. The popular vote to sanction the government is no longer a match for the situation: passive resistance is needed now, according to Alexandre Milinkevich. Relations with the European Union and the Council of Europe, as well as the help and support of other countries, are extremely important to the democratisation of the country.

Democracy does not come of its own accord: it has to be maintained and cared for. We must be watchful to ensure the continuance of democracy in Europe. Andreas Gross⁴¹ stressed that the nation-state is no longer the best way of organising individuals: “Nationalistic ideas bring misery on the world”. Nationalistic sentiments are still generating violence today. The development of democracy, especially transnational democracy, is proving extremely important. Democracy and its values know no frontiers.

This second Summer University for Democracy afforded some extraordinary exchanges and produced enriching debates. This annual rendezvous for schools of political studies is a powerhouse of democracy in Europe and, to quote Fabienne Keller, “a formidable impetus to a project for our continent’s future”.

40. Winner of the “Sakharov prize – for Freedom of Thought 2006”, Belarus.

41. Chairman of the Committee on Rules of Procedures and Immunities of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe.

Annex I: Programme of the Summer University for Democracy

Monday, 2 July 2007	
09.30 Hemicycle	Opening session Opening by Mr Terry DAVIS, Secretary General of the Council of Europe Mr Göran LINDBLAD, Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Sweden Ms Luisella PAVAN-WOOLFE, Representative of the European Commission to the Council of Europe
10.00	Mr Thomas HAMMARBERG, Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe
10.30	Opening lecture by H.E. Mr Boris TADIC, President of the Republic of Serbia
12.00	Family photo
12.30	Lunch at the Restaurant of the European Parliament
14.30-17.30	Conferences
Tirana, Bucharest, Pristina room 9	Conference I “European strategies and national policies: drawing together a common space” Chair: Ms Anne JUGANARU, Director of the “Ovidiu Sincai” European School, Bucharest Speakers: Mr Klaus SCHUMANN, former Director General of Political Affairs of the Council of Europe Ms Gaëtane RICARD-NIHOUL, Secretary General of Notre Europe, Paris
Sarajevo, Belgrade, Podgorica, Zagreb room 5	Conference I “European strategies and national policies: drawing together a common space” Chair: Mr Zdravko GREBO, Director of the Academy for Political Excellence, Sarajevo Speakers: Mr Ivan VEJVODA, Executive Director of the “Balkan Trust for Democracy”, Belgrade Mr Christopher CVIIC, Senior Political Counsellor, EBRD, London Mr Jean-François TROGRLIC, Director of the International Labour Organisation Office, Paris

<p>Kyiv/Minsk, Chisinau, Baku, Tbilisi room 1</p>	<p>Conference II “Identity, nationality and citizenship in a democratic society” Chair: Mr Viorel CIBOTARU, Director of the European Institute for Political Studies, Moldova Speakers: Ms Dominique SCHNAPPER, Conseil Constitutionnel, Paris Mr Hans-Peter FURRER, former Director General of Political Affairs of the Council of Europe</p>
<p>Yerevan, Sofia room 3</p>	<p>Conference III “Conditions for a democratic society: how to build a culture of democracy shared by all the European countries” Chair: Ms Svetlana LOMEVA, Director of the Bulgarian School of Politics, Sofia Speakers: Mr Julian POPOV, Chairman of the Board of the Bulgarian School of Politics, Sofia</p>
<p>14.30-16.00 Moscow, Skopje</p>	<p>Visit to the European Court of Human Rights</p>
<p>20.00</p>	<p>Reception offered by the City of Strasbourg Pavillon Joséphine, Parc de l’Orangerie</p>

<p>Tuesday, 3 July 2007</p>	
<p>09.00-12.00</p>	<p>Conferences</p>
<p>Kyiv/Minsk, Chisinau, Tbilisi, Yerevan room 1</p>	<p>Conference I “European strategies and national policies: drawing together a common space” Chair: Mr Armaz AKHVLEDIANI, Director of the Tbilisi School of Political Studies Speakers: Mr Jack HANNING, former Director of External and Multilateral Relations, Council of Europe Mr Nicolae CHIRTOACA, Ambassador of the Republic of Moldova to the United States of America, Washington</p>
<p>Sarajevo, Belgrade, Podgorica, Skopje room 5</p>	<p>Conference II “Identity, nationality and citizenship in a democratic society” Chair: Ms Sonja LICHT, Director of the Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence Speakers: Mr Piro MISHA, Institute for Communication and Dialogue, Tirana Mr Zarko PUHOVSKI, Helsinki Committee for Human Rights, Zagreb Mr Miljenko DERETA, Civic Initiatives, Belgrade</p>

Bucharest, Moscow, Tirana room 9	<p>Conference III</p> <p>“Conditions for a democratic society: how to build a culture of democracy shared by all the European countries”</p> <p>Chair: Ms Elena NEMIROVSKAYA, Director of the Moscow School of Political Studies</p> <p>Speakers: Mr Arcadie BARBAROSIE, Executive Director of the Institute for Public Policy, Chisinau</p> <p>Mr Henri PIGEAT, President of the Training Centre for Journalists, Paris</p> <p>Ms Annelise OESCHGER, President of the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe</p>
10.30-12.00 Pristina, Sofia, Zagreb, Baku	Visit to the European Court of Human Rights
12.30	Lunch at the Restaurant of the European Parliament
14.00-17.00	Conferences
Moscow, Sofia, Baku room 5	<p>Conference I</p> <p>“European strategies and national policies: drawing together a common space”</p> <p>Chair: Mr Ilgar MAMMADOV, Director of the Baku Political Studies Programme</p> <p>Speakers: Mr Istvan GYARMATI, Centre for Euro-Atlantic Integration and Democracy, Budapest</p> <p>Mr François-Gilles LE THEULE, Director of the Centre for European Studies, Strasbourg</p>
Pristina, Skopje, Zagreb room 9	<p>Conference III</p> <p>“Conditions for a democratic society: how to build a culture of democracy shared by all the European countries”</p> <p>Chair: Mr Gordan GEORGIEV, Director of the Skopje School of Politics</p> <p>Speakers: Ms Marijana GRANDITS, Stability Pact, Brussels</p> <p>Mr Loïc TRIBOT la SPIERE, Centre d’Etude et de Prospective Stratégique, Paris</p> <p>Mr Boris VUKOBRAT, Founder and Chairman of the Peace and Crises Management Foundation, Zug</p> <p>Ms Renate WEBER, Open Society Foundation, Bucharest</p>
14.30-16.00 Sarajevo, Yerevan, Podgorica	Visit to the European Court of Human Rights

14.00-17.00	Workshops
Kyiv/Minsk room 1	Workshop: European and national identities Moderators: Mr Sergey PANKOVSKIY, Chairman of the Board, Belarusian Institute for Strategic Studies, Minsk Mr Yevhen BYSTRYTSKYI, Director of the International Renaissance Foundation, Kyiv
Chisinau room 3	Workshop: How to engage the civil society in deliberative process? Moderators: Ms Zinta MIEZAINI, Civil Alliance, Riga Mr Andrei Popov, Executive Director of the Foreign Policy Association of Moldova
Tbilisi room 6	Workshop: Energy policies to guarantee safe and sustainable providing sources Moderators: Mr Philippe SEBILLE-LOPEZ, Researcher, French Institute of Geopolitics, University of Paris VIII Mr Charles ESSER, Energy Analyst, International Crisis Group, Brussels
Bucharest room 7	Workshop Media: how can they favour the democratisation of democracy? Moderators: Mr Paul DOBRESCU, National School of Political Studies, Bucharest Mr Doru POP, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca
Belgrade room 11	Workshop: The economical and social consequences of European integration Moderators: Mr Nebojsa VUKADINOVIC, Researcher, Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches Internationales (CERI), Paris Ms Milica UVALIC, Professor, Department of Economics, Finance and Statistics, Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Perugia
Tirana room 8	Workshop: Media: how can they favour the democratisation of democracy? Moderators: Mr Henri PIGEAT, President of the Training Centre for Journalists, Paris Mr Piro MISHA, Institute for Communication and Dialogue, Tirana
17.15-18.30 Hemicycle	Plenary session Chair: Ms Maud DE BOER-BUQUICCHIO, Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe Mr George SOROS, Chairman of the Open Society Foundation
Free evening	

Wednesday, 4 July 2007	
09.00-12.00	Workshops
Pristina room 3	Workshop: European and national identities Moderators: Mr Christophe BERTOSSI, Institut Français des Relations Internationales, Paris Ms Laure NEUMAYER, Pantheon-Sorbonne University, Paris
Sarajevo room 1	Workshop: European and national identities Moderators: Mr Gjergj SINANI, University of Tirana, member of the Advisory Committee of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities Mr Doru POP, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca
Tirana room 7	Workshop: European programmes and transition Moderators: Mr François BAFOIL, CERI-Sciences Po, Paris Ms Catherine PERRON, CERI-Sciences Po, Paris
Yerevan room 2	Workshop: European programmes and transition Moderators: Mr Karen BEKARYAN, National Assembly, Yerevan Mr Shavarsh KOCHARYAN, Member of Parliament, Yerevan
Sofia room 9	Workshop: Good practices in the field of civic participation: how to reverse the decline of turnout? Moderators: Mr Xavier DELCOURT, Centre Universitaire d'Enseignement du Journalisme, Strasbourg Mr Saso ORDANOSKI, Programme Director, FORUM-CSR (Centre for Strategic Research and Documentation), Skopje
Zagreb room5	Workshop: Media: how can they favour the democratisation of democracy? Moderators: Mr Renaud de LA BROUSSE, Senior Lecturer, University of Reims Mr Krunoslav VIDIC, Foreign Correspondent, Croatian radio-television
Skopje room 6	Workshop: Parties and civil society organisations Moderators: Mr Miljenko DERETA, Civic Initiatives, Belgrade Ms Nadia CUK, Council of Europe Office, Belgrade

Baku room 13	<p>Workshop: The European models of social, economical and political integration of minorities</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Ms Petra KOVACS, Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative, Budapest</p> <p>Mr Levente SALAT, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca</p>
Belgrade room 11	<p>Workshop: European integration and governance: the means for administration to adopt European schemes</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Ms Anne RASMUSSEN, European University Institute, Florence</p> <p>Mr François LAFARGE, Ecole Nationale d'Administration (ENA), Strasbourg</p>
Moscow room 8	<p>Workshop: To reform the public administration: between ethics and effectiveness</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Mr Christian SAVES, ENA, Strasbourg</p> <p>Mr Tuomas PÖYSTI, National Audit Office of Finland, Helsinki</p>
Podgorica room D3	<p>Workshop: The European models of social, economical and political integration of minorities</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Mr Dino ABAZOVIC, Center for Human Rights of the University of Sarajevo</p> <p>Mr Fabrice de KERCHOVE, King Baudouin Foundation, Brussels</p>
10.30-12.00 Kyiv, Minsk, Chisinau, Tbilisi, Bucharest	Visit to the European Court of Human Rights
12.30	Lunch at the restaurant of the European Parliament
14.30-17.30	Workshops
Kyiv/Minsk room 6	<p>Workshop: European programmes and transition</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Mr François BAFOIL, CERI-Sciences Po, Paris</p> <p>Ms Catherine PERRON, CERI-Sciences Po, Paris</p>
Chisinau room 11	<p>Workshop: To reform the public administration: between ethics and effectiveness</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Mr Christian SAVES, ENA, Strasbourg</p> <p>Mr Arcadie BARBAROSIE, Executive Director of the Institute for Public Policy, Chisinau</p> <p>Mr Tuomas PÖYSTI, National Audit Office of Finland, Helsinki</p>

Tbilisi room 7	<p>Workshop: European and national identities</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Mr Christophe BERTOSI, Institut Français des Relations Internationales, Paris</p> <p>Ms Laure NEUMAYER, Pantheon-Sorbonne University, Paris</p>
Bucharest room 5	<p>Workshop: Good practices in the field of civic participation: how to reverse the decline of turnout?</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Ms Renate WEBER, Open Society Foundation, Bucharest</p> <p>Mr Dan Popescu, Administrator, Directorate of Democratic Institutions (DGDPA), Council of Europe</p>
Pristina room 3	<p>Workshop: European integration and governance: the means for administration to adopt European schemes</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Ms Anne RASMUSSEN, European University Institute, Florence</p> <p>Mr François LAFARGE, ENA, Strasbourg</p>
Sarajevo room 1	<p>Workshop: Building a multi-ethnic State based on common projects</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Mr Zarko PUHOVSKI, Helsinki Committee for Human Rights, Zagreb</p> <p>Mr Thomas MARKERT, Deputy Secretary of the European Commission for Democracy through Law (“Venice Commission”), Council of Europe</p>
Yerevan room EDQM 500	<p>Workshop: Media: how can they favour the democratisation of democracy?</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Mr Shavarsh KOCHARYAN, Member of Parliament, Yerevan</p> <p>Mr Karen BEKARYAN, National Assembly, Yerevan</p>
Sofia room 9	<p>Workshop: Parties and civil society organisations</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Mr Bogdan BOGDANOV, New Bulgarian University, Sofia</p> <p>Ms Karin NORDMEYER, United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), Germany, Freiburg</p>
Zagreb room 2	<p>Workshop: How to engage the civil society in deliberative process?</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Ms Nadia CUK, Council of Europe Office, Belgrade</p> <p>Mr Igor VIDACAK, Office for Co-operation with Non-Governmental Organisations, Government of the Republic of Croatia</p>

<p>Skopje room 17</p>	<p>Workshop: The European models of social, economical and political integration of minorities</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Ms Petra KOVACS, Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative, Budapest</p> <p>Mr Levente SALAT, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca</p>
<p>Baku room 13</p>	<p>Workshop: Increasing the means of local authorities: a way of taking into consideration the diversity of local situations</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Mr Guy SIAT, Université Robert Schuman, Strasbourg</p> <p>Ms Antonella VALMORBIDA, Association of the Local Democracy Agencies, Strasbourg</p>
<p>Moscow room 8</p>	<p>Workshop: Good practices in the field of civic participation: how to reverse the decline of turnout?</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Mr Troy DAVIS, Consulting Democracy Engineer, Strasbourg</p> <p>Mr Xavier DELCOURT, Centre Universitaire d’Enseignement du Journalisme, Strasbourg</p> <p>Mr Stephen BOUCHER, Notre Europe, Paris</p>
<p>Podgorica room D3</p>	<p>Workshop: The economical and social consequences of European integration</p> <p>Moderators:</p> <p>Mr Nebojsa VUKADINOVIC, Researcher, CERI, Paris</p> <p>Ms Milica UVALIC, Professor, Department of Economics, Finance and Statistics, Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Perugia</p>
<p>14.30-16.00 Belgrade, Tirana</p>	<p>Visit to the European Court of Human Rights</p>
<p>20.00</p>	<p>Reception</p> <p>Conseil Régional d’Alsace Maison de la Région (1, Place de Wacken)</p>

Thursday, 5 July 2007	
09.00 Hemicycle	<p>Fifty years after the Treaties of Rome: where is the European project? Round Table with European personalities</p> <p>Chair: Mr Adrian SEVERIN, Member of the European Parliament, Romania</p> <p>Ms Gabriela KONEVSKA-TRAJKOVSKA, Deputy Prime Minister of “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”, Minister in Charge of European Affairs</p> <p>Mr Jean-Dominique GIULIANI, Chairman of the Robert Schuman Foundation, Paris</p> <p>Mr Daniel TARSCHYS, former Secretary General of the Council of Europe</p> <p>Mr Yavuz Mildon, President of the Chamber of Regions of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities, Council of Europe</p> <p>Mr Rainer STECKHAN, Chairman of the Administrative Council of the Council of Europe Development Bank</p> <p>Ms Luisella PAVAN-WOOLFE, Representative of the European Commission to the Council of Europe</p>
12.30	Lunch at the Restaurant of the European Parliament
14.30-17.30	Regional and bilateral meetings of the Schools of Political Studies
evening	Reception hosted by the Permanent Representations

Friday, 6 July 2007	
09.30 Hemicycle	<p>Closing Session</p> <p>Chair: Ms Fabienne KELLER, Senator Mayor of Strasbourg</p> <p>Presentation of conclusions by the rapporteurs of thematic conferences</p> <p>Mr Zurab TCHIABERASHVILI, Permanent Representative of Georgia to the Council of Europe, alumnus of the Moscow and Tbilisi Schools of Political Studies</p> <p>Mr Andreas GROSS, Chairman of the Committee on Rules of Procedures and Immunities of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Switzerland</p> <p>Mr Alexandre MILINKEVICH, winner of “Sakharov prize – for Freedom of Thought 2006”, Belarus</p> <p>Mr Oliver DULIC, Speaker of the Parliament of the Republic of Serbia, alumnus of the Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence</p> <p>Award of certificates to participants</p> <p>Presentation of the Final Declaration</p>
12.00	Free afternoon
19.30-21.00	<p>Garden party</p> <p>Jardin des Deux Rives</p>

List of speakers

Dino ABAZOVIC, Center for Human Rights of the University of Sarajevo
François BAFOIL, Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches Internationales (CERI), Paris
Arcadie BARBAROSIE, Executive Director of the Institute for Public Policy, Chisinau
Karen BEKARYAN, National Assembly, Yerevan
Christophe BERTOSSI, Institut Français des Relations Internationales, Paris
Bogdan BOGDANOV, New Bulgarian University, Sofia
Stephen BOUCHER, Notre Europe, Paris
Yevhen BYSTRYTSKYI, Director of the International Renaissance Foundation, Kyiv
Nicolae CHIRTOACA, Ambassador of the Republic of Moldova to the United States of America, Washington
Nadia CUK, Council of Europe Office, Belgrade
Christopher CVIIC, Senior Political Counsellor, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, London
Terry DAVIS, Secretary General of the Council of Europe
Troy DAVIS, Consulting Democracy Engineer, Strasbourg
Maud DE BOER-BUQUICCHIO, Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe
Xavier DELCOURT, Centre Universitaire d'Enseignement du Journalisme, Strasbourg
Miljenko DERETA, Civic Initiatives, Belgrade
Paul DOBRESCU, National School of Political Studies, Bucharest
Oliver DULIC, Speaker of the Parliament of the Republic of Serbia
Charles ESSER, Energy Analyst, International Crisis Group, Brussels
Hans-Peter FURRER, former Director General of Political Affairs of the Council of Europe
Jean-Dominique GIULIANI, Chairman of the Robert Schuman Foundation, Paris
Marijana GRANDITS, Stability Pact, Brussels
Andreas GROSS, Chairman of the Committee on Rules of Procedures and Immunities of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Switzerland
Istvan GYARMATI, Centre for Euro-Atlantic Integration and Democracy, Budapest
Thomas HAMMARBERG, Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe
Jack HANNING, former Director of External and Multilateral Relations, Council of Europe
Fabienne KELLER, Senator Mayor of Strasbourg
Fabrice de KERCHOVE, King Baudouin Foundation, Brussels
Shavarsh KOCHARYAN, Member of Parliament, Yerevan
Gabriela KONEVSKA-TRAJKOVSKA, Deputy Prime Minister of “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”, Minister in Charge of European Affairs
Petra KOVACS, Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative, Budapest
Renaud de LA BROSSE, Senior Lecturer, University of Reims

François LAFARGE, Ecole Nationale d'Administration (ENA), Strasbourg

François-Gilles LE THEULE, Director of the Centre for European Studies, Strasbourg

Göran LINDBLAD, Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Sweden

Thomas MARKERT, Deputy Secretary of the European Commission for Democracy through Law ("Venice Commission"), Council of Europe

Zinta MIEZAINĒ, Civil Alliance, Riga

Yavuz MILDON, President of the Chamber of Regions of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities, Council of Europe

Alexandre MILINKEVICH, winner of "Sakharov prize – for Freedom of Thought 2006", Belarus

Piro MISHA, Institute for Communication and Dialogue, Tirana

Laure NEUMAYER, Pantheon-Sorbonne University, Paris

Karin NORDMEYER, United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), Germany, Freiburg

Annelise OESCHGER, President of the Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe

Saso ORDANOSKI, Programme Director, FORUM-CSR (Centre for Strategic Research and Documentation), Skopje

Sergey PANKOVSKIY, Chairman of the Board, Belarusian Institute for Strategic Studies, Minsk

Luisella PAVAN-WOOLFE, Representative of the European Commission to the Council of Europe

Catherine PERRON, Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches Internationales (CERI), Paris

Henri PIGEAT, President of the Training Centre for Journalists, Paris

Doru POP, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca

Dan POPESCU, Administrator, Directorate of Democratic Institutions (DGDPA), Council of Europe

Andrei POPOV, Executive Director of the Foreign Policy Association of Moldova

Julian POPOV, Chairman of the Board of the Bulgarian School of Politics, Sofia

Tuomas POYSTI, National Audit Office of Finland, Helsinki

Zarko PUHOVSKI, Helsinki Committee for Human Rights, Zagreb

Anne RASMUSSEN, European University Institute, Florence

Gaëtane RICARD-NIHOUL, Secretary General of Notre Europe, Paris

Levente SALAT, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca

Christian SAVES, Ecole Nationale d'Administration, Strasbourg

Dominique SCHNAPPER, Conseil Constitutionnel, Paris

Klaus SCHUMANN, former Director General of Political Affairs of the Council of Europe

Philippe SEBILLE-LOPEZ, Researcher, French Institute of Geopolitics, University of Paris VIII

Adrian SEVERIN, Member of the European Parliament, Romania

Guy SIAT, Université Robert Schuman, Strasbourg

Gjergj SINANI, University of Tirana, member of the Advisory Committee of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities

George SOROS, Chairman of the Open Society Foundation

Rainer STECKHAN, Chairman of the Administrative Council of the Council of Europe Development Bank

Boris TADIC, President of the Republic of Serbia

Daniel TARSCHYS, former Secretary General of the Council of Europe

Zurab TCHIABERASHVILI, Permanent Representative of Georgia to the Council of Europe

Loïc TRIBOT la SPIERE, Centre d'Etude et de Prospective Stratégique, Paris

Jean-François TROGRLIC, Director of the International Labour Organisation Office, Paris

Milica UVALIC, Professor, Department of Economics, Finance and Statistics, Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Perugia

Antonella VALMORBIDA, Association of the Local Democracy Agencies, Strasbourg

Ivan VEJVODA, Executive Director of the “Balkan Trust for Democracy”, Belgrade

Igor VIDACAK, Office for Co-operation with Non-Governmental Organisations, Government of the Republic of Croatia

Krunoslav VIDIC, Foreign Correspondent, Croatian radio-television

Nebojsa VUKADINOVIC, Researcher, Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches Internationales (CERI), Paris

Boris VUKOBRAT, Founder and Chairman of the Peace and Crises Management Foundation, Zug

Renate WEBER, Open Society Foundation, Bucharest

Annex II: List of Participants

Moscow School of Political Studies

Ms Elena NEMIROVSKAYA, Founder and Director, Moscow School of Political Studies

Ms Nadezda FEDOROVA, Manager, Moscow School of Political Studies

Mr Andrei ZAKHAROV, Deputy Director, Moscow School of Political Studies

Mr Nikolay MYAKSHIN, Chair, Association of Invalids (Archangelsk region)

Ms Elena KHAZIEVA, Chair of special projects, “BashTrend” Company

Mr Rasul KHAYBULLAEV, Press-secretary of Dagestan Republic President

Mr Zapir ALKHASOV, Deputy, Makhachkala City Council (Republic of Dagestan)

Mr Evgeniy KANUKHIN, Head of Angarsk City Administration (Irkutsk region)

Mr Mikhail KOPYLOV, Chair, Svirsk City Council (Irkutsk region)

Mr Andrey KOZLOV, Vice-Mayor, Angarsk City (Irkutsk region)

Mr Evgeniy PASICHNIK, Deputy, Bratsk City Council (Irkutsk region)

Ms Tatiana BOCHAROVA, Director, Institute of Regional Politics and Legislation of Belgorod Region (Belgorod region)

Mr Andrey CHERNYSHEV, Deputy, Regional Legislative Assembly (Irkutsk region)

Ms Aleksandra BUZANOVA, Head of the Public Relations Department, Izhevsk City Administration

Ms Elena OBEZDCHIKOVA, Chairman, Youth Human Rights Group (Voronezh region)

Mr Alexey SAGAYDAK, Deputy, Kaliningrad City Council (Kaliningrad region)

Mr Galina GRECHENKO, Deputy Minister of Education, Regional Government (Kaliningrad region)

Mr Dmitriy KUZMIN, Vice-Mayor, Berezovsky City (Kemerovo region)

Mr Roman PLUYTA, Deputy, Tuapse Municipal Council (Krasnodar region)

Ms Evgenia DIMITROVA, Deputy Director, Municipal institution “Krasnoyarsk centre of provincial self-government development”

Mr Yuriy KOVYRSHIN, Consultant to Regional Commissioner for Human Rights (Lipetsk region)

Ms Anastasia DEMENKOVA, Head of Juridical Department, State Research Institute of System Analysis of the Accounting Chamber of the Russian Federation

Ms Maria ZHUCHKOVA, Regional Projects Co-ordinator, All-Russia Business Union “Delovaya Rossia”

Ms Svetlana PETRAKOVA, Staff Member, State Duma (Moscow)

Mr Alexey DULENKOV, Deputy, Golitsyno City Council (Moscow region)

Ms Marina YAKUTOVA, Director, “Centre for Legal Support of Local Self-Government” (Moscow)

Ms Lilia LEVKINA, Expert, EU-Russia Co-operation Program (Nizhny Novgorod region)

Ms Elena DUGELNAYA, Head of Regional Branch, “Delovaya Russia” (Novosibirsk region)

Mr Vladimir IVANOV, Consultant, Committee on Public and Political Affairs, Regional Administration (Novosibirsk region)

Ms Galina IVANOVA, President, Regional public organisation “Institute of social technologies” (Novosibirsk region)

Mr Sergey PONOMAREV, Expert, Perm Civic Chamber (Perm region)

Mr Alexey MIRONOV, Editor-in-Chief, *Toliatinskoe obozrenie* newspaper (Samara region)

Ms Oxana KUROVSKAYA, Deputy Director, Institute for Regional Problems of Russian Statehood on the North Caucasus (Stavropol region)

Ms Marina BESPALOVA, Deputy, Ulyanovsk City Council (Ulyanovsk region)

Mr Konstantin YANTSEN, Vice-President, Siberian industrial-investment corporation “ISTK”

Ms Olga KURAKINA, Minister of Youth Development of Ulyanovsk Region (Ulyanovsk region)

Ms Irina KOMAROVA, Editor-in-Chief, “Sibir” Information Company (Republic of Khakasiya)

Mr Vladimir IVANOV, Deputy, Cheboksry City Council (Republic of Chuvashia)

Ms Elena IZHENDEEVA, Department Head, “Chuvashiya” State TV-Radio Company (Republic of Chuvashia)

Mr Evgeny MAYN, Deputy, Regional Legislative Assembly (Yaroslavl region)

Mr Igor BLOKHIN, Deputy, Yaroslavl City Council (Yaroslavl region)

Mr Vladimir BEBEKH, Director of Surgut Subsidiary of “PR Corpus” Ltd, Khanty-Mansi Administrative District

Mr Irina VOROBIOVA, Chief Specialist, Yaroslavl City Administration (Yaroslavl region)

Mr Alexei KLESHKO, Deputy, Krasnoyarsk Regional Legislative Assembly

Tbilisi School of Political Studies

Mr Armaz AKHVLEDIANI, Founder and Director of the Tbilisi School of Political Studies

Mr David BATSIKADZE, Member of the Supreme Council of Adjara (Faction “Conservatives”)

Mr Eremia BERISHVILI, Member of the Parliament of Georgia (Faction “National Movement – Democrats”)

Ms Ekaterine BUGHADZE, Lawyer-Administrator, “Bank of Georgia”

Mr Vazha CHOPIKASHVILI, Director, Real Estate Registration Centre

Mr Vakhtang DEKANOSIDZE, Lawyer, Transinvest Capital Georgia L.L.C.

Mr Avtandil DVALISHVILI, Head, Public Relations Department, United Energy Distribution Company of Georgia

Ms Mariam EBANOIDZE, Journalist

Mr George GAMKRELIDZE, Regional Distribution Manager, “Magticom” Company

Ms Tamar JINCHARADZE, Head of PR Department, Tbilisi City Council

Mr Geronti KALICHAVA, Journalist, Radio “Atinati”

Ms Sophio KHAZHOMIA, Head of PR Department, “Sakhalkho Aptiaki” Company

Ms Inga KVACHANTIRADZE, Judge of the Tbilisi City Court

Ms Nino LEZHAVA, Deputy Director, Regional Branch, “Heinrich Boll Stiftung”

Mr Alexander MENABDE, Member of the Parliament of Georgia (“Faction National Movement – Democrats”)

Mr Nikoloz NATCHKEBIA, Member of the Parliament of Georgia (Faction “National Movement – Democrats”)

Mr David OKROSHIDZE, Notary

Mr Kakhaber SUKHISHVILI, Member of the Parliament of Georgia (Faction “National Movement – Democrats”)

Mr Shalva TADUMADZE, Military Lawyer, Association “Justice and Freedom”

Mr Zaza TAVADZE, Head, Department for Human Resources, Office of the Prosecutor General of Georgia

Ms Tea TORIASHVILI, Procurement Specialist, World Bank Financed Georgian Agriculture Development Projects Co-ordination Center (PCC)

Ms Natia TSKEPLADZE, Judge, Supreme Court of Georgia

Mr Gaioz TSAGAREISHVILI, Director of Department, “BCI” Insurance Company

Ms Nata TSAGARELI, Head, Directorate for Liberty and Equality, Department of Prisons.

Mr Vakhtang TSOTSONAVA, Representative, Association “Youth for Peace and Democracy”

Ms Darejan TSUTSKIRIDZE, Lecturer, Tbilisi Technical University

Mr Vladimir VARDZELASHVILI, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Culture and Sport of Georgia

Mr Petre ZAMBAKHIDZE, Chairman, Committee for Constitutional and Legal Affairs, Supreme Council of Adjara (Faction “National Movement”)

Ms Tamar KHIZANISHVILI, Head of International Relations Department, Bank of Georgia

Mr George JALABADZE, Journalist

Mr Vakhtang BALAVADZE, Member of the Parliament of Georgia (Faction “National Movement-Democrats”)

Mr Zurab ABASHIDZE, Professor, Former Ambassador of Georgia to Russian Federation

Mr David BERDZENISHVILI, Member of Parliament of Georgia (Faction “Democratic Front”)

Mr George TARGAMADZE, Director-General, Directorate of Public and Social Broadcasting, “Imedi” TV Company

Mr Mate KIRVALIDZE, Editor-in-Chief, Information Service “Imedi” TV Company

Mr George KALANDIA, Deputy Director National Centre of Manuscripts of Georgia

Mr Levan IOSELIANI, Defence-Lawyer

Mr Giorgi ONIANI, Foreign Relations Assistant to Prime-Minister of Georgia

Mr Bachana MIKELADZE, Adviser, Education and Training International

Mr Rati GUMASHVILI, Student, Tbilisi State University

Bulgarian School of Politics

Ms Svetlana LOMEVA, Director, Bulgarian School of Politics

Ms Denitsa LOZANOVA, Program Director, Bulgarian School of Politics

Ms Adriana PETROVA, Chairperson, Alumni Association

Mr Aleksandar MANOLOV, Member of the Municipal Council of the Bulgarian Socialist Party – Svoje

Mr Anton KOYCHEV, Assistant at the Department of Surgical Diseases, Medical University, Sofia, Member of Union for Democratic Forces

Mr Arif ALOV, Municipal Councillor, Municipality of Devin, District of Smolyan, Chairman of the of the Municipal Council Youth Movement for Rights and Freedoms

Mr Vasil AVRAMOV, Member of the Executive Bureau of the Municipal Council of the Bulgarian Socialist Party, Velingrad; teacher

Mr Vladimir YURUKOV, Member of the National Leadership of Democrats for Strong Bulgaria

Mr Valcho CHOLAKOV, Attorney at Law, the Bar of Bourgas, Member of the Municipal Council of the Union of Democratic Forces

Mr Dimitar IVANOV, Organizational Secretary of the Union of Democratic Forces

Ms Dolya PCHELINSKA-BOYCHEVA, Attorney at Law, the Bar of Varna, Member of Democrats for Strong Bulgaria

Mr Yossif ASSA, Medical Doctor, Commercial Director of Johnson and Johnson

Ms Mariana DIMOVA, Member of the Executive Bureau of the RS of the Bulgarian Socialist Party; Assistant professor, Faculty of Dentistry at the Medical University, Sofia

Mr Dragomir DRAGANOV, Expert, Ministry of Labor and Social Policy

Mr Georgi KYRYAKOV, Regional Co-ordinator for SE Bulgaria Democrats for Strong Bulgaria

Mr Ivailo YONKOV, Chairman of Democrats for Strong Bulgaria – Lozenets, Sofia

Mr Pencho ZAGORSKI, Deputy Chairperson of the Youth Movement for Rights and Freedoms

Mr Iliyan ZLATEV, PR of the National Movement Simeon II – Plovdiv, Deputy Chairman of the Liberal Youth Assembly of the National Movement Simeon II

Mr Kalin SLAVOV, Secretary, Legal Council to the Prime Minister of the Republic of Bulgaria

Mr Ljubomir PETKOV, Chairman of the ObS of the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP)– Pleven and Member of the BSP Supreme Council

Ms Mariana BACHEVA, Insurer at Allianz Bulgaria, Member of Democrats for Strong Bulgaria

Ms Mariya GINEVA, Expert at the Political Office of the Minister of Disaster Management Policy

Ms Maria DIMITROVA, Bulbrokers Ad, Investment International Company, Legal Adviser

Ms Mediha TOSUNOVA, Chairperson of the Municipal Council of the Youth Movement for Rights and Freedoms – Sliven

Mr Metin SYULEYMANOV, Member of Parliament, Movement for Rights and Freedoms

Ms Mima WASILEVA, Member of Parliament, National Movement Simeon II

Ms Nadezhda BOZHINOVA, Chairperson of the Liberal Youth Assembly of the National Movement Simeon II – Plovdiv

Ms Nevena ALEKSIEVA, International Department, Bulgarian Socialist Party

Ms Neli MINCHEVA, Deputy Chairperson of the Municipal Council of Sliven Union of Free Democrats

Mr Nikolay PEYCHEV, Media Policy Adviser to the Minister of Agriculture and Forestry

Ms Nuray GERDZHIKOVA, Legal Consultant at “RIOSV” Shoumen Member of the Supreme Council of the Bulgarian Socialist Party

Mr Orhan KUSHUDZHU, Member of the Central Operative Council of the Youth Movement for Rights and Freedoms Chairman of the Municipal Council of the Youth Movement for Rights and Freedoms – Silistra

Ms Petya VELKOVA, PR – “Media Group V” GERB – founder and member of the leadership

Ms Rabie KYOSEVA, Head of Protocol, Municipality of Smolyan

Ms Ralitza KATZARSKA, Co-ordinator, Access to Information Program

Mr Reyhan ABLEKIM, Member of Parliament, Movement for Rights and Freedoms

Mr Svetlozar TODOROV, Journalist, TS Radio, Member of the National Movement Simeon II

Ms Silviya GEORGIEVA, Chairperson of the Youth Union of Democratic Forces – Vratza

Mr Slavcho GAVRILOV, Member of the Youth Organization of BANU-PU

Mr Stefan ASENOV, Municipal Councillor (Sofia), Union of Free Democrats, Member of the Political Council and Secretary of the Sofia Leadership of the Union of Free Democrats

Ms Teodora ASLANSKA, Member of VMRO-BND, Blagoevgrad

Ms Teodora PETROVA, Director, Credit Division, International Asset Bank

Mr Todor STOYANOV, Member of the Board of BANU-PU, Inspector, Special Detachment and Internal Control, Sofia Municipality

Mr Toma BIKOV, Member of Democrats for Strong Bulgaria; Actor

Mr Philip KIREV, Organizational Secretary of the Union of Democratic Forces

Ms Hristina KOSTADINOVA-CHOLAKOVA, District Governor, Sliven, National Movement Simeon II

Mr Yulian ANGELOV, District Organizer of VMRO-BND for Rousse, Razgrad and Silistra

Mr Ivelin NIKOLOV, Deputy Chairman of Bulgarian Socialist Party

Mr Dimi PANITZA, Founder of Bulgarian School of Politics

Mr Korman ISMAILOV, Chairperson of Youth Movement for Rights and Freedoms

European Institute for Political Studies (Moldova)

Mr Viorel CIBOTARU, Director, European Institute for Political Studies

Mr Andrei POPOV, Political Analyst

Ms Ana REVENCO, Program Co-ordinator, European Institute for Political Studies

Ms Raisa MOROȘANU, Accountant, European Institute for Political Studies

Ms Angela LEAHU, Member of the Moldovan Parliament

Mr Victor BARBĂNEAGRĂ, Director, “AUDIT-COMPLEX” Ltd

Ms Veronica BEJENARU, Member of the National Bureau, Social Democracy Party

Mr Ion CEBANU, Student, Law Faculty, State University Moldova

Mr Ion CEKA, Financial Manager, Trade Company “Legolas”

Ms Simona CIBOTARU, Head of Moldova’s Chapter, People to People Association

Mr Iurie CHIORESCU, President of the Youth Municipal Organization of the Democratic Party of Moldova

Mr Anatolie COGUTEAC, Main Inspector, Analytical and Informational Department, Moldincombank

Mr Dumitru CRAVCENCO, Member of the National Council, President of the Youth Organization of Vulcanesti rayon, Democratic Party of Moldova

Mr Oleg CRISTAL, Journalist, National Daily Newspaper “Moldova Suverana”

Ms Viorica CULEAC, Member of the Exchange Department, Economics and Management Student Association

Mr Anatolie DIMITRIU, International Relations Manager, National Association of the Tourism Organizations

Mr Victor DRĂGUȚAN, Secretary, Union of the Communist Youth of Moldova

Mr Daniel DOHOT, Adviser Christian Democratic People’s Party

Ms Larisa DONCIU, Probationer, Center for Combating Economic Crimes and Corruption

Ms Svetlana DONI, Co-ordinator, The IPNA Company “Teleradio-Moldova”

Ms Nicolina DUMITRAȘ, Master student, University of Novi Sad, Serbia

Mr Victor FRIJA, Co-president, Federation of the Youth Organizations

Ms Veronica GUȚU, President of the Permanent Bureau of the Youth Organization, Social-Democratic Party of Moldova

Mr Igor KLIPPII, Member of the Moldovan Parliament

Ms Tatiana LIPCA, Student, Secretary general, Youth Organization, Liberal Party

Mr Anatol MĂMĂLIGĂ, PR & PI Officer, Every Child Moldova

Mr Dorin MÎNDREANU, Executive Director, Republican Center “STUDINCOM”

Ms Vera NOVIC, Records Manager, Local Government Reform Project

Mr Veaceslav PALADE, Program Officer, Eurasia Foundation

Ms Ecaterina POCLITARI, Deputy-Chairman “Democratic Youth”, Youth Organization of Democratic Party, Moldova

Ms Svetlana PODOPRIGORA, President of the Youth Organization, Balti, Party of Social Democracy

Ms Daniela RAILEAN, Inspector, Center for Combating Economic Crimes and Corruption

Ms Natalia SPÎNU, Member of the National Center for Transparency and Human Rights

Ms Ina ȘUPAC, First secretary, Union of the Communist Youth of Moldova

Ms Iulia TALMACI, Member, CAPTES

Mr Dinu ȚURCANU, Adviser Christian Democratic People’s Party

Mr Radu VRABIE, Programs Co-ordinator, Foreign Policy Association (APE)

Pristina Institute for Political Studies

Ms Leonora KRYEZIU, PIPS Executive Director

Ms Arjeta HASANI, PIPS Project Assistant

Mr Abelard TAHIRI, BA Political Sciences, Member of PDK youth forum

Mr Agim KULETA, Economist, Owner of the Printing House “XPrint”

Ms Albana KUSARI, BA English Language, Program Co-ordinator, USAID/Kosovo

Mr Armend BEKAJ, MA Peace Studies, Executive Director –Kosovo Research & Documentation Institute

Mr Armend ZEMAJ, BA Law Studies, Legal Manager – Ministry of Economy and Finance

Mr Arton KONUSHEVCI, BA Albanian Language, Journalist – Koha Vision

Mr Bashmir XHEMAJ, BA Political Sciences, Journalist – Koha Vision

Ms Bukurije BAJRALIU, BA Political Science/Journalism School, Journalist – Daily newspaper “Koha Ditore”

Ms Donika KADAJ – BUJUPI, BA Journalism, Public Information Officer – Energetic Corporation, Member of the Presidency – AAK

Mr Enis AHMETAJ, Law Studies, Human Rights Officer, OSCE

Mr Enis SUBI, BA Turkish Language, Member of the Youth Forum – Turkish Democratic Party

Mr Enver KRASNIQI, BA Law Studies, Director of Legal Office – Office of the General Auditor (OAG)

Mr Faton OSMANI, BA Journalism, Journalist/Editor – Daily newspaper “Lajm”

Mr Fatos MANI, BA History, General Secretary of the Youth Forum – Alliance for the Future of Kosovo (AAK)

Mr Fehmi FERATI, Political Science Studies, Manager – Post Telecommunication Kosovo

Mr Florian DUSHI, BA Law Studies, Administrative Co-ordinator of the Constitutional Commission (LDK)

Mr Ilir GASHI, BA Political Studies, Assistant of Parliamentary Group of PDK – Kosovo Assembly

Mr Ilir HOXHA, MD Health Systems Management London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine University of London. Project Co-ordinator – Kosovo Youth Development Project, Ministry of Culture

Mr Ismail DIBRANI, BA Political Science, President of the Drenas Branch – Reformist Movement ORA

Ms Luara KRYEZIU, MA Bussnis and Management, NAAC Regional Director

Mr Lorik BAJRAMI, Political Sciences & Journalism Studies, Researcher – KODI Institute

Mr Luan JUSUFI, MA Economy/Management, Member of General Council of LDK

Ms Maja MARKOVIĆ, BA Sociology, Political assistant for ethnic minorities – US Office, Prishtina

Ms Rozafa UKIMERAJ, MA Constitutional Law, Head of Permanent Secretary’s Office – Ministry LGA

Mr Samedin MEHMETI, MA International Law & Relations, Director of Administrative Support – Kosovo Police

Mr Samir REKA, Law Studies, Political Assistant of ORA President

Ms Sanja DAVIDOVIĆ, BA English Language, Head of International Commission for Foreign Languages

Ms Valentina QARRI, BA Philosophy, Head of Office – Academic Training Association

Ms Valmira REXHEBEQAJ, MS Economics & Business Analysis, Macroeconomics Adviser – Ministry of Finance

Mr Valon AHMETI, BA Political Science, International Politics & Military Affairs, Military Adviser – KPC

Mr Veton ELSHANI, Economic Studies, Spokesperson – Kosovo Police Service

Mr Visar DEMIRI, Political Science Studies, Member of Presidency – Youth Alliance of Kosova (AAK)

Ms Vjollca DIBRA, BA Albanian Language, Senior Material Control Assistant, OSCE

Skopje School of Politics

Mr Gordan GEORGIEV, Executive director

Ms Sonja ISMAIL, Project Co-ordinator and Moderator in the School of Politics

Ms Katerina KUS-IVANOVA, Monitoring and Policy Analysis

Mr Ante POPOSKI, Medical Doctor

Ms Ivana SOKOLOVSKA, Politologist

Ms Elena GEORGIEVSKA, Junior Associate for public diplomacy in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Ms Tanja LAZARESKA, Doctor

Mr Dejan ILLJEV, Insurance manager

Mr Idris FAZLIOSKI, Lawyer

Mr Kujtim DEARI, Economist

Mr Sejdi XHEMAILI, Economist

Mr Stojanche MANEV, Student

Ms Jasminka MITKOVSKA, Teacher, post graduate student on European studies

Ms Jelena TRAJKOVSKA, Lawyer

Mr Dimitar KARAKULEV, Manager of security sector

Ms Iskra ANDREEVA, Lawyer, LLM

Mr Redzepali CUPI, Student

Ms Aleksandra NIKOLOVSKA, Lawyer

Ms Suzana AHMEDI, Banking Commercial

Mr Semi MEMETI, Journalist

Mr Zage FILIPOVSKI, OSCE

Ms Melek ALIJA-ELEZI, Lawyer

Mr Oliver STOJANOSKI, military

Ms Nadije HOXHA, Journalist

Mr Danilo MANDIC, Lawyer

Ms Ksenija COCKOVA, Project assistant in FNF

Ms Shukran SALI, Government clerk

Ms Nial MEMETI, Junior associate/Financial management officer at BERIS Project, Ministry of Economy

Mr Sabidin ALI, Art Manager

Ms Biljana ZASOVA, Secretariat for European Affairs

Mr Aleksandar STAMBOLIEV, MCMS

Ms Ana ANGELOVSKA, Civil servant – Head of Unit in the Secretariat for European Affairs

Ms Violeta TASEVA, Adviser in MoD

Ms Merita PASHOLI-SELIMI, Business Law

Ms Sanja GRUEVSKA, Politicolog

Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence

Ms Sonja LICHT, President, Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence

Mr Zarko STEPANOVIC, Program Director, Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence

Ms Valentina DJURETA, Administrative Assistant, Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence

Ms Ivana BAKIC, Vice-President of the Information Service Democratic Party of Serbia in Kragujevac

Ms Bisera BUHIC, Chief of Cabinet of the Chairman of the National Council for Co-operation with The Hague Tribunal

Ms Ana CUBELA, Editor of the “Topic of the Day” column, BLIC daily

Mr Dragan DANICIC, President of the Democratic Party of Serbia Youth

Mr Boris DJURDJEV, Mayor, Bela Crkva Municipality

Mr Vladica GAVRILOVIC, President of the BoD, Sports Center “Mladost”, member of Nova Srbija

Mr Miodrag GLUSCEVIC, Secretary of the Committee on Municipal Public Services and the Committee for Energy Efficiency, Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities

Mr Sasa GOLUBOVIC, Mayor, Svrlijig Municipality

Mr Jaroslav HREBIK, MP, G17 plus

Mr Borko ILIC, MP, Democratic Party of Serbia

Ms Svetlana JANICIJEVIC, Editor of the Domestic Politics Section of the Information Program and Editor of “Dnevnik”, National Television (RTS)

Ms Aleksandra JERKOV, MP, League of the Social-democrats of Vojvodina

Mr Ivan JOVANOVIC, MP, Democratic Party

Mr Ivica KOJIC, Chief of Cabinet of the Minister of Economy and Regional Development

Ms Ivana KONSTANTINOVIC, Editor-Presenter, Radio and Television Station B92

Mr Semsudin KUCEVIC, Mayor, Tutin Municipality

Ms Mina LAZAREVIC, Vice-President of the Belgrade Democratic Youth Executive Board, Democratic Party

Ms Daniela LOVRIN-GAVRILOVIC, MP, Democratic Party

Ms Mia MAGAZIN, International Democratic Party of Serbia Youth Deputy Secretary

Mr Aleksandar MARTON, MP, League of the Social-democrats of Vojvodina

Ms Milena MIHAJLOVIC, Junior Adviser for Strengthening Administrative Capacity in the European Integration Process, The EU Integration Office

Ms Smiljana MILISAVLJEVIC, Vice-President of the Democratic Party Kosovo Provincial Board

Mr Marko NARANCIC, Member of the G17 plus Board

Mr Danko NIKOLIC, Project Manager, NGO Zajecar Initiative

Mr Mentor NUHIU, President of the Education Committee within the Media and Citizen Participation Committee, Party of Democratic Action

Mr Aleksandar PEJCIC, Head of the Jablanica District

Ms Nena PETKOVIC, Head of Protocol in the Ministry for Infrastructure

Mr Zeljko PRODANOVIC, Mayor, Kosjeric Municipality

Mr Atullah REDZEPI, Member of the BoD of the Democratic Union of Presevo

Mr Miodrag SHRESTHA, Executive Director, NGO Group 484

Mr Milos SIMONOVIC, MP, Democratic Party

Mr Nemanja STAROVIC, Vice-President of the Serbian Renewal Movement Novi Sad City Board

Mr Goran STEFANOVIC, MP, Democratic Party

Mr Bato SAJN, Member of the Roma Integration Council

Mr Edip SERIFOV, MP, Democratic Party

Mr Tamas TOT, MP, Democratic Party

Mr Milan VUCKOVIC, MP, Democratic Party

Academy for Political Development (Croatia)

Ms Nevena CRLJENKO, Executive Director of the Academy for Political Development

Mr Branislav BIBIC, President of the Academy for Political Development

Mr Tin GAZIVODA, Member of the Steering Board of the Academy for Political Development

Mr Krunoslav VIDIC, HRT, Foreign Correspondent

Mr Marko RAKAR, Prius d.o.o., General Manager

Ms Suzana KUNAC, B.a.b.e., Programme Co-ordinator

Ms Natasa BOZIC, Jutarnji list, Journalist

Mr Josip SARIC, HRT, Journalist/Reporter

Ms Iva Mia ERAK, Democratic Centre Party, Spokesperson

Mr Sandi BLAGONIC, Croatian Academy for Sciences and Arts, The Institute for Historical and Social Sciences, Assistant

Mr Dalibor RAKUSA, Ilirika Securities Ltd., Managing Director

Mr Djivo DJUROVIC, Adriatic Media d.o.o. Editor-in-Chief of Net.hr Portal

Mr Zdenko BABIC, The Institute of Economics Zagreb, Research Assistant
Mr Dan SPICER, Social Democratic Party, President of Croatian Social Democratic Youth
Ms Lada JURICA, EPP-ED Group in the European Parliament, Press Officer
Mr Dalibor DVORNY, Central State Office for Development Strategy and Co-ordination of the EU Funds, Expert Assistant
Ms Marija GERBEC NJAVRO, HRT, Journalist/Reporter
Ms Jelena MARIN (RAPO), OSCE Mission to the Republic of Croatia, Programme Assistant
Ms Marina MADJAREVIC, City of Vukovar, Associate for international co-operation and European integration
Ms Iva PRPIC, Social Democratic Party, Member of the City Council of Zagreb
Mr Igor ROGINEK, Croatian Youth Network, Vice-President
Mr Branimir JERNEIC, Ministry of the Sea, Tourism, Transport and Development, Assistant Minister
Mr Davor KONJIKUSIC, Fade In, Journalist/Director
Ms Ksenija KARDUM, Nova TV, Senior Political Correspondent
Ms Anka BILIC KESEROVIC, HRT, Reporter
Ms Melita MULIC, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration, Attaché
Ms Martina SOKAC, Croatian Chamber of Economy, PR specialist
Mr Sinisa GOLUB, Public institution for nature protection of Medjmurje county, Acting superintendent
Ms Gabrijela KASAPOVIC, Atlantic grupa, PR manager

“Ovidiu Șincai” European School (Romania)

Ms Anne JUGANARU, Director of the “Ovidiu Șincai” European School
Mr George Vadim TIUGEA, Project Assistant, Ovidiu Șincai European School
Ms Diana TIRZIU, Project Assistant, Ovidiu Șincai European School
Ms Mirela Elena ADOMNICA, MP, Social Democratic Party
Ms Claudia Gina ANASTASE, Expert Accountant, Associate of Fynkers Consulting Society
Ms Gabriela Andreea ANDREI, Vice-President of the Greater Romania Youth Organization, Bucharest Branch
Mr Ionel ANDRONE, Councillor, Romanian Government, National Authority for Property Restitution
Mr Bogdan Nicolae BADEA, Municipal Councillor, Ramnicu Valcea, Vice-President of the National Liberal Youth,
Mr George BAESU, MP, Social Democratic Party
Mr Maximilian BALASESCU, Prosecutor, Criminal and Penal Section, Bucharest Court
Mr Liviu BELEGA, Vice-President of the Greater Romania Party, Bucharest Branch)
Ms Daniela BERINDE, TV Editor, Romanian Television, Cluj
Ms Anca BOGDAN, Executive Secretary, Democratic Youth Organization, Timis County

Mr Felix Florin BRANISTE, Sales Manager, CSC Project Development, Pitesti
Mr Ionut BUCULEASA, Real Estate Councillor, Management Class, Drobeta-Turnu Severin
Ms Gabriela Alina BUCURENCIU, Lawyer, Bucharest Bar
Mr Bogdan Nicu BURGHELEA, Vice-President of the National Liberal Youth, Bacau
Mr Gheorghe Gabriel CARABUS, Director of the Bucovina's Library, Suceava
Mr Titus CORLATEAN, MP, Social Democratic Party
Mr Claudiu Daniel CRACEA, Manager, Agroinvest SRL, Vice-President, Conservative Party, Teleorman County
Mr CSIBI Magor Imre, Councillor of the President of the Chamber of Deputies, Vice-President of the National Liberal Youth
Mr Alexandru Dan DARABONT, Director, Efect Sistem, Bucharest
Ms Alina DRAGOMIR, University Lecturer, "Gheorghe Asachi" Technical University, Iasi
Mr Sebastian Florin FARCAS, Economic Director, Festiana Com, Reghin
Mr Doru FRANTESCU, Researcher, Public Policy Institute, Bucharest
Mr Georgian GHERVASIE, Business Promoter, Italian Trade Institute, Bucharest Office
Ms Daniela ITU, Cabinet Director of the President of the National Agency for Small and Medium Enterprises
Mr Bogdan George JANSEN, Manager of Caritas Hospital, Vice-President of the National Liberal Party, Bucharest Organization
Mr Radu LACATUS, Programmes Co-ordinator, Center of Resources for Roma Communities, Cluj
Ms LENGYEL Izabella Erika, Press Councillor of the Romanian Deputy Prime Minister, Member of the Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania
Ms Sorina Cristina MARIN, Economist, Agency for Environmental Protection, Arges County
Mr George Damian MOCANU, International News Editor, Ziua daily newspaper
Mr Traian MORARU, Military Prosecutor, High Court of Chancery and Justice, Military Courts Section
Mr Florin NEGRUTIU, Editorialist, Gandul daily newspaper
Mr Ioan Claudiu PADUREAN, Head of Cluj Office, Radio France International
Mr Bogdan Mihail PAUN, Managing Director and Owner, SECA Quality Services
Ms Zsuzsanna PETER, State Secretary, Ministry of Justice, Member of the Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania
Mr Dan Constantin PREDA, Journalist, Member of the Managing Board of the Romanian Broadcasting Society
Ms Florentina TINDECHE, School Teacher, Member of the Conservative Party, Rosiori de Vede
Ms Daniela TOLCIU, Councillor of the Ialomita County Council President

Yerevan School of Political Studies

Mr Armen ZAKARYAN, Yerevan School of Political Studies, Director
Ms Elina MKRTUMYAN, Yerevan School of Political Studies, Project Assistant

Ms Karine ABRAHAMYAN, “Gladzor” Management University, Professor

Ms Narine ALEKSANYAN, Constitutional Court of the Republic of Armenia, Assistant to the Judge / “Gladzor” Management University, Lecturer

Mr Serob ANTINYAN, “Human Rights Strategic Researches Center” NGO, Executive Director

Mr Artur AVTANDILYAN, “Centre for Electoral Systems”, Project Director

Mr Vahe BALABEKYAN, “Armenian Electrical Networks” CJSC, Engineer

Ms Mariam BARSEGHYAN, Internews Armenia, NGO, Journalist

Ms Sona DANIELYAN, “People” information centre, Journalist

Mr Grigori DOKHOYAN, “Nairi Soft Inc.” firm, Programmer

Mr Edgar GHAZARYAN, “Jermuk Group” Company, Adviser to President

Ms Nelli GHUKASYAN, “OLIMP” Co. Ltd , Executive Director / “European Integration” NGO, Responsible Secretary, Board member

Mr Gevorg GYOZALYAN, Central Bank of the Republic of Armenia, Law Department, Legal Adviser

Mr Edgar HAKOBYAN, “Free Society Institute” NGO, Chairman

Ms Hasmik HAKOBYAN, French Embassy to Armenia, Service of Cultural Action and Co-operation, Collaborator-translator

Ms Marine HAKOBYAN, Expert of the Standing Committee on Science, Education, Culture and Youth Affairs, National Assembly of RA, Economist

Mr Smbat HOVHANNISYAN, Yerevan State University, Department of History, Lecturer

Ms Armine HOVHANNISYAN, Ministry of Nature Protection of the Republic of Armenia, Legal Department, Lawyer

Ms Taguhi JAHUKYAN, U.S. Embassy to Armenia, Press Officer

Mr Karen KARAPETYAN, “Youth Association of the Nor Nork” NGO, President

Mr Vardan KEROPYAN, Anania Shirakaci academy, Teacher

Mr Artur KHEMCHYAN, “Panorama” News Agency, Journalist

Mr Artak MANUKYAN, Armenian Copper Programme CJSC, Head of Planning and Analyses Division

Ms Diana MARKOSYAN, A1+ News Agency, Editor

Mr Mikayel MELIKYAN, Mother See of Holy Etchmiadzin, Armenian Apostolic Church, Director of Information Services, Clergyman

Mr Tigran MESROPYAN, “Araratyan Ashkharh” NGO, President / RA Ministry of Finance and Economy, “Road Construction PIU” SO, Specialist

Mr Artur PETROSYAN, “Harutiunyan & Associates Law Office” LLC, Lawyer / Advocate

Ms Anahit SAFARYAN, Advocatory Company, President

Mr Vahram SARKISYAN, Compatriotik Benevolent Public Organization “Javakhk”, Vice-office Manager, Expert

Mr Menua SOGHOMONYAN, “Youth Parliament” NGO, Member

Mr Shahen TONOYAN, Department of Social Relations and Information of Head Office of Public Prosecutor of RA, Leading Specialist

Ms Sona TRUZYAN, Prosecutor General’s Office of the Republic of Armenia, Press Secretary

Ms Naira TSHNGRYAN, Staff of the President of the Republic of Armenia, Legal Department, Deputy Head

Mr Artak ZAKARYAN, “Public Tenders” Agency, Leading Specialist

Mr Karen BEKARYAN, Expert, National Assembly of RA, Committee of Foreign Relations

Mr Alexander ISKANDARYAN, Expert, Director of the Caucasus Media Institute, Political Scientist

Mr Shavarsh KOCHARYAN, Expert, Deputy of the National Assembly of RA

Ms Armine KHARATYAN, Central Electoral Commission of the Republic of Armenia, Member

Ukrainian School of Political Studies

Mr Igor KOGUT, Director, Ukrainian School of Political Studies; Chairman of the Board, Agency for Legislative Initiatives

Mr Oleksandr SYNOOKYY, Project Co-ordinator, Ukrainian School of Political Studies; Deputy Chairman of the Board, Agency for Legislative Initiatives

Ms Oksana AHARKOVA, Chairman of the Board of the New Generation NGO (Kherson)

Mr Andriy ANDREYKIV, Director of the Chernivtsi Customs Post, Western Regional Customs Office (Chernivtsi)

Mr Oleksandr ANDRIEIEV, Director of the Permit System Department of the State Committee for Regulatory Policy and Entrepreneurship

Mr Vitaliy BOHDANOV, Leader of BYuT Faction in Kherson Town Council; Chairman of the Permanent Commission for Communal Property; First Deputy Head of Kherson Regional Office of Batkivshchyna All-Ukrainian Union (Kherson)

Ms Ayida BOLIVAR, President of the Mykolayiv Regional Charity Fund Zhinochyi Svit (Women’s World) (Mykolayiv)

Ms Oksana BOLYUK, Lawyer of the Momentum Energy International Inc. (Canada) Representative Office

Ms Nataliya DROZD, Director of the Dobrochyn Centre (Chernihiv)

Mr Volodymyr FADIEIEV, Director of the Sector for Philosophical Problems of Ethnos and Nation, Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

Mr Artem GRYGORENKO, Chief Consultant of the Main Service for Law-Enforcement Bodies of the Presidential Secretariat

Mr Ruslan GRYTSENKO, Head of the Currency Control Department of the National Bank of Ukraine

Mr Andriy IVANOV, Member of Zaporizhzhya City Council; Leader of the Party of Regions Faction in Zaporizhzhya City Council; Director of Zaporizhzhya NGO Centre for Legislative Initiatives (Zaporizhzhya)

Mr Robert KHOROLSKYY, Assistant Professor of the Department for International Law and State Law of Foreign Countries of Yaroslav Mudryi Academy of Law; Deputy Editor-in-Chief of Buchhalter (Accountant) Magazine (Kharkiv)

Ms Ivanna KOBERNYK, Fakty TV Programme Presenter, ICTV

Mr Oleksandr KORNIYCHUK, First Deputy Mayor of Ostroh; Member of Rivne Regional Council (Ostroh, Rivne Region)

Ms Olena KRAVCHENKO, Deputy Director of the Department for Social Protection of Citizens Who Have Suffered from Chernobyl Disaster, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy of Ukraine

Ms Iryna KUCHMA, Manager of the Social Capital and Academic Publications Programme, International Renaissance Foundation

Ms Myroslava LENDEL, Assistant Professor of the Political Studies Department of Uzhhorod National University; Deputy Director of Democracy Through Local Self-Governance Public Union (Uzhhorod, Zakarpattia Region)

Ms Kateryna MAKSYM, Vice President for International Co-operation of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy National University

Mr Oleksandr MARTYNYENKO, Chief Specialist of the Territorial Organisation of Public Authorities and Local Self-Governance Section of the Regional Policy Department of the Secretariat of Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine

Mr Artem MYRGORODSKYY, Development Director of InterRybFlot Corporation

Mr Andrii NECHYPORENKO, Director of Natalia Subota and Partners Law Company

Mr Ivan POLTAVETS, Economist of the BEST Centre

Mr Oleksandr SAVYCH, Managing Partner of the SBC Business Consulting Company

Ms Oksana SERDIUK, Deputy Director of the Financial Policy Institute

Mr Svyatoslav SHEREMETA, Director of the Interior Policy Department of Lviv Regional State Administration; Director of Western-Ukrainian Centre for Political Research (Lviv)

Mr Taras SHEVCHENKO, Director of the Media Law Institute; Secretary of the Public Board for Freedom of Speech and Information (under the Parliamentary Committee for Freedom of Speech and Information)

Ms Nataliia STUKALO, Deputy Dean for Scientific Work, Assistant Professor of the International Economy Faculty of Dnipropetrovsk National University (Dnipropetrovsk)

Ms Vitalina TANTSYURA, Director of the Sector for Strategic Planning of Co-operation with the EU of the Ministry of Economy of Ukraine

Ms Nelia TERESHKO, Correspondent of the International department, Inter TV-canal

Mr Sergiy TKACHENKO, Chairman of the Board of Donetsk Regional Office of the Committee of Voters of Ukraine (Donetsk)

Mr Yuriy TKALYCH, Secretary of Vyshhorod Town Council (Vyshhorod, Kyiv region)

Mr Sergiy TOMILENKO, Editor-in-Chief of the Nova Doba (New Day) Newspaper; Project Manager of Media-Professional Association of Regional Journalists (Cherkasy)

Mr Oleh VALOV, Deputy Mayor of Berezhany (Berezhany, Ternopil Region)

Mr Ruslan VASYUTIN, Chairman of the Board, Jupiter Company (Vienna Insurance Group)

Ms Olga VINSKA, Head of the Interior Policy Section of Kamyanets-Podilskyi District State Administration (Kamyanets-Podilskyi, Khmelnytskyi region)

Ms Alla YAROVA, Vice Rector of the Ukrainian Banking Academy of the National Bank of Ukraine; Member of Sumy Town Council; Leader of Nichnyi Dozor (Night Watch) Faction (Sumy)

Mr Igor ZHOVKVA, Deputy Director of the European and Euro-Atlantic Integration Department of the Presidential Secretariat

Ms Tetyana ZHUKOVA, Member of Donetsk City Council; Chairman of the Permanent Commission for International Relations, Culture, Region, and Sport; Chief of Staff of Donetsk Regional Office of the Youth Union of the Regions of Ukraine (Donetsk)

Baku Political Studies Programme

Mr Shahin ABBASOV, Deputy Chief of Party, IREX/USAID ProMedia Project, Baku, Azerbaijan

Mr Rafael ABBASOV, Economics Officer, Asian Development Bank

Mr Ulvi AKHUNDLI, OSCE office in Baku, Media and Political Adviser

Ms Leyla AMIROVA, Issuing editor “Azerbaijanskije izvestiya” newspaper

Ms Nigar BAIMOVA, Peace Corps Education Program Manager

Mr Farid GAHRAMANOV, Correspondent, Political News Department, “Turan” News Agency

Ms Jamila GARAVALIYEVA, Head of International Relations, Space TV Channel

Mr Faig GURBATOV, UN-Azerbaijan Tourism Development Project, Azerbaijan National Project Co-ordinator

Mr Rashad HUSEYINLI, Co-ordinator in Azerbaijan, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung

Mr Ilgar IBRAHIMLI, Press and Information Officer, CoE office in Baku

Ms Eleonora ISAYEVA, Head of the records and processing department of “Intellekt Holding” group of companies

Mr Rafiq ISMAYILOV, Chairman of the “Youth for Development” NGO

Ms Aygun ISMAYILOVA, Deputy Director, “Trend” News Agency

Mr Gunduz KARIMOV, Deputy Chairman of the Board, CB “Crocus Bank”, Moscow

Ms Tarana MAHMUDOVA, Lecturer, Department of Journalism, Baku State University

Mr Rashad MAMMADOV, Chief of the Consulate-Legal Section of the Foreign Ministry of Azerbaijan Republic

Mr Azar MAMMADOV, Chief of the Sector for Financing of Infrastructure Projects, Ministry of Finance of Azerbaijan Republic

Mr Ilgar MAMMADOV, Director of the Baku Political Studies Programme

Ms Aybaniz MAMMADOVA, Constituency Relations Adviser, DAI, USAID-funded project for strengthening of Azerbaijan legislature

Ms Nigar MAMMADOVA, BP Azerbaijan, University Engagement Specialist

Mr Niyamaddin ORDUKHANOV, First Deputy Head of Mehdiabad Municipality, Absheron district.

Mr Anar ORUCOV, Director of the Caucasus Media Investigations Center

Mr Cingiz ORUJOV, BP Azerbaijan, Economic Development and Agribusiness Adviser

Mr Ilgar QASIMOV, Director of “Legal Help” Public Association

Mr Nazir QULIYEV, Chairman of “World of law” Legal Education Public Union

Ms Mehriban RAHIMLI, Public Relations Manager of the “For the Sake of Civil Society” NGO

Ms Lala RZAYEVA, Senior Adviser of The State Committee for Family, Women and Children’s Issues of the Republic of Azerbaijan

Mr Murad SADIKHOV, Business Development Manager, Baku Office of Mitsubishi Corporation.

Mr Atash SULTANOV, Deputy Director of the News Department, “Azad Azerbaijan” Broadcasting Company

Mr Mushfig TAHIROV, Lecturer at “Civil law” department of Baku State University

Academy for Political Excellence (Sarajevo)

Ms Taida BEGIC, Lawyer
Mr Zdravko GREBO, University professor
Mr Miroslav ZIVANOVIC, Librarian
Mr Nihad PENAVA, Journalist
Ms Jasmila PASIC, Project manager
Ms Jasmina MUSTACEVIC, Public relations officer
Mr Romeo DRLJIC, Civil servant
Ms Jelena KULUSIC, Civil servant
Mr Adis ARAPOVIC, Project manager
Ms Belma SKALONJIC, Civil servant
Mr Tvrtko MILOVIC, Political activist
Mr Adi KOLASEVIC, Professor
Mr Nenad GALIC, Civil servant
Ms Vesna GAVRILOVIC, Project manager
Mr Amir REDZIC, Economist
Mr Emil PINKAS, Lawyer/civil servant
Ms Lejla LILIC, Lawyer
Mr Adis MUHIBIC, Police officer
Ms Vanja IBRAHIMBEGOVIC, Portfolio manager
Mr Milos BLAGOJEVIC, Political activist
Mr Nedžad JUSIC, Civil society activist
Mr Osman GUDIC, School manager
Mr Elvedin MUSANOVIC, Professor
Mr Branko ROMIC, Professor
Mr Bojan KOVACEVIC, Lawyer
Mr Zoran TALIC, Political activist
Mr Edin DOLJANCIC, Political activist
Ms Aida VEZIC, Civil society activist
Ms Marinela STANKOVIC, Political activist
Mr Emir TATLIC, Political activist
Mr Adnan HUSIC, Manager
Mr Almir MUKACA, Civil society activist
Mr Nesar KRNJIC, Professor
Ms Danka SAVIC, Journalist
Mr Haris HASANSPAHIC, Student representative
Mr Adnan BESIC, Researcher

Ms Danijela DUGANDZIC, Civil society activist

Albanian School of Political Studies

Mr Artur HASANBELLIU, Member of Parliament

Mr Erjon META, ICITAP Analyst

Mr Artemon CUKALLA, PAD Youth Forum Leader

Mr Arben POROÇANI, Ass. Lector

Ms Iva HYSENI, Lawyer

Mr Arben SHKODRA, Prime Minister Office

Mr Gramos QENDRO, Min. of Interior Affairs

Ms Elga MITRE, Netherlands Embassy

Ms Arberesha MUSHANI, Teacher

Ms Anuela RISTANI, AMC (Head of Marketing Section)

Mr Artur KOPANI, Journalist

Ms Adriana ROSENTHAL, World Vision

Mr Andi KRROQI, Albanian Demochristian Party Youth Forum Leader

Mr Arben LAGRETA, Journalist

Ms Kimete KLENJA, UNIFEM

Ms Endri JORGONI, Head of Cabinet, Regional Council of Durres

Ms Blerina TEPELENA, Head of the Sector of Monitoring the Strategy on Roma

Ms Elma TERSHANA, Programme Assistant, Albanian Centre for Human Rights

Ms Blerina BALILAJ, NDI (Programme Officer)

Mr Kostandin KAZANXHI, Lawyer

Ms Sidita GJIPALI, Local Consulent (Min. of Health)

Ms Ersejla MURATI, Journalist

Mr Eltjon HALIMI, Lector

Mr Ledion KOLA, Ass. Client Executive (ABA)

Ms Lindita LUZO, UNDP Project Co-ordinator

Mr Arben HAVERI, Director of NBG Bank in Shkodra

Mr Teki KURTI, Head of Commune Council(Martanesh)

Mr Alban TARTARI, Deputy Editor in Chief of the Albanian Public TV

Mr Albert FARUKU, Member of Parliament

Mr Alfred GEGA, Member of Parliament

Ms Kozara KATI, Member of the Board

Ms Merita MYFTARI, Member of the Board

Ms Edlira HAXHIYMERI, Member of the Board

Ms Nikoleta MITA, Member of the Board

Mr Olsi DEKOVI, Project Leader of the School

School of Democratic Leadership (Montenegro)

Mr Boris RAONIC, Director of School of Democratic Leadership

Mr Zarko GLUSICA, Administrative Manager of School of Democratic Leadership

Mr Goran DJUROVIC, Member of Presidency of Movement for Changes

Mr Igor GOLUBOVIC, General Manager of Municipality of Pljevlja

Ms Dzenana CAUSI, Spokesperson of Democratic Union of Albanians

Mr Vladan ZUGIC, Journalist for daily newspaper *Vijesti*

Mr Slavisa GUBERINIC, Spokesperson of People's Party

Mr Dragoslav SCEKIC, Member of Executive Board of Socialist People's Party

Ms Marica BABOVIC, Member of Main Board of Socialist People's Party

Mr Mirsad DZUDZEVIC, Director of Bosniak Party

Mr Nikola CAMAJ, President of Municipal Assembly in Tuzi

Mr Slavko HRVACEVIC, MP of Movement for Changes

Mr Svetozar TREBJESANIN, Journalist in TV "IN"

Mr Boris MARIC, Adviser of MPs Club of Movement for Changes

Ms Marija LALATOVIC, Member of Main Board of People's Party

Mr Marko CANOVIC, Director of Center for Democratic Transition

Mr Halil DUKOVIC, President of local branch in Tuzi of Democratic Party of Socialists

Ms Enisa HAROVIC, Spokesperson of Liberal Party

Mr Aleksandar JURISEVIC, Member of Main Board of Liberal Party

Mr Matija NIKOLIC, Spokesperson of Democratic Serbian Party

Mr Veselin MARKOVIC, President of local branch in Budva of Socialist People's Party

Mr Bojan ZEKOVIC, Adviser in MPs Club of Social Democratic Party

Mr Kemal PURISIC, MP of Bosniak Party

Mr Lindon DJELJAJ, Chief of MPs Club of Albanian Alternative

Ms Rajka RAICEVIC, Journalist in daily newspaper *Dan*

Participants from Belarus

Ms Anzhela YEVGENYEVA, Project Co-ordinator, Ukrainian School of Political Studies

Mr Serguei PANKOVSKI, Local Co-ordinator, Belarus Programme, Ukrainian School of Political Studies; Chairman of the Board, Belarus Institute of Strategic Studies

Ms Valentina POLEVIKOVA, Local Co-ordinator, Belarus Programme, Ukrainian School of Political Studies; Member of the Political Council of the United Citizens' Party

Mr Aliaksandr ADAMIANTS, Editor-in-chief of the New Europe E-magazine

Mr Artsiom AHAFONAU, Entrepreneur

Mr Michael BOROZDIN, Entrepreneur

Ms Irina BUGROVA, Political Studies Expert, International Observer Centre

Mr Alexander DABRAVOLSKI, Member of the Political Council of the United Citizens' Party

Mr Andrey DMITRIEV, Director of the Info-Stalking Ltd.

Mr Uladzimir KAZAK, Representative of the AMA-International Ltd. (Holland) in the CIS

Mr Aleh KORBAN, Civil society activist

Ms Tatiana KOUZINA, Head of the Public and International Affairs Department of the European Humanitarian University, Minsk

Ms Natallia MELNIK, Lawyer, Elipton Ltd.

Mr Alexei PIKULIK, Researcher, political scientist, Ph.D. student at the European University Institute (Florence)

Ms Valeryia STUKINA, Senior lecturer of the International Department of the Belarus State University

Mr Andrew SUSHKO, Lawyer, Co-ordinator of the Observation Group, Belarus Helsinki Committee

Ms Nadzeya SYCHUGOVA, Ph.D. student of the Polish Academy of Sciences

Mr Aliaksandr TALSTYKA, Entrepreneur

Ms Katsiaryna TKACHENKA, Editor of the United Civil Party web-page

Ms Hanna YAHORAVA, Member of the Political Council of the United Citizens' Party (Youth Wing)

Annex III: Final Declaration

Final declaration

Second Summer University for Democracy Strasbourg, 2-6 July 2007)

We, the 600 participants in the Second Summer University for Democracy, representing the Council of Europe's 15 Schools of Political Studies, in Strasbourg, from 2 to 6 July:

- In this year of the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome, reaffirm our commitment to the grand design for Europe, which was launched immediately after the Second World War, on the basis of the fundamental values shared by the peoples of Europe, namely: democracy, protection of human rights and human dignity, the rule of law, respect for national identities and tolerance;
- Recall that European unity is a goal to be pursued and that, to this end, it is equally important to build institutions as it is to establish ever-closer co-operation in the institutional and economic fields and in respect of civil society;
- Consider that the resolution of the issue of identities is crucial to the establishment of a stable democratic Europe: the forging of a European identity will enable all the citizens of Europe to support a common blueprint and the respect of national identities, open to all, will make it possible to counter the threat that nationalism is posing to democracy and human rights;
- Reaffirm our firm conviction that the holding of free and fair elections is a prerequisite for any genuine democracy;
- Consider that the consolidation of democracy entails, in particular, the strengthening of the links between the political authorities and civil society, the existence of independent, high-quality media that foster rather than undermine the democratic debate, and enhanced local self-government, which ensures that policy makers are close to the grassroots;
- Undertake to continue our combat against all forms of discrimination and social exclusion, which breed populism and nationalism to excess and which undermine democratic institutions;
- Intend, particularly through the networks of former students, to step up our individual and collective action in order to ensure that Europe and its institutions are closer to the concerns of its citizens, thus contributing to a truly democratic European project, regardless of which institutions are pursuing it;
- Congratulate the European Union member states and the European Commission for the success of the recent European Council in Brussels and await with anticipation the future Reform Treaty;
- Call on the governments of member states to provide the Council of Europe, the Organisation which safeguards the values underpinning any grand design for Europe, with the political support and human and financial resources it needs in order to pursue its vocation for the benefit of 800 million fellow citizens;

- Invite the Council of Europe, the European Union, the governments of member states, observers and all public and private partners, to continue and to step up their support for the development and growth of the Schools of Political Studies, a unique initiative of European civil society, designed to ensure that democratic values, institutions and practices are firmly rooted in day-to-day reality;
- Welcome, in this connection, the recent signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between the Council of Europe and the European Union and hope that, as a result of their renewed partnership, the network of Schools will benefit from even greater and more effective support from these two European institutions;
- Express our satisfaction at being joined by our new colleagues from the Schools in Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Albania and Montenegro; this undeniably bears witness to the vitality of the movement launched in Moscow, in the early 1990s, to promote democracy in societies in transition;
- Express our solidarity with our colleagues from Belarus and hope that a School of Political Studies will shortly be set up in that country, in order to promote European values and help bring Belarus into the fold of European democracies as quickly as possible;
- Thank all the eminent personalities, speakers and experts who have contributed to making these past five days of discussion a rare opportunity for sharing views and ideas;
- Express our gratitude to the City of Strasbourg and to all the local and regional authorities, universities and other academic institutions concerned, the Ecole Nationale d'Administration, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe and to all the staff, as well as to all the financial partners, for the excellent organisation of this Second Summer University in Strasbourg;
- Look forward to the Third Summer University for Democracy, in July 2008.

Strasbourg, 6 July 2007