

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
Fourth Summer University for Democracy
6-10 July 2009, Strasbourg

“Global challenges to democracy”

SYNTHESIS OF PLENARY SESSIONS AND CONFERENCES

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

The opinions expressed in this work are the responsibility of the authors 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
Programme Co-ordinator
E-mail: francois.friederich@coe.int
Tel.: + 33 (0)3 90 21 53 02

Claude Bernard
Programme Manager
E-mail: claud.bernard@coe.int
Tel.: + 33 (0)3 88 41 22 75

Website: www.coe.int
www.coe.int/t/dgap/sps

© Council of Europe, June 2010

Table of contents

I. Introduction: democracy put to the test by today's crises	5
II. "Global challenges to democracy": opening lecture by Michel Rocard, former Prime Minister of France	7
III. "Fundamental challenges to democracy today" by Danilo Türk, President of Slovenia ...	15
IV. The impact of the economic and financial crisis on democratic systems	19
1. The role of the state	19
2. European democracy and the economic crisis	22
3. What lessons should be learned from the economic crisis?	23
V. Identity, terrorism, organised crime: new challenges for democracy	27
1. The crisis of identities and democracy.....	27
2. Corruption, organised crime and terrorism: a growing influence on democracy?.....	30
3. Combating international violence and respecting fundamental rights.....	33
VI. Environmental and climate challenges: what role for Europe?	37
1. Taking up the challenges of climate change	37
2. Green revolution: the role of the authorities and citizens	40
3. Environmental rights: a new generation of fundamental rights	42
VII. The Fourth Summer University for Democracy celebrates the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Iron Curtain	45
1. "1989 – year of change, year of freedom"	45
2. "1989 a year without parallel", the history of the fall of the Berlin Wall in pictures	53
VIII. Summer University for Democracy: forum for meetings, exchanges and dialogue	57
IX. Conclusion: the future of Europe and global democracy	61
Annex I: Programme of the Summer University for Democracy	67
Annex II: List of speakers	75
Annex III: List of participants	79
Annex IV: Final Declaration	99

I. Introduction: democracy put to the test by today's crises

The Fourth Summer University for Democracy was opened 20 years to the day after Mikhail Gorbachev's historic speech to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, on 6 July 1989, about the new relationship between western Europe and the Soviet bloc and his idea of the "Common European Home". Set against the backdrop of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the Council of Europe and the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Iron Curtain, the 2009 Summer University considered the future of democracy in Europe as it struggled with economic, identity and environmental crises. At the commemorative celebrations during the week and in the discussions about future challenges, it was clearer than ever before that democracy remains a fragile creature.

The events of 1989 in Europe and the following 20 years were a complex process. Catherine Lalumière¹ told the young democratic leaders that, unfortunately, there had been a "lack of sensitivity" and a "failure to take account of the condition of the populations concerned and their attitudes, habits and fears." *"Applied in an unqualified, unmodified form, the hard-line liberalism of the Chicago School was bound to cause problems in countries which were not prepared for it at all. That very quickly led to all kinds of unwelcome developments in east European countries, for example corruption, disruption of social protection and growing poverty among the elderly."*

For many west Europeans, the division of Europe came to an end in the space of only a few months. However, 1989 marked the beginning of a new process, which is continuing today and is central to the work of the Schools of Political Studies: the coming together of Greater Europe. Stjepan Mesić² pointed out that Croatia had not just been faced with a democratic and economic transition process like the countries in the former Soviet bloc, but had had to cope with war and post-war reconstruction. In his view, politicians bore a special responsibility, namely *"the building of reconciliation, the restoration of trust, tolerance and co-existence, which could only be achieved by dialogue and mutual appreciation of diversity and difference."*

By giving effect to the "founding fathers' immediate intentions", in other words, establishing peace throughout Europe by promoting democracy, and building on a system for the protection of fundamental rights embodied in the European Court of Human Rights, the Council of Europe's 60 years in existence had, above all, been a "success story", to quote Lluís Maria de Puig.³ By adopting a bold policy of enlargement in the aftermath of the fall of the Berlin Wall, the Organisation had become pan-European and had clearly demonstrated what it existed for by taking on a dimension which neither Monnet nor Schuman could have dreamed of.

Europe no longer looks anything like it did when Mikhail Gorbachev visited the Council of Europe. Our continent and the democracies which make it up are faced with a new geopolitical situation, with the emergence of the tensions stemming from the breakup of the USSR and new 21st-century challenges. *"Looking round this chamber, which I have known for so long and where we welcomed Mikhail Gorbachev on 6 July 1989, brings back all that has happened over the last 20 years. There has been outstanding progress, but we have also seen shortcomings and mistakes. The coming generations still have a huge amount of work to do."* Catherine Lalumière urged the participants from the Schools of Political Studies not just to be spectators in the commemoration of two historic anniversaries, but to take up the new challenges facing our democracies today.

1. Chair of the European Association of the Schools of Political Studies, former Secretary General of the Council of Europe.

2. President of Croatia.

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

In this connection, Danilo Türk⁴ and Luisella Pavan-Woolfe⁵ highlighted the issues of the implications of new technologies for the operation of democratic institutions, starting from the angle of information, at a time when political communication via the Internet and sites like Twitter were leading to a kind of instantaneous democracy, where in-depth debate was no longer possible and demagogy, sound-bites and hard-hitting images had an excessive and sometimes dangerous impact. Given these dangers and also to make sure that the holding of free elections really became standard practice, Danilo Türk urged the young leaders of the new Europe to work towards the development of additional international standards to support and strengthen international electoral assistance. This was a tool which Luisella Pavan-Woolfe believed was relevant to organisations like the European Union and the Council of Europe, at a time when electronic voting was expanding and, like other new technologies, involved new risks.

Discussing democracy today inevitably means considering how the fundamental principles relating to the rule of law and free elections can adapt to the new information technologies. The challenges of democratic systems themselves are central to the work of the Schools of Political Studies, as are the latest international political developments. The organisers of the Fourth Summer University therefore proposed that the participants consider the external threats which might weaken, eat away at and jeopardise democracy. It was to this process which Terry Davis⁶ referred in quoting the example of the economic crisis: *“Political progress without economic progress is meaningless, [for] an economic crisis is a threat to social fabric and social cohesion. It leads to uncertainty about the future and often provokes tensions along national, ethnic, religious or other lines. Economic problems produce fertile ground for populist politics catering to fear and prejudice. The consequences may be very serious, sometimes tragic.”*

This analysis was shared by Roland Ries,⁷ who believed that in the next few years democracy would have to show that, while it was the political system best suited to ensuring peace and the broadest possible participation in the political process, it was also effective in resolving the crises affecting our societies. How relevant is democracy in the face of the contemporary forms of warfare, represented by terrorism and organised crime, how capable is it of responding to identity politics and how efficient is it in relation to today’s new environmental challenges? These questions neatly encapsulate the entire programme of the Fourth Summer University.

4. President of Slovenia.

5. Permanent Representative of the European Commission to the Council of Europe.

6. Secretary General of the Council of Europe.

7. Senator and Mayor of Strasbourg.

II. “Global challenges to democracy”: opening lecture by Michel Rocard, former Prime Minister of France



Secretary General of the Council of Europe,
Former Secretary General and Chair of the
Association of the Schools of Political Studies,
Mr Mayor, dear Roland,
President of Slovenia

Global challenges to democracy. I really am mystified as to why it is me you have sought out to address an issue of this kind, knowing perhaps, or perhaps you do not know, that I have under-

gone a radical transformation and joined the pessimists' camp. My message will not be very optimistic.

One might begin by saying that the global challenges to democracy are the same as those to humankind. And, in these early years of the 21st century, it is true that many things seem to be speeding up, problems are becoming more acute and things are changing fast. We realise that our world must cope simultaneously with five quite major challenges:

- the threat of climate change;
- an economic and financial crisis which does not at all seem to be ending, but which is continuing and deepening;
- terrorism, in other words, a destructive threat or a desire for destruction;
- weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons, which are still far too numerous;
- and fragmentation of identities, or the decline in human beings' ability to co-exist.

The latter point already applies to the world's major communities. How are Muslims and Christians going to live together on our planet after having given such a strong impression that they do not really want to or do not know how to? And how can we address the fact that many smaller peoples find living in large communities difficult?

The United Nations was founded in 1945 by 46 nations, if my memory serves me right. The total is now 192 and there is no reason that it should stop increasing. The UN includes around fifty countries with fewer than 1 million inhabitants whose continued existence as nations is not guaranteed. The trend is continuing; divisions are emerging in most of our big communities.

That all throws up terrible problems, which are compounded by the fact that they are occurring simultaneously. For instance, the economic and financial crisis does not help with the threat of climate change.

You were all aware of that and we could discuss all the details. However, the reason the organisers of this Summer University have chosen to address the global challenges to democracy rather than just the global challenges to humankind is, of course, to put the emphasis on the decision-making processes. In this respect, I believe that the real challenge concerning

democracy is knowing whether, globally, it will be capable of dealing with all the various issues at once. And democracy is only attractive when people are living under dictatorships. Just look at all the democracies in eastern Europe which we have recently taken in. When they lived under dictatorships, the people of those nations showed great courage and a tremendous aspiration for democracy, for which they sometimes laid down their lives. Five years after independence, however, electoral turnout was already down by almost half. People are voting less and less but more and more for extremist parties, and democracy is giving the impression of being desperately ineffective. We also know that, compared with all other systems of government, democracy is characterised by slow decision-making, due to respect for our principles, which are taken into account in procedures. And this slowness itself usually undermines the effectiveness of the decisions.

In addition, the growing difficulty in achieving consensus, which is reflected in the attempts to divide or split up major nations, also shows that the scope for political consensus is gradually diminishing. To mix the example of a large democracy, the United States, with my own country, the medium-sized democracy of France, it is clear that our ability to carry out fiscal reforms is declining. It was possible to achieve consensus about mobilising 10% of GDP at the beginning of the 20th century and in 1950, but not any longer. We adjust our tax systems in piecemeal ways, as nothing else is possible, which, of course, causes pessimism and despair among all those who dream of *the* major tax reform, to give only this example.

So democracy will deal with all the problems in that area. I was struck by a good book by an American political scientist and friend of President Clinton, called Benjamin R. Barber, who published a book with the fine title, "Strong Democracy" – a title which was a kind of wish. The theme of the book was: why is democracy so weak? In it, he put forward the relatively widespread theory that both democracy, representative democracy, the electoral system for putting in place our government institutions and also press freedom came into being at roughly the same time and that the development of one and the development of the other have gone together, shaping one another in the process. He added that political economy also came into being during the same era and at much the same time. This reasoning assumes that democracy was developed with the same body of values, human rights and press freedom, as well as political economy, the market and *homo economicus*, and that our democratic institutions were designed to fit in with the rational behaviour of *homo economicus* on the market. It assumes that democracy involves effective, matter-of-fact procedures, which are outstanding as regards all rational conduct in terms of buying and selling, but that it disregards what we like, what we appreciate, our emotional and artistic tastes, our sporting practices, our interpersonal relations and our affinities between groups and between peoples. They are all outside the scope of democracy and are not concerned here. Democracy is an excessively rational process and, perhaps for that reason, it disappoints people. I do not like this analysis very much, but I am not aware of any other ones and have to admit that I find it fitting. In any case, it reflects our constant frustration as democrats with democracy itself. I therefore believe, to begin replying to the question put to me here, that there is no more important task for democrats today than considering democracy itself and ways of improving it.

I would make a few brief comments in this respect. The first concerns the spatial context of authority. If democracy is to function properly and be able to take decisions, it has to operate in a setting which is in line with the kind of problems to be resolved. Our history has left us nations, which used to be kingdoms or empires, and parishes which have become communes or municipalities. Given the way things have developed over time and various geographical factors, the problems of our daily lives are now determined in conurbations rather than in individual parishes or municipalities, or in rural areas with largely uniform economies rather than



in individual parishes or municipalities, but at that level there is no decision-making authority. In many countries, it is the case that, between central or national government and local government, there is a need for an intermediate tier, which is called region or district. It is often too small, which means that the intermediate tier does not have the power to raise funds, deliver urban, education, research or healthcare services or support economic activity. That is true in my

country and in many other countries in Europe. But it is precisely at this level that there is a need for an authority operating within an appropriate entity. We have two or three regions which do not even have a decent capital or a proper banking sector. That weakens democracy.

Coming back to our founding fathers, and I am grateful to Mr de Puig for mentioning the point in his address, we heard about the long story of the construction of Europe and, in particular, the successful building of the Common Market and the European Economic Community, which has become the European Union and is, one could say, the offspring of the Council of Europe, even though it does not include all its members. But the desires for power identified in the cultural channels we are familiar with from our history have won through.

The President enjoyed pointing out that I had said two or three years ago that Europe was dead as a political entity. We all know the President well, he is a cautious man, he did not contradict me. I stand by my analysis. There was no European response to the tragedy which hit the former Yugoslavia, among many others, because Europe as a political entity did not exist, as our nations' governments did not want it to. We are well aware that it is the Council of Ministers which keeps on putting paid to a properly integrated Europe with a strong political dimension.

So we now find ourselves in a situation where the Europe which we wanted, which we are building and whose 60th anniversary we have been celebrating here is unable to offer any response to the combination of the five crises that I mentioned earlier. And we still basically cling to our fragmented national diplomatic approaches – even in the economic and financial sector, the area where we have achieved the greatest integration, although that does not include all Council of Europe members. The banking crisis, which turned into the economic crisis we are now experiencing, seemed to be almost too much for institutional Europe to cope with. What happened was too violent, too new. The European Commission did not send out the message it should have done, the Council of Ministers did not discuss matters properly and only a combination of a few energetic prime ministers and a president with a lot of nerve and relatively little respect for procedures meant that an agreement was ultimately reached regarding the European proposal at the G20. That at least kept up appearances for Europe. But that decision-making process is not reliable enough to be repeated. There was not much Europe in it, other than a degree of convergence because we have a lot in common in terms of our traditions, our ways of life, our rules and our business habits. It was for the sake of all of that that we spoke.

And, of course, there is no global government and actually I do not believe that there should be one and am not a member of the campaign to set one up. I would be much afraid of bureaucratic excesses and abuse of power in that case. Nevertheless, the problems facing us have to be dealt with at global level and there is no authority at global level. Moreover, we are far from the habit we should have of negotiating good treaties, accepting their binding conditions and developing international machinery for supervising the proper fulfilment of our mutual commitments.

Seven or eight years ago now, Mr President, I joined with your predecessor, Milan Kučan, the saviour President of Slovenia in the tragedy that hit Yugoslavia, in setting up a think-tank. Heads of state and government do not usually believe that their neurons stop functioning the day they leave office. So they possibly still have some useful things to say. Combined with a few talented philosophers, scholars and economists, we form a group which could be of use to the world. This international ethical, political and scientific grouping has presented the United Nations with a draft declaration on interdependence which, if it were to be approved one day, would provide the intellectual and legal basis for generalised mutual supervision by our various nations and for the kind of interference which we really need to achieve. I apologise for being a doom monger, but I happen to believe that too much nationalism is the real threat to the world and that maintaining excessively high levels of nationalism which prevent international co-operation is the major weakness of democracy today.

The first problem for democracy in the future is therefore to try and change the spatial setting for its authority so that systems of power exist at the levels where they are needed; daily life in urban areas, in rural areas and regions as the first neighbourhood tier, but with the effectiveness of the urban services of a city, the continent or the world. We must realise that we are interdependent and we must acknowledge the fact.

That is not all, however: another of the difficulties of democracy is that we are facing growing demand from public opinion for things to be straightforward and to be said clearly.

At the time of the French Revolution, there was a huge theoretical dispute in my country which concerns you all and which should be covered in all our schools about whether, given that the founding revolutionaries claimed to be true democrats, they were supporters of direct democracy. The question was whether representative democracy was compatible with or acceptable to direct democracy. For most authors, the most well-known and, indeed, the most dangerous being Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the answer is no.

The very term representative democracy already includes the idea of harnessing the democratic will and the risk of an intermediate structure taking over the sovereignty of the people and speaking on their behalf. Obviously, direct democracy poses huge problems in terms of the need for closeness and in terms of management. It was invented in Athens roughly 2 600 years ago. Proximity was no problem then. However, we live in big entities today, if we take the example of our own countries before even thinking of Europe, the United States or the young Russian Federation now trying out democracy. The immensity of the whole process makes democracy distant and complex, weighed down by a vast range of terrifying problems. Public opinion has had enough and wants us to provide responses which are straightforward, rapid or symbolic. And we are unable to respond. And we should not respond because ignoring the complexity of issues and taking refuge in symbolism so as not to have address the real issues are a means of escaping from the severity of the problems and therefore, in a way, are betrayals of democracy, as we will have to pay for them in terms of effectiveness.

However, these comments about what public opinion wants are somewhat too general, as there is a third point to make here and, curiously, I was quite surprised, as I was not expecting it, to hear President Danilo Türk mention the same problem beforehand, namely the media. Here I would like to draw your attention to a book recently published by Neil Postman, a professor of political science at a mid-ranking American university. As a lecturer in the media, he wanted to publish his courses, which he did under the title of *Amusing ourselves to death*. However, he was unable to publish the book in the United States and had to use a British publisher. Looking at the role of the media in our democracy is such a sensitive issue that no newspapers wanted to mention him, so nobody has heard of him. Knowledge of the book has spread almost surreptitiously, by word of mouth.



The theme is as follows: civilisation means growing complexity and growing complexity means a need for language to be able to reflect that complexity. And from the end of the Middle Ages to the mid-19th century, there was tremendous progress in the logical and semantic apparatus of our great languages, with the spread of dictionaries and so on.

The author notes that the invention of the telegraph also meant the invention of an ultra-brief

form of communication which no longer used sentences employing the conditional, where everything was simplified, where everything was fast and there was no longer any need for polite phrases at the start or end of texts either. He also notes that the language of today's media system is the language of hyper-simplification.

The fact that images have now gained the upper hand over the written word in our ways of thinking has a number of consequences, including, for example, the disappearance of all long-term thinking.

Images cannot convey intellectual context, they can only convey drama, conflict, emotions or stirring events. So every issue we want to talk about must be made emotional, stirring, dramatic or conflictual. However, focusing on conflictual aspects obviously complicates any solutions. We encounter that when trying to reform our own countries. So it is a matter of symbolism and taking refuge in a taste for conflict, as we can never, ever compromise on symbols, we abandon them, we replace them, we capitulate when we are defeated, but we never compromise on symbols, we can only compromise on interests, provided that they are not too highly symbolised. But interests are technical and complicated, so the public quickly move on to something else. Today's media system cuts us off from and denies us the long term, not to mention the complexity of issues.

Once – and I swear this is true – I was asked on the radio what my blueprint for society was and given ninety seconds to reply. I did manage to control my desire to exert physical violence on the reporter, as I am at least a little civilised, but the question was a bit of a hard blow. As you no doubt realise, it is not possible to explain your plans for society under those conditions, and the need to restore the intensity of democracy, as it is not working very well, would imply exacerbating the use of symbolism, simplification and the rejection of historical references. Yet that is more or less the opposite of what we should do.

To deal with climate change, it is undoubtedly necessary to change patterns of energy consumption, which means using taxes to discourage the use of some forms of energy and promote the use of others. But we must not get things wrong. We must not destroy the opportunities of entire economic sectors or increase the heating bills of the poorest households. The process will therefore be tricky and terribly complicated and any compromising or avoiding complex solutions would be a betrayal given what is at stake.

At the same time, however, I was struck by the three questions to which you replied in this exercise in democracy, Mr President. But how can we respond when we are from outside; I am not a Yugoslav, but I did, a very long time ago, preface a book by my friend, Milojko Drulovic, about the Yugoslavian experience of self-management. For a while, before the governing party took control of everything, I thought that Yugoslavia was trying a solution which other people ought to have examined more closely and in greater depth. That was what I believed. But when you are faced with the Kosovo conflict and the Bosnian conflict – and I have sat in this chamber

as a member of the European Parliament – how can you make fair judgments if you have not learned a century and a half of history? What can we do so that the media system gives us the information needed to prevent stupid conclusions? That is not the case at present. And we really need to get used to complexity again and to put the language of the media back in its place. Of course, there can be no democracy without press freedom and without the media. But when the media start choosing the candidates for public office on the basis of charisma rather than competence and when they choose the issues we are going to discuss in relation to those that are not to be addressed, democracy is no longer possible. And it is us as politicians who get bawled at in the process. Of course, we cannot do anything about it, but it is there that the real problem lies.

And I therefore believe, Secretary General, to give an honest answer to the difficult question you put, that democrats now have a duty to try and combat these excesses, as they seem to be getting worse and worse.

There are a few possibilities, one of which is participatory democracy, which involves seeking the views of the public on a very wide range of issues and it works quite well. The Mayor of Strasbourg knows that I was Mayor of a smaller town for 18 years and had time to run in the procedures for getting people to sign up to collective decision making.

Unfortunately, participatory democracy only works at the local level and is insufficient for dealing with major issues such as, for instance, how we can restore the interest of the citizens of the United States in democracy so that they turn out in somewhat larger numbers at elections. How can democracy be consolidated in the Russian Federation? And how in Europe can democracy be reconciled with the necessary effectiveness for Europe to begin to take hold outside the field of economics and finance?

The second approach, involving a lengthy process, would be to mobilise all our education systems in this connection and, after all, there is an association of schools of political science here. However, it is not only a matter for political science, there is a vital need now to address the issues of excessive simplification, caricatures and the weakening of democracy through the dominance of the language of images. What can we do to enable the print media to act as a counterbalance and correct things instead of slavishly covering the same issues in the same arbitrary politically correct fashion as dictated by the television evening news in the way that happens today?

We could even go further and set up university chairs and introduce secondary teaching and critical reviews of the language used by the media. While we do learn our mother tongues and our national cultures in a critical fashion, the same is not true of media distortion, and I believe that is important.

Above all, regardless of the media, it is up to our school systems to make sure that all citizens in our countries retain a sense of complexity and of the precision of logical structures and teaching – aspects which are all disappearing on television – and a sense of the long-term.

I am a politician and therefore belong to an unfortunate professional category, which is the victim of this indifference and lack of understanding and is increasingly rejected by the public and distrusted because we are unable to deal with all the various crises, and many of my fellow politicians dream of settling scores with the media, like a kind of battle for power, which is, of course, stupid.

All the more so since it is hard to safeguard press freedom and if a dispute arises again about public scrutiny of the media, everyone will start talking about a return to censorship and we will



end up engulfed in the old struggle of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. That is, of course, totally unhelpful.

What is possible is for there to be a kind of civic impact between players and commentators. But how can we make sure that the long-term view is taken into account? How can we safeguard the concern for truthfulness and verification in spite of the speed constraints imposed by competition? News items are not checked any more. What can be done to preserve the

necessary minimum of detail about specific issues? I am sure that an alliance of good faith between democrats is possible. And then, of course, there are the trends in the system.

I have quite often had meetings with a very respectable Frenchman called Patrick Le Lay, who headed our largest commercial television station for many years. Many people have condemned him for a comment which I am grateful that he made or dared to make. One day, he said that his job was basically to soften up our brains for them to take in the messages Coca Cola wants us to hear. At least he dared to speak the truth.

Behind that was the fact that the advertisers in our media exert pressure so that there are not too many complicated items or too much need for people to think a lot during news broadcasts, as they are followed by what really matters, namely the adverts. That is quite unbelievable!

Partly in response to that, there has been growth in the United States in commercial television stations funded by subscriptions paid by viewers who want to be able to watch without being interrupted by advertising. In the United Kingdom, the BBC has always been kept free of advertising; we should pay tribute to the British government for at least seeing to that. In France, we are going through a tricky and unusual phase. Probably out of concern for these issues, the President, who is not from my camp, as you well know, decided that there should be no advertising on the non-commercial channels, at least in the evenings. That provoked anger and recrimination, as is to be expected in a democracy. So nothing is easy and nothing enjoys unanimous support, but it was a wise decision all the same.

Of course, there has not been enough public funding to make up the shortfall, so it could weaken the channels concerned. At the same time, however, they have won back a degree of freedom in getting rid of pressure for excessive simplification and of an obstacle to covering complex issues in depth.

That is one of the approaches.

Dear friends, many of your countries are in the midst of reconstruction. You were living in hell less than 20 years ago. When you are building everything, you have to think of everything. That is why I decided to discuss these issues with you. To conclude the analysis here, I would say that, if no improvements are made in these areas, we will not be able to deal with climate change, as we will all have to change the way we act and our energy consumption patterns. And we will not be able to deal with the banking and financial crisis because the major factor in the implosion of the financial system was an increase in the collective greed of the upper middle classes to a level that was not compatible with the system.

The crisis came about because the upper middle classes in the developed countries have given up the aspiration of achieving wealth through work and have replaced it with the hope of making massive short-term gains and huge fortunes. That is a change in situation and no government can do anything about it. The capitalist system is unable to cope with it. Hence the crisis. So

what we need is a change in attitudes and that will not come about unless this is really understood and the media go along with it. That is one of the requirements. What can we do so that we understand one another better? How can we give greater substance to democracy? In my view, that is one of the first requirements for dealing properly with the climate, the economic crisis and perhaps even, above all, terrorism because, unfortunately, at the heart of terrorism there is the moral contempt of a number of people who believe in their prophets and despise our “profit-oriented” society. There is a need for discussion there, too, and there will have to be a change in the way we act.

In conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, Secretary General – perhaps it was you who came up with this difficult topic – I would just point out that Jean Monnet was right: we probably should have started with culture. In any case, I would urge you never to forget the phrase by that great French philosopher who said “I think, therefore I am”. That is true for individuals and also for civilisations. We live in a civilisation where current trends mean that we no longer think. “I think, therefore I am”; when I stop thinking, I no longer exist.

Thank you for paying such close attention.

Palais de l'Europe, Strasbourg, 6 July 2009

III. “Fundamental challenges to democracy today” by Danilo Türk, President of Slovenia



Danilo Türk, President of Slovenia

Excerpt from the address during the 4th Summer University for Democracy, Strasbourg, 6 July 2009

“I wish to refer to three fundamental challenges to democracy resulting from the basic political relationships, first, between democracy and socio-economic prosperity; second, democracy and participation and the rule of law; and, third, democracy and peace and security.

Democracy and economic and social prosperity

Democratic change of the past decades has led to expectations some of which have not been fulfilled. In many countries where the experience with democracy is new there have been disappointments when achievements in economic development, social equity and human security did not match expectations.

The realisation that in the globalised world, more and more decision making power eludes democratic control has contributed to the feeling of powerlessness, and dissatisfaction with the democratic institutions and even to the opinion that democracy itself may find itself in a state of crisis. These dangers must not be underestimated. It is essential to bear in mind the principle that democratic society must be a just and responsible society.

A critically important test in many new or restored democracies is their ability to deliver. In most of the new democracies that ability is measured by economic and social progress. While economic prosperity helps to sustain and consolidate democracy, the reverse does not hold automatically: Rich societies have the means to sustain democracy while poor societies cannot automatically expect democracy to lead to economic growth and development. However, social equality and developmental welfare policies are critical for the durability of democracy. Moreover, it can be expected that democratic governance will strengthen human development when the necessary political will exists and state capacity improves.

Participation and the rule of law

Another key ingredient is the participatory character of democracy. Free, fair and periodic elections constitute the basic principle of participation. However, additional mechanisms, such as popular consultations and referenda are often necessary to strengthen the legitimacy of decision-making and develop the sense of ownership of the democratic process by the people. Participation of women in the democratic processes is unsatisfactory in many societies and needs to be strengthened.

Promoting the rule of law, transparency and the fight against corruption are among the basic elements of democratic governance in view of the equitable sharing of the fruits of development. These concepts are widely accepted and used in the rhetoric of the global policy debates. However, their practical use varies and their results remain elusive in many parts of the world. Anti-corruption activities require careful preparation and adequate design as well as persistence

in their use. It is essential that the illusion of quick fixes or reduction to their technical aspects be avoided. Corruption must be rejected as a matter of culture. Only then will democracy flourish to the full.

The principle of the rule of law and the requirement of combating corruption has to be high on the agenda of democracy and they require international discussion. The legal instruments developed within the Council of Europe are helpful relating to such matters as the criminalisation of corruption, liability and compensation for damage caused by corruption, corruption of public officials and financing of political parties.

Democracy, peace and security

The process of global democratic transformations has taken place in an era of turmoil and armed conflict as well as of new threats to international peace and security such as terrorism and organised crime. However, the number of armed conflicts has been reduced in the past decade. Democratic change has been both a result of the ending of wars and a factor of ensuring post conflict stability and peace building. Nevertheless, while it can be said that the world is more peaceful now than it was a decade ago, the issue of security remains. New threats are resulting from poverty, infectious diseases and environmental degradation, from armed conflicts between states and within states, from continued existence and the dangers of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, from terrorism and from transactional organised crime. In the past years, the international community has paid particular attention to the threats to international peace resulting from terrorist activities. The threats of terrorism to democracy are threefold: The first types are the direct threats. Terrorism undermines democracy deliberately and directly, and attacks the security of citizens that is democracy's central asset.

The second threat of terrorism is indirect. Counter terrorism, if not designed with the necessary sensitivity to human rights of citizens it is expected to protect, may erode the core values of democracy. Restrictions on human rights, which might have to be imposed in the context of counter terrorism, must be temporary and limited in scope. They could upset the delicate balance between democracy and security and undermine the former by excessive insistence on the latter. The Council of Europe's guidelines for member states on human rights and the fight against terrorism has been a most valuable contribution to uphold that balance and to protect human rights.

Third, when democratisation is pursued as a part of strategy of counter terrorism it has to be sensitive to the actual needs of the society in question. If democratisation became perceived as an imposition of alien concepts and values, it could easily backfire into a backlash against democracy promotion initiatives and the idea of democracy itself.

Another set of issues where the interface between democracy and security is central arises in post-conflict situations. In these situations democratic transformation has proven to be essential for the establishment of long-term stability and durable peace. In addition to such obvious ingredients as the rule of law, respect for human rights and good governance, the policies of post-conflict stabilisation have to give particular attention to accountability and justice. As the example of Afghanistan shows, the issues of accountability and responsibility for past violations might not be easily addressed in the immediate aftermath of armed conflict. However, they will have to be addressed as part of post-conflict peace building to ensure the durability of peace.

A particular focus in post-conflict peace building is placed on elections. It is expected that elections provide for a legitimate authority, which is vital for the realisation of an entire range of measures necessary to ensure durable stability and peace. However, the expectations should not be placed too high. A single election cannot by itself generate a durable authority. The experience in many post-conflict situations has demonstrated that several electoral terms have

to be completed before the situation can be considered as normalised. The timing of elections is extremely important. If conducted too early, elections might only give the semblance of legitimacy to actors emerging from armed conflict (including spoilers). If they are held too late, they might not be able to produce the necessary democratic change.

In many post-conflict situations, the international community needs to assist in the process of creation of political parties. Political pluralism is necessary as a condition for democratic legitimacy of government. However, it should not be developed in a manner, which makes the underlying ethnic and ideological divisions an obstacle to stabilise society after an armed conflict.

In short: democracy needs to promote economic and social prosperity, the rule of law as well as peace and security. On the other hand, progress in these three areas helps makes democracy and its institutions more robust."

IV. The impact of the economic and financial crisis on democratic systems

The economic and financial crisis of summer 2008 provided further indication of the degree of interdependence of our planet. The butterfly effect is now felt worldwide whenever there is the slightest trouble on the markets. Brought on by mortgage lending to the American middle classes, followed by the collapse of certain banks in the United States, the crisis quickly spread to Europe. Now the financial crisis has turned into a global economic crisis, causing considerable political and social upheaval in many countries, involving increased unemployment and poverty, especially in the transition countries, where success had come to depend on ever stronger growth at any price.

Was there not therefore a failure in democratic governance, which let this global economic and financial crisis develop without ever predicting its scale and consequences? In seeking the origins of the crisis, many theorists concluded that it had revealed the weakness of the regulation of the economy by politics, or a real breakdown between markets and governments, in the words of the economist and Nobel Prize for Economics laureate, Amartya Sen. The neoliberal thinking which gained the upper hand from the 1970s placed much emphasis on removing the constraints imposed by governments on the markets in order to ensure regular and sustained growth, while highlighting the ability of the economy to self-regulate. The movement was led by Ronald Reagan in the United States and Margaret Thatcher in the United Kingdom under the heading of deregulation. According to Bernard Boucault,⁸ the success of this neoliberal thinking had been facilitated by the decline in revolutionary ideologies: *"we entered a post-ideological era marked by efforts to achieve strong global growth designed to provide economic solutions to the issues of underdevelopment."*

In practice, deregulation resulted in extraordinary growth but, as it was no longer regulated, the financial sector became totally detached from the real economy. But does the current crisis really mean the end of neoliberalism, which has been a historic phase in capitalism? It is now commonly accepted that the crisis has revealed the dangers of the financial economy being disconnected from the real economy. How then should we analyse democratic states' share in responsibility for this failing if, like Bernard Boucault, quoting the French economist, Jean-Paul Fitoussi, we believe that there is a very strong link between capitalism and the rule of law or the democratic state?

1. The role of the state

The state between politics and economics

What is the link between politics and the economic system? This question has been debated by economists and political scientists since the 18th century. Can free markets exist without democracy? Can economic growth bring about greater democracy in the transition countries?

Picking up on the recent work by Jean-Paul Fitoussi on democracy and economic development, Bernard Boucault said that there was a very strong link between capitalism and the democratic state. In his view, capitalism was a kind of historical dispensation which had emerged from "the rubble and political upheaval of the *Ancien Régime*". The interdependence between the rule of law and the free production of goods and services had resulted in the emergence of a democratic state. It was thanks to, not in spite of, democracy that capitalism had survived as the dominant form of economic organisation.

8. Director of the Ecole Nationale d'Administration, Strasbourg.

The system had only been able to expand thanks to the state, which had developed education and training, provided public transport and drastically increased life expectancy through health policies. It was the state which, by adopting legal standards and reducing inequality, could regulate the excesses of the market and boost public confidence in the economic system. In the final analysis, democracy and the market economy were inextricably linked: *“by preventing exclusion through the market, democracy increases the legitimacy of the economic system. By limiting politics’ control over people’s lives, the market, in turn, ensures greater support for democracy.”*

As underlined by a participant from the School in Moldova, the market economy is one of the pillars of modern democracy because it requires the safeguarding of freedom of initiative, competitiveness, legal certainty and economic security. In most countries, the level of economic development is directly linked to the state of democracy. In the USSR, for example, where the private sector did not exist, there was no democracy either. In a country where the government is the key player in all spheres of society, neither democracy nor the private sector can really develop properly. But what happens when the system breaks down? Does democratic transition lead to economic growth? Does the introduction of the free market necessarily lead to more democracy?

From the planned economy to the market economy in eastern Europe

The Soviet Union was a socialist country with a planned economy based on the collective ownership of the means of production and centralised management of the economy by the state. Designed to remedy the shortcomings of capitalism, this centrally planned economy was put in place in the late 1920s when Stalin ended the New Economic Policy (NEP) championed by Lenin. In such economies, strict state regulation is omnipresent and the market is not stimulated or controlled by the balance between supply and demand but by government planning. A central unit called “Gosplan” laid down the rules for economic activity, doing away with private ownership and the market.

On taking office in 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev began a series of reforms that would fundamentally change the USSR: perestroika and glasnost. The increasingly obvious inefficiency of the central planning system led all east European countries gradually to give up the system and move over to the market economy. The first steps taken involved restoring private ownership and free enterprise.

However, the abandonment of central planning, which was intended to improve the economic situation, actually plunged eastern Europe into even greater difficulties. In many countries, there were huge falls in production and income, accompanied by mass unemployment, high inflation and rapid devaluation. The social cost of economic transformation was extremely high and resulted in real impoverishment of the disadvantaged sections of society. Privatisation and the ending of price controls are not enough unless they are followed by an increase in the value and global competitiveness of the relevant countries’ products and services.

The problem posed by the transition from a planned economy to a market economy mainly lies in the fact that the state giving up its central role does not on its own mean that economic agents automatically find themselves in a properly functioning market economy. Although the market may be regarded as the natural, spontaneous form of economic organisation in human societies, it can only function if a number of prior conditions are met.⁹ The waves of mass privatisation and the chaotic deregulation without any state control made economic transition difficult in the countries of eastern and south-eastern Europe.

As Ivan Krastev, Chair of the Centre for Liberal Strategies in Sofia, has written, some historians are tempted to write the history of the post-communist transitions in central and eastern Europe “as a story of the irresistible attraction between democracy and capitalism.” However, in the early 1990s, many theorists feared that the new democracies would reject market economics. While it was agreed

9. *Markets and Democracy*, journal of the United States State Department, June 2008.

that democracy and capitalism are natural partners and that free-market and competitive politics strengthen each other in the long run, some feared that the political and economic reforms needed to transform east European societies would block each other: "How can you give people the power to do what they want and then expect them to choose policies that will lead initially to higher prices, higher unemployment, and increased social inequality?" That was the dilemma of the post-communist transitions.¹⁰

Central and eastern Europe succeeded in a simultaneous transition to market economics and democracy, which, according to Ivan Krastev, was made possible by "a magic mix of ideas, emotions, circumstances, and leadership". In general, democracy and free markets go hand in hand, but the link is not always obvious. In this connection, it is enough to look at the experience of countries such as Russia, Belarus or China "to be sceptical about the natural tendency of capitalism to lead to democracy and the natural tendency of democracy to support capitalism".¹¹

The case of the post-Soviet countries: difficult "cohabitation" between the private sector and the state and democracy's continuing need to prove itself

Unlike western Europe, where democratic development has a longer tradition and where relations between the state and the private sector are complex and numerous, the former Soviet countries approach the issue of these relations in a much less advanced manner. Indeed, the very existence of the interdependence between the business sector and political leaders needed to ensure both democratic development and economic growth is still a subject of debate. In most of the former people's republics, the processes of democratisation have not reached business leaders, for whom democratic values all too often remain a closed book.

A participant from the School in Ukraine highlighted the one-sided approach of business circles and their consumerist attitude towards democratic progress: "we are willing to take and to demand things, but we are not willing to give anything back in return." On the other hand, the authorities and state institutions also have difficulties understanding the interaction. The statements by the participants at the Summer University showed that the authorities in post-Soviet countries still do not understand that they need to work with the private sector and that a strong private sector is vital to a strong economy. They often also misjudge the development strategy of the business sector. Yet it is obvious that the private sector cannot grow and become competitive unless some degree of democracy is guaranteed. The legislation needs to be adapted accordingly. A lack of democracy provides a breeding ground for excesses like corruption, which is becoming a common practice.

In the aftermath of the breakup of the Soviet Union, the political leaders in the former Soviet countries failed to ensure equality between citizens, in particular in terms of entrepreneurial and business opportunities. The privatisation process and the development of the new private sector in the transition countries remained in the hands of oligarchs close to those in power. The fact that the major winners of the transition process were educated people and well-connected members of the former regime did not help matters. The lack of democratic principles in the relevant legislation and, in particular, of equal opportunities for people wishing to work in the private sector had a major impact on the economic development of the post-Soviet countries. "As the new generation of politicians, we must hope that, sooner or later, the private interests of the structures which support state policy will come to play a secondary role and the private sector will begin to operate in accordance with democratic principles," was the conclusion of the Ukrainian participant.

To some extent, the experience of the democratic transition processes in central Europe also needs to be looked at again. Two years after Bulgaria and Romania joined the European Union, populism and nationalism are on the rise in these two countries. The public have lost confidence in the political

10. Ivan Krastev, *Democracy and Capitalism: The Separation of the Twins*, *Markets and Democracy*, journal of the United States State Department, June 2008.

11. *Idem*.

class, who are regarded as corrupt and self-interested. The democratic and economic transition, which was previously regarded as an unqualified success, has led to social stratification, causing hardship for many people while elevating only a privileged few.

To quote Ivan Krastev again, *“Twenty years ago theorists feared that the newly emerging democracies might lack a taste for capitalism. What we see now is that most people in Central Europe have more trust in the market than in the ballot box.”*¹² And the economic crisis which has just hit Europe is posing a serious challenge to the democratic systems of the countries of Greater Europe.

2. European democracy and the economic crisis

The crisis: a factor impacting on democratic processes

The impact of the economic and financial crisis on the democratic process in Europe largely depends on the context and the political and economic situation in each country.

According to Alexei Makarkin,¹³ in countries where democratic systems are relatively stable and in those which have achieved relatively successful democratic transitions, the crisis may stimulate and speed up changes in government. Rainer Stekhan¹⁴ cited the very telling example of Iceland. In a country where the financial system amounted to up to 10 times national GDP, the bank rescue plan had caused public discontent and protests, leading to the resignation of the Prime Minister and a change of government. In Hungary, the country most seriously affected by the economic recession, the Socialist Prime Minister who had hidden the scale of the austerity measures to make sure that he was re-elected had also had to go.

In countries which have almost completed the process of transition but still face serious internal difficulties, the crisis may help resolve these problems through the democratic process. In Latvia, for example, Nils Ushakov, the leader of the Harmony Centre party, an alliance of former pro-Russian parties representing the Russian-speaking population, had become Mayor of Riga after forming a local coalition with one of the “Latvian” parties. Alexei Makarkin saw this example as the first step towards the end of the isolation of the “Russian” parties, which he said was a specific feature of current Latvian politics. He hoped that this trend could subsequently spread at national level.

However, in countries still in the process of democratic transition, the crisis may bring about unexpected consequences for democracy and trigger changes which may be either positive or negative.

In Ukraine, where the liberalisation of politics led to a bitter power struggle, the economic crisis set the stage for a “broad coalition” between the two major political groupings. However, nothing came of this because of the hostility of the public, who were opposed to the limitation of their rights. One of the participants from the Ukrainian School said that this process could be explained by the inability of the elites to liberalise the economic and political sectors while retaining power. In the face of public discontent, the politicians were seeking to remain in power, even if that meant going back on the democratic principles the public had recently signed up to or, indeed, reintroducing some elements of an authoritarian regime.

In Russia, in contrast, the crisis has led to questioning of some authoritarian aspects of current policies, in particular increasing government control of the economy and the restrictions on the action of civil society and NGOs. According to Alexei Makarkin, one of the particular features of Russian politics is its cyclical nature, which depends largely on the economic situation, as in the late 1980s, when the events which occurred had been triggered by the fall in oil prices. Now Russia was experiencing the

12. Ivan Krastev, *Democracy and Capitalism: The Separation of the Twins*, *Markets and Democracy*, journal of the United States State Department, June 2008.

13. Vice-President of the Centre of Political Technologies, Moscow.

14. Chair of the Administrative Council, Council of Europe Development Bank.

beginnings of a partial and cautious process of liberalisation, which was still not going to the heart of the regime, but was creating more opportunities for debate and social activity and gradually changing the political climate. The success of such a policy clearly depended on the political authorities, the co-ordination of their actions and the effectiveness of the dialogue with the public, but also on the progression of the economic crisis, its length and its depth. In Alexei Makarkin's view, a turnaround of this kind meant there was hope for positive change in Russia.

The impact of the economic crisis on democratic systems must therefore be assessed in the light of the political context in each country. In spite of this relative "democratisation" of Russian politics which Alexei Makarkin referred to, the crisis has also revealed shortcomings in the democratic system in the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States, as well as in EU members.

Democracy put to the test by the economic crisis

Against this background of economic and financial crisis, the main threats to the democratic system have increased in number. One of the most striking developments has been the rise in corruption in central and east European countries, where bribes fill the pockets of the elites to buy political support. The participants at the Fourth Summer University gave numerous examples of corruption in their countries, but it is also a common problem in many west European countries. Moreover, the inadequate penalties applied in cases of the misappropriation of public funds feed an underground economy where money buys votes. The lower the turnout, the greater the influence of the bought votes. As described by one of the participants from Bulgaria, vote buying has become a common practice there in recent years: disadvantaged individuals, in particular among the Roma minority, sell their votes for modest sums (between €10 and €50) and there are always politicians who are willing to invest in these kinds of fraudulent practices. The responses of lawmakers and law-enforcement agencies are often inadequate for tackling such bribing of the electorate.

A new trend has also emerged recently in the form of "corporate voting". A Bulgarian participant explained that pressure by employers on their staff concerning elections is increasing. This involves pressure exerted by certain political parties on employees who are threatened with dismissal if they do not vote for the party to which their employer belongs. Especially in this period of economic crisis, the threat of dismissal leads employees to give up their rights and freedoms. In Bulgaria, corporate voting is common practice in small towns, in particular, where elections are won by independent candidates supported by local business organisations. The firms are often in "offshore zones" and are linked to the former communist secret services.

A third abuse is the purchase of leading media firms by business groups backing candidates. In Bulgaria, the "package" includes five print media outlets and a number of television channels, which is an effective means of influencing voters. Democracy faces a real threat when it is controlled by government or businesses.

3. What lessons should be learned from the economic crisis?

After the crisis: a return to Keynesianism?

"Greed has always been there, it wasn't it which caused the crisis, it was the failure of government regulation," according to Amartya Sen. One of the issues of concern to democracies is striking the right balance between the role of the government and the role of the private sector in the economy. That changes depending on the period and the context. In the view of Kim Campbell,¹⁵ one of the problems which had led to the financial crisis was the way the United States had signed up to the idea that the less the government was involved in the economy, the better things would be: *"The mistake was to believe that we could do away with all the rules and all government regulation and that everybody would*

15. Former Prime Minister of Canada.

behave properly; the market economy does not mean that people turn into angels, they will always be selfish." And the only authority which is legitimate and can therefore issue regulations is government.

This ties in with the dominant economic thinking of the post-war era: Keynes' "general theory" based on an analysis of the 1929 economic crisis.¹⁶ One of the outcomes of the Keynesian Revolution was the overhaul of the economic role of the state. As the economy was not capable of achieving equilibrium itself and the market was liable to function chaotically, Keynes recommended the expansion of the functions of the state, which alone was capable of preventing the complete destruction of the existing economic institutions. According to his theory, the state must assume responsibility for a large share in investments, funding them through budget deficits, and ensure high levels of demand and consumption, in particular by raising low incomes.

Are we now witnessing a revival of Keynesianism? To what extent are states today capable of coming to the aid of the economic sector and establishing a system of regulation? Governments have already made large contributions to funding investment programmes and schemes to purchase bank shares. Many measures have been taken by institutions and the public sector. According to Kim Campbell, France had been much more successful in raising the funds needed to "ease the impact of the crisis and place the funds in the hands of the people" than, for instance, the United States, where the notion of government had been much denigrated in recent decades and many institutions had been weakened. The main challenge facing democracies, in particular the more recent ones, is the capacity to respond. The solution is therefore less obvious in post-Soviet countries, where the main problem stems from the fact that democratic institutions and their ability to respond are in the process of being developed.

The complexity of the issues and the relevant institutions' limited capacity to deal with the crisis prevent any quick solution. In describing her experience as a member of parliament and then as Prime Minister, Kim Campbell said that when she had been elected to the Canadian parliament, the national debt and the deficit inherited from the previous government had been huge. It had also been necessary to change the tax system, which had been eroding public confidence. Even with a lot of time, it was difficult to rein in government expenditure and the recession had been very severe in Canada in the early 1990s. *"Where could the funds be found? It was not possible to take up some options which might have improved the situation, at least not without mortgaging the future with those policies. That created tremendous pressure because governments want to act and the public are also going to have to wake up in the morning with a certain level of debt to cope with in future."* That all limited governments' ability to implement certain measures which previously had been regarded as rights of the citizens in certain countries.

It was up to governments to make sure that the market was a level playing field and pass legislation that really protected the public interest. It had to be clear, effective and easy to comply with. It was also important to impose a degree of control and supervision, while avoiding over-regulation. Although it was a key tool, regulation, like protectionism, had to be limited to avoid the risk of being counterproductive.

The crisis was now confronting politicians with their responsibilities and the expectations of the public. Many people therefore believed that government should be more authoritarian, more centralised and more protectionist. In Kim Campbell's view, that reaction was normal and natural, but it had not been the answer in the 1930s and it was not the answer to the current crisis. Protectionism was a dangerous tool, especially in a globalised world which depended and was based on trade, co-operation and mutual trust. Protectionism could trigger the re-emergence of nationalist thinking, cause serious trade problems and damage the global economy.

Democracy must express itself across national boundaries to have an impact on global regulation. The main international institutions have a major part to play, but they must be more transparent,

16. John Maynard Keynes' work, "The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money" (1936).

more accountable and closer to civil society. According to Bernard Boucault, the way out of the crisis lay in closer European integration: *"We are in a phase of inadequate regulation of the economic system, including at European level. Some policies are not European matters but it would be better if they were. If a number of policies had been integrated, Europe could perhaps have found a common solution."* However, institutions like the G8 and, above all, the G20 also had a key part to play in making recommendations and establishing international machinery. Co-operation through the G20 would have positive effects, as it would enable more countries to act on the international arena. It was also necessary to consider what the Council of Europe, which safeguarded democracy, human rights and minority rights, could do to address the social impact of the crisis.

Greater integration required greater citizen involvement in public affairs. The action of public opinion at global level could contribute to the emergence of new tools which could prevent the recurrence of such crises in the future, provided that the means were found to enable citizens to make their voices heard. In this respect, Bernard Boucault sent out a fundamental message to the participants of the Fourth Summer University: *"It is up to you, young European democrats, and the associations you run to contribute to this process by expressing your views, giving accounts of your experience and making proposals so that our fellow citizens in all European countries take charge of their futures."*

Making citizens ever more active stakeholders in democracy

"We must deregulate democracies and regulate the markets, not the reverse". This comment by Jean-Paul Fitoussi prompted Bernard Boucault to consider the need *"to reinvent democracy"*. It was necessary to review the way democracy was organised and regulated so that it took precedence over economics and the order of values was restored, so to speak. There was also a need to broaden the base of our democracies, boost their significance for citizens and enable the latter to be more committed stakeholders. According to Bernard Boucault, it was necessary, first of all, to take account of the limitations of the current electoral system and devise non-electoral forms of representation. *"Democratic legitimacy is based on elections and the final public decisions lie with the representatives of the people. However, we are all also aware of the contribution which can be made, especially in the economic and financial sector, in terms of monitoring, making proposals and looking ahead, by economic, social and environmental assemblies and of the contribution which can also be made by the development of public debate procedures for involving the public in key decision-making, as well as by the emergence of independent administrative authorities for supervising and validating public decision making."*

Public confidence in the political and economic system had declined. Solutions needed to be found to respond to the social impact of the crisis and, in particular, bring about greater solidarity and help the most vulnerable groups such as the unemployed, young people and the elderly.

It was also necessary to reassure the public so that they did not lose all confidence in democratic institutions. According to Kim Campbell, *"it is vital for governments to assume their responsibilities, issue regulations and pass laws which are fair, while also communicating with citizens."* Democracy, which was based on elections as the method of legitimating the holders of power, also required supervision of those who govern. The development of a more lasting democracy required the emergence of a new culture of *"accountability"*, a term which combined the concept of responsibility with the obligation to account for one's actions. *"The best elections in the world and the best political system, even though leaders do not take the right decisions and do not fulfil their responsibilities, will not function properly unless the public are convinced of the validity of the system which protects them,"* was Kim Campbell's conclusion.

The art of taking "decisive decisions"

Apart from questions about the very nature of the democratic system and its interaction with the economic sector, the economic crisis raises issues about the way decisions are taken. This applies equally to policymakers, insurers, bankers and traders. Kim Campbell offered three types of response here.

The first, which might seem secondary, was related to the gender of the decision-makers. Involving more women in decision-making could be part of the answer. In Norway, political parity was extended to corporate boardrooms, where a quota of 40% female members applied. Other countries like Spain had also passed similar legislation. In Kim Campbell's view, it was unfortunate that laws had to be passed to achieve that outcome. It was now recognised by social science researchers that organisations headed by men tended to engage in riskier activities than those headed by women.

The concept of risk taking was being questioned more than ever before. The lure of quick profits at the price of unreasonable risks had prevailed in bankers' minds when subprimes had been created. The excessive risks had always been analysed in relation to the expected gains rather than any potential losses. Kim Campbell identified a lack both of vision and of clear-headedness among most leaders, who *"take decisions based on wishful thinking, refusing to see what they do not want to know."*

Knowing how to take the right decisions also and, above all, means being capable of taking a long-term perspective. Yet politicians are elected on a short-term basis and it is day-to-day issues which concern their electors. It is therefore in policymakers' interest to meet the expectations of those who elect them so that they are re-elected, whereas if they want their decisions to have a real impact, they would have to take an entirely different perspective. Reconciling the short and long term controls political action. Kim Campbell believes that this difficult equation could be solved through the decision-making environment, which covers the time taken, those involved, their culture and all factors which enable sensible, clear decisions to be taken.

The current crisis offered an opportunity to reassess the current economic system, the state of democracy and prevailing human and social values. It also offered an opportunity to reassess the role of governments, local authorities and international organisations. At the same time, the problems demonstrated the need for change. This global economic crisis had shown that the private sector must reconsider its values and change its attitudes, in particular in post-Soviet countries. The term "greed is good", which had been used for so long to describe Wall Street, had to give way. Responsibility and accountability must become the standard for the private sector.

At the same time, a crisis of this kind took no heed of national boundaries. It affected financial institutions, governments and communities worldwide. The need for international co-ordination of supervision of capital flows and banks was inescapable. A minimum of global economic governance was required automatically, contrary to the neoliberal theories about the need to reduce the role of public authority, which, however, could no longer be limited to the national level alone.

V. Identity, terrorism, organised crime: new challenges for democracy

The economic crisis has revealed the weaknesses of a system which, only 20 years ago, emerged victorious from the confrontation between the two blocs. While the crisis obviously has implications for democracies, there are other threats to them as well. The interpretation of a large number of conflicts in terms of ethnicity or religion, the debate raging about multiculturalism and the talk about the West fighting its enemies all mean that the issue of identity is at the very heart of today's political challenges.

This issue, which is one of the most acute and most complex in our time, raises vital questions about the future of nations and cultures. The excesses of identity politics, which often involve rejecting other groups and lead to hatred, racism or even ethnic cleansing, pose a serious threat to democracy.

Whereas armed conflicts between major powers no longer seem likely, we are witnessing growth in other forms of violence, which sometimes build on a loss of direction and people's feeling of abandonment. In this connection, terrorism and organised crime demand new responses which must not, however, restrict the fundamental freedoms that are the pillars of democracy.

The issues of identity and international violence are not, however, directly interrelated, although they do have an impact on people's lives. They can influence countries to the extent of generating instability or even internal crises.

1. The crisis of identities and democracy

One or more identities?

The concept of identity defines both what is specific to an individual and what makes him or her different from other people. *"Identity is not inherited from the past or determined at birth, but is something which we acquire for the future, in interacting with other people."* This perception of identity put forward by Andreas Gross¹⁷ was inspired by the sociologist, Max Weber, who defined it as the product of determined, singular actions which emerged within specific social contexts, for instance the work environment. Identities change constantly and are built and adjusted in a range of interactions throughout people's lives. According to the sociologist, Manuel Castells, identity is not an inherent part of human nature. *"It is built on the basis of materials taken from history, geography, biology, the collective memory and individual fantasies. [...] It gives rise to identity strategies, which enable individuals or groups to take shape."*¹⁸ Identity is a multiple, polysemic concept. This multiple nature of identities was the focus of the debate at the session on "The crisis of identities and international violence and the respect of fundamental rights and the rule of law".

Ideas and values are the basis of personal and collective identity. As Andreas Gross pointed out, "when ideas lead us to act for the future, they give shape to a common identity." Collective identity clearly required shared values. Respect for the diversity of identities was a *sine qua non* for the maintenance of democracy and peace between peoples. What led neighbouring countries to fight? What caused so much hatred between peoples who actually seemed to have many things in common? What cultural breakdown had taken place in the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia and the Caucasus? According

17. Member of the delegation of Switzerland to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Chair of the Socialist Group.

18. Manuel Castells, *Le pouvoir de l'identité*, Fayard, 1999.

to Thomas Hammarberg,¹⁹ solidarity within a group often led to tensions with other groups. People who were taken in by religious fanaticism or discourse based on national identity were easy prey for the militants of confrontation and hatred. Fear and a lack of sense of direction were fertile breeding grounds for fanatical leaders obsessed with identity to develop their theories and violently reject the concept of multiple identities.

With reference to Amartya Sen's book, "Identity and violence", Thomas Hammarberg said: *"It is wrong to believe that an individual has a single identity. We all have several identities. However, in a crisis situation, the focus is placed on a single aspect of that identity, which may be the individual's religion, culture or civilisation, while other aspects of identity such as class, age, gender, profession, language or even moral and political identity are ignored. They are also part of everyone's identity. We must avoid only considering a single aspect. That is how the conditions for conflicts between groups are created."*

From eastern to western Europe: identity put to the test by a crisis?

The globalisation of trade, the emergence of a new economy, the challenges to nation states and the growth in individualism are exacerbating identity-related issues and causing more and more existential crises. The collapse of the USSR and the rejection of communism shook the identity bearings of the peoples in the former Soviet bloc. Identity crises in both eastern and western Europe would therefore seem to be linked to particular economic, political and social circumstances, which make it difficult for people to define themselves and find their way in a cosmopolitan society.

This is a particularly sensitive issue in Russia. According to Boris Dubin,²⁰ the war between Russia and Georgia in August 2008 could be explained in part by a problem of identification among Russians. Studies conducted by the Levada Centre in Moscow showed that 70% of the Russian population did not feel European and did not believe that Russia was part of Europe. That was why the recent conflicts between Russia and Georgia, Russia and the Baltic states and Russia and Moldova had been possible. *"These conflicts are due to the rejection of Europe. 80% of the Russian population believe that Russia is a country that has shaped itself and that no one apart from Russians can understand them. 'We are different' is what 80% of Russians say. And as long as that is the case, both clashes between civilisations and also economic and political conflicts will continue to grow."*

Social scientists believed that this also tied in with the image people had of themselves. The sociologist, Carmel Camilleri, made a distinction between positive and negative identity. According to him, positive identity was the feeling of being able to influence people and things and to master one's environment and of having favourable self-images compared to other people. In contrast, negative identity involved a feeling of ill-being, powerlessness, being poorly regarded by other people and having unfavourable perceptions of oneself and one's own activities.²¹ Boris Dubin said that the unity of Russia and adhesion to Russian identity was a reaction to "nobody likes us" because Russians often felt they were the enemy in other people's eyes. Russians' collective identity was therefore built on this negative perception. Yet this *"is in no way modern and does not involve anything positive, lasting, tolerant or respectful."*

According to Boris Dubin, the main problem concerning Russians' identity lay in the fact that Russians, both collectively and individually, realised that there was a wide discrepancy between the imperial ambitions of the former Russian Empire and post-imperial and post-Soviet political reality. The lack of democratic institutions based on popular initiative made the situation worse. *"There are institutions which look like a parliament, courts and other democratic-type institutions, but at least three-quarters of Russians know that the truth does not lie in the judgments of the courts."* The Russian population needed to gain control over their lives so that they were able to feel that they were taking part in building their

19. Commissioner for Human Rights, Council of Europe.

20. Chief of the Department of Sociopolitical Studies, Levada Centre, Moscow.

21. Manuel Castells, *Idem*.

future. At a time when a large number of Russian families could not meet their own basic needs, the protection of human rights was the least of their concerns. In his view, this was *"the price of getting used to and making do with this situation. The question of freedom of expression, media freedom and freedom of association is of least concern. In the final analysis, human beings cling to the most basic rights in terms of the right to life and survival."*

In other words, the identity problems among Russians stemmed from the divide which they all knew existed between what they saw on the news on state television and the reality of their daily lives. Moreover, the gulf that separated the population of Russian origin from the other ethnic groups living in the country was huge. The various accounts by the participants had shown that, if you watched Russian national television, you would think that there were only Russians who lived in Russia and that there were no other ethnic groups or national minorities. *"The Russians themselves regard Russia as a homogenous entity. But that is wrong. They should stop watching TV and turn to the Internet where they would see that there are several Russias."* He believed that his country was suffering an identity crisis like all other post-imperial countries and that it needed to learn to live in peace rather than in confrontation. What could be done in such a situation? Politicians and civil society had a crucial part to play in bringing about a change in attitudes.

Should identity politics, in Russia or elsewhere, only be regarded as an attempt at exclusion? Did the European identity which was struggling to emerge follow the same logic? Would Europe also be faced with an identity crisis? To quote the term used by Thomas Hammarberg, this "emerging concept" in any case deserved to be monitored. The common European identity should be based on European values, namely human rights: *"I hope that these values will be accepted increasingly everywhere, especially on Europe's geographical boundaries. The fact that the death penalty no longer exists in Europe, except in Belarus, where it may be abolished shortly, is a step in the right direction. Dialogue should be continued with the emphasis we wish to place on European values, in order gradually to build this European identity."*

The common European identity is a work in progress. In spite of the progress made in establishing a strong European Union, European identity remains something that comes more from the mind than from the heart, to quote Francis Fukuyama.²² Education can help overcome the confrontation between the national history of one country and that of other countries by seeking to understand the consequences of the events of the past and deal with divisions. *"We must attempt to offer different perspectives and a range of views about historic events and thereby reconcile the specific with the universal. It is a matter not of abolishing histories and identities but of establishing co-operation between professional historians, politicians and schools so as to develop transnational accounts of the history of Europe's peoples which will help give meaning to a common European identity,"* said a participant from Bulgaria.

How can multiple identities be promoted?

Globalisation and the resulting great expansion in international exchanges are causing people, especially in large cities, to feel that they have lost their bearings. They no longer encounter the same family models and find it hard to maintain relations with other generations. In the words of Thomas Hammarberg, in order to enable all individuals to live out their multiple identities, it was necessary to *"combat this marginalisation of people in our societies and champion multicultural understanding."*

According to a participant from the Moscow School, it was necessary to eliminate the obstacles between peoples, which meant increasing the number of exchanges and improving mutual perceptions. Yet the problem today was the inadequate flow of information in both eastern and western Europe. Communication between political leaders and the public was poor. In Russia, there was no real sense of community, which resulted in xenophobia and racial discrimination. In both his private

22. F. Fukuyama, "Identity, Immigration, and Liberal Democracy", *Bologna Centre Journal of International Affairs*, January 2008.

life and as a professional footballer, Lilian Thuram²³ had seen the extent to which identities formed barriers between people, all the more so in an area where confrontation was symbolic such as football. In his view, the shared perception of living on the same planet and being faced with major challenges should be the binding force between human beings. It should bring down the barriers which had gone up over the centuries.

Multicultural understanding requires strong commitment by political leaders. According to Thomas Hammarberg, they needed to be encouraged to rethink the way they approached identity so as to see multiple identities as a response to the challenges of globalisation and the resulting cosmopolitanism. Since the Warsaw Summit in 2005, the Council of Europe had taken up these challenges and promoted European identity and unity “based on shared fundamental values and respect for cultural diversity”.

While the commitment of international organisations such as the Council of Europe facilitates mutual understanding and multiculturalism in our societies, the loss of points of reference and the need to identify with specific groups create the ideal conditions for the growth of terrorist or Mafia-like organisations.

2. Corruption, organised crime and terrorism: a growing influence on democracy?

Corruption, Mafia infiltration and terrorism – a global trend

No continent is free from corruption or organised crime and violence perpetrated by mafias and terrorist organisations is spreading everywhere.

Over the last 20 years, the situation has deteriorated throughout Europe. The long-standing activity of the mafias of southern Italy such as the *Camorra* and *Cosa Nostra* is now matched by the activity of new criminal organisations, in particular in the Balkans. Organised crime sprang up in all kinds of new areas of trafficking in the immediate aftermath of the fighting there. Christian Saves²⁴ emphasised these organisations’ great versatility, reflected in their ability “to sell everything: drugs, weapons, vehicles, spare parts of all kinds, medicines... and even human organs”. The strength of these organisations lay in the fact that they covered a broad range of activities.

It was in the territory of the former Soviet Union that criminal and Mafia-like activities had taken on quite stupendous proportions. Following the breakup of the USSR in 1991, a “political and economic jungle” had developed in the countries of the former Soviet Union and criminal organisations had found it easy to profit from the situation. Economic liberalism had been accompanied by plundering of the country’s assets and Russia’s “huge natural resources” to the benefit of businessmen with political, economic and Mafia connections. Seeking to “expand their social and economic networks and cultivate certain political friendships at the highest level so as to keep expanding their influence and control over entire sectors of the economy”, they had succeeded in the space of only a few years in amassing colossal fortunes that were almost as large as and sometimes actually larger than the GDP of some states. Vladimir Putin’s arrival in power in January 2000 had seen action being taken against past excesses and a restoration with a vengeance of state authority.

On the other side of the Atlantic, criminal organisations still controlled several forms of trafficking. While in the United States the influence of the Mafia and its infiltration of society were no longer comparable to the situation during the prohibition era, violence did persist. In Mexico, however, the last three years had been marked by a serious deterioration. With kidnappings, maimings and murders taking place in broad daylight in city centres, the bloody violence blighting the country had reached such a level that it received wide coverage in European newspapers. In South America, although the guerrilla

23. President of the Lilian Thuram Foundation – Education against Racism.

24. French political scientist and senior civil servant.

war between the Colombian government and drug cartels could not be ignored, it was in Brazil and, more specifically, in the *favelas* that the violence was at its most extreme. The army was intervening in broad daylight and the confrontations with criminal organisations were giving rise to warlike scenes in the very heart of Rio de Janeiro. Regardless of the country they operated in, the common feature of all these Mafia-like organisations was that they relied on a system of aid and mutual assistance to help the most disadvantaged groups and buy their support and following.

The situation was also complex in Africa. Off the coast of the Horn of Africa, a new type of crime was making the headlines and obliging western states to deploy their naval forces there. Piracy had become a modern form of aggression and the pirates were capable of attacking large trawlers, luxury yachts, cargo ships and oil tankers alike. Illegal migration was also a major source of trafficking for criminal organisations. Unscrupulous traffickers selling passages to a supposed European “Eldorado” for large sums of money were increasing in number and causing concern among western intelligence services. Although Africa remained the poorest continent, the criminal organisations found it relatively easy to arm and equip themselves with heavy weaponry. *“This more professional approach to criminal activity gives cause for concern insofar as the criminals are increasingly determined and operate more discriminately and more cold-bloodedly,”* said Christian Saves.

Organised crime and terrorism benefiting from the crisis of the state and globalisation

To develop and expand, criminal organisations and terrorist groups take advantage of the weaknesses of states and the effects of globalisation. Referring to the work by the economist, Stergios Skaperdas, “The political economy of organised crime”, a Moldovan participant pointed out that organised crime existed and prospered more easily in places where government was weak or lacking. The Mafia and criminal organisations were soundly structured and often succeeded in supplanting weak states. This was a view shared by Christian Saves, who believed that a strong government tradition protected societies more effectively against organised crime.

In this connection, it could be seen that criminal organisations encountered much less favourable breeding grounds in countries which had experienced authoritarian or centralising government traditions at some point in their history, for instance France and Germany. *“Mafias of all kinds only prosper when governments are lacking, shirk their responsibilities or capitulate.”* The best antidote against organised crime was still therefore the state, as it alone had the necessary resources for protecting citizens. That was what Max Weber had had in mind in defining the state as the body which had “the monopoly of legitimate physical violence”.

The strength of criminal organisations lay in their ability to take advantage of the weak points in a system and take over an area which would only become profitable in the long term. Christian Saves pointed out that these organisations had *“an inborn gift for worming their way into the slightest cracks in society and taking advantage of them later, starting from a secondary position.”* Their relationship with space and time was not the same as that of individuals. That enabled them to adopt long-term strategies and consolidate their control over an activity which they had decided to take over.

The collapse of the Soviet Union had led to the departure of the former communist elite and created a vacuum which criminal organisations had sought to fill by building on the disorder caused by the sudden arrival of capitalism and the market economy and on the ruins of the past. Moreover, a number of former communists had had no difficulty in switching to the Mafia. Bulgaria and Romania were the two countries that had been most seriously affected by corruption and crime, according to Christian Saves. Although now members of the European Union, they were still struggling with the organisations concerned.

It was total indifference and the abdication of the state governed by the rule of law which enabled economic, political and financial corruption to flourish: *“wherever there is a crisis of the state, there is*

often a social crisis which breeds on the intellectual and moral bankruptcy of the elites and the indifference of the public.” The ability to stand above specific interests was what made an independent state strong and credible. That enabled it to have an effective legal system capable of doing justice because it treated all individuals fairly. The rule of law was the foundation of all democracy and enabled values such as human rights to be defended robustly.

Justice and the monopoly of legitimate violence were specific, inherent features of the state. There were also external factors which could undermine the state and facilitate the operation of terrorist and criminal organisations. Globalisation, in other words, the uncontrolled growth of international exchanges and trade, played a part here. Free trade and freedom of movement for individuals and goods following the opening of national borders had created ideal conditions for organised crime: *“Freedom of movement for individuals and capital also means freedom of movement for individuals and capital for the benefit of mafias.”*²⁵ At the same time, the spread of new information and communication technologies had made for greater anonymity and opened up new possibilities for money laundering.

These new problems presented governments with new types of challenges because the enemy was less easy to track down or identify than in the past. *“It is all the more difficult to implement crackdowns when mafias are not so much seeking to take control of states but to exert pressure on those in power and quietly gain a hold over them,”* was the conclusion of Christian Saves.

The nature of organised crime and modern terrorism

The Mafia’s method is to make its contacts, whether senior officials or political leaders, offers which they cannot refuse. The pressure exerted may come from the criminal organisations themselves, in particular through corruption, but may also involve a form of social pressure from below geared primarily towards the interests of the Mafia. In his contribution, Christian Saves drew on the mechanisms at play in the film, *“Traffic”*, by Steven Soderbergh. When a large proportion of the population depended on a criminal organisation because of the income it provided them with, politicians were confronted with citizens and voters who defended the interests of the traffickers. Clientelism and deal making became means of buying social peace but, in the final analysis, the whole system was corrupted. *“The mafias are then held in respect by the political authorities and can establish a kind of ‘social dialogue’ with them,”* said Christian Saves.

Ongoing corruption of officials and the laundering of the proceeds of crime were the main levers which the Mafia could use. The corruption of the police, judges, politicians, lawyers and government and other officials was probably more dangerous to society than any other criminal activity. When the public authorities had given up, the result was an inextricable situation like the one portrayed in the film, *“Gomorrhah”*. The political class’s dereliction of duty had rendered it incapable of preventing the tentacles of the Neapolitan mafia from spreading through the whole of Neapolitan society. It was things getting out of control in this way which Alexander Seger²⁶ condemned in pointing out that the secret funding of political parties, conflicts of interest, lobbying and the exertion of undue political influence on the courts were threatening to corrupt democratic principles and processes in Europe.

The threat posed to democratic societies by organised crime was all the greater since terrorism benefited from and was funded with mafia income. In the past, terrorism had mainly been based on donations by people who supported the cause but now it was funded through a kind of international business involving trafficking in arms, drugs and human beings and money laundering. Terrorists and criminals often worked together, as pointed out by a participant from Moldova, who quoted the example of the IRA which had trained the Colombian mafia in bomb-making for the price of 100 kg of drugs.

25. Christian Saves, French political scientist and senior civil servant.

26. Head of the Economic Crime Division, Council of Europe.

Some experts in international relations believe that states have been facing a new era of international terrorism since 11 September 2001. This change is reflected both in terrorist groups' operating methods and actions and in their structural arrangements.

The agenda and goals of terrorist organisations have changed substantially. Unlike in the past, they no longer seek to destabilise governments directly but exert pressure on political leaders through public opinion by carrying out operations designed to kill large numbers of people. Their aims are more ambitious and involve long-term strategies to gain control over particular regions, redraw borders and bring about population movements, often accompanied by ethnic cleansing.

The actual structure of the terrorist cells has evolved from the traditional vertical model to a networked arrangement, with each group being relatively independent. However, the various cells may come together from time to time for joint operations. The organisation which developed this operating method is Al Qaeda, which the general public regard as a "terrorism multinational", but which is actually made up of various separate cells.

Organised crime and terrorism feed on one another and force governments to use new methods of protection, which sometimes involve restrictions on public freedoms, as with the Patriot Act in the United States, for instance. Given the need to protect the public and also to uphold fundamental rights, what is being done by international organisations like the Council of Europe?

3. Combating international violence and respecting fundamental rights

Combating organised crime and terrorism: what role for international organisations?

Nowadays, corruption, organised crime, money laundering and terrorist attacks all occur on a global level and therefore demand the development of joint responses by the international community. In the globalised world, crime and terrorism are no longer local problems.

Concerned to defend human rights and democratic values, the Council of Europe has made this issue one of its priority activities for over 10 years now. Its commitment to combating economic crime and organised crime in order to ensure the security of the citizens of Greater Europe was included on the agenda of the second Summit of Heads of State and Government in October 1997. In 2005, European leaders confirmed this commitment at the third Summit in Warsaw.

However, one of the participants at the Summer University did highlight an interesting point: *"We do not recognise the importance of the Council of Europe's work involving the adoption of legal standards such as the European Convention on Human Rights, the European Convention for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the Criminal Law Convention on Corruption and the Civil Law Convention on Corruption."* These texts are only the most significant examples of the Council of Europe's range of legal instruments, which include conventions, additional protocols, recommendations and resolutions.

Its work here is vital because, as underlined by a participant from the School in Moldova, just as criminal organisations are joining forces in order to extend their spheres of influence beyond the territory of individual states and are therefore becoming a shared problem for the international community, the fight against organised crime cannot succeed unless democratic states join forces. However, not all countries have the same perception of democracy and fundamental rights and freedoms. In this connection, the Council of Europe makes use of machinery such as the Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) and the Committee of Experts on the Evaluation of Anti-Money Laundering Measures (MONEYVAL), which help it to ensure compliance with European standards to which its member states have signed up.

The Council of Europe is therefore responding to the new challenges of organised crime and terrorism by general upgrading at Greater European level of fundamental rights standards. The case-law of

the European Court of Human Rights is its main weapon here. In order to be effective, the Council of Europe must step up its co-operation with the European Union and other international organisations with a view to developing a joint strategy to counter these new threats while continuing to uphold fundamental rights. This also involves strengthening the rule of law and democracy in all Council of Europe member states. The aim is ambitious but essential, as it is a matter of striking the right balance between measures to combat international violence and respect for human rights.

Respecting human rights as a precondition for defeating terrorism and organised crime

The terrorist attacks in New York on 11 September 2001 and subsequently in Madrid and London demonstrated that the traditional means of combating terrorism needed to be reviewed. Western intelligence used to assume that, not wishing to be identified or arrested, terrorists avoided endangering their own physical integrity so that their organisations or criminal networks remained secret. The attacks carried out by suicide bombers in recent years have shown how wrong this assumption was and revealed many shortcomings in western defence systems, leading governments to introduce major restrictions on fundamental rights in their legislation.

While the Council of Europe recognises the importance of combating terrorism, it also warns against the abuses which may result from the “special regulations” adopted by states and which may lead to serious violations of human rights. In order to ensure an effective response, international co-ordination was needed in the aftermath of 11 September. This is what the Council of Europe sought to achieve by setting up two new groups of experts: the Multidisciplinary Group on International Action against Terrorism (GMT) tasked with updating the relevant Council of Europe instruments and the Committee of Experts on Terrorism (CODEXTER), which replaced it in 2003.

The work of the two bodies led to the adoption of international treaties on the suppression of terrorism, terrorist financing and money laundering. These new instruments lay down the exceptions which may be made regarding human rights in the fight against terrorism. Apart from these legal standards, the Council of Europe remains vigilant concerning issues such as American forces secretly transferring terror suspects through the territory of its member states to the Guantanamo prison camp.

Terrorism and organised crime undermine the foundations of democratic societies and challenge the existence of a lawful, effective and secure state. The response of governments also requires preventive measures, which does not, however, relieve them from the obligation to respect fundamental freedoms. In this respect, the American methods for investigating terrorist acts go beyond what is permitted by the international Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War and the American government’s position that the Geneva Convention applies only to actual prisoners of war is unacceptable. Under Article 15 of the European Convention on Human Rights, “in time of war or other public emergency threatening the life of the nation”, states may take measures derogating from their obligations under the Convention. However, these restrictions on the right to privacy and the confidentiality of correspondence and communication must always be exceptional. The right to life and political and religious rights must not be called into question under any circumstances, even including the threat of terrorism.

The vital involvement of citizens: individual ethics in education and prevention

“The ability of democracies to resist organised crime will depend not only on the social and economic situation and the responses devised and implemented by the police but also, and above all, on individual ethics as applied or not; in short, on citizen involvement.” With these comments, Christian Saves highlighted the human factor in the development of organised crime or terrorism. The organisations concerned took advantage of the weaknesses of democracy to infiltrate it and gradually gain a hold over society, the courts and political leaders. This is what the author of the work, “Sépulture de la

Démocratie”;²⁷ condemned in pointing out that *“the permissiveness of democracy bolsters mafias. It creates an environment conducive to their growth because it does not allow itself to impose bans. The ‘soft underbelly’ of democracy therefore offers mafias an ideal breeding ground that is almost like a sanctuary, as it guarantees them near impunity.”* Once organised crime had infiltrated the democratic system, it spun its web. Like metastases attacking the human body cell by cell, the relevant organisations were the cancer of democratic systems.

The first defence for a state was therefore the existence of an impartial legal system and a sound economy based on the moral and ethical integrity of the men and women who worked in these areas of strategic importance for the survival of the state and upholding of its legitimacy. According to Christian Saves, the social and economic situation of a country was directly related to the level of organised crime: *“the sounder its socio-economic situation, the less likely it is that the criminal organisations operating within it will be powerful and will threaten the balance of society.”*

Organised crime did not only breed on the “permissiveness of democracies”, it also took advantage of hardship and poverty. Social hardship facilitated organised crime, ranging from basic smuggling to trafficking in drugs, weapons or human beings. Recent studies by American research centres had shown that social inequality and a lack of sense of community opened the doors wide for organised crime. When the “law of the jungle” replaced traditional forms of solidarity which had held the social fabric together, selfishness and permissiveness took over. For these reasons, everyone should be involved in combating organised crime and defending democratic values. *“As civic virtues to be harnessed against organised crime, courage and integrity and dedication and altruism are the keys to citizen involvement,”* concluded Christian Saves.

Civil society plays a vital educational role in combating organised crime and preventing terrorism. According to Jean-Marie Heydt,²⁸ the Council of Europe’s NGO partners in the Conference of INGOs had set themselves the task of “making sure that European states slip up as little as possible”. They worked in co-operation with the Committee of Ministers.

Globalisation has changed our societies and, in the process, called into question fundamental concepts such as national identity. Political leaders must devise new regulations to deal with the economic crisis. Integrity, efforts to combat corruption and a refusal to restrict fundamental freedoms or stir up fears and hatred by exploiting the issue of identity, in particular, are necessary if public faith in the democratic model is to be strengthened.

Democracies are under a dual obligation to consolidate their position and at the same time take up the challenges of global warming, environmental degradation, the increasing shortage of energy resources and the consequences of these trends for human societies.

27. Christian Saves, *Sépulture de la démocratie*, l’Harmattan – Questions contemporaines, Paris, 2008.

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

VI. Environmental and climate challenges: what role for Europe?

The Copenhagen Summit that was due to conclude a post-Kyoto agreement and give a global dimension to efforts to combat climate change meant that the issue of global warming and environmental challenges in general were the focus of political and topical debate. It was against this background that, for the first time, these issues were addressed at the Summer University for Democracy just as international civil society was beginning to mobilise and the public were becoming aware of issues which they had previously thought belonged to the realm of science fiction.

Global warming and all the resulting consequences in terms of increasing numbers of extreme weather events (flooding and droughts), desertification and rising sea levels are obviously only some of today's environmental challenges. Air pollution, the depletion of natural resources and drinking water supplies, the extinction of animal species and the rising cost of food are equally alarming problems which will have an unprecedented impact on human societies. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is unlikely to be resolved if the issue of access to water is not settled. Other conflicts and massive waves of migration will challenge existing equilibria.

The harmful effects of climate change are being felt worldwide with visible consequences. Environmental challenges involve clear risks for the coming decades for both developed and developing countries. Governments and all individuals must therefore act urgently to deal with them. Will democracies which have grown with economic success and access by the maximum number of people to mass consumerism be able in future to impose restrictions to bring about savings which now seem unavoidable?

1. Taking up the challenges of climate change

Global warming and biodiversity: current concerns

The situation today is characterised by the persistence of environmental problems which continue to grow in number, with none of them being properly under control. The use of fossil fuels, especially oil and gas, one of the direct causes of the increasing CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere, lies behind global warming. Over the last century, the quantity of CO₂ in the atmosphere has increased significantly. According to scientific observations by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the average temperature on the Earth's surface increased by approximately 0.6°C during the 20th century.²⁹ Recent studies also show that climate change is happening more quickly than predicted and there can be no doubt that global warming is actually taking place. It is having far-reaching repercussions on the environment: the melting of the polar ice is raising sea levels and changing climates. At the same time, the recent increase in floods and droughts would appear to be having an impact on certain human systems.

Reports by international bodies like the OECD, resolutions by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and various assessments by the scientific community all show that the prospects for the environment are worrying. Global warming is one of the most serious challenges facing the world today. However, as Oliver Dulic³⁰ rightly pointed out, it is not the only one and account must also be taken of the issues of biodiversity.

On a geostrategic level, Oliver Dulic believed the priority issue was water, in particular drinking water supplies. The increase in water consumption exceeded global growth, which meant that only a limited

29. IPCC website, <http://www.ipcc.ch>.

30. Minister of Environment and Spatial Planning of Serbia.

proportion of the population had access to drinking water. Supplies were due to fall by 50% in the developing countries by 2025 and 18% in the developed countries. In other words, approximately 1.8 billion people would be living in countries or regions with very serious water shortages. According to Oliver Dulic, *“this is a huge challenge because two-thirds of the world population could be affected by this very serious situation.”*

The food shortage should not be ignored by the international community either. The dramatic increase in food prices was not the result of some climate shock but of the “cumulative effects of the trends in recent decades”, including the problem of supply and demand: *“There are also the high prices for fuel, climate change itself and the water shortage. All these factors should mean that food prices will be above the 2004 levels,”* commented Oliver Dulic.

The third challenge highlighted by the Serbian Environment Minister was that of energy. One of the main debates at global level today concerned the future of the energy sector. In 2008, the International Energy Agency had drawn attention to major problems in the area: climate change, the issue of fossil fuel reserves, which were very limited, and the need to look into new sources of energy. In future, it would be necessary to invest in the development of alternative forms of energy, while taking care not to harm the environment.

Combined with the impact of the worldwide economic recession and global population growth, climate change was increasing poverty throughout the world. Moreover, poorer countries were suffering the most from global warming and its effects and would probably continue to do so although they contributed least to the process. The Serbian Environment Minister noted that the divide between rich and poor countries remained: *“The CO₂ in the atmosphere was produced over the last hundred years, with 80% to 90% coming from the developed countries. The poorer countries believe that they are also entitled to use the conventional energy sector and industry and take advantage of the same leverage effect which western countries have benefited from over the last 100 years. Yet now they are being told that they must bear their share in efforts to combat global warming. Therefore there is a risk of a deepening divide and misunderstanding between developing countries and developed countries.”*

The lack of action at global level was threatening to undermine the right of the poorest inhabitants of the planet to life, access to water, food, health and decent housing. In a draft resolution on the challenges posed by climate change, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe had therefore called on European countries to take urgent action in order to *“address a threat to two most vulnerable constituencies with a weak political voice: the world’s poor and the future generations.”*³¹

Climate change, a neglected issue?

Our world is changing radically because of climate change and we have been slow to respond over the last 50 years. However, environmental and climate issues seem to be of only limited interest to politicians, businessmen and ordinary citizens. Against the background of the economic crisis, many people are tempted to say that major action against climate change should be limited or even halted.

The Copenhagen Consensus, for instance, a project launched by Bjørn Lomborg³² in 2004, is intended to establish a number of priorities “for advancing global welfare”. The project brings together leading specialists once a year to determine environmental priorities. The main priority identified for 2008 was supplying added-vitamin products for children suffering malnutrition, especially in Africa. Climate change was almost at the bottom of the list. This was a decision which Mutsuyoshi Nishimura³³ found

31. *The challenges posed by climate change*, Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, 11 September 2009, <http://assembly.coe.int/Documents/WorkingDocs/Doc09/EDOC12002.pdf>.

32. Bjørn Lomborg is an adjunct professor at *Copenhagen Business School* and former director of the *Environmental Assessment Institute* in Copenhagen. He became internationally known for his book, *“The Sceptical Environmentalist”*.

33. Special adviser on climate change to the Japanese Cabinet.

difficult to accept: *"I respect the decision, but I do not really approve of it. Climate change is a very serious problem which could destroy any hope of a future for humankind. If Charles Darwin was alive today, he would say 'only the fittest will survive.'"*

Many sceptical voices could be heard around the world about global warming. But could we believe them and not take action? *"The sceptics tell us that global warming is a hoax and the world should not do anything about it. But what about your responsibilities as a member of a government if, by doing nothing, you prepare a disastrous future for humankind? All governments should assume their responsibility towards future generations,"* said Mutsuyoshi Nishimura.

However, both experts and activists believed that the commitments made by states under the Kyoto Protocol were inadequate. Many of them had not even been honoured. According to the European Environment Agency, greenhouse gas emissions by several European and other developed countries had increased substantially from 1990 to the start of the Kyoto commitment period, this being particularly true of Spain and Portugal. It could also be seen that it was the countries of the former Soviet Union and the countries in transition to the market economy which had cut their greenhouse gas emissions most significantly, with reductions of 25% to 60% for the period from 1990 to 2007, which was put down to the difficulties of transition to market economics.³⁴ The goals set in Kyoto were unlikely to be achieved by 2013 without radical changes in the use of energy and means of transport. In order to maintain the stability of the climate system and reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, in particular carbon dioxide, the Kyoto Protocol would have to be revised.

According to the Japanese expert, the international community was facing a "moral challenge" and if it succeeded in taking it up, it would be possible to avoid a global environmental disaster. *"If we start spending huge sums on putting an end to climate change, we must succeed. Small-time efforts are not a good strategy. If we want to combat climate change, we must set out to win the battle".*³⁵ Governments would have to assume their responsibilities and "look beyond the claims of the sceptics".

At the same time, only a small proportion of the population are interested in environmental issues and the risks they involve. However, as all the participants at the Fourth Summer University agreed, pollution and global warming are caused, above all, by the lifestyle developed by our contemporary society. *"We live in a consumerist society governed by the rules of the market. And if we stick to this attitude, without thinking about future generations, it will be impossible to change the current state of affairs. Thomas Fuller was right to say that we never know the worth of water till the well is dry,"* was the comment of one participant. He added: *"the Earth is big enough to satisfy the needs of all human beings but not to satisfy human greed"*. At a time of ecological crisis, the close link between all elements of nature is more than evident. In paraphrasing a quote from the Bible, one participant set out a "golden rule for the environment", which he urged his counterparts to follow: *"Do not do unto to nature what you would not have it do unto you."*

From the indifferent to the sceptics, there are many people who still do not feel concerned by these issues. Often forgetting that they bear part of the blame, they demand practical responses from governments.

What can governments and individual citizens do to respond to environmental challenges? Admittedly, it is impossible to put an end to climate change. However, it is up to politicians and representatives of the private sector and civil society to find the means of limiting the impact of human activity on climate change and preventing the future degradation of the planet.

34. Website of the European Environment Agency, <http://www.eea.europa.eu>.

35. Mutuyoshi Nishimura, Special adviser on climate change to the Japanese Cabinet.

2. Green revolution: the role of the authorities and citizens

Moving towards a green New Deal at global level

In projecting a short film about environmental challenges, Oliver Dulic sought to send out a clear message to the participants in the Fourth Summer University for Democracy: in the face of the environmental and climate crisis, the only way of meeting the challenges is through substantial joint efforts. However, we are also having to deal with an economic crisis at present. There are great and sometimes conflicting public expectations in these two areas, as demonstrated by the difficulties of the car industry.

The United Nations Environment Programme has put forward some solutions, urging governments to invest in clean energy sources, waste management, respect for biodiversity and sustainable construction: a programme which amounts to a real green New Deal at global level. Although the Kyoto process is still inadequate, it has at least led to the development of the environmental standards which will be needed under this green New Deal.

This clean energy revolution must involve energy-saving as well as the emergence of new technologies. *“We must use less energy per unit of production, rationalise our use of the available technologies and encourage these good practices politically,”* said Mutsuyoshi Nishimura. Such new technologies would clearly require substantial investment, but that would have to be regarded as being viable in the long term. However, the special adviser on climate change to the Japanese Cabinet strongly emphasised that, once these new clean technologies had been introduced in the industrialised countries, they would have to be shared with the developing countries so that carbon-producing fossil fuels could gradually be phased out.

A technical transformation of this kind would not come about automatically. It demanded innovation and hence also research and development. In this respect, the limited investment in this area by most countries, as reflected in the statistics of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), was most unfortunate.

According to Oliver Dulic, the environment and economic policy are complementary because, together, they create jobs. *“Everything that is good for the environment means a job. For instance, a solar panel cannot install itself, wind farms do not build themselves and buildings do not adapt themselves to reduce their energy consumption.”* All these activities involved labour. Hundreds of millions of people worldwide needed employment. In his view, if the people who needed jobs and the work that had to be done could be brought together, humankind could combat pollution and poverty at the same time. *“In Kenya, there is a programme for young people involving the assembly of solar panels in factories. That is quite a remarkable achievement in a developing country. In Bangladesh, micro-lending has also been extremely valuable and it has been possible to install solar panels in a very large number of homes.”* Japan had chosen to make the environment, in particular solar energy and eco-vehicles, an area in which it hoped to become the world leader.

According to Oliver Dulic, this meant that 2.3 million people were now employed in the new technology sector worldwide. By 2030, it was estimated that increased investment could create over 20 million jobs worldwide, including 2.1 million in the wind energy sector, 6.3 million in the photovoltaic sector and 12 million in agriculture using biofuels.

The combination of the comments by Oliver Dulic and Mutsuyoshi Nishimura showed the participants in the Fourth Summer University that only joint efforts by governments, the private sector and civil society would make this transition to the green economy possible: *“The economy is about consumption and production. We must radically transform our pattern of consumption and production and change our approaches and lifestyles. Attitudes must be changed completely.”*

Changing individual attitudes and behaviour: the search for human responsibility

Human beings must reconnect with nature. The Global Ecovillage Network, which was cited as an example by a participant from the Belarus School, has been contributing to efforts in this area for several years. Eco-villages group together individuals who have opted for a lifestyle which enables natural resources to recover, employing environmentally friendly methods. The network approach also allows exchanges of ideas and technologies.

In Japan, people are beginning to sign up to this philosophy and a new social movement involving an attempt to create a new food culture called slow food as opposed to the well-known concept of fast food is gaining ground. The movement, which began in Italy in the mid-1980s, has become extremely popular in Japan. It involves eating slowly and taking pleasure in eating. It also involves cooking local produce from people's own regions or communities. The aim is to avoid the import of meat and vegetables from far-off countries and thereby reduce CO₂ emissions. This new model, which was described by Mutsuyoshi Nishimura, combines the preservation of biodiversity with the development of poorer regions.

Raising public awareness also involves education. The Regional Environmental Centre (CRE), which was represented at the Summer University by Marta Szigeti Bonifert,³⁶ has been active in raising public awareness of environmental issues for many years. Marta Szigeti Bonifert described the working tools at the centre's disposal. These included "Kyoto in the home", the aim of which was to devise information and teaching methods concerning energy efficiency and the development of renewable forms of energy. The programme informed families about best practices for saving energy on a daily basis: limiting the use of private vehicles, choosing low-energy electrical appliances and using renewable forms of energy in the home, in particular through the installation of solar panels.

One of the policies of the Regional Environmental Centre was to promote child education about environmental issues. Its current projects therefore included the development of a series of cartoons called "My friend Boo" for 4 to 7-year-olds about energy conservation, renewable energy and sustainable transport. In addition, in order to develop children's interest in and awareness of environmental issues, an interactive online game called "Ecoville" had been developed under the "Kyoto in the home" project. The aim was to build a virtual community which would develop harmoniously in a manner that respected the environment and limited greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible. In building the community, the children had to respect the balances between the energy generated and the energy consumed and the waste produced and the waste processed.

Educating and raising the awareness of the entire population was clearly a key aspect in meeting the environmental and climate challenges facing humankind. *"The problem is not simply economic and technological; it is moral and spiritual. A solution at the economic and technological level can be found only if we undergo, in the most radical way, an inner change of heart, which can lead to a change in lifestyle and of unsustainable patterns of consumption and production."* This excerpt from the Venice Declaration on Environmental Ethics, quoted by Marta Szigeti Bonifert, was a call for awareness addressed to the young democratic leaders attending the Fourth Summer University.

Efforts to combat global warming and the responses to environmental challenges require changes in our practices and the transformation of our industrial economy into a "green" economy. Research and exchanges of know-how are vital tools for the authorities and the business sector. However, the advances concerned must be accessible to as many people as possible to allow comprehensive, effective responses to these global problems. These environmental issues also involve the

36. Executive Director of the Regional Environmental Centre, Budapest.

definition of universal rights in the environmental field to supplement human rights protection instruments.

3. Environmental rights: a new generation of fundamental rights?

The right to live in a healthy environment...

Unlike civil and political rights, which have long enjoyed extensive judicial protection, social rights and environmental rights, in particular, seem to be less well protected. As pointed out by Patrick Titiun,³⁷ *“the authors of the European Convention on Human Rights gave precedence to rights which could draw on a sufficiently sound political consensus and be set out in firm and precise legal definitions.”* The European Convention on Human Rights actually makes no reference at all to environmental rights. According to Patrick Titiun, that was hardly surprising, as environmental concerns had not been priorities for European leaders in the aftermath of the Second World War and had been completely ignored.

Alongside the awareness-raising activities conducted by civil society, the commitment of political leaders would have to be reflected in the development of new standards. The right to a healthy, high-quality environment had been confirmed internationally in 1972 in the Stockholm Declaration. On the basis of this principle, dialogue had been initiated between industrialised and developing countries, focusing on the relationship between economic growth, air, water and marine pollution and the well-being of peoples worldwide. Principle 1 of the declaration provided that: *“Man has the fundamental right to freedom, equality and adequate conditions of life, in an environment of a quality that permits a life of dignity and well-being, and he bears a solemn responsibility to protect and improve the environment for present and future generations.”*

The explosion of the Chernobyl nuclear power station and the oil slicks caused by the Erika and the Prestige had been wake-up calls for European states. However, as Patrick Titiun pointed out, merely asserting environmental human rights was not enough, they had to be protected against infringements. *“How could a court which claims to be so closely in touch with the developments in and concerns of our societies have stood aloof from the general increase in awareness in the 20th century?”* Over the years, the European Court of Human Rights had therefore had to “make up” environmental human rights using its own techniques.

... and how to protect it?

While some rights, in particular social and environmental rights, are not explicitly set forth as such in the European Convention on Human Rights, the case-law of the Strasbourg Court has to some extent made up for this.

In the area of environmental rights, the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights has made several advances. The scope of certain rights set out in the Convention has been extended. Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, which guarantees the right to respect for private and family life, now encompasses the right to live in a healthy environment, including protection against pollution and nuisances caused by harmful chemicals, offensive smells, agents which precipitate respiratory ailments, noise and so on. Patrick Titiun noted the close link between the urgent need to decontaminate the environment and human rights: *“after all, what do human rights pertaining to the privacy of the home mean if, day and night, it reverberates with the roar of aircraft or other engines?”*

Through Article 8, relied on in the case of *Powell and Rayner v. the United Kingdom*, which Patrick Titiun quoted, environmental issues had begun to be raised before the European Court of Human Rights. The applicants had claimed to be victims of excessive noise generated by air traffic in and out of Heathrow Airport and disputed the acceptability of the noise levels permitted by the air traffic regulations. Even

37. Head of the Office of the President of the European Court of Human Rights.

though the Court had not found a violation of the European Convention on Human Rights in that case, it had been a first step forward in the area of environmental human rights. It was in 1994, with the judgment in the case of *Lopez Ostra v. Spain* concerning nauseating smells from a treatment plant for sewage and waste water from a tannery, that the Court had modified its case-law and stated that *"severe environmental pollution may affect individuals' well being and prevent them from enjoying their homes in such a way as to affect their private and family life adversely."* As the applicants' health was threatened, the Court had ruled that Article 8 of the Convention had been breached, acknowledging that the right to respect for private and family life implied the right to live in a healthy environment.

As the years have passed and the case-law has evolved, the Strasbourg Court has gone further and further towards "truly establishing the environment as a value to be defended". Guy de Vel³⁸ raised the issue of including the rights set out in the case-law of the Court or certain Council of Europe treaties in additional protocols to the Convention. In other words, incorporating "a new generation of fundamental rights in the Convention". Attempts had, in fact, been made in the past, but without real results. Germany had proposed a "proper protocol on the environment" as long ago as the 1980s. The arguments put forward at the time by those opposed to including these rights in the Convention had been both legal and political: some rights had been deemed to be "non-enforceable" and others "collective", which had had "unfortunate connotations in some quarters" before the fall of the Berlin Wall, as he pointed out. *"Now, however, we are in the third millennium. Our Europe has changed considerably. We must adapt to the challenges facing our societies and take note of the significant geographical expansion of the Council of Europe. That is how we will be able to attempt to address the future consequences of these challenges, a task which will demand bold action."*

The extension of the rights set forth in the Convention is not, however, the only way by which the Court has "made up" environmental human rights. The positive obligations imposed on states, or the "requirements to do things", have made it possible to apply the Convention to new situations. While the Convention protects individuals against interference by state authorities, the environmental aspect of fundamental rights is not always directly threatened by such interference. According to Patrick Titun, the theory of positive obligations had enabled the Court to increase the intensity of its supervision: *"The question is often whether the state has taken the necessary measures to protect health and privacy or to combat infringements of privacy or harm caused to health by other individuals or entities. It is not surprising that the Court should expect states to implement the clearest possible regulations laying down preventive measures and making provision, if necessary, for penalties when industrial activities involve dangers."*

The European Court of Human Rights has taken account of these developments. However, as Patrick Titun pointed out, "although the Court plays a very important role, this can only be a secondary one; the Court cannot be the driving force." It was therefore up to political leaders and to civil society to make sure that the new generation of fundamental rights were respected and thereby safeguard the quality of life of current and future generations.

Environmental issues, above all global warming, cannot be solved at a single international summit. The meeting in Copenhagen in December 2009 would be essential for showing international public opinion the urgency of the challenges. Political and economic leaders will have vital responsibilities in bringing about changes that have to be made, for instance in the direction taken by the car industry.

It is not easy to mobilise public opinion regarding environmental issues. The obvious inconsistency between our daily habits and the melting of the glaciers does not permit a real individual awareness. Yet it is now scientifically proven that human beings are contributing to global warming, which they are speeding up and intensifying. All human beings, especially people in western countries, are

38. Former Director of Legal Affairs, Council of Europe.

concerned and will have to change their most routine habits and practices such as the use of water, electricity and gas.

Education can be a tool for raising public awareness and explaining that, just as there are good habits to follow for one's own health, new attitudes need to be adopted to preserve the environment.

Whether on a personal or industrial level, the changes brought about by environmental challenges will have to be initiated and carried through by policymakers. Will democracy be able to force changes on the public without assuming the traits of a totalitarian regime? Will we accept restrictions on our consumption of water, gas or electricity in the future? Are we willing to see schools as places not only for teaching and knowledge but also for learning particular practices? Are the restrictions and cut-backs imposed by global warming and the shortage of energy resources compatible with democracy? These questions are not as out of place as they might seem. They provide an opportunity to consider the limitations of a political system which it is probably better to prepare for than have forced on us.

VII. The Fourth Summer University for Democracy celebrates the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Iron Curtain

1. “1989 – year of change, year of freedom”

“Great changes can surprise even the most well-informed of us. One of the lessons which can be drawn from 1989 is the strength of the thirst for freedom. It is sometimes so great that it can move mountains.”

(Catherine Lalumière, 6 July 2009)

On 6 July 1989, the former President of the USSR, Mikhail Gorbachev made a historic speech to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, calling on the inhabitants of the “old world” to build a Common European Home. He advocated closer ties between eastern and western Europeans and likened Europe to a common home in which all Europeans would live together in peace. *“What we have in mind is a restructuring of the international order existing in Europe that would put the European common values in the forefront and make it possible to replace the traditional balance of forces with a balance of interests,”* declared Mikhail Gorbachev that day.

These comments by the Soviet leader had the effect of a veritable political earthquake, heralding the start of the restructuring of the geopolitical order in Europe. *“We welcomed this declaration with loud and warm applause,”* recalled Catherine Lalumière, who was Secretary General of the Council of Europe at the time. The geopolitical and territorial measures adopted at the Helsinki Conference in 1975 served as the foundation for the Common European Home. Gorbachev talked about the concerns of Europe’s citizens: European security, peaceful conflict resolution and abstention from the use of force, pan-European economic and commercial co-operation, environmental problems, the establishment of peace throughout Europe and respect for fundamental rights. Although Europe is no longer divided into two blocs, the challenges Mikhail Gorbachev raised in July 1989 are still relevant today.

With the proposed common home, the Soviet leader wished, first of all, to foster the emergence of new, calmer relations with his east European allies. These were to be based on trust rather than force or threats. He also wanted to establish a real partnership with western Europe, on the basis of a compromise that respected the differences between states.³⁹ It was in the context of this partnership and the closer relations it brought about that German reunification became possible.

Four months after Mikhail Gorbachev’s historic speech at the Council of Europe, the Berlin Wall came down on 9 November 1989, under pressure from tens of thousands of demonstrators. Beyond this highly symbolic moment, however, the breakup of the Soviet Union and the satellite communist countries was a complex process. During 1989, many protest and strike movements developed in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary and Bulgaria. The fall of the communist regime was particularly violent in Romania. In December 1989, a series of riots and demonstrations culminated in the overthrow of the country’s communist regime and the execution of the dictator, Ceausescu. Of all the countries in eastern Europe which overthrew communist regimes in the aftermath of the fall of the Berlin Wall, Romania was the only one where the process involved bloodshed. Petre Roman,⁴⁰ a protagonist in the Romanian revolution, gave a moving account of the events in 1989, which he described as the “year of freedom”.

39. Marie-Pierre Rey, “Gorbatchev et la maison commune européenne”, March 2007, <http://www.mitterrand.org/Gorbatchev-et-la-Maison-Commune.html>.

40. Former Prime Minister of Romania.

While the scenes of jubilation of the night of 9 November are now part of our collective memory, we sometimes forget that the first breaches in the Iron Curtain emerged in Hungary during the summer of 1989, paving the way for thousands of East Germans to flee the GDR. This was an event which the Fourth Summer University for Democracy celebrated in the presence of László Kovács⁴¹ and Erhard Busek.⁴²

Shortly afterwards, the Balkans followed the movement of democratisation in eastern Europe by even holding the first free, multiparty elections in five countries in the region. However, as noted by Stjepan Mesić, armed conflicts complicated the democratic transition in this part of Europe.

Through the accounts of five leading European figures who shared their memories, emotions and analyses with the new generation of political leaders from eastern and south-eastern Europe, let us recall 1989, the year which changed Europe beyond recognition.

41. European Commissioner, former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Hungary.

42. Former Vice-Chancellor of Austria, former Special Co-ordinator of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.



Catherine Lalumière, Chair of the European Association of the Schools of Political Studies, former Secretary General of the Council of Europe

Excerpt from speech given at the opening session of the Fourth Summer University for Democracy, Strasbourg, 6 July 2009

"I really must now mention what happened here on precisely 6 July 1989. Exactly 20 years ago today, the Council of Europe received a visitor unlike any who had come before. He

was Mikhail Gorbachev, President of the Soviet Union. He was the first visitor I received as Secretary General of the Council. From its establishment in 1949, the Council of Europe had developed, on the basis of humanist and democratic values, the opposite of communist ideology. Stalin's USSR had recognised that. The Council of Europe was one of its enemies, even though the Council did not have any military powers. However, ideas are sometimes just as powerful if not more powerful than weapons. The USSR was aware of this; its ideology was perceived as a threat and encouraged western Europeans to unite. In a way, the Cold War helped the process of European construction in the west.

And then one day, on 6 July 1989, the leader of the Soviet Union came to Strasbourg as a relaxed and peaceful visitor, extending a hand of friendship. In itself, his visit was already a revolution. It was to be followed by many others: the fall of the Berlin Wall on 9 November 1989, the breakup of the Eastern bloc, the revolutions in each of the satellite countries and, in December 1991, the breakup of the USSR itself.

For all my life, I will remember that visit by Mikhail Gorbachev. A charming, friendly, smiling visitor who was relaxed and did not waffle. I have never seen the parliamentarians, ambassadors and officials at the Council of Europe so spellbound by a visitor. Obviously, curiosity played a large part in this. Who was this Soviet leader of a new kind? What did he have to say? What was the meaning of perestroika, which people had already been talking about for several years? It was that day that Mikhail Gorbachev spoke about his plan for a Common European Home in which the USSR would play a full part. There was talk of human rights, democracy, a new world and a new Europe.

When that wind of change blew through the Council of Europe that day, we had no indication of what was going to happen in the next few months. There was probably no one who expected the breakup of the Eastern bloc, the Warsaw Pact and then the USSR. Nobody could have imagined how quickly communism would collapse in so many countries. Mikhail Gorbachev himself seemed only to be envisaging reforms and adjustments to the system, not the collapse of the system itself or revolutions in the countries of central and eastern Europe."



Petre Roman, former Prime Minister of Romania

Excerpt from speech given at the Fourth Summer University for Democracy, Strasbourg, 6 July 2009

"I am here today to tell you about the democratic transition in my country. I have called my speech "**1989 – year of freedom**" and I believe that for us Europeans 1989 was the year of freedom. That year, while many other countries in the Soviet camp were able to regain their freedom by negotiation, for instance through the famous roundtable in Poland, that was not the case in my country, Romania. In our country, freedom was only won with sacrifices and bloodshed. Above all, therefore, I am speaking today in memory and in

acknowledgment of my comrades at the barricade in central Bucharest. 39 of them died, slain by the bullets of the Ceausescu regime in the evening of 21 December 1989.

Why did that happen? Why was Romania not able to achieve peaceful change? Because the regime headed by the dictator, Ceausescu, was the only one left in the Soviet camp. The only country where a Stalinist regime still controlled power. It was a primitive, nationalist, xenophobic and profoundly antidemocratic regime. As the system held out until the end, it had to be overthrown by force.

Our life under the dictatorship, especially the last 10 years, was a mix of normal desires and hopes in the abnormal, absurd ambience of a totally controlled society. Our feelings were a mixture of anger at the lack of change and of shame because of our inability to bring it about. So it was inevitable that a mass popular uprising was needed.

In Bucharest, it was our barricade which sparked things off. It was almost nothing, just a line of tables, chairs and pipes, but we succeeded in stopping the traffic in central Bucharest. Ceausescu gave orders to knock down the barricade. There were not very many of us, not even 100. When the Minister of Defence decided in the end to carry out Ceausescu's orders himself, he called in trainee officers from the military academy to open fire on us. There were 82 of us and we paid a high price for our freedom that night."



László Kovács, European Commissioner, former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Hungary

Excerpt from speech given at the official celebration of the 20th anniversary of the opening of the Iron Curtain, Fourth Summer University for Democracy, Strasbourg, 10 July 2009

“At midnight on 10 September, Hungary officially opened its borders with Austria and thereby also to over 60 000 citizens of the German Democratic

Republic. They had entered Hungary as “tourists”, but did not want to return home. When the borders were opened, they were able to head for the Federal Republic of Germany. When we announced that the border would remain open for citizens of the GDR, the Berlin Wall, one of the symbols of the Cold War and of the division of Germany, lost its role and, two months later, it fell. Helmut Kohl, the then Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, said that it was in Hungary that the first brick had been removed from the wall.

A year later, Germany was reunified and the dream of a united Europe became a reality. Other factors were also, however, involved in bringing an end to the division of Europe. First of all, the meeting between Presidents Bush and Gorbachev in Malta in late 1989, which put an end to the Yalta system. Gorbachev made it clear that that system had ended by indicating that the Soviet Union would allow its satellite countries to leave the Soviet bloc. This was followed by the disintegration of the Warsaw Pact, Comecon and finally the Soviet Union itself. It was the era of transition in the former Soviet bloc and of the replacement of the one-party system with a multi-party system and the rule of law. There can be no doubt that the starting point for this entire process was the opening of the border between Hungary and Austria during the summer of 1989.

So what moved Hungary, a member of Comecon and the Warsaw Pact, to open its borders and side with the Federal Republic of Germany in this dispute between the FRG and the GDR? The answer is that Hungary had undergone changes which had gradually increased its independence from Moscow. Economic reforms began in the late 1960s, when Hungary introduced some aspects of market economics in its centralised economy.

However, alongside small democratic openings in the 1970s and 1980s, changes started taking place through foreign policy. I was involved myself. At the time, there was a vacuum in the Kremlin with three old and ailing Soviet leaders: Brezhnev, Andropov and Chernenko (1982-1985). During those three years, the Soviets were more interested in the succession process at the head of the USSR than in what was happening in Hungary. That left room for manoeuvre for Hungarian foreign policy [...].

In 1988 and 1989, three major decisions were taken: we introduced new passport regulations, enabling all Hungarian citizens to have passports valid for all five continents. That was taken for granted in the west at the time. Hungary was the only country in the eastern bloc whose citizens could travel freely to the west, from one day to the next. We also decided to dismantle the Iron Curtain between Austria and Hungary. The work began on 2 May and ended on 27 June 1989. The dismantling of the Iron Curtain encouraged the residents of East Germany to travel to West Germany via Austria. Hungary had ratified the refugee convention, so it was obvious that we would not force anyone to return. No one seeking refuge in our country on the grounds of political harassment would ever be returned to his or her own country.

After all these events, all these procedures and all these decisions, in June 1989 we had to acknowledge that the “tourists” from the GDR had become refugees. And we no longer had the means to stop them travelling through Austria to the FRG. It was therefore necessary to find a legal solution. There was a bilateral agreement between the GDR and Hungary signed in 1969, which provided that neither country would allow its or the other’s citizens to cross its territory to enter a third country for which they did not have a visa. Yet the refugees from the GDR had visas for Czechoslovakia, Hungary and possibly Romania and other countries in the Soviet bloc, but did not have passports or visas that were valid for travelling to Austria. At the same time, as all Hungarians could travel wherever they wanted throughout the world, the agreement with the GDR was unsound and we suspended application of it. We were thus able to open the borders legally and officially and test the Soviets’ reaction.

The Soviets kept repeating a single point, namely that the presence of 60 000 GDR citizens in Hungary was a German problem which the two Germanys should deal with and that Hungary had no role to play. What was clear, however, was that the Soviets would not intervene and that we therefore had the go-ahead. We also sought to make sure that there would be no reprisals on the part of the GDR and concluded that it was impossible for them to impose economic sanctions because the other countries in the eastern bloc had indicated that they would content themselves with declarations, not acts of reprisal. Noting that there was no danger, we opened the borders and over 60 000 people were able to cross into Austria. Two months later, the Berlin Wall came down and, a year later, Germany was reunified [...].

In conclusion, 20 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Hungary and the countries in the region are members of the European Union and NATO. So what Europe can I dream of now? What I want to see is a Europe which remains united and a democratic Europe which leaves no room for extremism, hatred or isolation. A Europe where common European interests take precedence over national selfishness and which is capable of meeting today’s international challenges.”



Erhardt Busek, former Vice-Chancellor of Austria, former Special Co-ordinator of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe

Excerpt from speech given at the official celebration of the 20th anniversary of the opening of the Iron Curtain, Fourth Summer University for Democracy, Strasbourg, 10 July 2009

"I was born in 1941 and grew up in a divided Europe. At the time, Austria was not a free country, as we were occupied by the Allies until 1955. My experience of Europe was as follows: we could travel west from Vienna but we had to come back the same way; it was not possible to go to the east, the north or the south-east, as the Iron Curtain was everywhere. My parents and grandparents had always told me great things about Prague, the City of Gold, Bratislava, which they said was beautiful, and other cities in the east, like Budapest. But none of that was really tangible for me because we could not cross the Iron Curtain. [...]

It was not politicians who destroyed the Iron Curtain. Above all, I believe, it was intellectuals, artists and other figures who took action to sabotage a political system that denied all individual freedom. Change came about thanks to movements like Charter 77 in the Czech part of Czechoslovakia, thanks to Vaclav Havel and to Solidarność in Poland. I had close dealings with some of these figures before 1989 without ever imagining that I was meeting future prime ministers. I was convinced that the communist system would collapse one day because that seemed to be the run of history, but I did not expect it to happen in my lifetime. We called 1989 the *annus mirabilis*, or year of wonders. [...]

It is also necessary to consider what has happened over the last 20 years. Our various countries are interdependent and, since 1989, we have had a real opportunity to build a new, shared Europe. Of course, the European Union is moving in this direction, but we must also develop a shared feeling of being Europeans. [...] We must seize the opportunity to build this shared Europe in a spirit of improved, mutual understanding. I believe that it is up to your generation to be the activists of this shared solidarity and our common responsibility to one another."



Stjepan Mesić, President of the Republic of Croatia

Excerpt from the address during the 4th Summer University for Democracy, Strasbourg, 6 July 2009

“Owing to a set of unfortunate circumstances, since its independence Croatia was not faced only with transition like many other countries. It had to face war and the post-war period, with

everything that was crushed and destroyed in it. [...]

The war years almost totally dissipated the achievements developed in the region for decades. The war swept the entire region because of the wish to seize territories of neighbouring countries under the guise of protecting one’s own people. The war was brief in Slovenia, bloody in Croatia and brutal in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The thousands of devastated homes, villages and towns, the thousands of lost lives, displaced persons and refugees, were not the only consequences of the wartime insanity. War produced hate, intolerance, loss of trust... But, let me stress that hate was not the cause of the war but its consequence!

Immediately after the war, along with the reconstruction of the country we, the politicians, had to foster reconciliation and renew trust, coexistence and mutual tolerance. [...] We knew that we could only achieve that by dialogue and mutual appreciation of diversity and difference. We had to have a vision and could not give it up. Non-governmental organisations through which citizens were involved in political life became more active throughout the country. We knew that we had to leave the war behind us, and that we had to restore co-operation with our neighbours. Accordingly, we proceeded to normalize and establish diplomatic relations with other countries. I have always pointed that the political leaders of the peoples involved rather than the peoples themselves were to be blamed for the war in our region, and that individuals were to be held accountable for the crimes. [...] Our democratic turn was recognised and appreciated. The acceptance of Croatia into the circle of democratic countries sent a message to everybody in the region that democracy was worth the effort. [...]

We, the politicians from our region, must always and ever anew substantiate the vision of democratic development and never stop talking about it. Moreover, our mission includes supporting confidence building measures for quite a long time to come because experience has shown us that confidence is frail and subject to disruption. This is why the concurrent building of trust into the institutions of the state, the strength of which rests on the consistent and equitable enforcement of regulations, is of the highest importance.

Let me remind you that present-day Europe has developed precisely on the establishment of trust among nations. The impulse provided by politicians was followed by all segments of society allowing it to take root and, moreover, to answer in a consistent manner the requirements of current developments. This is the development I want for our region. I want it to become stable and prosperous, and thereby European.”

2. "1989 a year without parallel", the history of the fall of the Berlin Wall in pictures



Lech Walesa at the Council of Europe
(Source: Council of Europe)



Dismantling of barbed wire, Hungary
(Source: INA)



Mikhail Gorbachev's official visit of the Council of Europe, 6 July 1989
(Source: Council of Europe)



Mikhail Gorbachev's speech to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, 6 July 1989
(Source Council of Europe)



Checkpoint Charlie, Berlin
(Source: INA)



Berlin Wall, November 1989
(Source: INA)



Berlin Wall, November 1989
(Source: INA)



Impromptu concert by Mstislav Rostropovich during the fall of the Berlin Wall
(Source: INA)

VIII. Summer University for Democracy: forum for meetings, exchanges and dialogue

Over the years, the Council of Europe's Summer University for Democracy has become a major fixture in the calendar of the young democratic leaders of the new Europe, at which they can debate issues, exchange ideas and seek to respond to the major challenges of our era. The economic and financial crisis, organised crime and terrorism, the identity crisis facing European democracies, global warming and environmental degradation in general all involve new challenges for young democratic leaders. At the 2009 Summer University for Democracy, they were able to discuss these fundamental issues in various special sessions and workshops. The professional workshops, in particular, enabled the participants to analyse and identify means of working together to meet the challenges of democracy. *"It is unusual for political leaders, civil society activists, media professionals and business leaders to have the opportunity to come together in their respective professional groups and exchange knowledge, experience, information and contacts,"* was the comment of one participant.

The Summer University for Democracy is also an ideal forum for regional and bilateral meetings between the Schools in the Network. These meetings have become an integral part of the programme, offering opportunities for informal and in-depth dialogue about the relations between countries in particular regions such as Russia and Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan and Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Kosovo.⁴³ The regional tensions and conflicts which have arisen in these countries over the last 20 years threaten peace throughout Europe. Every year, the Summer University for Democracy enables 600 participants from the 16 countries of eastern and south-eastern Europe to meet and talk freely. The success of all dialogue necessarily requires open-mindedness and the ability to recognise the justification of the arguments of the other party. Peaceful conflict resolution is a priority of the Council of Europe: *"Dialogue (...) contributes to strengthening democratic stability and to the fight against prejudice and stereotypes in public life and political discourse and to facilitating coalition-building across diverse cultural and religious communities, and can thereby help to prevent or de-escalate conflicts – including in situations of post conflict and 'frozen conflicts'."*⁴⁴ The regional meetings also provide opportunities for in-depth discussion and exchanges of views on the major issues in those regions, which affect both the countries in question and Europe as a whole.

The regional meeting about the prospects for European integration of the Balkan countries raised the issue of political co-operation in the region and looked at future relations with the European Union. In the words of Tim Judah,⁴⁵ it was vital to continue moving forward with European integration in the Balkans, not necessarily within the European Union – although, in his view, it was the best framework that existed for the time being – but general convergence with the rest of Europe was of paramount importance. If the countries concerned did not move in this direction, there was a risk of renewed tension. *"It does not seem likely that things will get worse. Yet 20 years ago, we could not imagine what was going to happen either. Today, I do not expect such a radical reversal. However, unless we keep moving in this direction, we may experience setbacks, as there are forces that could drag us down. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, for instance, the "Yugosphere" concept exists alongside the belief that the war is not over in people's hearts."* In Tim Judah's opinion, European integration was vital for maintaining a peaceful

43. All references to Kosovo, whether to the territory, institutions or population, in this text shall be understood in full compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.

44. White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue, *"Living Together As Equals in Dignity"*, Council of Europe, May 2008.

45. Balkans correspondent of *The Economist*, visiting research fellow at the South East European Research Unit of the London School of Economics and Political Science.

situation in the region. Otherwise, nationalism in the Balkans might gain the upper hand. For the time being, the region was still relying too heavily on the attraction of Brussels for the purpose of consolidating the situation. However, as Goran Svilanovic⁴⁶ pointed out, the financial crisis had caused an upsurge in nationalism in the European Union. *“The Thessaloniki agenda for enlargement would not have succeeded if it had been drawn up today. The European Union still has to convince voters about the benefits of enlargement.”*

While moving forward with enlargement in the Balkans is not the European leaders' priority at present, what happens in the region does have implications for the European Union. The recent enlargements have brought the countries concerned closer to the EU. Their stability is now of increasing importance to the EU. This is particularly true of the countries of eastern Europe and the southern Caucasus. The conflict in Georgia in August 2008 confirmed this and demonstrated that the security of the European Union starts outside its borders. The regional meeting on “Eastern Partnership: new perspectives of co-operation in Eastern Europe” focused on the European Union's neighbourhood policy and the fresh momentum in the EU's multilateral co-operation with its neighbours.

Defined as a form of “soft power” by European leaders, the neighbourhood policy pursued the strategic objective of “mutual prosperity, stability and security”, according to Anna-Carin Krokstade.⁴⁷ It was a “privileged relationship” based on joint efforts, which was also aimed at supporting the political, economic and social reforms in the countries concerned. The Eastern Partnership launched in Prague in May 2009 gave fresh momentum to the EU's foreign-policy relations with Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine and Belarus. As Gert-Rudiger Wegmarshaus⁴⁸ stressed, the Eastern Partnership was also aimed at encouraging interpersonal contacts and fostering democracy and good governance. Civil society, which Anna-Carin Krokstade highlighted, could help to build trust and understanding in conflict-ridden regions and promote democratic and economic reforms in transition countries. Strengthening democracy, stability and the rule of law in neighbouring countries, especially in the aftermath of the conflict between Russia and Georgia and in the context of the global economic and financial crisis, remained a priority for the European Union.

The regional meeting for the countries of the Black Sea region addressed the issue of the risks relating to the security of energy supplies for European Union countries. Whether geological, geopolitical, economic, environmental or technical, they should under no circumstances be ignored when dealing with the subject of energy security, said Philippe Sébille-Lopez.⁴⁹ The complex relations between Russia and Ukraine concerning gas prices and the political crisis in Georgia had changed the situation regarding the security of supplies for the EU. Moscow had seen the European Union's Eastern Partnership and the prospect of future free-trade agreements, changes in visa regulations and political reforms as a provocation. According to István Gyarmati,⁵⁰ Russia wished to recover its status as a global power: *“It is seeking to control both the resources needed for supplying Europe and also the transit routes. Russia is a classic 19th-century state using 20th-century weapons. That is very dangerous for the whole of Europe.”* For its part, the European Union was seeking to diversify the sources of supply and the transit routes for oil and gas. The construction of the Nabucco gas pipeline was central to this European strategy for diversifying the suppliers of natural resources. However, some problems concerning supplies for the new pipeline had still not been resolved. *“Europe must first decide what it wants and has to do. I only hope that Russia is not going to use gas as a weapon,”* he concluded.

Apart from preventing and settling conflicts through regional meetings, another key aim of the Summer University is to consolidate the democratic system in the new Europe. The fundamental method of

46. Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities.

47. Directorate General for External Relations, European Commission.

48. Professor of Political Science, Viadrina European University, Frankfurt (Oder).

49. French Institute of Geopolitics, University of Paris VIII.

50. President of the International Centre for Democratic Transition, Budapest.

safeguarding democracy is to establish the rule of law through compliance with legal standards and the development of a body of fundamental rights covering wide areas such as respect for minorities, efforts to combat discrimination and gender equality, etc. In order to underline the importance of the law and how decisive a weapon it can be for democrats, every year, the Summer University for Democracy therefore includes a meeting at the European Court of Human Rights between the participants from each School of Political Studies and the judge or a lawyer from their country.

The Summer University for Democracy is also a forum for informal meetings and exchanges between the participants. Through their friendly atmosphere, the various receptions and evening events help to consolidate the Council of Europe's Network of Schools of Political Studies.

The bilateral and multilateral meetings, whether formal or informal, between the participants are the first steps towards the development of the mutual understanding between peoples which Thomas Hammarberg⁵¹ called for on the opening day. Of course, they are not the only response to contemporary challenges. Nevertheless, exchanging views on these issues is a starting point in a long process of integration leading to all countries in Greater Europe sharing in full the values of human rights, democracy and the rule of law.

51. Commissioner for Human Rights, Council of Europe.

IX. Conclusion: the future of Europe and global democracy

The debates at the Fourth Summer University focused on external challenges whose effects involve decisive consequences for the future and survival of democracy. One common point emerged from all the discussions: the economic and environmental crises and those relating to identities and international violence now show just how interdependent the world has become. Although we do not live in the same countries or even the same continents, we are facing the same problems which are actually international threats.

In the light of these challenges, Erhard Busek⁵² set out a theory of European and international solidarity, which all speakers at the closing session signed up to. This inevitably involved “recognition of the diversity of identities, peoples and interests, in short, of equality in otherness”, according to Catherine Trautmann.⁵³ However, the various speakers, not least Catherine Lalumière, noted that exacerbated nationalism, religious extremism, sectarian thinking and isolationism were increasingly gaining ground in all countries and were real threats to European humanist values, culture and civilisation.

Education and, in particular, history teaching geared towards a common European history is a fundamental tool for breaking down the barriers which people, especially some politicians, are trying to erect in Europe. Erhard Busek said that this European and international solidarity was the great challenge that the generation attending the Fourth Summer University would have to take up, which would demand a militant approach. In this connection, the former Austrian Vice-Chancellor drew on the word “crisis” as defined in Chinese, in which it meant both a danger and an opportunity. The crises which had been the focus of the discussions throughout the week were also an opportunity to promote a new world order in which Greater Europe would be a driving force. In Catherine Trautmann’s view, the risks at global level and the democratic management of the relevant conflicts demanded the establishment of a new type of global governance. This could only come about through the mobilisation of NGOs, governments and parliamentarians as the representatives of peoples and, more particularly, European parliamentarians who were responsible for watching over an emerging supranational democracy.

This governance on a planetary level would now seem to be the tool needed for establishing a form of global regulation of the economy and also for addressing issues such as access to water, energy sources and minerals, which cause regional tensions today and may cause armed conflicts in future. Catherine Lalumière believed that an international political revolution of this kind would inevitably require a change in attitudes: *“Since the 19th century, our dominant thinking has been based on materialism. The humanist values which the Council of Europe champions require us to put this approach behind us and build a society where ideas and knowledge are more important than frenzied production and consumption.”*

Discussing tomorrow’s Europe meant recognising the need for this new world order and making the Europe of 27 and the Europe of 47 the testing ground for international democracy: *“we have a leadership role to play, not through a new kind of colonialism but in a genuine partnership that takes account of other people’s values.”*⁵⁴ It was democracy which would trigger the changes in tomorrow’s world.

To perform its role as a driving force in the debate and discussion about the state of our democracies, the Fourth Summer University for Democracy, for the first time, paid host to non-European participants, who came from Africa with the support of the *Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie* (OIF).

52. Former Vice-Chancellor of Austria, former Special Co-ordinator of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

53. Member of the European Parliament.

54. Erhard Busek, former Vice-Chancellor of Austria, former Special Co-ordinator of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

The exchanges showed that the problems facing east European and African countries were similar and that the achievement of true democracy through the full establishment of the rule of law was an urgent requirement worldwide. *“In spite of our differences, we are united by the challenges facing us. That is how we believe this Summer University has helped us and will help us to defend the same values, namely building a true democracy, strengthening human rights and establishing the rule of law in our countries,”* were the comments by one of the OIF participants at the closing ceremony. Representing seven countries in Africa, they called on the Council of Europe to confirm non-European involvement on a lasting basis while enabling more countries from Africa to take part in the meetings, *“which will undoubtedly help to raise awareness among future leaders so that we can build a better world together”*.

Demagoguery and fear of other people are powerful instruments which can have a strong influence on the behaviour of a community. To achieve the trust mentioned by Terry Davis, it is necessary also to have a world vision, a blueprint for society and ideas that can eradicate fears. That is the main objective of the Summer University for Democracy: its debates and informal meetings offer the young political leaders of tomorrow an opportunity to get to know one another and exchange views about their cultures, as well as about the interests of their countries. They will therefore be able in future to work to bring about the international democracy which the various participants at the Fourth Summer University called for.

The involvement in the Summer University of leaders from public and private sectors and civil society representatives from other continents and the establishment of its exchanges on a lasting basis through the European Association of the Schools of Political Studies will turn the event into a real International Forum for Democracy in future.



Opening lecture by Michel Rocard, former Prime Minister of France



Roland Ries, Senator Mayor of Strasbourg



Luisella Pavan-Woolfe, Permanent Representative of the European Commission to the Council of Europe



Opening session, group photo of the Directors of the Schools and guest speakers



Rainer Steckhan, Chairman of the Administrative Council, Council of Europe Development Bank,
Bernard Boucault, Director of the Ecole Nationale d'Administration, Strasbourg,
Kim Campbell, former Prime Minister of Canada



Participants of the Summer University during a conference



Participants from the Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence during their visit to the European Court of Human Rights



Lilian Thuram, President of the Lilian Thuram Foundation – Education against Racism



Ihor Kohut, Director of the Ukrainian School of Political Studies,
Terry Davis, Secretary General of the Council of Europe



Participant from the Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie at the closing session of the Summer University



Party at the City hall in Kehl



Family photo

Annex I: Programme of the Summer University for Democracy

Monday 6 July 2009

09.30–11.00 Opening session

The Right Honourable Terry DAVIS
Secretary General of the Council of Europe

Ms Catherine LALUMIERE
President of the European Association of the Schools of Political Studies,
former Secretary General of the Council of Europe

Mr Roland RIES
Senator and Mayor of Strasbourg

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

Mr Lluís Maria DE PUIG
President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

Address by HE Danilo TÜRK
President of Slovenia, on behalf of the Slovenian Chair of the Committee of
Ministers of the Council of Europe

11.00 Opening lecture

Mr Michel ROCARD
Former Prime Minister of France

12.00 Group photo in front of the Palais

12.30 Lunch at the Restaurant of the European Parliament

14.30-15.15 Contribution by Mr Petre ROMAN Former Prime Minister of Romania

**“1989 – The Year of Freedom. The Case of the Romanian Revolution: Passion,
Controversies, Real Changes and New Challenges”**

Chair:

Ms Catherine LALUMIERE
President of the European Association of the Schools of Political Studies,
former Secretary General of the Council of Europe

15.30-17.30 Introductory conferences

**Conference A:
The consequences of the crisis of the international financial system
on the functioning of democratic political systems**

Speakers:

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

The Right Honourable Kim CAMPBELL

Former Prime Minister of Canada

Chair:

Mr Bernard BOUCAULT

Director of the Ecole Nationale d'Administration, Strasbourg

Conference B:

The crisis of identities and international violence (organised crime, corruption, terrorism, etc.) and the respect of fundamental rights and the rule of law

Speakers:

Mr Thomas HAMMARBERG

Commissioner for Human Rights, Council of Europe

Mr Boris DUBIN

Chief of the Department of Sociopolitical Studies, Levada Center, Moscow

Chair:

Mr Wendelin ETTMAYER

Former Permanent Representative of Austria to the Council of Europe

Conference C:

Political priorities, natural and technological challenges (shortage of natural and energy resources, demography, climate change)

Speakers:

Mr Oliver DULIC

Minister of Environment and Spatial Planning of Serbia

Mr Mutsuyoshi NISHIMURA

Special advisor on climate change to the Japanese Cabinet

Chair:

Mr Jean-Louis LAURENS

Director General of Democracy and Political Affairs, Council of Europe

20.00 Reception offered by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe at the Palais Universitaire

Tuesday 7 July 2009

09.00 – 12.00 Workshops

Workshops for Conference A

Democracy and business are they compatible?

Speakers:

Mr Rainer STECKHAN

Chairman of the Administrative Council, Council of Europe Development Bank

Mr Mladen IVANIC

Member of the delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Vice-President of the Assembly

Chair:

Mr Ihor KOHUT

Director of the Ukrainian School of Political Studies

The consequences of the financial crisis on transition countries: how does the crisis affect the democratic processes in Europe and other parts of the World?

Speakers:

Mr Alexei MAKARKIN

Vice-President of the Centre of Political Technologies, Moscow

Mr Wendelin ETTMAYER

Former Permanent Representative of Austria to the Council of Europe

Chair:

Ms Svetlana LOMEVA

Director of the Bulgarian School of Politics

Does the financial crisis affect the future of the enlargement of the European Union?

Speakers:

Mr François-Gilles LE THEULE

Director of the Centre for European Studies of the *Ecole Nationale d'Administration*, Strasbourg

Mr Vlad CONSTANTINESCO

Professor of Public Law, University of Strasbourg, College of Europe, Natolin

Ms Fernanda GABRIEL

Journalist, National Radio and TV of Portugal, President of the Association of the European Parliamentary Journalists

Chair:

Ms Nevena CRLJENKO

Director of the Academy for Political Development, Zagreb

Workshops for Conference B

National, cultural and religious identities and democracy

Speakers:

Mr Andreas GROSS

Member of the delegation of Switzerland to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Chair of the Socialist Group

Mr Harald WYDRA

Lecturer in Russian and Eastern European Politics, University of Cambridge

Chair:

Ms Sonja LICHT

Director of the Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence

The fight against terrorism and organised crime, and the respect of human rights

Speakers:

Mr Alexandre GUESSEL

Council of Europe Anti-Terrorism Co-ordinator

Mr Igor GAON

Directorate General of Democracy and Political Affairs, Council of Europe

Mr Dick MARTY

Member of the delegation of Switzerland to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Chairperson of the Sub-Committee on Crime Problems and the Fight against Terrorism of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights

Chair:

Mr Ilgar MAMMADOV

Director of the Baku Political Studies Programme

Democratic society and organised crime: who will be stronger?

Speakers:

Mr Christian SAVES

French political scientist and senior civil servant

Mr Alexander SEGER

Head of the Economic Crime Division, Council of Europe

Chair:

Mr Viorel CIBOTARU

Director of the European Institute for Political Studies of Moldova

Workshops for Conference C

How to promote a better and effective protection of the environment?

The role of public authorities

Speakers:

Mr Mutsuyoshi NISHIMURA

Special Advisor on climate change to the Japanese Cabinet

Ms Marta SZIGETI BONIFERT

Executive Director of the Regional Environmental Center, Budapest

Chair:

Mr Armen ZAKARYAN

Director of the Yerevan School of Political Studies

How do diminishing resources affect economic development?

Speakers:

Mr Olivier VEDRINE

President of the “Collège Atlantique-Oural”, Paris

Mr Julian POPOV

Chairman of the Board of the Bulgarian School of Politics

Chair:

Ms Anne JUGANARU

Director of the “Ovidiu Sincai” European School, Bucharest

Towards a new generation of fundamental rights and ways to protect them

Speakers:

Mr Guy DE VEL

Former Director General of Legal Affairs, Council of Europe

Mr Patrick TITIUN

Head of the Office of the President of the European Court of Human Rights

Chair:

Mr Armaz AKHVLEDIANI

Director of the Tbilisi School of Political Studies

12.30 Lunch at the Restaurant of the European Parliament

14.30 – 17.30 Continuation of Workshops and Conclusions

18.00 – 19.00 Information meeting for participants from the media sector

Mr Jean-Louis LAURENS

Director General of Democracy and Political Affairs, Council of Europe

Ms Gabriella BATTAINI-DRAGONI

Director General of Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport,
Council of Europe

Mr Philippe BOILLAT

Director General of Human Rights and Legal Affairs, Council of Europe

Ms Marie-Claire LEFEVRE

European Association of Schools of Political Studies

**Followed by a reception offered by the Directorate of Communication
of the Council of Europe (Blue Restaurant)**

Evening Free or invitation by the Permanent Representations

Wednesday 8 July 2009

09.00-11.00 Workshops

Media

Chair:

Mr Jack HANNING

Secretary General of the European Association of Schools of Political Studies

Politics

Chair:

Mr Klaus SCHUMANN

Former Director General of Political Affairs, Council of Europe

NGO

Chair:

Mr Jean-Marie HEYDT

President of the Conference of INGOs, Council of Europe

Business

Chair:

Mr Frank PROCHASKA

Lecturer, Colorado Technical University, Denver

11.30 Address by HE Stjepan MESIC

President of Croatia

Afternoon Free

Evening Free or invitation by the Permanent Representations

Thursday 9 July 2009

09.00–12.00 Regional meetings for the Schools of:

• **Tirana, Sarajevo, Zagreb, Pristina, Podgorica, Belgrade and Skopje**

Speakers:

Mr Goran SVILANOVIC

Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities

Mr Tim JUDAH

Balkans correspondent of *The Economist*, visiting research fellow at the South East European Research Unit of the LSE

Mr Juri LAAS

Press Officer EULEX Kosovo, Council of the European Union

Chair:

Ms Sonja LICHT

Director of the Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence

Visit to the European Court of Human Rights for the Schools of:

09.00 Yerevan, Baku, Tbilisi, Moscow

10.30 Sofia, Chişinău, Bucharest, Kyiv

10.00-12.00 Information meeting on the Council of Europe's programmes and activities for the School of Minsk

Mr Daniil KHOCHABO

Head of Division of Political Advice, Council of Europe

12.30 Lunch at the Restaurant of the European Parliament

14.30-17.30 Regional meetings for the Schools of:

- **Yerevan, Baku, Minsk, Sofia, Tbilisi, Chişinău, Bucharest, Moscow, Kyiv**

Eastern Partnership: new perspectives of co-operation in Eastern Europe

Speakers:

Ms Anna-Carin KROKSTADE

Directorate General for External Relations, European Commission

Mr Gert-Rüdiger WEGMARSHAUS

Professor of Political Science, European University Viadrina, Frankfurt / Oder

Chair:

Mr Ihor KOHUT

Director of the Ukrainian School of Political Studies

Energy and security issues in the Black Sea region

Speakers:

Mr István GYARMATI

President of the International Centre for Democratic Transition, Budapest

Mr Philippe SEBILLE-LOPEZ

French Institute of Geopolitics, University of Paris VIII

Chair:

Ms Elena NEMIROVSKAYA

Director of the Moscow School of Political Studies

14.30-16.30 Information meeting on the Council of Europe's programmes and activities for the School of Skopje

Mr Jean-Pierre TITZ

Head of the History Teaching Division, Council of Europe

Visit to the European Court of Human Rights for the Schools of:

14.30 Pristina, Podgorica, Belgrade

- 16.00 Sarajevo, Zagreb
- 19.30-21.00 Reception offered by the City of Strasbourg at the *Pavillon Joséphine, Parc de l'Orangerie*

Friday 10 July 2009

09.00–11.00 Regional meetings for the Schools of:

- Yerevan and Baku
- Zagreb and Sarajevo
- Bucharest, Kyiv and Chişinău
- Moscow and Tbilisi

09.00-11.00 Visit to the European Court of Human Rights for the Schools of:

- Tirana, Minsk, Skopje

09.00-11.00 Information meetings on the Council of Europe's programmes and activities for the School of Pristina

Ms Claudia LUCIANI

Director of Political Advice and Co-operation, Council of Europe

11.30-12.30 Official Celebration of the 20th Anniversary of the opening of the Iron Curtain
"20 years after: have the divisions been overcome?"

Projection of the film "1989: an exceptional year"

Interventions by:

Mr Erhard BUSEK

Former Vice-Chancellor of Austria, former Special Co-ordinator of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe

Mr László KOVACS

European Commissioner for Taxation and Customs Union, former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Hungary

12.30-13.30 **CLOSING SESSION**

Ms Catherine TRAUTMANN

Member of the European Parliament

Intervention by:

Mr Lilian THURAM

President of the Lilian Thuram Foundation – Education against Racism

Presentation of the Final Declaration

Award of diplomas to the participants

Closing of the 4th Summer University for Democracy

Rt. Hon. Terry DAVIS

Secretary General of the Council of Europe

13.30-14.30 Reception offered by the Permanent Representations of Austria and Hungary

Afternoon Free

19.30-21.00 Garden Party at the *Jardin des Deux Rives*

Visits to the European Court of Human Rights

Yerevan	9 July – 9.00	Alvina Gyulumyan <i>Judge elected in respect of Armenia</i>	Main Hearing Room
Moscow	9 July – 9.00	Anatoli Kovler <i>Judge elected in respect of Russia</i>	Room 20 RC Jardin
Baku	9 July – 9.00	Vugar Fataliyev <i>Lawyer (Azerbaijan) at the Registry of the Court</i>	Press Room
Tbilisi	9 July – 9.00	Giorgi Badashvili <i>Lawyer (Georgia) at the Registry of the Court</i>	Seminar Room
Bucharest	9 July – 10.30	Corneliu Bîrsan <i>Judge elected in respect of Romania</i>	Main Hearing Room
Chişinău	9 July – 10.30	Mihai Poalelungi <i>Judge elected in respect of Moldova</i>	Room 20 RC Jardin
Sofia	9 July – 10.30	Zdravka Kalaydjieva <i>Judge elected in respect of Bulgaria</i>	Seminar Room
Kyiv	9 July – 10.30	Inna Shyroкова <i>Lawyer (Ukraine) at the Registry of the Court</i>	Press Room
Belgrade	9 July – 14.30	Dragoljub Popović <i>Judge elected in respect of Serbia</i>	Main Hearing Room
Podgorica	9 July – 14.30	Nebojša Vučinić <i>Judge elected in respect of Montenegro</i>	Room RC Jardin
Pristina	9 July – 14.30	Ylli Peco <i>Lawyer (Albania) at the Registry of the Court</i>	Seminar Room
Zagreb	9 July – 16.00	Zvonimir Mataga <i>Lawyer (Croatia) at the Registry of the Court</i>	Main Hearing Room
Sarajevo	9 July – 16.	Enida Turkusic <i>Lawyer (Bosnia and Herzegovina) at the Registry of the Court</i>	Seminar Room
Tirana	10 July – 9.00	Ledi Bianku <i>Judge elected in respect of Albania</i>	Main Hearing Room
Skopje	10 July – 9.00	Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska <i>Judge elected in respect of “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”</i>	Seminar Room
Minsk	10 July – 9.00	NN <i>Lawyer at the Registry of the Court</i>	Press Room

Annex II: List of speakers

Armaz AKHVLEDIANI, Director of the Tbilisi School of Political Studies

Gabriella BATTAINI-DRAGONI, Director General of Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport, Council of Europe

Philippe BOILLAT, Director General of Human Rights and Legal Affairs, Council of Europe

Bernard BOUCAULT, Director of the Ecole Nationale d'Administration, Strasbourg

Erhard BUSEK, former Vice-Chancellor of Austria, former Special Co-ordinator of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe

Kim CAMPBELL, former Prime Minister of Canada

Viorel CIBOTARU, Director of the European Institute for Political Studies of Moldova

Vlad CONSTANTINESCO, Professor of Public Law, University of Strasbourg, College of Europe, Natolin
Nevena CRLJENKO, Director of the Academy for Political Development, Zagreb

Terry DAVIS, Secretary General of the Council of Europe

Lluís Maria DE PUIG, President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe

Guy DE VEL, former Director General of Legal Affairs, Council of Europe

Boris DUBIN, Chief of the Department of Sociopolitical Studies, Levada Center, Moscow

Oliver DULIC, Minister of Environment and Spatial Planning of Serbia

Wendelin ETTMAYER, former Permanent Representative of Austria to the Council of Europe

Fernanda GABRIEL, Journalist, National Radio and TV of Portugal, President of the Association of the European Parliamentary Journalists

Igor GAON, Directorate General of Democracy and Political Affairs, Council of Europe

Andreas GROSS, member of the delegation of Switzerland to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Chair of the Socialist Group

Alexandre GUESSEL, Anti-Terrorism Co-ordinator, Council of Europe

István GYARMATI, President of the International Centre for Democratic Transition, Budapest

Jack HANNING, Secretary General of the European Association of Schools of Political Studies

Thomas HAMMARBERG, Commissioner for Human Rights, Council of Europe

Jean-Marie HEYDT, President of the Conference of INGOs, Council of Europe

Mladen IVANIC, member of the delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Vice-President of the Assembly

Tim JUDAH, Balkans correspondent of *The Economist*, visiting research fellow at the South East European Research Unit of the LSE

Anne JUGANARU, Director of the "Ovidiu Sincai" European School, Bucharest

Daniil KHOCHABO, Head of Division of Political Advice, Council of Europe

Ihor KOHUT, Director of the Ukrainian School of Political Studies

László KOVACS, European Commissioner for Taxation and Customs Union, former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Hungary

Anna-Carin KROKSTADE, Directorate General for External Relations, European Commission

Juri LAAS, Press officer EULEX Kosovo, Council of the European Union

Catherine LALUMIERE, President of the European Association of the Schools of Political Studies, former Secretary General of the Council of Europe

Jean-Louis LAURENS, Director General of Democracy and Political Affairs

Marie-Claire LEFEVRE, European Association of the Schools of Political Studies

François-Gilles LE THEULE, Director of the Centre for European Studies of the Ecole Nationale d'Administration, Strasbourg

Sonja LICHT, Director of the Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence

Svetlana LOMEVA, Director of the Bulgarian School of Politics

Claudia LUCIANI, Director of Political Advice and Co-operation, Council of Europe

Alexei MAKARKIN, Vice-President of the Centre of Political Technologies, Moscow

Ilgar MAMMADOV, Director of the Baku Political Studies Programme

Dick MARTY, member of the delegation of Switzerland to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Chairperson of the Sub-Committee on Crime Problems and the Fight against Terrorism of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights

Stjepan MESIC, President of Croatia

Elena NEMIROVSKAYA, Director of the Moscow School of Political Studies

Mutsuyoshi NISHIMURA, Special advisor on climate change to the Japanese Cabinet

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

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

Frank PROCHASKA, Lecturer, Colorado Technical University, Denver

Roland RIES, Senator and Mayor of Strasbourg

Michel ROCARD, former Prime Minister of France

Petre ROMAN, former Prime Minister of Romania

Christian SAVES, French political scientist and senior civil servant

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

Alexander SEGER, Head of the Economic Crime Division, Council of Europe

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

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

Goran SVILANOVIC, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities

Marta SZIGETI BONIFERT, Executive Director of the Regional Environmental Center, Budapest

Patrick TITIUN, Head of the Office of the President of the European Court of Human Rights

Jean-Pierre TITZ, Head of the History Teaching Division, Council of Europe

Lilian THURAM, President of the Lilian Thuram Foundation – Education against Racism

Catherine TRAUTMANN, Member of the European Parliament

Danilo TÜRK, President of Slovenia

Olivier VEDRINE, President of the “Collège Atlantique-Oural”, Paris

Gert-Rüdiger WEGMARSHAUS, Professor of Political Science, European University Viadrina, Frankfurt / Oder

Harald WYDRA, Lecturer in Russian and Eastern European Politics, University of Cambridge

Armen ZAKARYAN, Director of the Yerevan School of Political Studies

Annex III: List of participants

Moscow School of Political Studies

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

Mr Alexander ALEKSENTSEV, Council of "Soglasie" NGO

Ms Olga ARTAMONOVA, "Dialog" Centre for the regional municipal studies, Assistant to the Head

Ms Natalia BALAKIREVA, Head of department of Governor Press-cutting Service

Mr Vakha BELKHAROEV, Volunteer of NGO "New Ingushetia"

Mr Elena BELOVA, Assistant to the Head, "Alye paruca" NGO

Mr Anton CHABLIN, Journalist, "Otkrytaya dlya vseh i kajdogo" Newspaper

Mr Grigory DANILOV, Deputy, Cheboksary Municipal Council

Mr Nodary DARASELIYA, Senior officer, Centre of political studies

Mr Sergey DOKHOLYAN, Head of the Department, Institute for Socioeconomic Studies

Ms Veronika DOVGAN, Director General, "DVS Consult"

Ms Vyacheslava IVANOVA, PR-Senior Specialist, Branch of Executive Committee "Edinaya Rossiya" Political Party

Mr Georgy KAITUKOV, Expert, Government and Presidential Administration

Mr Petros KARAMYAN, Chair, "ArmRosgazprom" production and technical development

Mr Timur KHALILOV, Chief of public relations, "Obschee delo" Charitable foundation

Mr Khusen KHAUTIEV, Co-ordinator, "Novaya Ingushetiya" Regional NGO

Mr Lasha KILADZE, Chief of Regional Department, Ministry of Public Health

Mr Alexander KOROVIN, Director, "Smekhnov-Korovin" AD Agency

Mr Ivan KOSTORNOV, Officer, "Mondi Business" Newspaper

Mr Mikhail KOVAL, Chair, "Svoboda vybora" regional NGO

Mr Igor KOVALEV, Assistant to the Deputy, the State Duma

Ms Elena KOVESHNIKOVA, Assistant to the Head "Institute of regional development"

Mr Artur MAISS, Expert, Charitable organisation

Mr Dmitriy MARGELOV, Student

Mr Alexey NEGEREV, Deputy, City Council

Mr Evgeniy NIKONOV, Partner, "Personnel Touch" Training and Consulting Bureau

Mr Kirill ORESHKIN, Executive Director, Think tank

Ms Zareta OSMAEVA, Assistant to Director General, "Obiedinennaya gazeta", "Moya gazeta" Newspapers

Mr Leonid PETRASHIS, Member of the Regional Bar

Mr Daniil PODOLNY, Deputy Director of the “Business Incubator”
Ms Evgeniya RAZLATAYA, Director of Branch, “Novyi Kvartal” Holding Company
Ms Anna SALAMATINA, Manager of the Moscow School of Political Studies
Ms Tatiana SAVCHENKO, Director General, “Jet Aero” Company
Mr Mikhail SOKOLOV, Partner, “Content” Agency
Mr Maxim SUCHKOV, Chief of the Department, “Belyi parus” Company
Ms Regina SULTANOVA, President, Nonprofit partnership of the republican charity organisations
Mr Dmitriy TEPLUKHIN, Director, “Stayfirst” Agency
Ms Greta TUCHKUTE, Director, Centre for Geopolitical Studies
Ms Ekaterina VASILENKO, Expert, Centre for the Regional Studies
Ms Elena ZUEVA, Deputy Chairman, Regional Youth Parliament

Tbilisi School of Political Studies

Mr Armaz AKHVLEDIANI, Founder and Director of the Tbilisi School of Political Studies
Ms Teona AKUBARDIA, Executive Director, NGO “Centre of Public Projects”
Ms Ekaterine BABUNASHVILI, First Secretary, Policy Analysis Division, Political Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia
Mr Giorgi BOCHORISHVILI, Specialist, Company “Energopro Georgia”
Ms Tatia BURDULI, PR Manager, Department of Sport and Youth Affairs of Georgia
Mr Lasha CHAKHAVA, Director General, Company “CardioSOS”
Ms Rusudan CHIKOVANI, Head of Mortgage Sector, Registration Agency of Tbilisi, National Agency of Public Registry of Georgia
Ms Ekaterine GABRICHIDZE, Judge, Tbilisi City Court
Mr Zaza GABUNIA, Director of Communication, Press-Speaker of Christian-Democratic Faction, Parliament of Georgia
Mr Giorgi GODABRELIDZE, Member of Parliament, Deputy Chairman of the Committee of Health and Social Issues, Parliament of Georgia
Mr Beka GOGIBERIDZE, Deputy Head of Marketing Department, Ltd “Georgian Railway”
Ms Manana GOGOKHIA, Field Office and Community Mobilizator, Danish Refugee Council
Mr Giorgi JAVAKHISHVILI, Member of Central Election Commission of Georgia
Mr Otar JANJALASHVILI, Deputy Chairman, Tbilisi Chamber of Arbitration
Mr Giorgi JGARKAVA, Corporate Credit Manager, JSC Kor-Standard Bank
Ms Nino KAJAIA, Head of Division of Agreements Expertising, Ministry of Justice of Georgia
Mr Zurab KARTSIVADZE, Head of Unit, Bank “Republic” Societe Generale Group
Ms Irina KERESLIDZE, Specialist, Department of Statistics of Georgia
Ms Shorena KIRVALIDZE, PR Manager, “Georgian Water and Power” Company
Mr George KVARATSKHELIA, Executive Director, Business and Economic Centre

Ms Ketevan KVINIKADZE, Head of Administration, National Bureau of Enforcement, Ministry of Justice of Georgia

Mr Koka KVIRKVELIA, Journalist, Media Holding "Palitra"

Mr Beka MACHUTADZE, Administrator, State Foundation for Protection of Victims of Trafficking

Mr Konstantine MAGRADZE, Executive Director, GEPR – PR and Marketing Communication Company

Mr Paata MANJGALADZE, Chief of Department, Resource Management and Control Department, Ministry of Defence of Georgia

Mr George MEKHRISHVILI, Senior Specialist, Staff of the Parliament of Georgia

Mr Lado MGALOBILISHVILI, Leading Specialist, Office of Public Defender of Georgia

Ms Nino MTVARELISHVILI, Project Officer, CARE International

Mr Malkhaz NAKASHIDZE, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Finance and Economic of Adjara Autonomous Republic

Mr Juga SIKHARULIDZE, Consultant of Assurance and Advisory Services, PricewaterhouseCoopers

Ms EKA SOSELIA, Journalist, TV Company "Imedi"

Mr Anri TABAGUA, Student, Batumi State University

Mr Giorgi TKESHELASHVILI, Financial Director, Mobitel LLC "Beeline"

Mr Giorgi TOPURIA, Head of Democratic Institute, NGO "Democratic Institute"

Ms Irina TSAKADZE, Head of Lawmaking Department, Ministry of Justice of Georgia

Mr Jemal TSETSKHLADZE, Regional Director, Association for Protection of Landowners Rights; Regional Co-ordinator, National Agency of Public Registry of Georgia

Mr Juba TSULADZE, Chief Financial Officer, Company "Bennet and Bennet Capital"

Bulgarian School of Politics

Ms Svetlana LOMEVA, Executive Director of the Bulgarian School of Politics

Ms Diana BOYADZHIEVA, Expert in "Foreign Policy and Eurointegration" Department, Bulgarian Socialist Party

Ms Krasimira CHAHOVA, Monitoring Board of Union of Free Democrats, Sofia

Mr Emanuil DIMITROV, Member of the Leadership of Democrats for Strong Bulgaria – Pernik

Ms Rositsa DIMITROVA, Director of Agency "Social work and Healthcare", Veliko Tarnovo

Mr Krasen FERDINANDOV, Deputy Chairman of Union of Democratic Forces, Sofia-Oborishte; Senior expert "Education, Culture and Youth," Sofia Municipality

Ms Snezina GABOVA, Director Development, Bulgarian School of Politics

Ms Veselka GEORGIEVA-ZLATEVA, Chair of the Municipal Council of Bulgarian Socialist Party, Botevgrad

Mr Hristo HRISTOV, Member of BZNS, Stara Zagora

Mr Iordan IORDANOV, Chair of Express Intellect, OOD

Mr Ivelin IVANOV, NDSV, Gabrovo, Member of the Board of YMCA

Mr Orlin KALEV, Member of the National Council of Union of Democratic Forces

Mr Danail KIRILOV, Municipal Councillor, GERB, Sofia
Mr Zyulfin KOLASHOV, Chair of EVET NGO in Blagoevgrad
Ms Daniela KOLEVA, Programme Manager, ARK Bulgaria
Ms Denitsa LOZANOVA, Programme Director, Bulgarian School of Politics
Ms Neli NIKOLOVA, Chair of the Municipal Council of Bulgarian Socialist Party, Antonovo
Ms Nevin OSMAN, Secretary on legal issues of the President of Bulgaria, Movement for Rights and Freedoms
Ms Monika PANAYOTOVA, Member of Parliament, Chair of the Youth Organisation of GERB
Mr Dimi PANITZA, Founder and Honorary Chairman, Bulgarian School of Politics
Mr Teodor PETKOV, Deputy Chairman of Union of Democratic Forces, Sofia
Mr Dobromir PETROV, Manager of PM Consulting, Sofia
Ms Milena PETROVA, Chief Specialist, Parliamentary Group of NDSV
Mr Julian POPOV, Chairman, Bulgarian School of Politics
Ms Mira RADEVA, Political Assistant and PR, British Embassy
Mr Konstantin RAYKOV, Member of the Regional Council of Union of Democratic Forces, Burgas
Mr Peter SLAVOV, Member of the Municipal Leadership of UDF, Lozenetz
Mr Nikolay STOINEV, Deputy Chair of GERB Councillors in Sofia Municipality
Ms Silvia TCHERNEVA, HR Manager, M3 Communications Group, Inc.
Ms Lyubomila TOTINA, Project leader of REDline, Institute “Nikolay Dobrev”
Mr Trendafil VELICHKOV, Deputy Chairman, Institute for Youth Policy K2, Pazardjik
Mr Grigor VLADIMIROV, Deputy Director of the Institute for Conflict Resolution
Mr Robert YANAKIEV, Speaker of the group of GERB Municipal Councillors, Sofia Municipality
Mr Kiril ZHEGLEV, Chairman of Bulgarian Socialist Party, Municipal Council in Nessebar
Ms Daniela ZHELYAZKOVA, Democrats for Strong Bulgaria, Municipal Councillor, Plovdiv

European Institute for Political Studies (Moldova)

Mr Viorel CIBOTARU, Director of the European Institute for Political Studies
Mr Igor AGACHE, Chişinău Municipal Committee
Mr Alexandru ANDRONIC, Popular Republican Party of the Republic of Moldova
Ms Ana BALAN, Social Democrat Party of the Republic of Moldova
Ms Catalina BARBAROSIE, International Labour Organisation
Ms Victoria BOIAN, Programme Co-ordinator, Foreign Policy Association
Ms Lilia BOLOCAN, Liberal-Democrat Party of the Republic of Moldova
Mr Andrian BULIGARI, Democratic Party of the Republic of Moldova
Mr Denis CENUŞA, “Acum” review
Mr Gheorghe CHIOSA, Liberal-Democrat Party of the Republic of Moldova

Mr Petru CULEAC, PhD student, Vienna
Ms Marina DAMASCHIN, Romanian Embassy in the Republic of Moldova
Ms Lilia GUREZ, "Infotag" News Agency
Mr Dragos GROSU, Popular Christian-Democrat Party of the Republic of Moldova
Ms Daria GVINDJIA, TV7 Television
Mr Vitalie LAZĂR, "Moldova Noastra" Alliance of the Republic of Moldova
Mr Denis LEBEDA, "Moldova Noastra" Alliance of the Republic of Moldova
Ms Adelina LUNGU, Lecturer, Psychology and Social Assistance, Management of Human Resources Departments
Ms Virginia MORARU, Center for Combating Economic Crime and Corruption of the Republic of Moldova
Ms Raisa MOROSANU, Accountant, European Institute for Political Studies
Mr Silvian MUNTEANU, The National-Liberal Party of the Republic of Moldova
Mr Fadei NAGACEVSCHI, NGO "Journalists for Human Rights"
Mr Alexei PERCEMLI, Social Democrat Party of the Republic of Moldova
Ms Daniela POPA, Moldova Governance Threshold Country Programme
Ms Natalia RABEL, "Caritas" Moldova
Ms Irina ROMANCENKO, Ministry of Justice Transdnistria
Ms Olga ROTARU, "TeleRadio Moldova" Company
Ms Ana SARIVAN, Liberal Party of the Republic of Moldova
Ms Natalia SCIUCHINA, Transdnistrean State University
Mr Eugeniu SPATARI, Democratic Party of the Republic of Moldova
Mr Vadim STANGACIU, "TeleRadio Moldova" Company
Ms Alina (Aliona) TURCANU, ProTv Television Company
Mr Ernest VARDANEAN, Press Agency "Novy Region", Tiraspol
Ms Daria ZIMBELSKAIA, "Komsomolskaia Pravda" Newspaper

Pristina Institute for Political Studies

Ms Leonora KRYEZIU, Executive Director of the Pristina Institute for Political Studies
Ms Mimoza AHMETAJ, Member of Parliament, PDK
Mr Demush BAJRAKTARI, Head of the Youth Forum, LDD
Ms Silvana BARDHI, Journalist, «BBC» Correspondent
Mr Kreshnik BASHA, National Professional Officer Senior, OSCE
Ms Albina BERISHA, Business Development Manager, MDA
Mr Seb BYTYCI, Associate Professor, Pristina University & Project Manager, Kosovo
Mr Hajrulla CEKU, Project Co-ordinator, "FORUMI 2015"

Mr Adrian COLLAKU, Journalist, Daily Newspaper “Zëri”
Mr Liridon DALIPI, Legal Officer, Independent Media Commission
Ms Edona DEMAJ, Journalist, “Voice of America” Correspondent
Mr Agron DEMI, Political Analyst, Institute for Advances Studies – GAP
Ms Arjeta EMRA, Director, British Council Office
Mr Bashkim FAZLIU, Member of Ferizaj Assembly, PDK
Mr Nazim HALITI, Project Co-ordinator, Forum for Civic Initiatives, FIQ
Ms Arjeta HASANI, PIPS Project Co-ordinator
Ms Valentina HOXHA, Consular Officer, German Embassy
Ms Valëza ISLAMI, Member of Youth Forum, AAK
Ms Mirjana JAKSIC, Legal Officer – UNMIK, Mitrovica Court
Mr Ergin KALA, Finance Officer, Kosovo Turkish Democratic Party, KDTP
Mr Ramadan KLISURICA, Project Co-ordinator, Kosovo Democratic Institute, KDI
Transparency Initiative, UNDP
Ms Liridonë KOZMAQI, Public Relations Officer, Ministry of Justice
Ms Fatime LUMI, Public Relations Officer, Ministry of Economy and Finance
Mr Vehbi MIFTARI, Associate Professor & Spokesperson of LDK
Ms Dragana MILUTINOVIC, Administrative Assistant, UNMIK
Mr Fisnik MUSA, Public Relations Officer, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ms Shqipe NEZIRI, Co-ordinator for the Youth Department, World Bank
Mr Luaras OSEKU, Head of Office Assistant, OSCE
Mr Besnik RAMADANAJ, Journalist, Daily Newspaper “Express”
Mr Gazmend REXHEPI, Programme Manager, European Integration Programme, INPO
Ms Sinavere RYSHA, Member of Parliament, LDD
Mr Bekim SINANI, Regional Director Reiffeisen Bank, member of party ORA
Mr Gorica SCEPANOVIC, Policy Officer – Religious and Cultural Heritage, International Civilian Office – ICO
Mr Olivera SLAVKOVIC, Senior Legal Assistant, Human Rights & Communities Department, OSCE
Mr Blerim VELA, Head of Assembly Functioning, OSCE
Mr Bashmir XHEMAJ, PIPS Information Officer
Mr Avni ZUKA, Legal Officer, National Democratic Institute – NDI

Skopje schools of politics

Mr Gordan GEORGIEV, Director of the Skopje School of Politics
Mr Edmond ADEMI, Spokesman of the Liberal-Democratic Party – LDP
Mr Emil ATANASOVSKI, Programme Manager, Westminster Foundation for Democracy

Ms Irena BABAMOVA-STOJCHEVA, Political Analyst, PhD studies in Euro institutions and politics at the Faculty of Law in Skopje, Department of International Relations

Ms Biljana BOSNJAKOVSKA, Secretariat for European Affairs, Project Assistant of the EU financed project "Technical assistance to the Secretariat for European Affairs – CARDS – FARE

Ms Marija DELEVIK, Adviser for International Relations in the Ministry of Local Self-Government

Mr Ivan DESPOTOVSKI, Head of Agency for Financial Support of Agriculture and Rural Development

Ms Ana DOJCINOVSKA, Commission for Protection of Competition, Sector for EU Procedures and Law

Mr Nehat EMINI, Civil servant, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr Oliver GASEV, Lawyer, Member of the Central Board of LDP (Liberal Democratic Party) and has several functions in Veles Municipality

Mr Borce GEORGIEV, Professor of Theology

Mr Albert HANI, Project Co-ordinator in the Swiss Embassy, Regional Office for Peace Building

Ms Sabina IDRIZI, Teaching Assistant at the South-Eastern European University in Tetovo

Ms Vjolca ISTREFI, Junior officer for analytical issues, Constitutional Court of "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"

Mr Milan JANIKIJEVIK, Councillor, Section for Cooperation with NATO, Ministry of Defence

Ms Tanja KALOVSKA, Regional Officer, Council of Europe and European Commission Office in Skopje

Mr Darko KAZANKOV, Economist, Shipping Agent in Lemi Dooel, Skopje

Mr Dime KOCEV, Head of Division of Urology, General Hospital in Kavadarci, member of Liberal-Democratic Party – LDP

Mr Aleksandar KOLEV, Medical student, member of the Executive Committee of the Union of the VMRO-DPMNE's Youth

Mr Bojan KORDALOV, Assistant, Programme of Norwegian bilateral support to "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", within the Secretariat of European Affairs, member of the Social-Democrat Union of Macedonia – SDSM

Mr Kiril KOVACEV, Economist, Executive Director, Association for Regional Development

Ms Cvetanka MIHAJLOVSKA, Project assistant, FORUM – CSRD

Ms Sihana NEBIU, Programme Manager, Peace Corps of USA in "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"

Ms Ana PEJOVA, Project Manager, Project for Enforcement of Civil Society (USAID)

Mr Besim RAMIKEVIK, Prefect, Organized Crimes Division, Ministry of Interior

Ms Vasilka SALEVSKA, Deputy Head of the Sector for Preparation of the National Version of *acquis communautaire*

Ms Kalinka SENTIK-GABER, Political consultant

Mr Besim SHABANI, Economist, member of New Democracy Party

Mr Goran SPASOVSKI, Advisor for political analyses and coordination in the field of economic system and current economic policy within the General Secretariat of the Government of RM

Ms Veronika STANOJEVSKA, Junior Legal Officer, Office of the Government Agent at the European Human Rights Court, Ministry of Justice

Ms Kate TRAJKOVA, Advisor for Human Resources Management, Ministry of Labor and Social Policy

Mr Kire VASILEV, Works in the National Mechanism for directing the victims of human traffic in the Ministry of Labor and Social Policy of “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”

Mr Arben YONUS, Professor

Ms Seyhan ZEYNEL, Cabinet of the Minister without Portfolio in the Government of RM within the General Secretariat of the Government of “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”

Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence

Ms Sonja LICHT, President of the Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence

Mr Abdulla AHMETI, Presevo Office Co-ordinator, Youth Initiative for Human Rights

Mr Fuad BACICANIN, Secretary General, SDA

Mr Milan DJUKIC, MP at the Province of Vojvodina Assembly, SPO

Ms Valentina DJURETA, Alumni Programme Co-ordinator, Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence

Ms Maja DJUROV-ZLATKOV, Member of the Municipal Assembly, DSS

Ms Natasa DRAGOJLOVIC, Executive Board Member, European Movement in Serbia

Mr Robert FEJSTAMER, Member of the Presidency of the Municipal Board, SVM

Mr Jan GAGES, MP at the Province of Vojvodina Assembly, LSV

Ms Milica JAHURA, Member of the International Secretariat of DSS Youth, DSS

Ms Jelena JEVTOVIC, Advisor in the European Integration Department, Ministry of Finance

Mr Dejan M. JOVANOVIC, Vice-President of the Municipal Board, G17 plus

Mr Dejan Z. JOVANOVIC, Member of the City Board Steering Committee, SNS

Mr Vlatko JOVICEVIC, MP at the Province of Vojvodina Assembly, DS

Mr Ilirian JUSUFI, Member of the Youth Forum Presidency, PDD

Mr Jovica KRTINIC, Executive Editor, Standard Weekly

Ms Aleksandra KUZMANOVIC, Member of the party's European Integration Board, LDP

Mr Milan LAPCEVIC, Member of the party's European Integration Board, LDP

Mr Srdjan MARJANOVIC, Mayor, Bor Municipality

Mr Jovan MARKOVIC, Mayor, Uzice City

Mr Marko MILUTINOVIC, Member of the Belgrade City Assembly, DSS

Mr Nenad MITROVIC, Mayor, Vladicin Han Municipality

Ms Stanislava MITROVIC, Judge, The First Municipal Court

Mr Mujo MUKOVIC, State Secretary, Ministry for Infrastructure

Mr Marjan MURATOVIC, President, NGO-Education and Health Centre “JAK-ER”

Ms Tijana NIKOLIC, MP at the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia, DS

Ms Marija RADOJCIC, MP at the Province of Vojvodina Assembly, LSV

Mr Zoran SIMIC, Co-ordinator in the Readmission Office, Ministry for Human and Minority Rights

Mr Aleksandar SKAKIC, Senior Advisor in the Defence Policy Sector, Ministry of Defence

Ms Aristeja STAKIC, Journalist, News Department Editor, Panonija TV

Ms Jelena SVILANOVIC, Deputy Chief of the party's Press Service, G17 plus

Ms Jelena TRAVAR, MP at the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia, G17 plus

Ms Maja VIDENOVIC, MP at the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia, DS

Mr Mihajlo ZDRAVKOVIC, Member of the Nis City Assembly, G17 plus

Mr Miodrag ZDRAVKOVIC, Member of the Municipal Assembly, LDP

Ms Ivana ZIVKOVIC, Member of the party's Belgrade City Board, NS

Academy for Political Development (Croatia)

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

Mr Ivor ALTARAS-PENDA, Director, Essa d.o.o

Mr Valerio BACAK, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Faculty of Philosophy, Zagreb

Ms Ivana BARAC, Fund Manager, VB Invest

Ms Danijela BERETIN, Youth Programme Moderator, Europe House Vukovar

Ms Vesna BUTERIN, Member of Croatian Parliament, Croatia Democratic Union (HDZ)

Ms Andrea COVIC, Expert Associate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration

Mr Franko DOTA, LGBT Activist

Ms Ivana DRAGICEVIC-VELICKOVIC, Journalist, Croatian Radiotelevision (HRT)

Ms Dijana FERKOVIC, Consultant for Local Development, Pleternica d.o.o.

Mr Marko FILIPOVIC, Member of Rijeka City Council, Social Democratic Party of Croatia (SDP)

Mr Marin GRGETA, President of Istrian Democratic Assembly (IDS) Youth Club

Mr Bojan HUZANIC, Tax Consultant, Leitner + Leitner Consulting d.o.o.

Mr Damjan JANJUSEVIC, Assistant and Secretary, Association for Self Advocacy

Ms Darija JURICA, Head of Department, Bureau of Macroeconomics Analysis and Planning, Ministry of Finance

Ms Jelena KATIC, Deputy Director, Croatian employers association (HUP)

Mr Hrvoje KRESIC, Journalist, Novi list daily

Mr Damir KRSTINIC, Research Associate, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture and Member of Main Committee of Social Democratic Party of Croatia (SDP)

Ms Ana KURPES, Head of Department, Phare and Ipa Programme, Central Finance and Contracting Agency (CFCA)

Ms Andrijana PARIC, Consultant, Razbor d.o.o and activist in Center for Peace Studies

Ms Dunja POTOČNIK, Research Assistant, Institute for Social Research

Ms Vanja RATKOVIC, Magazine editor, GEO

Ms Slavica ROBIC, Research Associate, Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computing

Mr Klen SAMARINAC, Deputy Editor, online edition of “Jutarnji list daily” (www.jutarnji.hr)

Ms Tea SEKELJ, Programme Assistant

Ms Sonja SIMUNOVIC, Member of Croatian Parliament, Social Democratic Party of Croatia

Ms Jasmina SOCKOVIC, Director of Consulting Department, Selectio d.o.o.

Mr Tomislav TOMASEVIC, President of NGO Green Action

Mr Nikola VRDOLJAK, Marketing Manager, Digital komunikacije d.o.o.

“Ovidiu Sincai” European School (Romania)

Ms Anne Rose Marie JUGANARU, Director of the “Ovidiu Sincai” European School

Ms Luminita APOSTOLESCU, Column Editor, Political Parties, Radio Romania

Ms Stela ARHIRE, Real estate expert evaluator

Mr Ferenc Alpar BARTHA, Lawyer, Member of the Hungarian Democratic Union

Mr Costel BERCUS, President of the Roma Education Fund

Ms Oana Claudia BICA, County Councillor, Dolj County, Social Democratic Party

Ms Eva BIRO, Councillor, Ministry of Regional Development

Ms Iulia-Despina CINDROIU, President of the Greater Romania Youth, Cluj-Napoca

Ms Loredana-Diana CISMAS, Councillor, European Parliament, National Liberal Party

Mr Romeo CORNICI, Councillor, Health Insurances House

Mr Florin CRACIUN, Sound Engineer, Romanian Television

Mr Cristian FOTIADE, Engineer, Institute of Atomic Physics, Magurele

Ms Carmen Gina IONESCU, Editor-in-chief, RADOR News Agency, Radio Romania

Mr Mihnea Remus IUORAS, Spokesman of the National Liberal Youth

Mr Felix Daniel MANTA, Local Councillor, Drobeta-Turnu Severin Municipality

Mr Augustin MIHALACHE, Councillor, Ministry of Education and Innovation

Mr Nicolae Teodor MITU, Councillor, Protocol Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr Musat MUDRAC, Manager, New Victoria Cauciuc company

Mr Rares-Mihai MUSAT, Professor, Babes-Bolyai University, Sibiu

Mr Robert Eugen MUZSIC, Director, Energy Consulting company, Hateg

Ms Camelia-Luciana NEDEA, Service Chief, National Office of Commercial Registry

Ms Alexandra NICHITA, Cabinet Chief, “Ovidiu Sincai” Institute

Ms Elena Mirela OLARIU, Lawyer, member of the Democratic Liberal Party, Bacau

Ms Camelia PARASCHIV, Assistant of the Ambassador, Embassy of Peru

Mr Razvan Codrut POP, Secretary General of the National Liberal Youth

Mr Silviu POPA, Member of the Democratic Liberal Party, Iasi

Ms Olivia Irene PREOTEASA, Head of the Conservative Youth, 2nd District, Bucharest

Mr Eugen ROSCA, Senior Lecturer, University “Politehnica” of Bucharest

Ms Raluca SPATAREANU, Web Editor, Realitatea TV
Ms Bianka SZENCZI, Member of the Hungarian Democratic Union, Cluj-Napoca
Ms Oana-Mihaela TAMAS, Legal expert, Ministry of Justice and Citizens' Liberties
Ms Ana-Claudia TAPARDEL, Municipal Councillor, Bucharest, Social Democratic Party
Ms Cristina TATU, Editor, Agerpres National News Agency
Mr George-Vadim TIUGEA, Project Assistant, "Ovidiu Sincai" European School
Mr Mihaita VOICU, President of the Greater Romania Youth Organisation

Yerevan School of Political Studies

Mr Armen ZAKARYAN, Director of the Yerevan School of Political Studies
Ms Ani AVETISYAN, National Assembly of the Republic of Armenia, "Dashnaksutyun" Faction, Expert
Mr Aleksander BADALOV, "Helsinki Initiative 92" Committee of Nagorno-Karabakh, Head of Youth Affairs
Ms Maria BARAGHAMYAN, *Business Planet* journal, Chief-Editor
Ms Lusya GALOYAN, Gyumri Branch of Armenian State University of Economics, Lecturer
Mr Garnik GEVORGYAN, *168 Hours* newspaper, Deputy Chief-Editor
Mr Mher GHALECHYAN, "August Agency" LLC, Director; *Chorrord Ishkhanutyun* daily, Journalist
Mr Edgar GHAZARYAN, Yeghegnadzor Branch of the Armenian State Economic University, Director, Doctor of Economics
Ms Veronika HAKOBYAN, "European Integration" NGO, Co-ordinator of Projects
Ms Hasmik HAMBARDZUMYAN, Armenian State University of Economics, Lecturer
Ms Zaruhi HARUTYUNYAN, Enterprise Incubator Foundation, Yerevan, Leading Specialist/Translator
Mr Ruben HAYRAPETYAN, Armenian State University of Economics, Lecturer; "Elola" CJSC, Deputy Director
Ms Hasmik HOVHANNISYAN, "ARMEDIA" Information – Analytical Agency, Website Co-ordinator
Mr Vache KALASHYAN, "Union of Armenian Government Employees" NGO, President
Ms Anna KARTASHYAN, Embassy of the Republic of Bulgaria in Armenia, Administrative Assistant to the Ambassador/Translator
Mr Hovhannes KOSYAN, "AR" TV, News Presenter; "INTERFAX", permanent anchor in Armenia
Mr Vardges MANUKYAN, Director for the Inter-Church Relations Department of the Mother See of Holy Etchmiadzin, Ecumenical Officer, Armenia
Ms Yevgenia MANUKYAN, "Press Club Ararat" NGO, Programme Manager
Mr Ruben MEHRABYAN, "Ignatsia" LLC, Director
Ms Narine MELIKYAN, "Ashtarak-kat" Company, Deputy Chairman of Board of Director
Mr Yeznik MIRZOYAN, Yerevan State University, Deputy Director of YSU Library
Ms Elina MKRTUMYAN, Yerevan School of Political Studies, Project Co-ordinator
Mr Paruyr NALBANDYAN, National Assembly of the Republic of Armenia, Assistant to MP, Lawyer; Gyumri State Pedagogical Institute, Lecturer of Law

Mr Aram NAVASARDYAN, Armenian Marketing Association, President

Ms Hasmik OHANYAN, Multi Media Kentron TV CJSC, Journalist

Mr Tigran PETROSYAN, "ARMEDIA" Information – Analytical Agency, Journalist/Analyst

Ms Yeghisabet PETROSYAN, "Millennium Challenge Account – Armenia" SNCO, Office Manager

Mr Mkrtich PROSHYAN, Gevorgyan Theological Seminary, Director

Mr Ruben SAFARYAN, "Sky Media" LLC, Director

Mr Davit SANASARYAN, National Assembly of the Republic of Armenia, Assistant to MP, Lawyer

Mr Aram SARGSYANTS, "Zeytun" Cultural Centre, President

Mr Vahagn SAROYAN, Institute of Physical Culture, Lecturer

Ms Kristine SUKIASYAN, Multi Media Kentron TV CJSC, Journalist / Commentator

Ms Sona TOROSYAN, Public TV of Armenia, the Host of Hailur Information Service

Mr Artem YERKANYAN, "Shant" TV, Political Analyst

Ukrainian School of Political Studies

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

Ms Olga AIVAZOVSKA, "Member of the Board and Information Director of the OPORA Non-Governmental Network, Editor-in-Chief of the Point of OPORA All-Ukrainian Printed Publication"

Mr Dmytro ANOPCHENKO, News Presenter of the Inter TV Channel

Mr Dmytro ARABADZHYIEV, Head of the Administrative Section of the Secretariat of Zaporizhzhia Oblast State Administration

Mr Vyacheslav BEZRUK, Director of Kyiv Branch of CMA CGM Shipping Agencies Ukraine

Mr Volodymyr BOGATYR, Deputy Minister of Justice of Ukraine

Ms Tetyana BONDARENKO, Head of the Department of Journalism, Advertising, and PR-Technologies of Cherkasy National University named by Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, Member of the Board of the Media Professional Association of Regional Journalists, Expert of the Media Law Institute

Mr Denys BUGAY, Lawyer, Partner of the Vashchenko, Buhai and Partners

Ms Olena CHERNEZHENKO, Assistant to the Swiss Ambassador to Ukraine

Ms Lesia CHMIL, Founder and Managing Partner of the BREEZE Company, Member of the Garnet Working Group to Democracy through Private Sector

Ms Nataliya DATCHENKO, Deputy Director of the Regional Office, Luhansk Regional Office of the Ukrainian Social Investments Fund, Head of Luhansk City Office of Viche Ukrainy All-Ukrainian NGO

Ms Ilona DOVGAN, News Presenter of the 1+1 TV Channel

Ms Anna GULEVSKA, Director of the Ukrainian Benefactor Forum, President of the Association of Guides of Ukraine (All-Ukrainian Children Organisation)

Mr Oleksandr ILKOV, Deputy Head of the Main Service of the Presidential Secretariat, Head of the Department for Relations with the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine and the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine

Mr Andriy IVANETS, Chief Consultant of the Analysis and Information Service of the President's Representative Office in Crimea

Mr Mykola IVANIUK, Deputy Mayor of Lutsk City, Executive Officer of the Executive Committee of Lutsk City Council

Mr Valentyn KHARLOV, Deputy General Director for Legal Issues of the Auto Standard Ukraine Ltd.

Mr Yuriy KHRYSTYANOVYCH, Deputy Head of the Secretariat of Donetsk Oblast Organisation of the Union of the Youth of the Ukrainian Regions (All-Ukraine Youth Organisation), Commercial Director of the Alsart Group LLC

Ms Kateryna KOTENKO, Executive Director of the Industrial TV Committee

Ms Natalya LAPARDINA, Chairman of the Board of the Social and Economic Strategies and Partnerships NGO Association

Ms Olga LEBEDYNSKA, Deputy Head of Section for Territorial Organisation of Authorities and Local Self-governance, Regional Policy Department, Secretariat of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine

Mr Sergiy LYASHCHENKO, Chairman of Synelnikivska District State Administration of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast

Ms Svitlana MATVIENKO, Information Manager of the Ukrainian School of Political Studies

Mr Taras MYKOLAIIENKO, Adviser to the Member of Parliament of Ukraine

Mr Ayder OSMANOV, Managing Partner of the PiaRt LLC

Ms Oleksandra PAVLENKO, Lawyer, Partner of the Pavlenko and Poberezhniuk Law Group

Mr Andriy PROKOPENKO, Director of the Social Development Processes Institute, Owner and Editor-in-Chief of the Lobbying.com.ua Internet Journal

Mr Dmytro SENNYCHENKO, Managing Director of the Parkridge Company (UK) in Ukraine, Member of Obukhiv Town Council, Member of the Permanent Commission for Municipal Economy

Mr Dmytro SHULGA, Senior Manager of the European Programme of the International Renaissance Foundation

Mr Oleksandr SOLONTAY, Member of Zakarpattia Oblast Council, Expert of the Political Education Institute

Mr Oleksandr SYNOOKYI, Deputy Chairman of the Board of the Agency for Legislative Initiatives

Ms Viktoriya TALASHKEVYCH, Manager of the All Kirovohrad Media Group, Co-ordinator of Kirovohrad Reform Press Club

Ms Olga TUNII, Press Secretary of the Ukraine Presidential Foundation of Leonid Kuchma

Ms Iuliia TYSHCHENKO, Chairman of the Board, Manager of the Programmes for the Civil Society Development, the Ukrainian Independent Centre for Political Studies

Mr Yury VAKHEL, Deputy General Director for Legal Issues and Business Development of the Noble Resources Ukraine LLC

Mr Dmytro VOLOSHENKOV, Member of the 5th Parliament, Member of the Executive Committee of Odesa City Council, Head of Odesa City Organisation of the Party of Regions

Mr Yuriy YAREMCHUK, First Deputy Head of Krasnopillia District State Administration, Member of District Council, Chairman of the District Council Commission for Social Protection, Education, Public Health Care, Youth, and Sport

Ms Olga IURKOVA, Editor-in-Chief of the Newspapers of the RIA Media Corporation

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

Ms Oleksandra ZAYARNA, Manager for Corporate Social Responsibility of the System Capital Management (SCM), Co-Chairman of the Committee for Corporate Social Responsibility of the European Business Association

Baku Political Studies Programme

Mr Ilgar MAMMADOV, Director of the Baku Political Studies Programme

Mr Rufat ABBASOV, Public Relations Officer, Azercell Telecom LLC

Mr Yunus ABDULOV, Assistant to the Chairman of Azerbaijan Association of Bankers

Mr Khalid AGALIYEV, Programme Co-ordinator, Media Rights Institute

Ms Aygun AGHAMIRZOYEVA, General Manager, The World of Carpets Association, Guba, Azerbaijan

Ms Farida AKHUNDOVA, Head of Investor Relations Department, Azerbaijan Investment Company

Mr Namig ALIYEV, TV news presenter, correspondent, ATV

Ms Dinara ALIYEVA, Head Specialist, Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights of Azerbaijan

Ms Liaman ALIYEVA, Network Officer, BPSP Alumni Network

Mr Ilgar ALLAHVERDIYEV, Leader of the Cuma Mosque Religious Community

Ms Nigar ARPADARAI, Press and Information Officer in EC delegation to Azerbaijan

Mr Hamlet BABAYEV, Deputy Head of Institutional & Analysis Division, the National Central Bureau of ICPO – Interpol in the Republic of Azerbaijan

Mr Elnur BAIMOV, IT business network owner

Ms Elnura CIVAZADA, Head of Baku office, BayernLB; Thelen Reyners & Trepte Legal & Financial Advisors GmbH

Ms Vafa FATI-ZADA, Grants Manager, US Embassy Baku

Ms Aytan GAHRAMANOVA, Programme and Policy Officer, OXFAM Azerbaijan

Ms Gulnaz GULIYEVA, Press/Reporting Officer, International Committee of the Red Cross Office in Baku

Ms Maryam HAJI-ISMAYILOVA, Programme Assistant, Elections and Human Rights, OSCE Office in Baku

Mr Mushfig JAFAROV, Programme Manager, Bridge to the Future Youth Union

Ms Vafa JAFAROVA, Leader of Dalga Youth Movement

Ms Nigar KOCHARLI, Owner, "Ali and Nino" bookstores chain

Mr Ruslan MAHAMMADLI, CEO, VTB-Azerbaijan commercial bank

Mr Ziya MAJIDLI, Radio talk show presenter, Radio Liberty

Mr Elsevar MAMMADOV, Political Programme Assistant, IRI

Ms Ulviyya MAMMADOVA, Executive Director, Public Union for Gender Equality and Women's Initiatives

Mr Fuad MAYILOV, Chief Consultant, the Civil Service HR Recruitment Department of the Civil Service Commission under the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan

Mr Mehman MEHDIYEV, TV news presenter, correspondent, Lider TV

Mr Tahir MIRKISHILI, CEO and owner, ULTRA Company

Mr Elshan MUSAYEV, Founder of the Azeri Times newspaper and Caspian Investment Centre, Chairman of Board of Azerbaijan Franchise Association

Mr Ramig MUSTAFA, Deputy Chairman of Badamdar Municipal Council

Mr Ismayil RAFIYEV, Country Director, U.S. Civilian Research and Development Foundation

Mr Emil RZAYEV, Senior Consultant, Booz Allen Hamilton

Mr Ramil RZAYEV, Adviser, 1st Territorial Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Ms Yelena SIDORENKO, TV news presenter, correspondent, ANS TV

Mr Yashar ZEYNALOV, World Bank-Azerbaijan, Programme for International Student Assessment, Data Manager, Sociologist and Consultant

School of Political Studies of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Mr Esad MAVRIC, Co-ordinator of the School of Political Studies of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Mr Dario ATIJAS, SG of the Jewish community in RS

Ms Samira AVDIC, Municipality Council Member, Bratunac, member of SDP Presidency Board

Ms Dajana BAKIC, SG of NGO Revolt and member of SDP

Mr Goran BERA, Member of PDP political party board, Paolo intesa bank- Banja Luka

Mr Marko BOKSIC, HDZ 1990 youth presidency, President of Student Association, Mostar University student

Mr Branislav BORENOVIC, MP-RS National assembly, Deputy President of PDP

Ms Martina BOSNJAK, HDZ youth presidency, student

Mr Nebojsa BULIC, Councillor, Banja Luka city, SNSD political party

Mr Edin COLIC, LDP political party, Vice-President

Mr Semsudin DEDIC, PM of USK canton, Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Mr Nerin DIZDAR, President of "Youth forum Stolac" NGO, Professor of English, Mostar University

Ms Zumreta DIZDAREVIC, Councillor, Municipality Novi Grad, SBiH political party

Ms Nermina GUSO, Councillor, Municipality Novi Grad, SBiH political party

Ms Amila KARACIC, Vice-President of SDA youth, Assistant at the Ministry of Civil Affairs

Mr Muamer HODZIC, Councillor, Municipality Centre Sarajevo, Head of cabinet

Mr Adi KOLASEVIC, Assistant, School of Political Studies of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Mr Djordje KRAJISNIK, Member of Nasa stranka political party, Student

Ms Maja KREMENOVIC, Secretary General of the Council of Minorities of RS

Ms Ines KUBUROVIC, Member of GDS political party, student

Mr Milos LAKIC, PDP youth presidency, student

Ms Spomenka LJUBIC, Professor, Faculty of journalism, University of Mostar

Mr Sasa MAGAZINOVIC, MP, FBiH Parliament, member of the SDP Presidency Board

Mr Vlatko MARINOVIC, HDZ Youth President, employed in “Elektrobosna HB”
Mr Damir MASIC, MP, FBiH Parliament, SDP BiH Spokesman
Mr Darjan NIKIC, HDZ youth presidency member, student
Ms Emina OMANOVIC, member of GDS political party, student
Ms Suzana PEHAR, Journalist, *Hercegovacke novine* daily newspaper
Ms Antonela PRIMORAC, Councillor, Municipality Ljubuski
Ms Ana PULIJIC, Musician, Student
Mr Bojan PUSIC, HDZ youth presidency, chairman of NGO Kairos
Mr Rajko ROMIC, Councillor, Municipality Laktasi
Mr Dejan SAINOVIC, Journalist, *Nezavisne Novine* daily newspaper
Mr Erdal SELMANOVIC, Chief of Cabinet of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina President
Mr Senad SEPIC, Deputy Minister of MCA BiH, Vice-President of SDA political party
Ms Sandra STANKOVIC, PDP youth presidency, student
Mr Slavisa STOJAKOVIC, Councillor, Municipality Laktasi
Ms Anita SUNJIC, Musician, student
Mr Marko VIDA KOVIC, Municipality council member, SNSD political party
Mr Danijel VIDOVIC, Mostar City Council President
Ms Vesna VLASIC-JUSUPOVIC, Member of Nasa stranka political party, PR
Ms Sanja ZUNIC, Councillor, Banja Luka city, SNSD political party

Albanian Academy of Political Studies

Mr Olsi DEKOVI, Director of the Albanian Academy of Political Studies
Ms Liliana ALIMETA-CANO, Chief of contracts and procedures for donors, EU, IPA Assistant Ministry of Finance
Mr Hysni AHMETAJ, Advisor at Integration Ministry
Mr Redi BADUNI, Head of Youth Forum, Republican Party
Mr Urim BAJRAMI, Editor in chief, SHQIP newspaper
Ms Elira CANGA, Journalist, *Gazeta Shqiptare* newspaper
Ms Elira CANGA, Head of department, Albanian Competition Authority
Mr Ermal GJINAJ, Head PR department at the Ministry of Economy
Ms Rezarta GODO, Brain Gain Programme Associate, Council of Ministers
Ms Plejada GUGASHI, Programme manager of the OLOF Palm International Center AL
Ms Entela HAMITI, Socialist Party
Ms Albana HANA, Specialist and Co-ordinator at the Ministry of Integration
Mr Genc HOXHA, Vodafon AL
Mr Gentian ISLAMI, Urban Planning Director, Kucova Municipality

Ms Mimoza KOCIU, Spokesperson of the President of Albania
Mr Blerim KOLA, Editor in chief, Naser TV
Mr Gentian MANO, World Vision Librazhd, ADP Manager
Ms Sonila MECO, Journalist, KLAN TV
Ms Gerta META, Executive Director, Society for Democratic Culture NGO
Ms Ledi MUCA, Co-ordinator of the Albanian Academy of Political Studies
Ms Beti NJUMA, Journalist, Top Channel
Mr Eugen PEPA, Legal Advisor at the Albanian Parliament
Ms Admir POCI, Goethe Institute
Ms Ingrid PRIZRENI, Publishing House "Media Print"
Mr Plarent RUKA, Advisor at the Ministry of Health
Ms Erinda SHAH, G99 movement
Mr Adrian SHEGA, Asst. Lawyer, TLAS NGO
Ms Ardita SHEHAJ, Head of Department, Albanian Competition Authority
Mr Edvin SHVARC, Director of Public Information & Protocol of the AL President
Mr Redi SKENDERAJ, KOHA TV Journalist
Mr Ilir TOPI, Youth Forum of the Democratic Party
Ms Elsa TOSKA, Judge Advisor, Constitutional Court
Ms Anna XHEKA, Director of Equal Opportunities Department at the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities

School of Democratic Leadership (Montenegro)

Mr Boris RAONIC, Director of the School of Democratic Leadership
Mr Samir AGOVIC, Municipality of Pljevlja, President of Municipal Parliament
Mr Veselin BAJCETA, MANS, technical director
Ms Antonella BALIC, Government's office for cooperation with NGOs, DPS member of Youth wing Presidency
Mr Milos BIGOVIC, Movement for changes, member of Presidency, MP
Mr Boris BOGDANOVIC, SNP, advisor of Secretary General
Mr Aleksandar DEDOVIC, Alfa centre, Executive Director
Mr Nik GJELOSHAJ, AA, member of Presidency
Mr Zeljko GOLUBOVIC, Peoples party, member of Main board
Mr Zoran GOSPIC, MP, DPS member of Main board
Mr Ervin IBRAHIMOVIC, Bosniak Party, member of Presidency
Mr Nikola JANJUSEVIC, SDP, president of Municipal board in Nikšić
Ms Snezana JONICA, SNP, MP, Secretary of Executive Committee

Mr Ismet KALLABA, Koha Javore, journalist

Ms Ena KATANA, NDC, administrative manager

Ms Milica KOVACEVIC, CDT, Spokesperson

Ms Snezana KRSMANOVIC, Municipality of Pljevlja, Chapter for development

Ms Jelena KULIDZAN, TV IN, journalist

Mr Branislav MANDIC, Vijesti, journalist

Ms Jelena MRDAK, NDI, Co-ordinator of Parliamentary programme

Mr Genci NIMANBEGU, MP, Forca, Ulcinj business alliance, Executive Director

Mr Milisav POPOVIC, Municipality of Podgorica, Mayors' advisor for European integrations

Ms Jelena RADENOVIC, SNP, chief of MPs in local Municipality of Danilovgrad

Mr Branislav RADULOVIC, Member of Senat of State Audit Institution

Ms Magdalena RAICKOVIC, TVCG, journalist

Mr Boris RISTOVIC, School of Democratic Leadership, Staff member

Mr Sean SADIKOVIC, Journalist of Monitor, Radio Free Europe and TV Vjesti

Mr Sergej SEKULOVIC, Movement for changes, member of Presidency, MP in Municipality of Podgorica

Ms Zeljka VUKSANOVIC, SDP, member of Presidency

Mr Rados ZECEVIC, NOVA, president of Municipal board in Podgorica

Mr Predrag ZENOVIC, Logos, Co-ordinator, Winner of serial "We are choosing leader"

Mr Drazen ZIVKOVIC, Dan, journalist

East European School of Political Studies (Belarus)

Mr Aleksander DABRAVOLSKI, Director of the East European School of Political Studies

Mr Dzmitry ANANYEU, Belarusian State University of Physical Culture and Sport, Chief of Chair of Tourism

Ms Alena ANANYEVA, "BELARUSKALY" State Enterprise, Deputy Head of Department

Mr Dzianis ARDABATSKI, "Intransition" JSC, Business Analyst

Mr Andre BANDARENKO, "Belvysotstroigroup" Ltd., Business Consultant

Ms Enira BRONITSKAYA, Committee of Repressed People Protection "Solidarity"

Ms Volha CHAICHYTS, Smolevichi Palace of Culture, Head of Theatre Section

Mr Aliaksandr CYARGEENKA, "Young Democrats" NGO, Deputy Chairman

Ms Yuliya DARASHKEVICH, "Nasha Niva" Newspaper, Journalist and Photographer

Mr Pavel DRUHAKOU, Belarusian State Agricultural Academy, Associate Professor, PhD

Mr Dmitri DUDI, "BELARUSBANK" JSC, Dealer of the Management Department

Mr Alexsei GOLONTSOV, International Educational NGO "ACT", Board Member

Ms Olga HARLAMOVA, International Humanitarian-Economic Institute, Associate Professor, Svisloch Municipal Council, Deputy

Mr Yury ISTOMIN, Mises Research Center, Law Expert
Mr Anton KALINOVSKY, Acting Chairman of “Youth of Belarusian Popular Front” NGO
Mr Aliaksandr KASPIAROVICH, “Saving.ru” Ltd. (Moscow), IT Director
Ms Ksenya KHAMIANKOVA, “NP-Service” Ltd., Sales Manager
Ms Darya KORSACK, Committee of Repressed People Protection “Solidarity”
Ms Anna KRASULINA, www.expertby.org, Project Manager
Mr Dzmitry KUKHLEI, “Mostovdrev” JSC, Manager
Mr Hleb LEUSHUNOU, CIS Economic Court, Assistant of Law Procass Department
Mr Aliaksei MELNIKAU, International Educational NGO “ACT”
Ms Maryia NESTSERAVA, “Future in Common e.V.” International NGO, Freiburg, Germany, Chairwoman
Ms Natallia NIKANDRAVA, Ernst & Young FLLS, Minsk, Chief Accountant, Financial Manager
Mr Maksim NOVIKOV, Freelance-programmer
Ms Natalia OSTROVSKAYA, LG Inc. Representation in Belarus, Chief Accountant
Ms Valentina POLEVIKOVA, Manager of the EESPS
Mr Yauheni PUHACH, Belarusian Popular Front Party, Minsk Regional Organisation, Secretary
Ms Yuliya SALNIKAVA, EHU (Vilnius, Lithuania), Magistrant, PhD
Mr Aliaksandr SARNA, Belarusian State University, Associate Professor
Mr Ivan SHCHARBAKOU, “Sem Morey” JSC, CEO
Ms Volha SHESTAKOVA, “Komsomolskaya Pravda in Belarus”, Head of Department
Ms Alesia SHYBEKA, Law Consultant (was fired recently), EHU MA Student
Ms Yuliya TSERPILOUSKAYA, Mikalayeuskaya School (Brest Region), Teacher of German Language
Mr Dzmitry YANENKA, *Tovarisch* newspaper, Deputy Editor-in-Chief
Mr Mikhail YERMILIN, “ReSpect” Private Enterprise, Head of Technical Department
Mr Dzianis ZHORAU, Minsk Bearing Plant JSC, Head of the Audit Department

Organisation internationale de la francophonie

Mr Sébastien AGBOTA
Ms Amina BOUAYACH
Mr Floribert CHEBEYA
Honourable Vincent de Paul EMAH ETOUNDI
Mr Lazare KI-ZERBO
Ms Michèle Sona KOUNDOUNO
Ms Marie-Edith Douzima LAWSON
Mr Apollinaire MUPIGANYI
Mr Honoré TIEGNAN
Ms Alexandra VELEVA

Annex IV: Final Declaration

4th Summer University for Democracy Strasbourg, 6-10 July 2009

In this year, which marks the 60th anniversary of the Council of Europe and the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall, we, the participants from the Council of Europe's Schools of Political Studies, have reaffirmed our commitment to democratic values and principles such as the rule of law, good governance, protection of human rights, respect of identities and sovereignty, tolerance and human dignity. These values and principles became the cornerstone for the democracies that emerged in Europe after the fall of the Berlin Wall and we hope that the peoples of Europe will continue to uphold them.

We, the participants of the Fourth Summer University for Democracy, gathered from 6 to 10 July 2009 in Strasbourg to analyse and identify how, as the new generation of leaders, we could better work together to meet the main challenges of our time:

Consequences of the financial crisis on democracy

Despite the consequences of the financial and economic crisis on the functioning of democratic institutions, we are committed to the liberal economic system. Nevertheless, we should work together on establishing new mechanisms that would provide effective instruments of control over financial institutions. We would like to point out that today's crisis is not purely financial or economic in nature, but first and foremost a global crisis of values and trust of business, financial, and political leaders.

We must heed the strong voice of citizens demanding everyone, including intellectuals, to put their heads together to devise new ways of behaving at all levels – individual, national, regional and global – to introduce ethics, accountability and responsibility in their actions and their behaviour.

We consider that for all of our countries further European co-operation remains the key factor for peace and stability and a driving force for economic and social prosperity.

Identity crisis, international violence and the rule of law

Democracy is challenged by both the global economic crisis and identity crisis. Each of us has a plurality of identities, on which we build our future and that imposes us to respect our neighbours.

We believe that democracy has to be strengthened by the fight against international violence, stronger involvement of civil society and participative democracy at all levels. Terrorism is a criminal activity and can never be a political means of action. There cannot be any justification in using terrorist acts to solve the world's problems, or to impose one's identity to others. In this regard, when fighting terrorism, our societies must always respect all the fundamental rights, as defined by the European Convention on Human Rights and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights. We encourage the promotion of different forms of dialogue between communities and stakeholders.

Only through respect for diversity can society promote democracy, freedom and welfare for citizens. In this respect, organised crime, corruption and trafficking of all kinds constitute real threats to society and we call upon our governments and the international community to increase their co-operation and efforts.

We welcome the important contribution of the Council of Europe in all these matters and express our strongest support for this Organisation in its continued efforts to promote pluralist democracy, human rights and the rule of law.

Environmental challenges and political priorities

We, the participants of the Fourth Summer University for Democracy, believe that all people should have the same right of access to natural resources and energy. We believe that we are creating a welfare society, not only for ourselves but for the generations to come. The development of our society has shown necessity to adapt legal instruments for the protection of human rights, in order to extend the field of protection to the new generation of fundamental rights such as: the right to a clean environment, social rights, the protection of intellectual and privacy rights, bioethics, the rights of embryos, the use of communication technologies.

It is our responsibility to find solutions to the emerging environmental problems, in order to avoid their impact on security, peace, nature as well as to the survival of the whole of mankind.

Today, we see a growing awareness among people to search for answers, but a still comparatively low level of readiness to do so. Human resources gives us, together with technologies and know-how, promising possibilities to reverse the process of the self-destruction of our planet. Within this perspective, information and education are essential, as well as co-operation between economic leaders and society. However, corruption and fraud can affect decision-making and can make additional obstacles for sustainable development, preventing the preservation of the balance between the human race and Mother Nature.

Recommendations and acknowledgements

We, the participants of the Fourth Summer University for Democracy, believe that global challenges to democracy should be faced through advocating the rule of law and re-thinking the values that prevail in our world. The purpose of all public action should always be human beings. Responsibility and accountability must guide the new generation of leaders at local, as well as at national and international, level.

We would like to express our gratitude to the Council of Europe, the European Union, the French Government, the City of Strasbourg, the *Conseil Général du Bas-Rhin* and the *Conseil Régional d'Alsace* for supporting the network of the Schools of Political Studies, in particular the Summer University for Democracy.

We express our most sincere gratitude to the eminent personalities, speakers, experts and institutions who have selflessly contributed to making these past five days of discussions into an amazing opportunity for sharing experiences and ideas.

We would like to welcome the participation of our colleagues from Africa, within the framework of co-operation between the Council of Europe and *Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie*. This illustrates the universal character of the principles of democracy and the growing interest that the network of the Schools of Political Studies generates in Europe and beyond. We strongly look forward to reinforcing this co-operation in the future.

In this context, the establishment of the European Association of the Schools of Political Studies will continue to develop this unique project into a more extensive event at the international level and will reaffirm Strasbourg's global position as the Capital of Democracy and Human Rights.

We, the participants of the Fourth Summer University for Democracy, invite the Council of Europe and its partners to renew the successful experience of the first four Summer Universities and look forward to the Fifth Anniversary Summer University for Democracy in July 2010.

Strasbourg, 10 July 2009