

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
Third Summer University for Democracy
29 June-4 July 2008

Governance, powers and 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 author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Council of Europe.

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

Contacts at the Council of Europe:

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

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

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

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

Table of contents

Introduction: From Summer University to “Davos of Democracy”	5
Chapter I. Democracy and governance issues	7
1. Governance, discussion of the concept	7
2. Components of good governance	10
3. The challenges of good governance	12
Chapter II. Governance and globalisation	15
1. What is globalisation?	15
2. The search for global governance	18
Chapter III. Media, power and democracy	21
1. Independent media: a vital part of democracy	21
2. Protecting journalists and media independence	23
3. The new challenges for information professionals	25
Chapter IV. Europe and its neighbours	27
1. Eastern Europe, a region posing many challenges for Europe	27
2. European instruments for greater stability in eastern Europe	30
3. The United States, Greater Europe’s neighbour	33
Conclusion: The Association of Schools of Political Studies: giving the European project meaning again	37
Annex I: Programme of the Summer University for Democracy	45
Annex II: List of participants	61
Annex III: Final Declaration	81

Introduction: From Summer University to “Davos of Democracy”

“Our democratic health is as precarious as it is precious.” In opening the Third Summer University with those words, Terry Davis¹ sent out a strong message to all the participants from eastern and south-eastern Europe: the main requirement for democrats is to be vigilant. However, adopting a defensive attitude towards those who may threaten a pluralist system governed by the rule of law is not enough. In 2005, at the Third Summit in Warsaw, Council of Europe Heads of State and Government concluded that “effective democracy and good governance at all levels are essential for preventing conflicts, promoting stability, facilitating economic and social progress, and hence for creating sustainable communities where people want to live and work, now and in the future”.² The issue of governance, which is now central to all discussion of democracy, was therefore a relevant and topical theme for the 2008 Summer University of the Schools of Political Studies. Governance, power and democracy were the three headings for the discussions by the young political leaders from eastern Europe and the Balkans.

A step change is about to take place in the exercise of political power. Globalisation is revealing the weakness of democracies by limiting the power and influence of political leaders and thereby undermining their legitimacy. The challenges for politics are no longer confined to the national level alone. It is this need to manage human problems at all levels which leads us, according to Mary Kaldor,³ to talk of governance. In a system where the people we elect are now merely negotiators, how can fresh energy be injected into democracy?

In the opinion of Göran Lindblad,⁴ it is vital for elected representatives to keep their campaign promises if democracy is to thrive in the 21st century. Endorsing this moral imperative, Roland Ries⁵ said that more regular participation by citizens in the decision-making process was the key to modernising the democratic system and the secret of good governance. Local elected representatives must be able to “waste time” by consulting the public in advance so as to “save time later” by drawing up plans that meet the expectations of as many people as possible and are not subject to any challenges. Greater interaction of this kind between politicians and citizens demands considerable efforts in terms of education so as to avoid the pitfalls of demagogic. Meglena Kuneva⁶ saw good governance as a means of moving towards the knowledge-based society which Europe aims to become. In the words of the European Commissioner, “education will help us to take up the challenges of the future by enabling us to harness our human resources and make the most of our human potential. It is a priceless asset.”

This new democratic imperative requires specific arrangements or techniques in terms of representation, consultation, decision-making and evaluation. This point highlighted by Bruno Gain⁷ raises a crucial question which was explored in the thematic workshops. What can be done so that good governance ensures optimum participation by all stakeholders in the decision-making process without forgetting civil society or undermining the state?

1. Secretary General of the Council of Europe.

2. Warsaw Declaration, <http://www.coe.int/t/dcr/summit/>.

3. Director of the Centre for the Study of Global Governance, London School of Economics.

4. Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Sweden.

5. Senator and Mayor of Strasbourg.

6. European Commissioner for Consumer Protection, European Commission.

7. Permanent Representative of France to the Council of Europe.

Beyond this question, governance is a complex issue insofar as it calls for a comprehensive review of the state of our democracies and, more broadly, of society. It was necessary to avoid the trap of addressing the concepts of “democracy”, “power” and “governance” in isolation from one another. The Third Summer University therefore afforded participants an opportunity to play Rubik’s Cube with the three concepts through questions which President Filip Vujanovic⁸ put during the opening session. Where are the boundaries between power and democracy? What influence do power and democracy exercise over governance? However, as pointed out by Per Sjögren,⁹ these inextricably linked concepts have corollaries which are also the focus of much debate: the rule of law, the media, citizen participation, the fight against corruption, the legitimacy of politics and the relationship with globalisation. The new generation of political leaders must be aware of all these issues to be tackled in their countries and, more generally, on a European and global level. This applies both to longstanding democracies and to newly established states such as Montenegro, which was cited as an example by its President.

Lastly, the breadth of the subject discussed at the Third Summer University demonstrates the ambition of the programme. The Strasbourg Summer University for Democracy is set to become a benchmark annual event for all those working to establish and strengthen democracy in Europe and worldwide. It was in this spirit and with great resolve that François Friederich,¹⁰ supported by the Mayor of Strasbourg, voiced the hope that the capital of Europe and human rights would become the “Davos of Democracy”. “The plain of Alsace and the Swiss Alps, the leaders of the richest economies and the new generations of leaders from the former communist dictatorships, and the winter snow and summer sun all come together for these two annual meetings which at first sight are far removed from each other but actually are very close in their desire for constructive dialogue and exchanges.”

8. President of the Republic of Montenegro.

9. Permanent Representative of Sweden to the Council of Europe.

10. Co-ordinator of the Schools of Political Studies programme, Council of Europe.

Chapter I. Democracy and governance issues

Governance is a term which is now widely used, but what does the sometimes controversial concept really mean? What does it mean for the young political leaders from eastern and south-eastern Europe? What can the concept offer European democracies? As Jean Howiller¹¹ put it, governance is “a concept which is poorly defined but which, for that reason, seems to be the subject of consensus, as everyone can make something of it and put their own slant on it.”

However, the importance of the concept in political and academic debate cannot be explained by the vagueness surrounding the term. The reason governance has acquired such significance in current debate, in particular with regard to the future of the democratic model, is because it raises questions, issues and challenges. In this context, the main aim of the thematic workshops at the Summer University was to clarify the concept by considering its implications from an economic point of view and in terms of its impact on the democratic model. The participants were then able to look at the mechanisms of good governance and the challenges facing it.

1. Governance, discussion of the concept

Governance: a new instrument in politics?

The concept of governance has been omnipresent in academic and political circles for the last decade or so. In the 1930s, the term started being used in the United States to describe the management of major firms (corporate governance) and, from 1960 onwards, it was frequently employed in economic literature. It really came to the fore more recently, however, with the publication in 1999 of the first version of the Principles of Corporate Governance by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

The idea of governance has gradually taken hold in political debate and thinking and is now a concept of political science. Patrick Le Galès defines it as “the process of co-ordination of public and private players, social groups and institutions for the purpose of achieving specific goals discussed and agreed together in fragmented and uncertain environments”.¹² The challenge is therefore to strive for the optimum political outcome and thereby ensure that government is exercised efficiently and effectively. That means accepting an overall approach to the exercise of power which involves greater dialogue, consensus building and taking account of multiple interests. Accordingly, governance would be a response to the crisis of legitimacy currently affecting politics, which means that those in power can no longer rely solely on elections to justify their action and decisions.

Jean Howiller homed in on the relevant issues here by stating that it was “a new way of governing for the purpose of resolving complex problems, with overlapping but clashing interests, given that there is no longer a single source of legitimacy in the form of universal suffrage and election results that is strong enough to manage or, indeed, impose solutions.”

Good governance also offers politicians the opportunity to use new tools for boosting their legitimacy and fostering public acceptance of decisions taken collectively. The consensus method, which makes the relevant measures more widely acceptable, takes the place of unilateral decisions. “Political leaders, whether local, national or international, sometimes regard governance as a miracle solution to the voter abstention and the crisis of representativeness that is affecting most

11. Head of the Private Office of the President of the Conseil Général du Bas-Rhin, Strasbourg.

12. Hermet Guy, Badie Bertrand, Bimbaum Pierre, Dictionnaire de la Science politique et des institutions politiques, Paris, Armand Colin, 2005.

democracies worldwide”.¹³ In this respect, governance involves the establishment of forums for representation and intermediary bodies such as trade unions, which themselves, however, are currently experiencing significant decline.

Two years after the publication by the OECD of the principles of corporate governance, the European Union defined a model of “European governance” based on the five principles of openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence. The term “European governance” means “rules, processes and behaviour that affect the way in which powers are exercised at European level, particularly as regards openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence”.¹⁴ These five principles of good governance reinforce those of subsidiarity and proportionality.

Are governance and democracy compatible?

Does good governance lead to real democracy? Are the concepts of governance and democracy equally influential in western and in eastern Europe? The participants sought to provide answers here by studying the conceptual differences between “governance” and “democracy”.

According to Harald Wydra,¹⁵ in representative democracies, government is generally viewed as a “centralised and top-down relationship between order and obedience”. Direct citizen involvement in the complex system of political affairs remains relatively limited. Public policies are decided upon by democratically elected politicians. However, the latter often lack specialist knowledge in complex and sometimes highly technical fields. In contrast, the civil service and bureaucrats have the necessary know-how and institutional expertise but lack political legitimacy. The democratic system is based on power emanating from the sovereign, which, under most European constitutions, is embodied in the people. Fundamentally, this means that time in government is limited and involves temporary power exercised by elected representatives who are accountable to the public.

Good governance is viewed as an integrating factor aimed at specific problems, which is based on networks and divided into several levels. Unlike the above-mentioned vertical relationship, governance fosters horizontal relationships: leaders take decisions after co-operation, consultation and dialogue with a network of specialists or other players concerned by the issue in question. Partnership is a key factor here. The decision-making process based on consensus moderates the polemical and sometimes futile nature of debate so often found in political systems and compounded by sharp divides between governments and opposition parties. In Harald Wydra’s view, governance therefore involves power being exercised from below and the institutionalisation of negotiation, which leads to the “depoliticisation” of the decision-making process.

In east European countries, the relationship between democracy and governance is different. The Cold War created two blocs where the meaning assigned to democracy was radically different. The western part of Europe viewed democratic freedoms as non-negotiable rights, whereas the eastern part of the continent was denied democratic choices. According to Mr Wydra, the sweeping changes in central and eastern Europe in 1989 and then in 1991 proved that communism did not collapse solely because of economic inefficiency: “the influence of democracy over the public conscience led to various forms of dissidence and active resistance aimed at the establishment of independent states, the restoration of human dignity and, to a lesser extent, economic prosperity.”

The collapse of the USSR was followed by the emergence of post-communist capitalism, which quickly took the form of neoliberal governance. The communist states had a system of centralised redistribution, while the new model sought to achieve convergence with the capitalist democracies of the West. As state regulation was inadequate here, it had to be backed up by techniques based on governance. This was to transform “socialist citizens” into “active, mobile and autonomous individuals capable of making choices and running their own lives.” According to Harald Wydra,

13. Jean Howiller, Head of the Private Office of the President of the Conseil Général du Bas-Rhin, Strasbourg.

14. European Commission White Paper on European Governance.

15. Lecturer in Russian and Eastern European Politics, University of Cambridge.

there is a paradox in the relationship between governance and democracy here: “becoming ‘European’ cost some countries like the Baltic states dear, as they had to exchange newly acquired national independence for rapid enlargement of the European Union.”

It has proved difficult to put the theoretical approach into practice on the ground, however. The participants’ accounts showed that those in east European countries who seek to establish good governance are faced with many difficulties, in particular public apathy reflected in increasing disinterest in politics. The Ukrainian participants complained that political parties had become kinds of closed clubs which the public could no longer join. The promised reforms were being implemented only slowly and oligarchic tendencies remained.

The young political leaders from eastern and south-eastern Europe therefore see governance as a form of “leadership” or a means of influencing government at all levels in society. As pointed out by Antonella Valmorbida,¹⁶ governance as it is now understood can actually undermine democracy, as it is no longer really clear at which point in the decision-making process the decisions are taken. Nevertheless, the participants believed that democracy and governance were compatible, with democracy legitimating good governance. Their conclusion was that “Democracy concerns us all; change can only be brought about through action.”

What is the correlation between economic development and governance?

For around twenty years, most east and south-east European countries have seen sweeping changes in terms of political and economic management. The working session on Governance and economic power afforded participants an opportunity to consider the impact which good governance can have on a country’s economic development. That applies, in particular, to the countries which, following the collapse of the Soviet bloc, had to reinvent their economic systems and enter a highly competitive global market. Does a correlation exist between economic development and governance? Do improvements in governance automatically lead to growth and economic competitiveness?

Before answering these questions, Ante Čičin-Šain¹⁷ said that, in spite of the transition countries’ bad experiences during the Soviet era, many people still supported certain features of the system from that era. This was particularly true of universal free education at all levels, job security, free medical care and government-guaranteed pensions. At the same time, the advent of the capitalist system had left many people fearing mass unemployment.

Recent studies by organisations like the World Bank, which Shpend Ahmeti¹⁸ quoted in his statement, now show a high degree of interdependence between governance and per capita gross national income. This appears to underpin the idea that improvements in governance lead to higher incomes for individuals.

Good governance also seems to be vital to sustainable development and a healthy climate for investment. Donors and lenders recognise that aid will be all the more effective if the beneficiary countries have good quality institutions that are free of corruption. Transparency in the use of public resources helps prevent economic power being taken over by groups which would subsequently control the political process. Public sector management is an important aspect of governance and the latter clearly has a major impact on countries’ economic development. Budget management, budgetary transparency and the use of auditing make it possible to assess the level of good governance.

Partnerships between the public and private sectors offer European countries opportunities for good governance. The participants took particular note of the need for improved dialogue between EU members and candidate countries to help the latter achieve the relevant economic standards and implement the EU’s body of law.

16. Director of the Association of Local Democracy Agencies, Vicenza.

17. Former Governor of the Central Bank, Zagreb.

18. Executive Director, Institute for Advanced Studies, Pristina.

The concept of good governance remains vital to the political, economic and social development of the countries of eastern and south-eastern Europe. However, Ante Čičin-Šain warned participants about the obstacles to the application of the principles of good governance in the former Soviet bloc. At any event, the competitiveness of these states demands internal stability, which depends on the quality of the political elite and its management of the public sector. Good government leads to good governance which, in turn, will lead to economic development.

2. Components of good governance

Transparency and accountability, rule of law, active civil society: key principles of governance

The Council of Europe defined 12 principles of good governance in its *Strategy for Innovation and Good Governance at Local Level*,¹⁹ which Giovanni Di Stasi²⁰ mentioned in his presentation. The Third Summer University for Democracy provided an opportunity to consider the transparency and accountability which leaders must display in order to achieve good governance.

It is vital for citizens to be familiar with the political decision-making process: it is part of their control over politics. If citizens do not properly understand how political choices are made they will not take part in the democratic process. In this connection, the participants noted that the dilution of decision-making inherent in governance as it is now understood can be problematic. One reason for this is that the person actually taking the decisions is no longer clearly identified because of the consensus method. This has the effect of making the decision-making process more opaque. At the same time, establishing the accountability of decision-makers becomes more complex because, when decisions are taken collectively, it is difficult to hold individuals to account for them.

Moreover, as Shpend Ahmeti observed, the accountability of politicians and officials for their decisions is a vital precondition for the emergence of a strong government and an effective administration. The legitimacy of a political system is also based on its ability to respond to citizens' expectations and therefore implies the concept of accountability in a democratic system.

The rule of law was the second principle which the participants at the Summer University discussed, in the working session on Governance, representative systems and the rule of law. The efficiency of government, the protection of human rights and even, nowadays, the performance of markets depend on the establishment of clear rules which everyone is aware of, understands and complies with. The importance of the rule of law is indisputable, as it safeguards the stability of the economic, social and political system in democracies. Europe –both in the EU and outside – plays a major part in defending this principle. The young political leaders from eastern and south-eastern Europe recognised the importance of soft law and, more particularly, the Council of Europe's recommendations, which they wish to see extended.

Special emphasis was placed on not “copying and pasting” legal systems from one country to another. The rule of law can only be guaranteed in all the countries of eastern Europe and the Balkans if account is taken of each country's specific national features. The experience built up by west European countries and European legislation and the related legal standards are further tools available to the transition countries.

Good governance also requires the involvement of new players in the decision-making process. Civil society is coming to play an increasing role alongside politicians in the public arena. As pointed out by Jean-Louis Laurens,²¹ the key feature of good governance is the participatory process which makes citizens stakeholders in decision-making that affects them directly. Elections may not be

19. The principles of good governance set out in the Council of Europe's Strategy for Innovation and Good Governance at Local Level are as follows: fair conduct of elections, representation and participation; responsiveness; efficiency and effectiveness; openness and transparency; rule of law; ethical conduct; competence and capacity; innovation and openness to change; sustainability and long-term orientation; sound financial management; human rights, cultural diversity and social cohesion; and accountability.

20. Head of the Centre of Expertise for Local Government Reform, Council of Europe.

21. Director General of Democracy and Political Affairs, Council of Europe.

enough to legitimate all the actions of policymakers. Civil society organisations, in particular NGOs, play a major part in promoting citizen participation. That necessarily requires civic education and pluralist, high-quality information.²²

Gert-Rüdiger Wegmarshaus²³ pointed out here that taking greater account of civil society would allow for genuine representation of minorities at all stages in decision-making. This aspect is quite significant in east and south-east European countries, where ethnic issues remain vital to the security and stability of Europe as a whole.²⁴

In the course of this summary, it will become clear that good governance is essential for democracies because it ensures efficiency and strengthens legitimacy. Governance is just as relevant for local governments and local public services, which are closest to the public on a daily basis, as for central governments and supranational bodies.

The emergence of local players and the triumph of the local approach

With governance as its subject, the Third Summer University was bound to consider the issue of local political power. The thematic workshops highlighted the part which the local level plays in involving citizens in the decision-making process. “Governance is often inextricably linked with the concepts of decentralisation and the local approach,” to quote Jean Howiller. Taking account of the largest possible number of partners in policymaking, which is the distinctive feature of good governance, is particularly appropriate at local level and is regarded as a relevant and pragmatic approach by citizens who live and think locally, above all. The aim of good local governance is to involve the public fully in the decision-making process.

The participation of the largest possible number of people in public decision-making is ensured, first of all, by decisions being taken as closely as possible to citizens themselves rather than at national or European level. Local democracy offers citizens the opportunity to exercise their freedom and express their local identities. Against the current background of fragmented institutions, globalisation and Europeanisation, local leaders have the task of involving citizens in public affairs. The fact that France was cited as an example during the discussions, in particular by Jean Howiller, proves that even states in Europe with centralist traditions have transferred a significant proportion of their functions to local public institutions.

The introduction of tools that facilitate the direct involvement of individuals, enabling them to interact with politicians in decisions on public affairs, is the second aspect of good local governance. Many mechanisms for citizen participation in and oversight of the action of the public authorities are emerging. In France, for instance, neighbourhood councils are being set up in major cities, as are advisory committees on public services, in which public service users join together in “seeking out optimum efficiency in public action”.²⁵ According to Jean Howiller, these local examples illustrate “the change brought about by the concept of governance in the traditional balance of power between the public authorities and elected representatives on the one hand and civil society on the other.”

For Antonnella Valmorbida, the increasing part played by local authorities in the management of public affairs means that the term “Europe of regions” has been more realistic than “Europe of nations” for around a decade now. The various legal provisions and cultural aspects contribute to this approach. The experience and systems of local self-government in Europe cannot be properly understood unless account is taken of the key role which the legislation and institutions of the European Union currently play in European countries. However, the new powers assigned to local authorities mean that corresponding resources must also be transferred – something which still has not occurred in certain states.

22. See Chapter IV, Media, power and democracy.

23. Director of EuroCollege, Tartu University.

24. See Chapter I, Europe and its neighbours.

25. Jean Howiller, Head of the Private Office of the President of the Conseil Général du Bas-Rhin, Strasbourg.

In conclusion, and as underlined in the document presented by Violaine de Villemeur,²⁶ decentralisation or devolution strengthens democracy because “it enables individual citizens and local authorities to take on responsibility for the management of public affairs; it helps promote local development by providing local decision-makers with the financial and human resources for managing their areas as effectively as possible, taking maximum account of citizens’ needs”.²⁷ Good governance brings new players into the decision-making process. It moves away from the relatively limited and formal types of public decision-making and replaces them with a whole range of diverse relationships. This increases the number of players, which naturally throws up a number of challenges.

3. The challenges of good governance

Slower decision-making and more cumbersome bureaucracy

Good governance allows for greater participation by the various components of society in the decision-making process. The relevant dialogue necessarily leads to a new social contract, to use Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s term, which is facilitated by recourse to the consensus method. Technical obstacles, primarily in the form of slower decision-making and more cumbersome bureaucracy, can, however, arise.

As Jean Howiller observed, governance as it is now understood makes the decision-making process longer and more complex. The involvement of more players results in various committees, councils and other bodies being set up. “It is rule by experts. The number of consultations, meetings and discussions to draw up plans or projects increases out of all proportion. The many ways of involving society in decision-making also mean many ways of paralysing the system.” For example, in France, it takes four to five years to draw up a local development plan and 10 to 15 to build a road. The lengthening of the timeframes resulting from the more complex procedures also leads to greater legal uncertainty by opening up the possibility of appeals which can sometimes call projects into question. The involvement of different partners – whether political, administrative, voluntary sector or corporate – must not be exploited as an opportunity for each group to defend its own interests, but should entail their contributing to a joint decision-making process.

In addition, the thematic workshops showed that bureaucracy could be a threat to good governance. Vilfredo Pareto, Max Weber and James Burnham predicted the trend towards growing interpenetration of the political and administrative elites. Governance as it is now understood brings the confusion highlighted here by these social scientists to a peak. Technocrats seem to have taken power, primarily because of the withdrawal or discrediting of politicians. “The term governance hides the fact that a country is being governed by technocrats or specialised civil servants who actually should only administer public affairs under the orders of politicians,” said Christian Saves.²⁸

All east and south-east European countries are facing difficulties in implementing good governance. To tackle them, Mr Saves recommended a number of reforms: reducing the number of civil servants while improving recruitment and training procedures, introducing a stronger performance culture, implementing systems for evaluating administrative action and, lastly, making wider use of new information and communication technologies and thereby opening up opportunities for rationalising and simplifying existing administrative procedures.

The fact is that governance as it is now understood – both in its positive aspects such as the consolidation of good practices and greater consideration for the wishes of society and in its negative ones such as the increasing tendency of administrative bodies to act independently at the expense of politicians – reveals a major crisis of politics and, indeed, of its legitimacy.

26. Deputy Director of the Democratic Governance Division, French Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs.

27. Stratégie Gouvernance de la coopération française (French development co-operation governance strategy), Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs, Democratic Governance Division, September 2007.

28. Deputy Academic Director, Ecole Nationale d’Administration, Strasbourg.

Corruption and political party financing

The crisis of legitimacy affecting politics in modern democracies may be explained by two factors. The first is the public perception that elected representatives are unable to deal with the social and economic changes facing our societies. Corruption is the second reason for people's disillusionment with politics. The working session on Governance and the interaction of public and private players focused particularly on the latter factor, which seems to be a major problem in east and south-east European countries, judging by the participants' comments. More specifically, the issue was addressed from the angle of political party financing.

Over the last ten years, European countries have adopted anti-corruption measures, in particular through the common frameworks established by international bodies such as the United Nations, the European Commission and the Council of Europe. Much progress has been made in this area under the impetus of the media and civil society. Efforts to prevent and control corruption have gained importance and are now an integral part of the European and international agenda.

Political parties need funding, especially during elections. Most political parties in Europe receive public funding, sometimes extending to the partial reimbursement of their campaign expenses. Unregulated party funding opens the door to dirty money and leads to corrupt systems which undermine democratic principles. The work of the Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) and the drafting of common rules on party financing bear witness to the Council of Europe's efforts to promote democracy and good governance by combating corruption. Most European countries have adopted this system of regulation, which requires a strong rule of law to make it fully effective.

Alexander Seger²⁹ underlined that state funding should not be granted without conditions or without penalties for any breaches of regulations. In France, for instance, only political parties which won a certain percentage of votes received reimbursements. Transparency demanded that political party accounts should be public. Germany was quoted as a good example of the publication of political party accounts. Political parties should also act responsibly here and strengthen internal controls with professional accountants and party treasurers. Supervision of internal and external funding by bodies such as the anti-corruption office in Latvia was vital. Lastly, civil society and, in particular, the media played a decisive role in monitoring party funding and exposing scandals.

Political will – which the participants saw as a key factor – can therefore be exercised by introducing effective anti-corruption measures. Governments, parliamentarians and political parties must adopt and apply the regulations on party funding so as to increase transparency and accountability.

Relations with the private sector: the impact of lobby groups

Pluralism, which is a key characteristic of all democratic systems, enables different and sometimes conflicting interests to develop and compete. In these circumstances, citizens have always tried to put pressure on governments to obtain favourable decisions. Lobbying has institutionalised the relevant practices; it fosters citizen participation in the decision-making process. Lobby groups both exert pressure by seeking to influence policymakers and also produce the know-how needed for taking better informed decisions and thereby bringing about better governance.

At the same time, lobby groups are not always transparent and some of their methods can hide cases of corruption. In most European countries, the groups are not regulated. During the working session on Governance and the interaction of public and private players, it was said that there was a risk of lobbying undermining democratic principles, reducing the transparency and accountability of decision-making and compounding the problem of inequality in access to the law and policymakers. For some participants, lobby groups were a type of manipulation whose effect was to relegate citizens' views to second place in the decision-making process: "lobbying activities are on the rise in Europe, posing a growing threat to democracy." The participants from the Pristina

²⁹. Head of the Economic Crime Division, Directorate General of Human Rights and Legal Affairs, Council of Europe.

School pointed out that poor and vulnerable people are unable to defend their interests, and called for fair access to policymakers.

At European level, the issue of the regulation of lobby groups is addressed both through self-regulation and through the establishment of standards by the European institutions themselves. Alexander Seger presented the code of conduct introduced by the Society of European Affairs Professionals (SEAP). The society had established “high ethical standards” for its members, most of whom represented commercial interests at EU institutions. For its part, the European Commission has taken action under the European Transparency Initiative based on “the need for a more structured framework governing the activities of interest representatives” from the angle of good governance. Several key aspects of the initiative were highlighted during the workshop, including the establishment of a voluntary registration system run by the European Commission for lobby groups. In return, the groups are to be notified of consultation processes in areas of interest to them. The establishment of a common code of conduct for all lobbyists, or at least common minimum requirements, was the second aspect looked at by the participants. Lastly, they also considered the proposed introduction of a system of monitoring and sanctions to be applied in case of incorrect registration and/or breaches of the code of conduct.

According to Alexander Seger and the participants, civil society’s role in monitoring the activities of lobby groups is very valuable and needs to be further consolidated. Experience to date has shown that the regulations are only part of the efforts needed to ensure good governance. The regulation of lobby groups must take account of the need for balance between preventing corruption and promoting transparency and accountability on the one hand and the risk of restricting civil society’s direct involvement in decision-making on the other. Lobby groups have a legitimate role in democracy; their activities must be transparent.

Governance as it is now understood has altered the decision-making process and considerably boosted the influence of citizens, voluntary associations and businesses, as well as lobby groups. Good governance promotes the accountability and transparency of governments and government action, while also increasing the influence of local politics and thereby fostering economic growth and social progress in Europe.

Private and individual interests are now bursting into the international, national and local arenas of power. This new development is the subject of much debate. The concept of networks is gaining ground in the decision-making process at the expense of the traditional forms of the hierarchical exercise of power based on institutional prerogatives and legitimated by universal suffrage. As the decision-making process becomes increasingly interrelational, the difficulty lies in identifying the most representative players, who are not necessarily the ones who make themselves heard most loudly.

At the same time, cumbersome bureaucracy and the various forms of political corruption are major challenges for the establishment of good governance in European countries. They are a threat to the future of democracy in Europe. The measures set out above, namely improving the operation of the civil and public services, combating corruption, especially in the area of party funding and lobbying, and strengthening the influence of the justice system and the decision-making process in general are bound to breathe new life into democracy.

The technological revolution which has made the world a smaller place and speeded up the movement of capital, goods and services, human beings and information demands new practices in governance. Globalisation calls for European and international governance.

Chapter II. Governance and globalisation

The growth in the movement of individuals, ideas, knowledge and goods and services which we are witnessing today is part of a longstanding historic trend. Globalisation is not a recent development; it reflects the extension across national boundaries of the market forces which have operated for centuries at all levels of economic activity. The concept of “globalisation” now means the integration at global level of economic, financial, ecological and even cultural factors.

The term “globalisation” began being used more frequently in the 1980s, when technical progress made it possible to carry out international commercial and financial transactions more easily and more speedily. Globalisation is a historic process which is the result of human innovation and technical progress and which, according to Lars Kolte,³⁰ is leading to closer integration of economies worldwide on the basis of trade links. What are the main component factors and challenges here? How can politics deal with the process?

1. What is globalisation?

The technological revolution behind globalisation

The market fosters efficiency through the division of labour. This principle ties in with the theory of international trade described by the classical economists. David Ricardo’s famous example about port wine and cloth as an illustration of the trade between Portugal and the United Kingdom is several centuries old. However, his theory of comparative advantage, according to which each country should specialise in producing goods in the areas where it has the greatest comparative advantage, still applies to trade today.

What then are the necessary conditions for globalisation? Lars Kolte identified three factors which favoured globalisation. The first was the extension of transport and communications. The past 20 years had seen a revolution in the system of land and, above all, air and maritime transport. In illustrating his comments with the example of his own country, he pointed out that Denmark was the world’s biggest exporter of Christmas trees. The trees were grown in Denmark, but only from a certain stage in their development. They were planted in Siberia and then uprooted and, within 24 hours, transferred to Denmark and replanted. That would be impossible without air transport.

Knowing what was happening on the markets was another precondition for the globalisation of commerce and trade. The new information technologies, especially the Internet, meant political, cultural, economic and financial information could be disseminated instantaneously. It took only a few seconds to locate the cheapest goods which were available at the earliest opportunity and in large quantities. The Internet was a new stage in economic development and was comparable to what steam had been to the industrial revolution. Information management was therefore a component of globalisation.

Globalisation would have been impossible without the development of communication technologies. With mobile phones, it was now possible to contact London from Kamchatka to buy goods in Singapore. Regardless of distance, it was possible to carry out major financial and trade transactions by pressing a key on a computer. Communication was therefore the third major factor that had made globalisation possible.

30. Chairman of the Governing Board, Council of Europe Development Bank, Paris.

Lars Kolte also pointed out that access to information, cheap forms of transport and means of communication that opened up the entire planet were inextricably linked factors: “there can be no costly transport arrangements without logistics or communication.” Moreover, the various features of these three factors would be more useful in a more open, more mobile world without borders. There could be no globalisation if these conditions were not met. Communication technologies helped to foster global economic integration and weaken the power of nation states, giving rise to a new form of governance.

Weakening of nation states’ sovereignty and a new form of governance

The end of the 20th century showed that the traditional interstate arrangements of the 1648 Westphalian order are no longer adequate for coping with the emergence of new players. State institutions are unsuited to the development of increasingly complex, interdependent modern societies involving multiple players and demanding flexible forms of co-operation. In this context, to quote Bernard Boucault,³¹ governance is a “symbol of modernity and efficiency that is particularly well suited to the trend of globalisation”.

Globalisation entails new methods of governance which states must adapt to. A range of players now seem to be involved in decision-making processes, both formally and informally: states and government institutions, as well as businesses, NGOs and associations. Moreover, it is consensual solutions that are sought: decisions are now the result of negotiations and compromises that take account of the different points of view of those involved. According to Bernard Boucault, however, “this effacement of political power in favour of technical regulation bodies and the relegation of the state to the position of only one player among others do not fully reflect the actual situation which is still marked by conflict and domination strategies”. States have adapted to the new situation. They have understood that they no longer have sole responsibility for solving collective problems and that effective results can only be achieved with the involvement of different players.

A new type of governance is emerging, namely that of a “virtual state”, in the words of Steven Ekovich.³² This new type of state advocates co-operation and flexibility in its responses but also, and above all, the production of human capital. In the past, states adapted only slowly to change and found it hard to take action. However, today’s extremely dynamic markets force states to adapt very quickly. The “virtual state” is characterised by a tradition of relying on civil society, as seen in the United States. According to Steven Ekovich, American society prefers limited state intervention and a greater role for civil society. In the United States, a number of humanitarian, social and political functions of the state are assigned to non-governmental organisations.

Taking the example of France, Bernard Boucault described the emergence and substantial growth in recent years of public debate procedures for major projects, which had been accompanied by an increase in the number of independent bodies that ensured the independence of that debate. Accordingly, public action was becoming the product of a long and complex process involving many different players.

The state remains the main method of political organisation and representation, both at domestic and at international level, but is increasingly having to share its sovereignty with other players. It retains an arbitration function, which Bernard Boucault said was essential for overcoming any conflicts or opposing positions. At international level, the multilateral bodies which help regulate globalisation only have the power assigned to them by states. Moreover, it is democratic states which provide the basis for the value system underpinning the action of these organisations. Lastly, states are vital for combating one of the scourges of globalisation, namely organised crime and terrorism, regardless of the progress in international police co-operation. Ultimately, according to Lars Kolte, globalisation leads to better governance in democratic states. But what impact does it

31. Director of the Ecole Nationale d’Administration, Strasbourg.

32. Professor at the American University of Paris.

have on countries which resist the trend with all their force and cut themselves off from the rest of the world?

Globalisation: what impact on authoritarian states?

It is up to sovereign states to decide whether they wish to open up to globalisation or protect themselves against it, close their borders and withdraw from the international arena. That is the choice which Zimbabwe, North Korea and Myanmar have made. Yet this stance leads to violence, poverty and deterioration of human rights. According to Lars Kolte, making the political choice of withdrawal means no longer being part of the overall division of labour at international level and, consequently, being faced with a period of poverty. When the opposing choice of openness is made, it is necessary “to be flexible, to simplify procedures and to accept losing some control over information.” That is a choice which some authoritarian states find very hard to make.

Aiko Doden³³ gave a description of the situation in Myanmar which illustrated this point. The country, which had returned to the international arena at the time of Cyclone Nargis, was often, however, neglected by the international community, with little being heard about the disaster and the political situation there. Like North Korea, it was a country which the media rarely covered, as foreign media organisations were not allowed to operate there. However, the scale of the cyclone had brought the country into the headlines and revealed key aspects of Myanmar’s military regime.

Myanmar was often regarded as a “forgotten Asian crisis”, or a litmus test for gauging the commitment of the relevant players and the collective efforts to involve it in the international community. Globalisation had not reached Myanmar because the government had always been very cautious about its contacts with the outside world. During the emergency phase after the cyclone had struck, the government had refused international assistance, which it viewed as “interference in domestic politics” that could lead to the collapse of the regime. In Aiko Doden’s view, more subtle multilateral diplomacy reflecting the collective political will of the international community would be the best solution. The “Group of Friends” of the UN Secretary General on Myanmar set up in December 2006 had been working in this direction for two years.

Globalisation marginalises authoritarian countries and it would seem that it will ultimately gain the upper hand over authoritarian regimes both in Myanmar and in other non-democratic countries. According to Lars Kolte, it is impossible to control information in a globalised world. At Tiananmen Square in the late 1980s, the Chinese authorities had thought they had the flow of information under control. However, they had forgotten the development of the telefax, with which the rest of the world had found out about what was taking place. In only a few hours, the whole planet had been aware of the developments, which had complicated the situation for the Chinese authorities. During the democratic transformation in east European countries, the role and impact of the media was also substantial: the world was able to follow live coverage of the historic events, which generated a sense of solidarity within civil society.³⁴

It is civil society and the media which now have the responsibility for disseminating information throughout the world.

In the absence of a global sovereign power, it is essential to draw up rules for managing interdependence and reconciling the interests of the various players. The concept of global governance is emerging, the aim being to establish new methods of international regulation and integration. How can globalisation be governed without a global government? Does that role still fall to the United States?

33. Journalist, NHK TV, Tokyo.

34. See also Chapter IV, Media, power and democracy.

2. The search for global governance

Need for an international financial centre

As of the 1980s, technical progress and lower transport and communication costs led to closer and more complex international economic and financial integration. In the words of Yegor Gaidar,³⁵ the rapid economic growth which marked the 19th and, especially, 20th centuries and is continuing today is linked to the world adopting standards, in particular the gold standard: “a radical measure which led to economic growth.” However, even the most stable system of economic relations leads to radical changes, resulting in movements in the international monetary system itself.

The fact that this was not understood at the beginning of the 20th century led the world into one of the greatest economic disasters: the Great Depression. In a changing world, it is impossible to keep economic relations unchanged: a flexible system is needed. To avoid the destabilising fluctuations of the 1930s, a new arrangement, the Bretton Woods system, was established. Although formally tied to gold, it was much more flexible in practice. The system operated with low inflation and good economic growth. The Bretton Woods institutions (World Bank, International Monetary Fund) played a key part in it. According to Mr Gaidar, however, the relationship between the economy and the real world broke down again. When the United States abandoned the gold standard in the 1970s, very high inflation followed, in Europe and elsewhere. It is a repetitive cycle: a stable system must evolve and adapt.

In Yegor Gaidar’s view, the current system of international financial regulation had been suited to the reality of the situation in the 1970s. The factor taken into account at the time was the existence of two major economic powers which dominated the world: the United States with 75% of world gold reserves and western Europe with a conservative financial policy. The two controlled international finance according to “unwritten financial rules under which Europe and the United States managed world finances and took the major decisions, while other countries were forced to accept their power.”

Since the end of the 1970s, however, there have been substantial changes throughout the world, including, in particular, the emergence of China, Korea, India, Russia and Brazil. Other developing countries have seen very strong and dynamic growth over the last 10 years. Their growth rates are now much higher than those of the United States or Europe and their GDP is growing steadily. Under these circumstances, according to Mr Gaidar, it was not possible to preserve the system which had been developed at the time of the great colonial empires; keeping the old system would undermine long-term international financial relations.

Globalisation has involved many monetary and financial crises. The international monetary system has become hybrid and disorganised, with fluctuations in exchange rates between the major currencies and various recurrent crises, demonstrating the complexity introduced by the mobility of capital. Through its unexpected nature and the way it spread, the Asian financial crisis of 1997 showed the extent to which capital mobility could amplify shocks to the system and spread them worldwide. The roles and tasks of the IMF, the WTO and the World Bank are evolving with the growing economic integration, but they are poorly suited to complexity of globalisation.

While these organisations lay down criteria, it is important that they are authoritative and are capable of taking decisions independently without being manipulated by groups of states. Yegor Gaidar placed particular emphasis on the fact that these international institutions must play a fair role in the world, remain truly international and not just represent a specific group of countries. The “globalised” world needed real international bodies that were capable of adjusting to the reality of the current situation. The difficulty in persuading European partners was unfortunate, however. “If the Europeans do not do their utmost for these organisations to become truly international, there will be no alternative to these financial systems.” In his view, the international community needed a global finance centre so that economic and financial globalisation could be managed more

35. Former Prime Minister of the Russian Federation.

effectively. If such a centre came into being, it would have to represent all countries – that was one of the challenges of globalisation today.

The regional approach: a requirement for controlled globalisation?

The processes of economic integration and institutionalised regionalisation are interacting, giving rise to new types of governance. Globalisation offers new solutions for states and markets, by providing the technical resources which make for new ways of organising society. The importance of the relationship between globalisation and regionalisation to governance at international level is substantial. It is the main factor for change in the management of the economic order in the post-Cold War era.

The most striking feature of globalisation is the decline in national sovereignty and the transfer of governance to a supranational level. Political and economic agreements involving various groups of states, such as the European Union, the North-American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation Forum (APEC), have come into being, establishing new, supranational systems of regulation. In the case of NAFTA, the focus is on trade. For its part, the European Union is seeking to develop a regionally integrated economy based on a single set of rules. According to some economists, Europe's "closed" regionalisation contrasts with the "open" type that prevails in APEC.

Referring to Pascal Lamy, Bernard Boucault made a distinction between three types of governance: solid, liquid and gaseous. "Solid" governance represented government by a sovereign state with clear mechanisms for exercising power. The holders of public decision-making power were clearly identified and were recognised as exercising it legitimately. However, their scope of action remained limited. "Gaseous" governance represented the Westphalian order that was found in international organisations, which operated on the basis of unanimity of the member states. "Liquid" governance, which came in between the two, was like the European Union, an unprecedented type of body whose operating rules allowed majority decisions in a wide range of areas. The European Union was an institution which involved "a real ability to take decisions in a very broad area, while fully incorporating the rules of modern governance: participation by all players in public decision-making, consensus building, flexibility and pragmatism." Peace, respect for fundamental rights, the rule of law, solidarity and cultural diversity were the whole range of values which all its members signed up to.

Between global governance and nation states, is regional solidarity the key to shaping and developing globalisation in a controlled manner? The decline in the impact of national policies brought on by globalisation is making the regional level more relevant for managing global problems more effectively. Should states not therefore transfer still more of their authority to regional bodies with a view to managing the world economy more effectively?

Globalisation is very often regarded as a form of Americanisation. The fact that most global regulatory bodies are based in the United States played a major part in the development of that view. Today, global economic expansion is causing far-reaching economic and political changes. The globalisation of markets is now due just as much to Japanese savers as to American financiers, and the United States is no longer always the winner. Moreover, globalisation is facilitating the emergence of China and India, the United States' main potential rivals.

Although economic globalisation is fostering the development of certain emerging countries, it is widening the gap between rich and poor countries. Economic expansion is playing a part in compounding poverty in the poorest countries. Markets do not necessarily ensure that the wealth created benefits as many individuals as possible and contributes to the fair development of humankind. The assistance of banking institutions like the Council of Europe Development Bank is necessary.

The need for global governance stems from the need for democratic management of the major shared challenges affecting humankind as a whole. The emergence of an environmentally friendly,

sustainable development model is a clear priority. Yet nation states and the traditional forms of intergovernmental co-operation no longer seem capable of imposing a new model of global development. Global governance is therefore a practical necessity, but the relevant arrangements still have to be devised. Europe and the European governance model which is taking shape at present are a testing ground which other regions in the world may copy in future.

In a world where borders are disappearing, bringing human beings closer together but also greatly increasing fears of other groups, the media bear great responsibility and must take up many challenges. The democratic model is at stake.

Chapter III. Media, power and democracy

The separation of powers, which John Locke and Montesquieu described as a clear distinction between the legislature, executive and judiciary, is a fundamental aspect of the rule of law and all democratic systems. These three branches of power are joined by a fourth, which emerged following the development of freedom of expression.

Under the influence of liberal thinking and building on the idea of the separation of powers, the term “fourth estate” was coined at the end of the 18th century to describe the action of the press in society and their role in ensuring balance in the democratic system. Barely half a century later, in *Democracy in America*, Alexis de Tocqueville set out a new classification comprising central power (executive, legislature and judiciary), local power (the states), the voluntary sector (pressure groups) and the written press.

The current increase in information sources and the growing impact of the “entertainment society” now raise the question of the relationship between the media, politics and business. No discussion of modern democracy can fail to consider the role and legitimacy of the “fourth estate” and the new challenges facing media professionals.

1. Independent media: a vital part of democracy

Pluralism and press freedom in a democratic society

“I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it” – in the words of Jack Hanning,³⁶ this famous quote by Voltaire embodies the very principle of the democratic system. One of the vital requirements of any democracy is the existence of a public arena in which public opinion can flourish. Keeping that arena alive while ensuring pluralism of ideas is the role of the media in a democratic society.

Freedom of expression is the yardstick by which democracy can be judged. The democratic system cannot exist if the media are unable to exercise the rights, freedoms and responsibilities set out in the international legal instruments on the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Of particular relevance here are Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, both of which Jack Hanning mentioned. Media freedom is vital to democracy and the Council of Europe obviously sets great store by it. Andrew McIntosh³⁷ pointed out that the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe is active in protecting media freedom, in particular by monitoring the situation in all the organisation’s member states.

The essential function of the media must be to disseminate information and offer the public an objective picture of the news, politics and the activities of the government and the opposition. Journalists have a vital part to play in combating corruption and exposing broken electoral promises and cases of maladministration. This involves one of the key countervailing powers in our societies. Pluralism and a diverse media landscape are crucial for safeguarding democracy, while the concentration of the media poses a real threat.

Jack Hanning explained that cultural pluralism, “a fundamental ingredient of democracy”, required different cultures to be able to express themselves in the media. Societies marked by divisions and

36. Former Director of External Relations, Council of Europe, Representative of the European Movement International to the Council of Europe.

37. Member of the House of Lords and Rapporteur on Media Freedom of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe.

inequality or the exclusion of social groups on the grounds of their gender, race or origins were unable to guarantee democratic stability. Social cohesion was vital in democratic systems and the Council of Europe attached great importance to it. In advocating responsible participation by the stakeholders in society, namely the state, civil society and business, its work hinged on combating all types of inequality, exclusion and discrimination. At European level, the concept of social cohesion was especially significant, as it was through solidarity between Europeans and the reduction of economic and social disparities that a European identity was being forged.

The challenge for Europe in the years ahead was accordingly not only economic but also cultural and social, so that different peoples could be brought together while their diversity was respected. Journalists could and should help achieve that objective. “Diversity is an asset and Europe must not be a place where only a few people’s views can be heard,” was Jack Hanning’s conclusion. Economic growth and the fight against poverty and social exclusion are not enough in themselves to build a fairer society. Free and enlightened information and media pluralism are essential factors in tackling this challenge.

The media as forces for change in establishing a liberal democracy

In the 1990s, the hate speech in the media that accompanied Slobodan Milosevic and his “campaign of destruction” played a decisive part in extending the Yugoslav president’s power base and exacerbating hatred to the point of no return. This example illustrates how the media can be negative forces for change. However, the Balkans is also a region of Europe where the media have shown that they are positive forces for change. The analyses by Veton Surroi³⁸ and Zarko Puhovski³⁹ showed how the media moved from being producers of objective information to builders of the political changes in the former Yugoslavia.

The daily newspaper *Koha Ditore* and the media outlet *B92* played a “heroic” role in the post-communist era in the Balkans according to Mr Puhovski. The nationalist regimes of the 1990s had been able to win support by harnessing emotions. The independent media had countered with information, the aim being to reveal the truth about the crimes committed and raise public awareness. While the facts had initially been powerless against the weight of emotion, the war crimes were now being investigated by the police and courts and the public were aware of them.

In Kosovo, the media also played a part in the changes. Veton Surroi pointed out that *Koha Ditore* had been the first newspaper to recognise that there was an armed revolt in the country. In publishing information and creating a climate of openness, the media in Kosovo had fostered all the conditions conducive to the establishment of a state and its institutions. Analysis of this decisive role of the media during the transition period in the countries of the Balkans also, however, requires an analogy to be drawn with the post-communist revolutions where the media, after playing a part in the changes, came under the influence of the new authorities.

Whether they are democratic, non-violent or guerrilla movements, the forces for change seek to enlist the support of the media through a relationship of “natural influence”. When the media are involved in the process of change, the political authorities believe that, having joined together on the barricades, they have to work together once the transformation has taken place. “The Revolution is like Saturn – it eats its own children”.⁴⁰

The media are therefore a kind of countervailing force to state power. In disseminating information and fostering public debate, the written press, radio, television and now also the electronic media act as vital tools in modern democratic life. It is therefore essential for them to be free and independent of the public authorities.

38. Political analyst and editor of *Koha Ditore*, Pristina.

39. Lecturer, University of Zagreb.

40. Georg Buchner, Danton’s Death, 1835.

2. Protecting journalists and media independence

Political control over the media: a traditional form of domination

The issue of the relationship between the media and the authorities is not new. Indeed, it first arose with the emergence of the written press. History has shown the dangers of political domination of the media several times. During the Soviet era, the mass media were under the monopoly of the single ruling party. The press and the radio were used as means of disseminating state propaganda, leading to the development of what Vaclav Havel called the “parallel society” in which the “powerless” were able to express their views.

The accounts by the speakers at the Third Summer University showed that the situation in some east and south-east European countries has not changed much and the media have still not acquired the independence and freedom which they ought to enjoy.

In describing the situation in his country, Veran Matic⁴¹ underlined that the public broadcaster in Serbia was pro-government and several press organs were entirely under the control of the political authorities. The media were therefore divided into two camps – on the one hand, the pro-government media and, on the other, the independent media. The same goes for other countries in the region. In Kosovo, the government is still trying to influence and control the mass media. The government has a monopoly over advertising and can restrict its dissemination in the press. According to Veton Surroi, the government can subject private company advertising to various conditions and restrict it to a certain number of media outlets. This means that there is an “artificial newspaper market” in Kosovo, with most newspapers controlled by the various political authorities which ensure their survival without any actual competition.

The role of the media as vectors of resistance to authoritarian regimes and oppression is vital. However, being a journalist becomes a high-risk profession in this context. Veran Matic rightly stated that one can end up assessing the quality of a newspaper or a television channel according to the number of its reporters who are killed. In this connection, Veton Surroi recounted a personal anecdote: during the NATO campaign in Pristina in 1999, a western diplomat had asked Milosevic to ensure his safety. Milosevic’s reply had been curt: “Don’t worry, he’s only a journalist.”

This still applies today and journalists face many dangers. *B92* has often had to run risks: “everyone has to protect themselves and protect one another”.⁴² After being in constant danger during the Milosevic era, the independent media are now under threat from the mafia and neo-Nazi groups, as demonstrated by the arson attack at *B92*’s headquarters in February 2008.

Given the risks and dangers facing media professionals, the existence of bodies that defend journalists’ rights is particularly significant. In reply to a question put several times during the debate, Andrew McIntosh referred to the International News Safety Institute regarding physical safety and the International Association of Journalists, the International Federation of Journalists and the International Press Institute regarding political protection.

The risks and dangers affecting the media today deserve attention. How can they be overcome? How can a service free of manipulation be established? How can a media-friendly market be created where the media are not subject to political control? Those are the major challenges facing media professionals for the years ahead.

B92 is making good progress along this long road to independence and press and media freedom. In spite of the difficulties and obstacles imposed by the government, according to Veran Matic, it has become a “successful movement” and has increased its market share. In addition, there is now effective convergence between its three communication tools of television, radio and the website.

Given the new challenges facing the media today, namely the increase in the number of information sources and growing commercialisation, media firms need to consider how to safeguard their

41. Chief Executive Officer of *B92*, Belgrade.

42. Veran Matic, Chief Executive Officer of *B92*, Belgrade.

brand and keep the trust of their readers, listeners and viewers. Now that big finance is becoming ever keener on media firms, the relationship between media and politics needs to be reassessed. The commercial, profit-making media have gained the upper hand over the independent media, thereby calling freedom of expression into question.

Commercialisation of information sources: a new form of media domination

The development of new technologies and, in particular, the emergence of the Internet have increased the number of information sources and radically altered the media landscape. According to Veran Matic, this puts journalists under pressure. The process of “commercialisation” of media ownership is very pronounced at present and is a threat to democracy.

The Croatian weekly, *Feral Tribune*, which was renowned as a professional and objective press organ, had to close down in June 2008. The Croatian journalists’ organisation and other bodies were unable to keep it open. This shows how information comes under threat when commercialism and advertising become the main activity of the media.

In his novel, *Anna Karenina*, Leo Tolstoy wrote: “Happy families are all alike; every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.” In Zarko Puhovski’s view, this quote reflects the current situation of the media now that they are confronted with their own worst elements: the tabloids. Quality information no longer interests the public. It is scandals and “spicy stories” that people want to read about in the tabloid press. Even television news bulletin headlines now begin with crime reports. The BBC, which is often regarded as a paragon of quality, is also falling into the trap.

As Jack Hanning observed, disasters and spectacular items sell more easily. When asked once about the secret of his success, the founder of the *Daily Mail* had replied that he gave readers something to hate every day. Many believed that the British tabloid press were to blame for the situation. Moreover, Rupert Murdoch’s media empire had encouraged Euroscepticism by spreading myths and not exposing the distortion of facts by governments. Political leaders often blamed Brussels for unpopular measures they decided themselves.

But why does the public want tabloid news? For Zarko Puhovski, it was a matter of socialisation. People liked scandals presented as important information about public life. One of the participants from Montenegro explained that the situation of the media was a reflection of consumer society. Through the media, the political authorities tried to bribe the public, who actually preferred to be soothed by this type of discourse than to hear reasoning that would bring about real reflection. In this connection, Veran Matic stressed the part which society should play in condemning the lack of press freedom.

The vulgarisation and commercialisation of the media is an alarming issue. In condemning the trend, Zarko Puhovski went so far as to draw an analogy between the work of the state media under the communist regime and the self-censorship exercised by the press today for the purpose of protecting sales. Economic and financial conditions have a much greater impact on the media than in the past.

A triangle of interdependence is now developing between politics, business and the media. It took us years to realise that the people in the spotlight are often much less important than those in the background. Daniel Riot⁴³ demonstrated this by describing the situation in France marked by concentration of press titles and domination by private investors. Whatever the country, this trend inevitably leads to a reduction in press freedom. The interdependence of politics and the media is so obvious that people are talking less and less about democracy and more and more about “mediocracy”, with the media forming a new model for the organisation of democracy or, indeed, “dexocracy”, as could be said with reference to the power of the dominant current of thinking.

The vulgarisation and trivialisation of journalism is a dangerous pattern. The media landscape is changing today and the media are becoming “court jesters”. The issue of the commercialisation of

43. Director of the “RELATIO-europe” webzine, Strasbourg.

the media, which is now very sensitive, involves new challenges for media professionals and raises a very real question about the credibility of journalists.

3. The new challenges for information professionals

What form of supervision for today's media?

While freedom of expression used to involve struggling to protect the media against authoritarian regimes, citizens now have to stand up to the great power of the media. The latter no longer merely report the facts; they actually make the news. In a way, they are “king-makers”. Zarko Puhovski expressed concern about the inability to submit the power of the media to democratic supervision. The separation of powers allows for the emergence of institutional checks and balances, without threatening the individual branches of power. However, information sources cannot be supervised, as that immediately throws up the question of politics gaining a hold over the media.

Protecting ourselves against media excesses means putting quality before quantity and restoring the credibility of the work of journalists. That requires resources, as Veran Matic explained when describing the infrastructure limits that had affected *B92* a few years ago. As a Summer University participant pointed out, it could also be achieved through self-regulation by the media. However, manipulation of the kind practised by Milosevic, for instance, is a complex problem and is often an obstacle to self-regulation by media professionals.

External oversight therefore seems essential. For the French journalist, Daniel Riot, it is a key issue. He believed that only a representative high authority bringing together politicians and civil society was capable of taking up the challenge. However, a solution of this kind still seems far off, including in the most democratic countries. Debate and the expression of civil society's views are still the best counterbalance in democratic societies.

Lastly, the media can also work on their credibility by investigating past war crimes, for instance. In the Balkans, the investigations which have led to the arrest of war criminals have helped re-establish ties between journalists and readers, listeners and viewers. For this to be done properly, Veran Matic pointed out that co-production work ensured objectivity and meant that documentaries could not be suspected of giving biased versions of history.

The relationship with free information

Information technologies and media professionals' working conditions are undergoing far-reaching changes. The Internet is one of the key factors in this process. While it may be said that this new tool fosters citizen expression and democratic debate, some reservations do have to be mentioned.

At a time when citizens are being bombarded with information, it is vital to determine whether this trend is actually positive and whether it allows rational and coherent judgments as should be the case in democracies. Can individual citizens cope with the complexity of the issues and check the veracity of the reports? Alongside these key questions, as a result of the information overload, a belief is emerging that information comes free of charge. Yet high-quality, accurate information confirmed according to the rules of journalism has a price. Indeed, it is actually expensive. Daniel Riot deplored the fact that we “are getting more and more used to free information which we swallow whole while at the same time distrusting it. There is therefore a credibility problem.”

Globalisation involves a change in era and a change in speed; we are faced with total instantaneity in the media and politics. However, both of the latter require time for reflection between action and effect. Developments are coming on top of one another with little room for reflection. The trivial is taking over and proper distinctions are no longer being made between what is interesting and supposedly important and what has an impact on our future. In Veran Matic's view, the more media outlets there are, the more the real information sources become blurred.

The analysis of images takes precedence today: “we have to learn to decipher information; that is people’s window on the world.⁴⁴ Education has a key role in ensuring that people in future are able to master a development which the new technologies have intensified, namely the power of information which is also the power of misinformation. The whole of society is concerned here; training increasingly demanding citizens is the condition *sine qua non* for the modernisation and survival of the democratic system.

Emerging concept of the “citizen journalist”

The growth of websites, blogs and forums has given millions of people access to information, while also enabling them to express themselves freely. Citizens are moving from being recipients to disseminators of information or kinds of media outlets themselves. Does this mean that there will no longer be any need for journalists and correspondents in future and that they will be replaced by “citizen journalists”?

Given its various advantages and limitations, this concept meets with some misgivings among media professionals and gives rise to real debate about the very future of media and journalism.

Citizen participation in public debate is important to democracy. Veran Matic underlined that it was a means of generating trust between the media and the public. *B92* set particular store by it and took account of the general public’s comments. However, it is impossible for citizens to replace journalists. Moreover, media professionals have a duty to be cautious and check the information provided by the public before broadcasting it. It has often been the case that information submitted by ordinary citizens has been false or fabricated, as, for instance, with videos designed to spread rumours or trigger scandals. The idea that citizens can have a role to play in disseminating information alongside journalists seems positive, but it is difficult to put amateurs and media professionals on the same footing in practice. The code of ethics which journalists must abide by is a guarantee of quality which ordinary citizens cannot offer.

For his part, Daniel Riot found the term “citizen journalist” somewhat amusing, saying that he could hardly imagine a journalist who was not a citizen. “The increasing number of sources of information and expression is a good thing, but some clarification is needed. Journalists’ role is to pass on accounts and opinions, discover talent and ideas and act as catalysts. Citizen journalists become real journalists if they are able to put facts in perspective, as information has to be checked, analysed and put in context. That is a task for professionals.”

While some reservations must be voiced regarding information overload, the revolution brought about by the new technologies may also lead to substantial progress in information sharing and hence in public debate. That optimistic note was struck by Daniel Riot, for whom journalism has not yet reached its golden age. Given the challenges facing the media today, the role of journalists is increasingly difficult, and they are constantly having to adapt to ever more complex realities.

In opening public debate up to citizens throughout history, the press really have acted as the “fourth estate”. However, the growing emphasis on the production of entertainment in the media today calls for critical analysis of this “fourth estate”. The question remained open at the end of the debate. However, one thing was clear for the speakers at the Third Summer University: the press must act as the conscience of a society, defend cultural diversity and expose corruption and cases of maladministration.

The commercialisation of the media and the transformation of information into a commodity which have been criticised for over half a century but which nevertheless still apply today mean we must reconsider the role of the media in a democratic society. A very real question put by Zarko Puhovski could serve as a conclusion: “Will we learn from our mistakes or are we going to repeat what happened in the past under the eye of Moscow and what is now happening under the eye of London and the City?”

44. Daniel Riot, Director of the “RELATIO-europe” webzine, Strasbourg.

Chapter IV. Europe and its neighbours

The aim of the European project launched in the aftermath of the Second World War was to restore peace in a continent which had reached new depths of self-destruction with that war. 60 years on, the process of European construction is moving slowly towards a political union involving the emergence of integrated European domestic and foreign policy. The relationship between the two main European organisations, the Council of Europe and the European Union, and their respective neighbours is an essential aspect of their policies and actions.

The fall of the Berlin Wall and the increasing scarcity of resources have transformed the previous geopolitical landscape, and the Black Sea, the Caucasus and the Balkans are now key regions for the stability of Europe. At the same time, the direction taken by American diplomacy in recent years and the slow emergence of Europe on the international arena suggest a change in the shape of the relationship between Europe and America.

The establishment of a peaceful and safe world built around democratically elected leaders is the key challenge of relations between Europe and its neighbours. The Third Summer University for Democracy looked at this challenge from the angle of energy issues, the co-operation tools developed by European organisations and relations between the United States and Europe.

1. Eastern Europe, a region posing many challenges for Europe

Stability and security: the challenges on Europe's borders

At the end of the 1980s, the democratic transitions in east European countries that led to the break-up of the Soviet Union fundamentally transformed Europe's borders. The newly independent countries became a zone of economic and political influence for the European Union and an area whose stability is essential to its security. The most recent enlargement of the European Union in 2007 extended the organisation to the shores of a vital geostrategic region, the Black Sea. At the meeting point between Europe, Central Asia and the Middle East, this region rich in natural resources is a major crossroads for energy supplies.

While it is an expanding market, the Black Sea region also has to face many challenges, including outright and frozen conflicts, the existence of terrorist groups, environmental problems and inadequate border controls which encourage illegal migration and organised crime. These problems all raise the issue of security and stability not only in the region but throughout Europe as a whole.

The most serious problem undermining the development of co-operation in the Black Sea region is the persistence of confrontation between Russia and Georgia and between Armenia and Azerbaijan in particular. Following the break-up of the Soviet Union, the transformation processes in the countries of the former Soviet bloc triggered a series of regional conflicts which have still not been resolved.

Today, over 15 years after the break-up of the Soviet Union, the democratic transition process in these countries still does not seem to have come to a successful conclusion. Some conflicts remain frozen while others are of burning relevance. The region's very fragile political and economic stability must be of concern to Europe's leaders. The various regional meetings held as part of the Third Summer University for Democracy provided a general overview of the situation of Europe's neighbours and the challenges facing Europe on its borders.

In February 2008, Kosovo's declaration of independence marked the culmination of the break-up of the former Yugoslavia. This decision, which has not yet been recognised by all of the international community, brought a new reality to the region. Kosovo⁴⁵ is a state that remains incomplete in terms of its legitimacy and the functional implementation of its authority over its territory. The situation seems close to deadlock, not only as regards Kosovo but also as regards Serbia and even Bosnia and Herzegovina. Indeed, there is a risk of the issues posed by the emergence of Kosovo turning into a frozen conflict with many potential consequences for all the countries in the region.

The agreement of shared interests by the countries of the Balkans through tools such as regional co-operation is the only way forward for the region. Moreover, no change will be possible without support from inside, namely from civil society. In this connection, Hido Biscevic⁴⁶ mentioned that the Balkans was in a period of uncompleted peace, although all countries in the region were moving towards European integration in spite of the obstacles. Regional co-operation makes a major contribution to the process.

In the east, Belarus has shared a border with the European Union since Poland's accession in 2004. However, the country seems to be cutting itself off still further. Having been ruled with an iron fist by President Lukashenko since 1994, Belarus is faced with many violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms. At the meeting between the Minsk and Moscow schools, Stanislau Shushkevich⁴⁷ stressed the need to end the information blockade that had affected most citizens for several years. Moreover, Belarusian society seems to be divided between those who want to continue down the path of integration with Russia and those who want instead to open up to the West and European integration. Belarus is far from being a stable and reliable neighbour for Europe.

Further afield, Armenia and Azerbaijan remain fragile democracies. With regard to the two countries' progress towards democracy, the two experts, Karen Bekaryan⁴⁸ and Rauf Mirgadirov,⁴⁹ were not very optimistic, given the lack of media pluralism and of real opposition forces. Moreover, the Nagorno-Karabakh issue, one of the main frozen conflicts in the region, seems to be re-emerging following the independence of Kosovo. As Europe has geopolitical and economic interests in Azerbaijan, it is not in its interests to regard the situation in the Balkans as a precedent for the region. It should be noted that the development of the geopolitical situation could influence the European Union's system of security and its strategy in the region.

Lastly, the conflict-laden relations between Russia and Georgia have come to a climax. According to Revaz Adamia,⁵⁰ the lack of bilateral dialogue has led to a divorce between the two nations. Alexander Arhangelskiy⁵¹ said that, unfortunately, even the close, centuries-old cultural ties between Russia and Georgia could not ease the tensions between the two countries. The unprecedented escalation of the conflict in South Ossetia during the summer of 2008 demonstrated once again that these territorial conflicts affect both the countries in the region and the international community.

As Nika Chitadze⁵² observed, these separatist tendencies created a climate conducive to the development and spread of terrorism in the region. The separatist territories also provided bases for illegal trafficking, in particular in drugs. The "independence" or terrorist movements received support from some quarters in certain countries. Elsewhere, they set themselves up as de facto separatist authorities by force and/or corruption.

The region's instability also stems from its lack of cohesion. Iulian Chifu⁵³ set out the reasons from two angles. Firstly, there was what he called "integration": people still wondered whether Russia

45. All reference 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.

46. Secretary General of the Regional Co-operation Council for South-East Europe, Sarajevo.

47. Former Head of State of Belarus.

48. Chair of the "European Integration" NGO, Yerevan.

49. Political analyst, *Zerkalo* newspaper, Baku.

50. Former Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe.

51. Author and presenter of the Russian television show, "Tem Vremenem", Moscow.

52. Associate Professor, Tbilisi Ilia Chavchavadze University.

53. Centre for Conflict Prevention and Early Warning, Bucharest.

should be regarded as part of the region or as being separate. What interests did cities like Irkutsk and Vladivostok have in the region? Then there was the “asymmetry” in relations with Russia. Institutions which co-operated with Russia often did so in an unco-ordinated manner, for instance, the EU and Russia and NATO and Russia. In Mr Chifu’s view, it would therefore be desirable to foster relations between the Black Sea and Russia based on the same model, taking account of the Russian Federation’s strategic interests.

Many organisations are present in the region and employ various political and economic instruments. However, they find it hard to establish cohesion between the countries around the Black Sea. With reference to the example of the Organisation of the Black Sea Economic Co-operation (BSEC), Rauf Mirgadirov demonstrated the lack of prospects for regional organisations, given the divergent geopolitical interests of the countries in the region. That was mainly linked to the differences between Russia and the relevant countries about the issue of energy supply routes. That was why the establishment of “clubs” based on the convergence of geopolitical interests and the existence of a clear European perspective for each country could, in his view, help bring together the forces and resources for solving specific problems, in particular the existing territorial conflicts. It would also help to make regional co-operation more effective.

This part of Europe is still facing many problems and challenges, which need to be dealt with by the countries concerned with the support of the international community. It is only natural that Europeans should want to increase security in, and also develop, the fragile Black Sea region, as over a quarter of the European Union’s energy supplies cross the region.

The Black Sea: Europe’s energy hub

The Black Sea region is very important for the transit of oil and gas supplies from Russia and Central Asia to Europe. A large number of oil and gas pipelines cross the region, forming what could be called a 21st-century Silk Route. The Black Sea is now one of the busiest transit corridors worldwide. Millions of tonnes of oil are transported annually from Russian, Georgian and Ukrainian ports. Moreover, as the Caspian Sea is landlocked, the Black Sea is an ideal outlet for the export of resources from Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and Azerbaijan. According to Vladimir Socor,⁵⁴ the Black Sea is set to become busier and busier as a transit region as time passes.

Having been ignored for many years by both the East and the West, the Black Sea region came back into the spotlight again and took on real strategic importance at the beginning of the 21st century, in particular following the attacks on 11 September 2001. The analysis of this trend by Ognyan Minchev⁵⁵ and Vladimir Socor revealed the strategic interests at stake between the main players in the region.

For the West, it is essential to control the spread of radical Islam throughout the Middle East region in the broad sense, in other words, including Central Asia. American and European think-tanks are studying strategies for co-operation with the Black Sea region. Europe’s need to define a strategy for the Black Sea became acute with the most recent enlargement of the European Union. With the accession of Bulgaria and Romania, the European Union has moved much closer to the region and the “European club” of importers of hydrocarbons from the Caspian has expanded. Vladimir Socor even suggested that the Black Sea should be viewed as a strategic corridor operating in two directions: West-East for the projection of power between Europe/the United States and the Middle East and East-West for the transfer of energy from Russia and Central Asia to the European market.

According to Vladimir Socor, Moscow has also been demonstrating growing strategic interest in recent years, driven by the dual desire to prevent the penetration of western influence in the region and extend its own influence. Russia’s interest lies in thwarting western oil projects in the region. If additional oil reserves appeared on the world market, it would stabilise global oil prices and harm the Russian economy. Russia is also trying to keep the post-Soviet countries in its sphere of

54. Jamestown Foundation, Washington DC.

55. Director of the Institute for Regional and International Studies, Sofia.

interest; according to Nika Chitadze, many Russian political leaders find it hard to accept the loss of 5 million km² of territory following the collapse of the USSR.

Russia's strategy consists in monopolising energy supplies to Europe by forcing it into a more dynamic partnership. However, as Ognyan Minchev observed, that involved a partnership based solely on Russia's interests. While Vladimir Socor did not rule out the possible success of the Russian strategy: "if Russia succeeds, the West will be deprived of major strategic assets and the Black Sea countries will once again come under Russian influence", Ognyan Minchev did not believe in the success of Russia's approach at all: "the problem is that Russia itself does not have enough energy to meet European demand and exercise its monopoly." Russia supplied Europe with 25% of the gas it needed. Even by mobilising all of its resources, it would not be capable of meeting more than 27-29% of the European Union's needs. The Russian political elite would seem to realise that Russia's future as a major player in the region depends on partnership with the West, ie both Europe and the United States. The situation on the ground is less clear, however.

The recent trends in the price of Russian gas and oil supplies to Europe and the problems between Russia and Ukraine in 2006 and then between Russia and Belarus in 2007 demonstrated the need for a new strategy to ensure European energy security and have led European leaders to consider new sources of hydrocarbon supplies. In addition, in its communication on the Black Sea Synergy, the European Commission underlined that the Black Sea offers "significant potential for energy supply diversification and it is therefore an important component of the EU's external energy strategy".⁵⁶

The Nabucco gas pipeline project approved by the European Union in 2006 is central to the strategy for diversifying Europe's gas suppliers. According to Nika Chitadze, once it has been completed, a potential amount of 8 to 16 billion m³ of natural gas from Georgia could be supplied to the European market without having to cross Russia. The project – at an estimated cost of almost 6 billion euros – is, however, encountering some difficulties because of the lack of certainty about the quantity of gas needed for its operation.

The diversification of energy sources and the development of fair and transparent trading practices in the region are vital for Europe. In this connection, Pekka Huhtaniemi⁵⁷ underlined that Europe strongly encouraged the liberalisation of trade in the region and needed to continue its support for the development of the countries concerned.

The European Union's strategy in the Black Sea seems to be moving towards the diversification of oil and gas transit routes. Only diversity of supplies can bring increased resources to the European market, counterbalancing the resources that only Russia can supply today. However, in spite of its efforts to establish closer ties with other producers and of the pipeline building projects under way, the European Union is finding it hard at present to reduce its energy dependence on Russia. At the same time, differences in European Union countries' positions on the matter are preventing it from establishing a common energy policy. The Black Sea should therefore be a key focus of European foreign policy. This situation has heightened the European Union's awareness and led it to make a greater commitment to the political and economic stabilisation of the Black Sea countries through various co-operation instruments.

2. European instruments for greater stability in eastern Europe

The European Union's neighbourhood policy

With the latest enlargement, the European Union has extended towards regions marked by conflict and poverty and now faces a whole range of complex challenges on its borders: disparities in levels of development, illegal immigration, organised crime, environmental problems, energy challenges and, above all, conflicts which threaten to create new divides in the European continent. Concerned

56. Black Sea Synergy – A New Regional Co-operation Initiative, Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament, COM(2007)160 final, 11 April 2007.

57. Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland.

for the stability and security of its neighbourhood and seeking to reduce the risks along its borders, the European Union has developed a specific policy aimed at its neighbours: the European Neighbourhood Policy.

This strategic external relations policy established in 2004 has two key strands: a unified approach to the European Union's relations with all its neighbours and a strategy of closer ties without the prospect of accession. It also seeks to promote good governance in relations with the EU's neighbours. It is an essential aspect of the EU's external policy for the purpose of achieving prosperity, stability and security on both sides of its borders through political, economic and sector-based reforms. However, as Anna-Carin Krokstade⁵⁸ observed, the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) differs from the enlargement policy and depends on the will of the countries concerned. In her view, reforms that were imposed did not work: "The European Union supports its partners with their reform projects, but if the latter are to have a lasting effect, they must be wanted by the countries themselves."

The European Union had developed a bilateral approach based on action plans so as to integrate measures from a wide range of areas in the European Neighbourhood policy. These covered various European policies such as education, research and the environment, but also included co-operation in areas such as domestic security, justice (combating organised crime, controlling migration flows), transport and energy. Specific measures were also planned to improve the coordination of efforts to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as to resolve regional conflicts. The bilateral agreements had already been concluded with 12 of the 16 countries covered by the European Neighbourhood Policy, serving to lay down the key commitments, according to Anna-Carin Krokstade.

In reply to questions from the participants concerning the effectiveness of the policy, Ms Krokstade underlined that a review conducted in December 2006 had shown significant progress in certain countries, in particular in the area of human rights, justice and home affairs. Moreover, civil society played a vital part in helping leaders to understand how the policies operated and could be improved. However, in order to be effective, the programme would have to be strengthened still further: as she said, "reforms cost a lot in financial terms and also in terms of political credibility." Three areas required improvement: trade and closer economic integration, mobility between neighbouring countries and the EU's role in resolving regional conflicts.

At the Third Summer University, the European Neighbourhood Policy rekindled debate about the frontiers of the European Union, in particular the issue of the integration of Turkey. In this connection, Hans-Peter Furrer⁵⁹ stressed that Europe was not a question of ethnic origins or religion, or indeed of traditions or cultural values. It was the diversity of individuals and a shared desire to abide by the principles of democracy, the rule of law and human rights. It was commitment to these principles which formed Europe's specific identity, or European identity.

Citing the example of her country, Kim Campbell⁶⁰ observed in this connection that the government in Canada had succeeded in uniting the mosaic of different people, and it was necessary to invest more in programmes which foster integration. However, while recognising that Turkey is a secular state, European leaders seem to be divided over the issue of its joining the European Union. The launch of the Mediterranean Union, a key aspect of the French Presidency of the European Union, was seen by Turkish leaders as a means of circumventing Turkish accession to the European Union. "It is also from the angle of this Mediterranean Union that we should see relations between Europe and Turkey," had been the comments of Nicolas Sarkozy.⁶¹

At a time when the regional aspects of the South and, in particular, the Euro-Mediterranean project were becoming priorities for the French EU Presidency, the European Council was considering

58. Directorate General for External Relations, European Commission.

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

60. Former Prime Minister of Canada.

61. Speech by the French President in Montpellier on 3 May 2007.

ways of stepping up the efforts at regional level in the eastern neighbourhood area. As Ms Krokstade commented, to the extent that the European Neighbourhood Policy was divided into an eastern policy and a Euro-Mediterranean policy, the EU would need to perform a “balancing act” in the neighbourhood policy’s regional approach. The Black Sea Synergy could be the first step in that direction.

Stepping up regional co-operation in the Black Sea: Black Sea Synergy

Alongside the Euro-Mediterranean partnership and the Nordic dimension, the Black Sea Synergy initiative launched by the European Commission in April 2007 confirmed the regional co-operation approach in the European Union’s neighbourhood. As underlined by the European Commission, the Black Sea region presents both great potential and major challenges, demanding co-ordinated action at regional level.⁶² This new EU instrument covers areas such as energy, transport, the environment, mobility and security.

European leaders have already made major efforts to foster democratic and economic reforms and promote stability in the region. Pekka Huhtaniemi pointed out in this connection that three European policies already applied in this context: the European Neighbourhood Policy, the Strategic Partnership with Russia and the pre-accession process in the case of Turkey. Looking to the stability and peaceful development of the region, the Black Sea Synergy initiative therefore supplemented the EU instruments already operating in the region.

The European Union has already been involved in bilateral co-operation efforts with various Black Sea countries in the past. According to Mr Huhtaniemi, regional co-operation now needs to be stepped up. The new initiative seeks to refocus political attention on the regional dimension and to create more opportunities for expanding co-operation with the European Union. To extend its commitment in the region, the EU is also intending to step up its contacts with regional organisations such as the Organisation for Black Sea Economic Co-operation and the Black Sea Economic Forum.

In this connection, the European Commission communication underlines that a cross-border co-operation programme for the Black Sea has been established under the European neighbourhood and partnership instrument. “Managed locally in the region, with the partners taking joint responsibility for its implementation [, this] programme facilitates the further development of contacts between Black Sea towns and communities, universities, cultural operators and civil society organisations.⁶³” This could also help to resolve the frozen conflicts in the region.

With reference to the European Commission’s communication, Pekka Huhtaniemi said that the European Union’s presence in the Black Sea region offered new prospects and new opportunities. However, this required “a more coherent, longer-term effort which would help to fully seize these opportunities, to bring increased stability and prosperity to the region”.⁶⁴ Greater engagement in Black Sea regional co-operation was necessary and would contribute to this objective.

Regional co-operation is one of the key aspects of the Council of Europe’s work in this region. Anna-Carin Krokstade said that the two European organisations often exchanged know-how in the main reform areas. “The European Union is moving forward hand in hand with the Council of Europe. The Council has great know-how and the EU takes account of its experience,” she said. So how is the Council of Europe involved in that part of Europe?

The importance of local and regional co-operation: the Euroregion project

Through the work of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities, the Council of Europe has devoted much energy in recent years to expanding co-operation between local and regional authorities in the Black Sea basin, which includes the countries both of the Caucasus and of the

62. Black Sea Synergy – A New Regional Co-operation Initiative, idem.

63. Idem.

64. Black Sea Synergy – A New Regional Co-operation Initiative, idem.

Balkans. The aim is to foster greater mutual trust between the citizens of the region and promote regional and cross-border co-operation at local and regional level.

The meeting of the Balkan countries concerning regional co-operation rightly demonstrated the need for and benefits of trade and co-operation at regional level. Many positive examples of regional co-operation were quoted at the meeting. Civil society plays a very important part, as civil society organisations supplement the work of political leaders. The whole process creates an open arena for social interaction and communication, thereby helping to unite the younger generations. Hedvig Horvat⁶⁵ explained that the European Fund for the Balkans supported the European integration process in the region by building on existing models and using the natural ties established between its inhabitants. In this context, the Council of Europe's network of Schools of Political Studies is a major player. Only regional co-operation can help the countries concerned to move forward.

Yavuz Mildon⁶⁶ underlined that, in focusing on this part of Europe, the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities wished to supplement existing initiatives, while remaining within its area of responsibility. It sought to expand co-operation between local and regional authorities in the Black Sea region, while fully respecting the powers and responsibilities of the regions and municipalities in the various countries.

Many legal instruments which could help improve regional co-operation already existed at European level, including, for instance, the Council of Europe's Madrid Outline Convention.⁶⁷ However, as Mr Mildon underlined, these instruments were still not enough to "make cross-border co-operation take root in the minds and hearts of the citizens concerned." In addition, the authorities in the region were confronted with the problems of social cohesion, the management of migration and the environment, to mention only the most pressing. For these reasons, the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities had launched a project to set up a Black Sea Euroregion, the aim of which would be "to facilitate real exchanges of know-how and experience and establish a network capable of bringing together the representatives of local and regional authorities from that geographical region." As a platform for co-operation, the Euroregion would promote and encourage the process of regionalisation, while expanding local and regional and cross-border co-operation.

According to Yavuz Mildon, the initiative, which was launched in September 2008, would offer the towns, cities and regions around the Black Sea "the opportunity of jointly contributing to improved management of the region." At the same time, it should enable the citizens of the relevant countries to address the challenges facing them more effectively and also and, above all, to contribute to stability and security in Europe.

The co-operation tools which the European Union and the Council of Europe implement for the countries of eastern and south-eastern Europe provide a framework for and institutionalise the relations between Europe and its neighbours. Stabilising the region and increasing security there, in particular through regional co-operation, enables the European organisations to consolidate peace throughout Europe. However, Europe has other neighbours, too, and studying its relations with its neighbours also involves looking at the relations which have developed between Europe and the United States of America.

3. The United States, Greater Europe's neighbour

Convergence or divergence of values?

Unlike the situation with the fragile and unstable neighbours in the East, Europe's relations with its western neighbour are of a different nature. The United States has had a presence in Europe for over sixty years. In the aftermath of the Second World War, motivated by a desire to defend common values in the face of the emergence of the Soviet bloc, the United States undertook to help

65. Director of the European Fund for the Balkans, Belgrade.

66. President of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe.

67. European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Co-operation between Territorial Communities or Authorities, signed in Madrid on 21 May 1980.

its European partners to rebuild their post-war economies and also to protect them against any aggression from eastern Europe. It also helped to defend and promote throughout Europe the values of democracy, the rule of law and human rights, which are symbols of the European construction process. The special feature of Europe's relations with its western neighbour lies in the fact that the United States is present both inside and outside Europe. However, twenty years after the end of the Cold War and the Soviet threat, can we still speak of common values shared by the United States and Europe? Do the two still share the same political objectives?

Hans-Peter Furrer noted a fundamental difference in the two regions' approaches here. In his view, this was because, in Europe, the principles of democracy, human rights and the rule of law had followed a process of internationalisation, which was continuing. In the United States, however, these values had remained at the domestic level in terms of their legitimacy and content.

According to Mr Furrer, one of the differences between the two regions is reflected in the way Americans and Europeans see the law in relation to politics. In building a union in which states shared sovereignty, Europe had to overcome "aggressive nationalism". The European Union required "the establishment of the concept of legitimacy, stability in the common public order and prosperity of the population." Europe is a continent which has carried on building its institutions with a process of standardisation, while sticking to its commitment to fundamental principles. European countries have accepted common legislation and transferred the task of interpreting the relevant standards to supranational institutions. This process is subject to a system of collective supervision and monitoring covering all the participating countries through universally accessible international courts. "For their part, the Americans believe that American legislation fully satisfies their domestic needs. The idea of submitting to courts which take precedence over theirs seems inconceivable to them".⁶⁸

The United States and Europe both set great store by the protection of human rights. According to Hans-Peter Furrer, however, the American refusal to submit to international courts marked a divide between Americans and Europeans in their understanding of respect for social, cultural and human rights. In this connection, the controversy surrounding the death penalty was significant. Europeans did not tolerate any exceptions to the ban on torture and inhuman or degrading treatment. In the war on terrorism, these principles were not a priority for the American government. There was an obstacle here to the recognition of shared values. In conclusion, he therefore asked whether human rights were merely a tool used to serve the interests of American diplomacy.

Between shared concerns and diverging political priorities

Europe is continuing the task of integrating all European countries around a common approach geared towards democracy, human rights and the rule of law in the context of political stability and mutual prosperity. However, the Americans' main concern in Europe is security and stability. For their part, the Europeans set greater store by their goal of unity and union. Hans-Peter Furrer therefore said it had to be asked whether the United States really shared common interests with Europe, not only in the area of security, but also in terms of the political union of Europe based on common values.

Following the end of the Cold War, the Americans are expecting the European Union to step in and assume its responsibilities in Europe. However, European countries do not all share this approach: some countries in central and eastern Europe would prefer the United States and NATO to deal with security in Europe. The idea of European political union did not suffice to overcome the crisis and then the war in the Balkans. In this context, the new EU member states and also Ukraine and Georgia, which wish to join NATO, put their faith in security guarantees which Europe cannot really offer, as it still does not have a proper defence policy. For these countries, the United States and NATO are vital, as they are reliable and more effective.

68. Hans-Peter Furrer, former Director General of Political Affairs of the Council of Europe.

NATO does, indeed, play a key role in resolving security problems in eastern Europe. Following the accession of the Baltic countries and Romania and Bulgaria to NATO, its main strategy could, in Nika Chitadze's view, include closer co-operation with the former Soviet republics in the Black Sea region. He believed that the active co-operation of these countries in NATO for the purpose of achieving the organisation's standards would play a positive role in the process of democratising the region and strengthening regional security. Moreover, as Iulian Chifu pointed out, NATO had made great progress in the area of energy security between the Riga and Bucharest summits.

Following the attacks on 11 September and the United States' declaration of war on terror, a number of situations have arisen in which divergences have emerged between Americans and Europeans in the way they perceive and tackle security issues. While they both believe that terrorism is a major threat, they differ about how it should be tackled. In particular, Hans-Peter Furrer referred to the United States' unilateral decision to attack Iraq. This also applies to the way the Americans are dealing with persons suspected of terrorism in Afghanistan and their negative stand on the International Criminal Court.

NATO has changed radically because of developments imposed by the USA. It is no longer the main instrument for security co-operation between the United States and Europe. It has been supplanted several times by unilateral decisions, coalitions and other types of joint operations. Many countries are members of both the EU and NATO. That raises the question of the nature of the relations between the two bodies. The participants at the Summer University voiced a number of concerns about the impact of these divergences between the European Union and the United States. According to Mr Furrer, serious disagreements could arise within NATO itself, with the main impact being on east European countries which bore dual allegiance to NATO and the European Union. Yet it was difficult to predict the future ahead of the American elections. In his view, it could not be ruled out that the United States would pay more attention to European and Russian demands after the elections. An era was coming to an end in American politics.

There are, however, many points in common which allow a degree of optimism about the future of relations between the United States and Europe. In particular, they include democracy and the desire to prevent the emergence of a hegemonic power, while attempting to contain the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Some analysts would see the position here as the contrast between the American way and the European dream. The United States sees global policy as a power struggle between good and evil and employs military force as the key element of its foreign policy. The European model is primarily based on "softer" power and on non-military aspects regarding security, in particular the origins of potential conflict such as poverty, underdevelopment, migration, human rights violations and threats to the environment. Assuming that we are moving towards a multipolar world, Mr Furrer believed that there was a chance of the European model prevailing over American hegemony.

The last decade has been marked by fundamental changes in security in eastern Europe. The East-West conflict has given way to the growing integration of central and east European states in the European and transatlantic organisations. At the same time, new risks have emerged in countries which often face major socioeconomic difficulties and whose political institutions have low legitimacy in the eyes of the international community. European security now depends on these new high-risk areas, especially when issues such as energy are mixed up with frozen conflicts. Crisis prevention and post-war reconstruction will take many more years in the western Balkans and the southern Caucasus. The establishment of stable conditions is a requirement laid down by western countries and demands the commitment of appropriate resources.

Democracy and the rule of law are essential preconditions for peaceful coexistence and social, political and economic development. Appropriate measures should facilitate the emergence in Europe's partner countries of non-violent conflict-resolution and reconciliation mechanisms, as well as the protection and integration of minorities and disadvantaged groups in society. Kim Campbell called on the leaders of the nations in question to follow the path set out 50 years

ago by Europe's founding fathers. They should build on the example of European construction by starting with the development of areas of practical solidarity based on common interests. The spill-over effect would then cover a wider and wider range of relations between more and more countries.

The improvements which have to be made in terms of good governance are closely linked to security and stability. They involve firmly establishing political structures and setting up legitimate democratic institutions, while promoting the rule of law and the rejection of violence and also moving human rights forward. The economic aspects of good governance are of vital importance; it leads to the emergence of legal instruments that are essential to the development of the private sector and for combating corruption. Helping civil society to flourish and developing good relations between the public and the state deserve particular attention. These issues place the concept of governance at the very heart of debate, as successful development is not possible without good governance or strong and legitimate public authorities capable of meeting citizens' expectations and safeguarding their rights.

Conclusion: The Association of Schools of Political Studies: giving the European project meaning again

In a democracy, the citizen is at the centre of politics. Elections provide an opportunity for the public to exercise their sovereignty and delegate their authority to politicians. That is the basis for representative democracy in Europe. The crisis in politics and technological progress mean that citizens now wish to have a more active part in the policymaking process. The objective of the Third Summer University for Democracy was to see how the young leaders of east and south-east European countries could take up this challenge in future. Because it involves methods based on direct democracy and allows for a fairer distribution of power between the local, national and European levels, governance as it is now understood is an appropriate tool for responding to the needs of citizens. Andreas Gross⁶⁹ pointed out in this connection that the nation state now placed limits on democracy: “Democracy is a promise and an outcome; it must be able to stand on an equal footing with the market. Nowadays, we have national democracies and a global market. That explains the weakness of democracies. We need a transnational democracy.”

The press, the media and NGOs play a fundamental social and political role in the survival of democratic systems. They safeguard pluralism, enabling political debate to take place in complete freedom. The European Court of Human Rights helps defend freedom of expression, making it the sentinel of democracy in our continent. In describing the European Court of Human Rights’ contribution to the protection of human rights and the rule of law, Jean-Paul Costa⁷⁰ also issued a message of hope to the participants, drawing on his own experience: “With time, I have come to realise that democracy, like human rights, demands a lengthy learning process. The Schools of Political Studies perform that fundamental role.”

In addition to that work, Terry Davis⁷¹ pointed out that the aim of the programme was “not only to give people an opportunity to study democracy, human rights and the rule of law, but also [to] provide an opportunity for students to meet other students – to promote dialogue and a better understanding between politically active and democratically oriented people from different European countries.”

The announcement during the closing ceremony of the establishment of the European Association of Schools of Political Studies was a highlight of the Third Summer University for Democracy. The need to expand contacts, meetings and exchanges of information and advice between the young leaders of east and south-east European countries lay behind the establishment of this association chaired by Catherine Lalumière.⁷² Continuously reflecting on the functions of democracy in the 21st century and making history a springboard to the future rather than a political taboo will ensure that the network has a key part to play in the European project and contributing to the advent of a political Europe.

Since the Enlightenment, the question of the relationship between freedom and authority has shaped all discussion of what a democracy should be. While it must not be a weak system, it must not fall into the trap of authoritarianism either. The balance to be struck is fragile, especially during periods of crisis or when the legitimacy of politics is called into question. Democracy therefore

69. Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Chair of the Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs, Switzerland.

70. President of the European Court of Human Rights, Council of Europe.

71. Secretary General of the Council of Europe.

72. Former Secretary General of the Council of Europe.

requires ongoing modernisation so as to meet the expectations of citizens as they change with time and technological advances. In choosing *Governance, power and democracy* as its theme, the Third Summer University contributed to debate in this area and opened the way for certain reforms which the participants will be able to implement in their countries in future.

The changes needed in any democratic system cannot be made without knowledge of the past. The history of the individual countries and regions in our continent must not be forgotten. Full responsibility must be accepted for it if it is to be put behind us. Franco-German reconciliation is a model to be followed. The stability and peace of Europe are still the driving force of the European project. The development of a prosperous economy in Europe is a necessity but not an end in itself. Social justice, solidarity and the protection of human rights and the rule of law must also be central to the European project, which is both human and political.

The Association of Schools of Political Studies will play a part in this project in future. It will have to provide fresh impetus from the young leaders from politics and civil society. In that way, the heirs of the European construction process will become worthy descendants of the Founding Fathers.

Annex I: Programme of the Summer University for Democracy

Monday, 30 June 2008	
09.30 Hemicycle	Opening session Opening by Right Hon Terry DAVIS, Secretary General of the Council of Europe Mr Filip VUJANOVIC, President of the Republic of Montenegro Mr Roland RIES, Senator Mayor of Strasbourg Mr Per SJÖGREN, Permanent Representative of Sweden to the Council of Europe, on behalf of the Chair of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe Mr Göran LINDBLAD, Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Sweden Mr Bruno GAIN, Permanent Representative of France to the Council of Europe, on behalf of the French Presidency of the Council of the European Union Ms Meglena KUNEVA, European Commissioner for Consumer Protection, European Commission
11.00	Opening lecture by Ms Mary KALDOR, Director of the Centre for the Study of Global Governance, London School of Economics, on “Governance, power and democracy”
12.15	Group photo in front of the Palais
12.30	Lunch at the Restaurant of the European Parliament
14.30-17.30	Working sessions
Agora room G 03	Working session 1: Governance: a new instrument in politics? Speakers: Mr Christian SAVES, Deputy Academic Director, Ecole Nationale d'Administration, Strasbourg Mr Gert-Rüdiger WEGMARSHAUS, Director of EuroCollege, Tartu University Moderators: Mr Gordan GEORGIEV, Director of the Skopje School of Politics Mr Armaz AKHVLEDIANI, Director of the Tbilisi School of Political Studies <i>Workshop 1.1: What function for governance in government?</i> <i>Workshop 1.2: How to simplify a complex organisation of the state?</i>

EDQM room 100	<p>Working session 2: Governance and European integration</p> <p>Speakers: Mr Pierre DEFRAIGNE, Executive Director of the Madariaga, College of Europe Foundation, Brussels Mr Nikolay MLADENOV, Member of the European Parliament, Bulgaria Mr Dimitar BECHEV, Lecturer, European Studies Centre, St Anthony's College, University of Oxford</p> <p>Moderators: Mr Armen ZAKARYAN, Director of the Yerevan School of Political Studies Ms Svetlana LOMEVA, Director of the Bulgarian School of Politics</p> <p><i>Workshop 2.1: From national governments to EU governance: which powers should be given to supranational authorities?</i></p> <p><i>Workshop 2.2: Reforms for implementing good governance at EU level</i></p>
Palais room 1	<p>Working session 3: Governance and democracy are they compatible?</p> <p>Speakers: Ms Antonella VALMORBIDA, Director of the Association of the Local Democracy Agencies, Vicenza Mr Harald WYDRA, Lecturer in Russian and Eastern European Politics, University of Cambridge Mr Michel MULLER, Representative of the INGO Service, Conference of INGOs, Council of Europe</p> <p>Moderators: Mr Serguei PANKOVSKI, Director of the East European School of Political Science, Minsk Mr Ilgar MAMMADOV, Director of the Baku Political Studies Programme</p> <p><i>Workshop 3.1: Is democratic government preserved in governance? Or is good governance good for democracy?</i></p> <p><i>Workshop 3.2: How can governance be legitimate?</i></p>
Palais room 5	<p>Working session 4: Governance and the interaction of public and private actors</p> <p>Speakers: Ms Elisabeth LULIN, President of the Institut Aspen France, Lyon Mr Alexander SEGER, Head of the Economic Crime Division, Directorate General of Human Rights and Legal Affairs, Council of Europe</p> <p>Moderators: Ms Anne JUGANARU, Director of the “Ovidiu řincai” European School, Bucharest Mr Viorel CIBOTARU, Director of the European Institute for Political Studies of Moldova</p> <p><i>Workshop 4.1: New public management: are private actors good for public sector management?</i></p> <p><i>Workshop 4.2: Government bodies, political parties and private lobbyists: implications for society</i></p>

16.30-17.30	Presentation of the workshop conclusions
19.30	Reception offered by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe <i>Palais Universitaire</i>
Tuesday, 1 July 2008	
09.30-12.00	Conferences
Hemicycle	<p>Conference I “Media, power and democracy”</p> <p>Chair: Mr Andrew McINTOSH, Member of the House of Lords and Rapporteur on Media Freedom of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe</p> <p>Speakers : Mr Veran MATIC, Chief Executive Officer of <i>B92</i>, Belgrade Mr Veton SURROI, political analyst and editor of <i>Koha Ditore</i>, Pristina Mr Zarko PUHOVSKI, Lecturer, University of Zagreb Mr Daniel RIOT, Director of the “RELATIO-europe” webzine, Strasbourg Mr Jack HANNING, former Director of External Relations, Council of Europe, Representative of the European Movement International to the Council of Europe</p>
Palais room 1	<p>Conference II “Europe and its neighbours”</p> <p>Chair: Mr François-Gilles LE THEULE, Director of the Centre for European Studies of the Ecole Nationale d’Administration, Strasbourg</p> <p>Speakers : The Right Honourable Kim CAMPBELL, former Prime Minister of Canada Mr Hans-Peter FURRER, former Director General of Political Affairs of the Council of Europe Ms Anna-Carin KROKSTADE, Directorate General for External Relations, European Commission</p>
12.30	Lunch at the Restaurant of the European Parliament
14.30-17.30	Regional meetings between the Schools of:
Palais room 1	<p>Belgrade, Podgorica, Pristina, Sarajevo, Skopje and Zagreb</p> <p>Speakers: Mr Blagoj ZASOV, Ambassador, State Counsellor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Skopje Mr Veton SURROI, political analyst and editor of <i>Koha Ditore</i>, Pristina Mr Hido BISCEVIC, Secretary General of the Regional Co-operation Council for South-East Europe, Sarajevo Ms Hedvig HORVAT, Director of the European Fund for the Balkans, Belgrade</p> <p>Moderator: Ms Sonja LICHT, Director of the Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence</p>

Palais room 5	Moscow and Tbilisi Speakers: Mr Alexander ARHANGELSKIY, Author and presenter of the Russian television show “Tem Vremenem”, Moscow Mr Alexei MAKARKIN, Vice-President of the Centre of Political Technologies, Moscow Mr Revaz ADAMIA, former Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe Moderators: Ms Elena NEMIROVSKAYA, Director of the Moscow School of Political Studies Mr Armaz AKHVLEDIANI, Director of the Tbilisi School of Political Studies
14.30-17.30	Meetings of the Schools of:
14.30-17.30 room 10	Minsk <i>Council of Europe's programmes for Belarus</i> Speakers: Mr Daniil KHOCHABO, Head of Division, Directorate General of Democracy and Political Affairs, Council of Europe Mr Plamen NIKOLOV, Civil Society/NGO Division, Directorate General of Democracy and Political Affairs, Council of Europe
room 11	Sofia <i>European integration and the frontier of national sovereignty</i> Speaker: Mr Julian POPOV, Chairman of the Board of the Bulgarian School of Politics
16.00-17.30 room 3	Baku <i>European values and European integration</i> Speaker: Mr Olivier VEDRINE, Professor at the Schiller International University, Paris
room 8	Bucharest <i>The role of mass media in a democratic society</i> Speaker: Mr Malcolm DEAN, Fellow at Nuffield College, University of Oxford
room 7	Chisinau <i>The European perspectives of the Republic of Moldova</i> Speaker: Mr Nicolae CHIRTOACA, Ambassador of the Republic of Moldova to the United States of America, Washington DC
room 2	Kyiv <i>European Energy Charter and energy security challenges</i> Speaker: Mr Philippe SEBILLE-LOPEZ, Researcher, French Institute of Geopolitics, University of Paris VIII
14.30-17.30	Visit to the European Court of Human Rights for the Schools of:
See Appendix	Baku, Bucharest, Chisinau, Kyiv, Tirana and Yerevan
Evening	Free or reception offered by Permanent Representations

Wednesday, 2 July 2008	
09.30-12.00	Round Table
Hemicycle	<p>Round table on “Governance and globalisation”</p> <p>Chair: Mr Bernard BOUCAULT, Executive Director of the Ecole Nationale d’Administration, Strasbourg</p> <p>Speakers: Mr Egor GAYDAR, former Prime Minister of the Russian Federation Mr Lars KOLTE, Chairman of the Governing Board, Council of Europe Development Bank, Paris Ms Aiko DODEN, journalist, NHK TV, Tokyo Mr Steven EKOVICH, Professor at the American University of Paris</p>
12.30	Lunch at the Restaurant of the European Parliament
14.30-17.30	Regional meetings between the Schools of:
Palais room 2	<p>Baku and Yerevan</p> <p>Speakers: Mr Karen BEKARYAN, Chairman of the “European Integration” NGO, Yerevan Mr Rauf MIRGADIROV, political analyst, <i>Zerkalo</i> newspaper, Baku</p> <p>Moderators: Mr Ilgar MAMMADOV, Director of the Baku Political Studies Programme Mr Armen ZAKARYAN, Director of the Yerevan School of Political Studies</p>
Palais room 5	<p>Bucharest, Chisinau and Kyiv</p> <p>Speakers: Mr Nicolae CHIRTOACA, Ambassador of the Republic of Moldova to the United States of America, Washington DC Mr Taras CHORNOVIL, First Deputy Head of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, Kyiv Mr Iulian CHIFU, Centre for Conflict Prevention and Early Warning, Bucharest</p> <p>Moderators: Mr Viorel CIBOTARU, Director of the European Institute for Political Studies of Moldova Mr Ihor KOHUT, Director of the Ukrainian School of Political Studies</p>
Palais room 1	<p>Pristina, Skopje and Tirana</p> <p>Speakers: Mr Shpend AHMETI, Executive Director, Institute for Advanced Studies, Pristina Mr Ermal HASIMJA, European University of Tirana</p> <p>Moderator: Ms Leonora KRYEZIU, Director of the Pristina Institute for Political Studies</p>

Palais room 6	Belgrade and Podgorica Moderators: Ms Sonja LICHT, Director of the Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence Mr Boris RAONIC, Director of the School of Democratic Leadership, Podgorica
14.30-16.00	Minsk and Moscow Speakers: Mr Stanislau SHUSHKEVICH, former Head of State of Belarus, Minsk Mr Egor GAYDAR, former Prime Minister of the Russian Federation Moderators: Ms Elena NEMIROVSKAYA, Director of the Moscow School of Political Studies Mr Serguei PANKOVSKI, Director of the East European School of Political Science, Minsk
14.30-17.30	Visit to the European Court of Human Rights for the Schools of:
See Appendix	Minsk, Moscow, Sarajevo, Sofia, Tbilisi and Zagreb
Evening	Reception offered by the City of Strasbourg <i>Pavillon Joséphine, Parc de l'Orangerie</i>

Thursday, 3 July 2008	
09.00-12.00	Working sessions
Palais room 5	Working session 5: Governance, representative systems and the rule of law Speakers: Ms Violaine de VILLEMEUR, Deputy Director of the Democratic Governance Division, French Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs Mr Giovanni DI STASI, Head of the Centre of Expertise for Local Government Reform, Directorate General of Democracy and Political Affairs, Council of Europe Moderators: Ms Leonora KRYEZIU, Director of the Pristina Institute for Political Studies Mr Boris RAONIC, Director of the School of Democratic Leadership, Podgorica <i>Workshop 5.1: Does governance create a more participative decision-making process?</i> <i>Workshop 5.2: Governance and the rule of law: better law-making?</i>

Palais room 1	<p>Working session 6: Governance and economic power</p> <p>Speakers: Mr Ante CICIN-SAIN, former Governor of the Central Bank, Zagreb Mr Shpend AHMETI, Executive Director, Institute for Advanced Studies, Pristina</p> <p>Moderators: Mr Olsi DEKOVI, Director of the Albanian School of Political Studies Ms Nevena CRLJENKO, Director of the Academy for Political Development, Zagreb</p> <p><i>Workshop 6.1: The economy under governance: prospects for economic development</i></p> <p><i>Workshop 6.2: The impact of corporate governance: what is left of political rule?</i></p>
Palais room 9	<p>Working session 7: Good governance, cause or effect of the crisis of politics?</p> <p>Speakers: Mr Ivan VEJVODA, Executive Director of the “Balkan Trust for Democracy”, Belgrade Mr Jean HOWILLER, Chief of cabinet of the President of the Conseil Général du Bas-Rhin, Strasbourg</p> <p>Moderators: Ms Elena NEMIROVSKAYA, Director of the Moscow School of Political Studies Ms Sonja LICHT, Director of the Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence</p> <p><i>Workshop 7.1: Is good governance the cause or an effect of the crisis of politics?</i></p> <p><i>Workshop 7.2: Can it be a solution to the crisis of politics?</i></p>
EDQM room 100	<p>Working session 8: From good governance to good government</p> <p>Speakers: Mr Wendelin ETTMAYER, Permanent Representative of Austria to the Council of Europe Mr Frank PROCHASKA, Lecturer, Colorado Technical University Mr Owen MASTERS, former Member of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe</p> <p>Moderators: Mr Ihor KOHUT, Director of the Ukrainian School of Political Studies Mr Zdravko GREBO, Director of the Academy for Political Excellence, Sarajevo</p> <p><i>Workshop 8.1: How can democratic government and institutions be reinforced?</i></p> <p><i>Workshop 8.2: Post-democracy or improved democracy?</i></p>
11.00-12.00	Presentation of the workshop conclusions
12.30	Lunch at the Restaurant of the European Parliament

14.30-17.30	Regional meetings between the Schools of:
Palais room 6	<p>Sarajevo and Zagreb</p> <p>Moderators: Ms Nevena CRLJENKO, Director of the Academy for Political Development, Zagreb Mr Zdravko GREBO, Director of the Academy for Political Excellence, Sarajevo</p>
Palais room 5	<p>Baku, Bucharest, Chisinau, Kyiv, Minsk, Moscow, Sofia, Tbilisi, and Yerevan</p> <p><i>Group 1 : Economic and energy issues in the Black Sea region</i></p> <p>Speakers: Mr Pekka HUHTANIEMI, Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland Mr Ognyan MINCHEV, Director of the Institute for Regional and International Studies, Sofia Mr Nika CHITADZE, Associated Professor, Tbilisi Ilia Chavchavadze University Mr Vladimir SOCOR, Senior Fellow, Jamestown Foundation, Washington DC</p> <p>Moderator: Mr Ihor KOHUT, Director of the Ukrainian School of Political Studies</p>
Palais room 1	<p><i>Group 2 : The political context of Black Sea regional co-operation</i></p> <p>Speakers: Mr Yavuz MILDON, President of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe Mr Stanislau SHUSHKEVICH, former Head of State of Belarus, Minsk Mr Karen BEKARYAN, Chairman of the “European Integration” NGO, Yerevan Mr Rauf MIRGADIROV, political analyst, <i>Zerkalo</i> newspaper, Baku Mr Iulian CHIFU, Centre for Conflict Prevention and Early Warning, Bucharest</p> <p>Moderator: Mr Julian POPOV, Chairman of the Board of the Bulgarian School of Politics</p>
14.30-18.00	Meetings of the Schools of:
14.30-16.30 room 3	<p>Tirana</p> <p><i>Role and effectiveness of public administration</i></p> <p>Speaker: Mr Christian SAVES, Deputy Academic Director, Ecole Nationale d'Administration, Strasbourg</p>
16.30-18.00 room 7	<p>Pristina</p> <p><i>Civil society and democratisation</i></p> <p>Speaker: Ms Jutta GUTZKOW, Head of Civil Society/NGO Division, Directorate General of Democracy and Political Affairs, Council of Europe</p>

14.30-17.30	Visit to the European Court of Human Rights for the Schools of:
See Appendix	Belgrade, Podgorica, Pristina and Skopje
Evening	Free or reception offered by Permanent Representations

Friday, 4 July 2008	
09.30-12.00 Hemicycle	<p>Closing Session</p> <p>Mr Jean-Paul COSTA, President of the European Court of Human Rights, Council of Europe</p> <p>Mr Andreas GROSS, Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Chairman of the Committee on Rules of Procedures, Immunities and Institutional Affairs, Switzerland</p> <p>Presentation of conclusions by the Rapporteurs of working sessions</p> <p>Presentation and adoption of the Final Declaration</p> <p>Award of certificates to participants</p> <p>Official launching of the European Association of the Schools of Political Studies by Ms Catherine LALUMIERE, former Secretary General of the Council of Europe</p> <p>Closing remarks by Right Hon Terry DAVIS, Secretary General of the Council of Europe</p>
Afternoon	Free
19.30	Garden party <i>Jardin des Deux Rives</i>

Programme for the European Court of Human Rights

Tuesday 1 July 2008

- 14.30 Meeting with Corneliu Bîrsan, Judge elected in respect of Romania
(European Court of Human Rights, Main Hearing Room)
- 14.30 Meeting with Khanlar Hajiiev, Judge elected in respect of Azerbaijan
(Palais de l'Europe, Room 3)
- 14.30 Meeting with Alvina Gyulumyan, Judge elected in respect of Armenia
(Palais de l'Europe, Room 6)
- 14.30 Meeting with Mihaï Poalelungi, Judge elected in respect of Moldova
(Palais de l'Europe, Room 7)
- 14.30 Meeting with Pavlo Pushkar, Lawyer (Ukraine) at the Registry of the Court
(Palais de l'Europe, Room 2)
- 15.00 Meeting with Ledi Bianku, Judge elected in respect of Albania
(European Court of Human Rights, Small Hearing Room)

Wednesday 2 July 2008

- 14.30 Meeting with Zdravka Kalaydjieva, Judge elected in respect of Bulgaria
(European Court of Human Rights, Main Hearing Room)
- 14.30 Meeting with Théa Tsouloukiani, Lawyer (Georgia) at the Registry of the Court
(European Court of Human Rights, Small Hearing Room)
- 14.30 Schools of Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina:
Meeting with Elica Grdinic, Lawyer (Croatia) at the Registry of the Court
(Human Rights Press Room)
- 16.00 Meeting with Olga Chernishova, Head of Division (Russia) at the Registry of the Court
(Palais de l'Europe, Room 3)
- 16.00 School of Belarus:
Meeting with Viktorya Maradudina, Lawyer (Russia) at the Registry of the Court
(Palais de l'Europe, Room 8)

Thursday 3 July 2008

- 14.30 Meeting with Mirjana Lazarova Trajkovska, Judge elected in respect of “The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”
(European Court of Human Rights, Small Hearing Room)
- 14.30 Schools of Serbia and Montenegro:
Meeting with Dragoljub Popovic, Judge elected in respect of Serbia
(European Court of Human Rights, Main Hearing Room)
- 14.30 School of Kosovo:
Meeting with Paul Harvey, Lawyer (United Kingdom) at the Registry of the Court
(European Court of Human Rights, Seminar Room)

List of speakers

- Revaz ADAMIA, former Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe
- Shpend AHMETI, Executive Director, Institute for Advanced Studies, Pristina
- Alexander ARHANGELSKIY, Author and presenter of the Russian television show “Tem Vremenem”, Moscow
- Dimitar BECHEV, Lecturer, European Studies Centre, St Anthony’s College, University of Oxford
- Karen BEKARYAN, Chairman of the “European Integration” NGO, Yerevan
- Hido BISCEVIC, Secretary General of Regional Co-operation Council for South-East Europe, Sarajevo
- Bernard BOUCAULT, Executive Director of the Ecole Nationale d’Administration, Strasbourg
- Kim CAMPBELL, former Prime Minister of Canada
- Iulian CHIFU, Centre for Conflict Prevention and Early Warning, Bucharest
- Nicolae CHIRTOACA, Ambassador of the Republic of Moldova to the United States of America, Washington DC
- Nika CHITADZE, Associated Professor, Tbilisi Ilia Chavchavadze University
- Taras CHORNOVIL, First Deputy Head of Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, Kyiv
- Ante CICIN-SAIN, former Governor of the Central Bank, Zagreb
- Jean-Paul COSTA, President of the European Court of Human Rights, Council of Europe
- Terry DAVIS, Secretary General of the Council of Europe
- Malcolm DEAN, Fellow at Nuffield College, University of Oxford
- Pierre DEFRAIGNE, Executive Director of the Madariaga, College of Europe Foundation, Brussels
- Giovanni DI STASI, Head of the Centre of Expertise for Local Government Reform, Directorate General of Democracy and Political Affairs, Council of Europe
- Aiko DODEN, journalist, NHK TV, Tokyo
- Steven EKOVICH, Associate Professor at the American University of Paris
- Wendelin ETTMAYER, Permanent Representative of Austria to the Council of Europe
- Hans-Peter FURRER, former Director General of Political Affairs of the Council of Europe
- Bruno GAIN, Permanent Representative of France to the Council of Europe
- Egor GAYDAR, former Prime Minister of the Russian Federation
- Andreas GROSS, Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Chairman of the Committee on Rules of Procedures and Immunities, Switzerland
- Jutta GUTZKOW, Head of Civil Society/NGO Division, Directorate General of Democracy and Political Affairs, Council of Europe
- Jack HANNING, former Director of External Relations, Council of Europe, Representative of the European Movement International to the Council of Europe
- Ermal HASIMJA, European University of Tirana
- Hedvig HORVAT, Director of the European Fund for the Balkans, Belgrade
- Jean HOWILLER, Chief of cabinet of the President of the Conseil Général du Bas-Rhin, Strasbourg

Pekka HUHTANIEMI, Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Helsinki

Mary KALDOR, Director of the Centre for the Study of Global Governance, London School of Economics, on “Governance, power and democracy”

Daniil KHOCHABO, Head of Division, Directorate General of Democracy and Political Affairs, Council of Europe

Lars KOLTE, Chairman of the Governing Board, Council of Europe Development Bank, Paris

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

Meglena KUNEVA, European Commissioner for Consumer Protection, European Commission

Catherine LALUMIERE, former Secretary General of the Council of Europe

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

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

Elisabeth LULIN, President of the Institut Aspen France, Lyon

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

Owen MASTERS, former Member of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe

Veran MATIC, Chief Executive Officer of *B92*, Belgrade

Andrew McINTOSH, Member of the House of Lords and Rapporteur on Media Freedom of PACE, Council of Europe

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

Ognyan MINCHEV, Director of the Institute for Regional and International Studies, Sofia

Rauf MIRGADIROV, political analyst, “Zerkalo” newspaper, Baku

Nikolay MLADENOV, Member of the European Parliament, Bulgaria

Michel MULLER, Representative of the INGO Service, Conference of INGOs, Council of Europe, Switzerland

Plamen NIKOLOV, Civil Society/NGO Division, Directorate General of Democracy and Political Affairs, Council of Europe

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

Frank PROCHASKA, Lecturer, Colorado Technical University, Colorado

Zarko PUHOVSKI, Lecturer, University of Zagreb

Roland RIES, Senator Mayor of Strasbourg

Daniel RIOT, Director of the “RELATIO-europe” webzine, Strasbourg

Christian SAVES, Deputy Academic Director, Ecole Nationale d’Administration, Strasbourg

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

Alexander SEGER, Head of the Economic Crime Division, Directorate General of Human Rights and Legal Affairs, Council of Europe, Strasbourg

Stanislau SHUSHKEVICH, former Head of state of Belarus, Minsk

Per SJÖGREN, Permanent Representative of Sweden to the Council of Europe

Vladimir SOCOR, Senior Fellow, Jamestown Foundation, Washington DC

Veton SURROI, political analyst and editor of “Koha Ditore”, Pristina

Antonella VALMORBIDA, Director of the Association of the Local Democracy Agencies, Vicenza

Olivier VEDRINE, Professor at the Schiller International University, Paris

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

Violaine de VILLEMEUR, Deputy Director of the Democratic Governance Division, French Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs

Filip VUJANOVIC, President of the Republic of Montenegro

Gert-Rüdiger WEGMARSHAUS, Director of EuroCollege, Tartu University, Tartu

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

Blagoj ZASOV, Ambassador, State Counsellor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Skopje

Schools

Moscow School of Political Studies

7/2, Bolshoi Kozikhinskiy pereulok, office 21-22
123104, Moscow, Russia
tel/fax: +7 495 202 8501
e-mail: msps@msps.su
website: www.msps.ru; www.eng.msps.ru
Director: Elena NEMIROVSKAYA

Tbilisi School of Political Studies

0102, Tbilisi, Georgia, p/b №7
tel/fax +995 32 922862
e-mail: tsps@tsps.ge
website: www.tsps.ge
Director: Armaz AKHVLEDIANI

Bulgarian School of Politics

92, Patriarch Evtimii Blvd; 1463 Sofia; Bulgaria
tel: (359 2) 952 68 82, (359 2) 851 93 46; fax: (359 2) 952 66 64
e-mail: sp@sp-bg.org
website: www.schoolofpolitics.org
Director: Svetlana LOMEVA

European Institute for Political Studies in Moldova

NR 16/1 Puskin St., Chisinau MD 2012, Republic of Moldova
tel: +(37322) 222503, +(37322) 222504; fax: +(37322) 222504
e-mail: viorel_cibotaru@ipp.md
Director: Viorel CIBOTARU

Pristina Institute for Political Studies

Bulevardi Deshmoret e Kombit 46/4
10000 Prishtina, Kosovo
tel/fax: +381 38 545 818
e-mail: info@pips-ks.org
Director: Leonora KRYEZIU

Skopje School of Politics

ul. Kosta Novakovic 16, 1000 Skopje
tel: +389 2 31 21 100
e-mail: sonja@forum.com.mk
Director: Gordan GEORGIEV

Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence

Dositejeva 9, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia
tel/fax: +(381 11) 3034 830, +(381 11) 3036 520
e-mail: office@bfpe.org
website: www.bfpe.org
Director: Sonja LICHT

Academy for Political Development

c/o Atlantic Grupa
Miramarska 23
10000 Zagreb, Croatia
tel: +385 99 3003 101; fax: +385 1 24 13 901
e-mail: info@politicka-akademija.org
website: www.politicka-akademija.org
Director: Nevena CRLJENKO

“Ovidiu Șincai” European School

11, Atena Street, Sector 1,
Bucharest, Romania
tel: + 4 021 230 24 34; + 4 021 230 24 74
fax: + 4 021 231 55 23
e-mail: scoalaovidiusincai@yahoo.com
website: www.seos.ro
Director: Anne JUGANARU

Yerevan School of Political Studies

“Tashir” Centre, 6th floor, room 31, Khorenatsy Str. 33
Yerevan, Armenia 375 000
tel/fax + 374 10 51 11 71; mobile: + 374 93 777 335
e-mail: armeen@mail.ru; yspc_ysps@yahoo.com
website: www.ysps.am
Director: Armen ZAKARYAN

Ukrainian School of Political Studies

33 Nizhniy Val Street, No. 8,
Kyiv 04071, Ukraine
tel: +38 044 531 37 68; fax: +38 044 425 25 33
e-mail: info@laboratory.kiev.ua
website: http://usps.parlament.org.ua
Director: Ihor KOHUT

Baku Political Studies Programme

Menzil 8, ev 21, Haqverdiyev kucesi
Baku, AZ 1065, Azerbaijan
tel/fax: +994 12 439 19 55
mobile: + 994 50 300 53 07
e-mail: ilgar@hotmail.com; layman.aliyev@gmail.com
Director: Ilgar MAMMADOV

Academy for Political Excellence

University of Sarajevo
Zmaja od Bosne 8
71000 Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
tel/fax: + 387 33 66 86 83, 66 86 85, 66 86 87
e-mail: coordination@cps.edu.ba
Director: Zdravko GREBO

Albanian School of Political Studies

Sheshi Skenderbej
Palatti i Kultures, Kati I pare
Tirana, Albania
tel: + 355 4 22 84 19; fax: + 355 4 24 89 40
e-mail: olsi.dekovi@coe.int
website: www.coealb.org
Acting Director: Olsi DEKOVI

School of Democratic Leadership

c/o Nansen Dialogue Centre – Montenegro
Vukice Mitrovic 8,
81000 Podgorica, Montenegro
tel: +382 81 655 299; 655 295
fax: +382 81 655 305
e-mail: raonic@cg.yu
website: www.sdr.ndcmn.org
Director: Boris RAONIC

East European School of Political Science

Subuciaus 96

LT 11342 Vilnius, Lithuania

e-mail: spankovski@yandex.ru

Director : Serguei PANKOVSKI

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

Administrative and Financial Assistant

e-mail : claude.bernard@coe.int

Tel.: + 33 (0)3 88 41 22 75

Annex II: List of participants

Moscow School of Political Studies

Ms Elena NEMIROVSKAYA, Director, Moscow School of Political Studies

Ms Nadezda FEDOROVA, Manager, Moscow School of Political Studies

Mr Daud ADZHIEV, Business Manager of Permanent Establishment of Republic of Dagestan under the RF President

Ms Leila ARAPKHANOVA, Head of Analysis, Planning and Strategic Department, Ministry of Public and International Relations

Mr Vasily BOCHKAREV, Deputy, Yoshkar-Ola City Council

Mr Yuri BOGDANOV, Executive Director, «Consultant Plus» SPS Political Party Information Center

Ms Liubov CHILIKOVA, Reporter of «RIA Novosti» Newspaper

Ms Brigit Dreize, Expert, Liepa City Council in the matter of NGO and Social Integration

Ms Elena DUDUKINA, Co-ordinator, Youth Organization «Human Rights» Protection Group

Ms Irina EFREMOVA, Chief Specialist PR Department

Mr Grigory FANDEEV, Deputy, Regional Legislative Council

Mr Maxim GLAZKOV, Deputy, Likino-Dulevo Municipal Council

Mr Igor GOLDOBIN, Consultant, Administration of the Interaction with Local Authorities, Apparatus of Regional Legislative Council

Mr Vladimir GOLOBOKOV, Development Director of the Group of Professional Titles

Ms Elena GOLOVACH, Former Special Assistant to the Head, Administration of the Kharabalinsky District

Mr Maxim GOMA, Executive Director, «Erel» Non-Government Pension Fund

Ms Anastasiya GONTAREVA, Politology Department assistant of Kuban University, Reporter of «Universitetskaya zhizn» Newspaper

Ms Tatiana GREBENYUK, Tomsk Regional Branch of the Moscowsian Public Organization «Moscowsian Union of the Local Government», the Head of the Executive Committee

Mr Dmitry GRUSHEVSKIY, Publishing House «Kommersant», Nizhnevolsk Regional Office Director

Mr Andrey KARPOV, Deputy Director for the Legal affairs of «Oriolregionservis» LLC

Ms Elena KASTORNOVA, Head of Analytic and Informational Administration, Regional Department of Economic Policy

Ms Olga KAZARINA, Co-ordinator, «Youth Movement for Human Rights», Informational Programs

Ms Liliya KHRAMTSOVA, Chairman of City Public Organization Council «Together in the future»

Ms Irina KHRUNOVA, Lawyer, Advocacy Chamber, Republic of Tatarstan

Mr Sergey KHUDYAEV CEO, «SENIVA» LLC

Mr Abubakar KHUSAINOV, Head of the Department, President and Government Administration, Chechen Republic

Ms Galina KLEYMENOVA, Head, Legal Bureau for agreements and law expertises, Investment Development company, «Metropolis Development»

Mr Sergey KLIMENKOV CEO, of «Ivex» company

Mr Yury LITVINOV, Chairman, «Human Rights, Charitable and Educational Centre “Egida” NGO»

Mr Mikail MAGOMEDOV, Leading Expert, National Bank of Republic of Dagestan, Bank of Russia

Mr Nikolay MAMRUKOV, Deputy to Manager, «Crisis Managers Guild»

Mr Stanislav MOLCHANENKO, Assistant of the Deputy of State Duma of Russian Federation for Youth policy in Stavropol Region

Mr Roman OBUKHOV, Head, Ministry of Education and Science, Samara Regional Department

Ms Vera PRONKINA, Head, «Center for Developing of Parliamentarism and Self-Administration» Regional NGO

Ms Elena RUKAVISHNIKOVA, Kabardino-Balkaria College of Design under Kabardino-Balkaria State University – Teacher, Head of the «Presentation Design» Course – Reporter of «University life» Newspaper

Mr Pavel SARYCHEV, Executive Director, Informational Section of Radiostation «East of Russia»

Mr Evgeniya SHAMIS CEO, «Personnel Touch» Training and Consulting Center

Mr Andrey SINAYSKIY, Chairman of Public Organization «Sodejstviye», Chairman of Trade Organizations Leaders Association of Krasnoyarsk

Ms Natalya SOKOLOVA, Deputy of Pskovcity Duma, Chairman of Youth Policy Committee, Deputy Head of Pskov Regional executive Committee of «Edinaya Rossiya» Party

Mr Viatcheslav STAFEEV, Deputy Head of Department, Organized Crime Control Section, Interior Management, Vologda Region

Mr Andrey STARKOV, Director, «Magnitogorsky House of Cinema»

Mr Konstantin VISHNEVSKIY, Director Stavropol Regional Center for Civil Education

Ms Olena YURKINA, Lawer, Director of «Zodiak TV»

Tbilisi School of Political Studies

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

Mr Giorgi ABASHISHVILI, Economist, Young Republican Institute, Executive Director

Mr Iakob ALKAZASHVIL,I Economist, TV Company «Kavkasia», Journalist

Mr Vazha CHOPIKASHVILI, Economist, Real State Registration Center, Director

Mr Vakhtang DARTSMELIDZE POTI, Self-Government Member of Council, Lawyer

Mr Giorgi DAVLADZE MP, «Marabda-Kartsakhi» LLC Member of Supervisory Board

Mr Vakhtang DEKANOSIDZE, Lawyer, Insurance Company «Partner» CEO

Mr Besik GAZDELIANI, Tbilisi Municipality the Deputy Head of the Civil Integration Service, MP

Ms Ia GEGESHIDZE, Journalist, Regional Newspaper in Samtskhe-Javakheti «Southern Gate»

Ms Shorena GUNTSADZE, Lawyer, Tbilisi City Court, Judge

Mr Giorgi JASHI, Political Scientist, Director of the Council of Europe Information Office in Georgia

Ms Jana JIBLADZE, Lawyer, Shota Rustaveli State University, Head of Department of Law
Mr Mate KIRVALIDZE, Journalist, Georgian TV Company
Mr Kakhaber KOLELISHVILI, Financier, Consulting company Synergy group, Partner
Mr Jumber MARUASHVILI, Political Scientist, the International Association of Business and Parliament
Ms Tamar MIKABERIDZE, Lawyer, Parliament of Georgia, Legal Issues Committee, Assistant of the Chairman
Ms Tamar MTAVRISHVILI, Lawyer, Office of the Parliamentary Secretary of President of Georgia, Chief Consultant
Mr Ioseb NAKAIDZE, Lawyer, Bank of Georgia, Constructor's Relationship Assistant
Ms Nato NIZHARADZE, Journalist, Broadcasting Company «Kustavi 2», Host
Ms Nino NOZADZE, Lawyer, Parliament of Georgia, Agrarian Issues Committee, Assistant of Chairman
Mr Shalva PAPUASHVILI, Lawyer, German Technical Cooperation, Project «Legal and Justice Reforms in south Caucasus», Team Leader
Ms Ekaterine PIRTSKHALAVA, Psychologist, Tbilisi State University, Assistant Professor
Mr Tornike SHARASHENIDZE, Georgian Institute of Public Affairs, Professor
Mr Giorgi SHENGELIA, AG Construction General Director
Ms Nino SOSELIA, Lawyer, Tbilisi City Hall Administration Legal Department, Chief specialist
Mr Mate TAKIDZE, Lawyer, Minister of Education Culture and Sport of Autonomous Republic of Adjaria
Mr Irakli TAKIDZE, Economist, Government Staff of Autonomous Republic of Adjara, Senior Staff at Protocol Department
Mr Giorgi TKEMALADZE, Economist, Tbilisi City Assembly Member
Mr Elguja TKHELIDZE, Financier, «TBC Bank» Director of Mtatsminda Branch
Mr Gaioz TSAGAREISHVILI, Financier, JSC Insurance Company People's Insurance
Mr Kakha TSETSKHLADZE, Lawyer, Autonomous Republic of Ajara, Member of Assembly of Shuakhevi Municipality

Bulgarian School of Politics

Mr Dimi PANILZA, Founder of BsoP
Mr Julian POPOV, MRF, Deputy Regional Governor, Pernik
Ms Svetlana LOMEVA, Director of Bulgarian School of Politics (BSoP)
Ms Denitza LOZANOVA, Program Director, BSoP
Mr Ivan ANDONOV, UDF – Deputy Chairman of the National Executive Council UDF – Youth Organization, Burgas, Manager, Evro Business Consulting Group, EOOD
Ms Margarita ANGELOVA-GUTEVA, Mayor, Sredetz District, DSB
Mr Hristo APOSTOLOV, UDF – Organization Secretary for Southwest Bulgaria
Ms Olga APOSTOLOVA, Editor, Gorichka.bg
Ms Galina ASENOVA BSP, Municipal Councilor (Pernik), Junior Expert, Directorate «Waste Management»

Ms Evdokiya ASENOVA, BSP, Deputy Mayor of Radomir, Secretary of Youth Organization, Member of the Executive Bureau of the Municipal Council of BSP – Radomir

Mr Atanas CHOLAKOV, Chief Expert, State Agency for Youth and Sport (Sliven)

Ms Valentina DANEVA, Partner in Provida Company, Foreign Investments Consulting

Ms Zornitsa DIKLIEVA, UDF – Member of UDF – Stara Zagora

Mr Georgi DIMITROV BZNS, Member of the Board of BZNS-NS, Manager/Owner of «Georgi Dimitrov 7» Company

Ms Daniela DIMOVA, Executive Director of Public Charity Fund, Stara Zagora

Ms Mariyana DOBREVA, Chief Expert of the Program of the President of the Republic of Bulgaria

Ms Jordanka FANDAKOVA, Deputy Mayor of Sofia (2nd term), GERB

Ms Snezhina GABOVA, Development Director, BSoP

Mr Javor GECHEV BSP, Member of BSP City Council Plovdiv, Member of the Executive Bureau of BSP Plovdiv South, Secretary of 130 District Plovdiv South, Member of the Board of Directors of Info House NGO

Ms Irena GEORGIEVA, Partner Plutinex OOD, Exterior and Interior Design and Architecture

Ms Elitsa HRISTOVA, BNS (BZNS), Member of the Board of BZNS, Chief Specialist Public Relations, «Vazrazhdane» Pasari

Mr Boris IVANOV, National Security Service

Ms Antoaneta KISSELINCHEVA, BSP, Expert in the Cabinet of the Chairman of the Supreme Council of BSP

Ms Ralitsa KOSTOVA, NMSS, Expert, Department Analyses and Researches

Mr Joro KOVATCHEV, Director of Senior People Home, Veliko Tarnovo

Mr Antoniy KRASTEV, Bulgarian National Television, Member of GERB

Ms Anastasiya KRASTEVA, NMSS, Expert in the Cabinet of Milen Velchev

Mr Halil LETIFOV, MRF, Restaurant Manager, Kazanlak

Mr Hasan MEHMED, MRF, Municipal Councilor 2003-07, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance and European Integration, Pomorie Municipality, Member of the Committee on Regional Development, Construction and Environment Protection

Ms Boryana METODIEVA, MRF, Manager of Construction Company RIDO, OOD

Mr Ventzislav MIHAYLOV, Editor, Dnevnik Newspaper

Mr Milen MILANOV, Co-ordinator, Program for Roma Community Development, Sofia Municipality

Ms Presslava MUNGOVA, Public Administration Expert

Mr Svetlin NACHKOV, UDF – Member of UDF – Youth Organization, Veliko Tarnovo

Ms Silviya NEDEVA, Media Expert

Ms Iliyana NIKOLOVA, Executive Director, Foundation Workshop for Civic Initiatives

Mr Kalin PARVANOV, Journalist, Editor in Tema Journal

Mr Lyuben PETROV, UDF, Deputy Chairman of UDF-Sofia City Organization, Mayor of Vitosha District

Mr Prochko PROCHKOV, Mayor of Lozenetz District, DSB

Mr Emil RAYKOV, Director, «Intellect» – Pleven

Ms Nevin RIZA, UDF – Manager of Dreams OOD Advertising, Deputy Chairman of NGO Association for Social, Cultural and Educational Development of Minorities in Bulgaria

Mr Tsvetan SAYKOV, NMSS, Deputy Regional Governor, Yambol

Mr Belgin SHUKRI, MRF, Director, Isperikh Municipality

Mr Viktor TASLAKOV, NMSS, Deputy Regional Governor, Lovech

Mr Tihomir TSAROV, NMSS, Journalist, Manager/Partner of TS Radio, Gabrovo

Ms Alizan YAHOVA, MRF, Deputy Executive Director of State Fund Agriculture

European Institute for Political Studies (Moldova)

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

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

Ms Raisa MOROSANU, Accountant, European Institute for Political Studies of Moldova

Ms Monica BABUC, Christian Democratic People's Party, President of the Permanent Bureau, President of the Christian Democratic Women Society

Ms Natalia BEREGOI, National Company «Teleradio Moldova», Co-ordinator Editor

Ms Victoria BOIAN NATO, Information and Documentation Centre, Academical Programs Co-ordinator

Mr Sergiu BOISTEANU, Christian Democratic People's Party, Secretary on organizational issues

Ms Doina BORDEIANU, Main Consultant, Central Electoral Commission

Ms Aurelia BRAGUTA, UNDP Moldova, Broker

Mr Vitali CATANA, Free International University Lawers Bureau, Lawyer

Mr Corneliu CIRIMPEI, National League of Debates, National Co-ordinator

Mr Sergiu CORLAT, Education Informational and Communication Technologies Centre, Vice director

Ms Natalia COROBCA, Association for Foreign Policy, Programs Assistant

Ms Snejana CVASNEI, Public Administration Academy near the President of Republic of Moldova, Lecturer Public Association «Pro Community Centre», Community Development Consultant

Mr Nicolae DANDIS, Pro Europa Centre, Cahul Town, Lecturer, Independent Councilor, Cahul Town Council

Mr Vitali DICH,I Socialist Party «Patria-Rodina», Vice President, national Council of the Party

Mr Andrei HINCU, Party «Alliance Moldova Noastră», Vice President, Youth Organization, Member of the National Political Council

Ms Gloria JIGAU, Centre for Sociological Investigation and Market Studies «CBS-AXA», Junior Researcher

Mr Dumitru JIOARA, Liberal Democratic Party, President of the Youth Organization, Chisinau Branch

Mr Vitalie LUNGU, Parliament Apparatus, National Security, Defence and Public Order Commission Moldova, Main Consultant

Ms Ludmila LUPU, International Officer, Party «Alianta Moldova Noastră»

Ms Veronica LUPU, Liberal Democratic Party of Moldova, President, National Political Council

Mr Andrei MECINEANU, Democratic Party of Moldova, Member, National Council, Member of the Party Municipal Council, Vice President ad-interim, Youth Organisation

Mr Ghenadie MOCANU, IDIS «Viitorul», Programme Co-ordinator

Mr Sergiu NAVIN, Superior Inspector at the Center for Combating Economic Crimes and Corruption

Mr Victor NICHTUS, Radio Editor

Mr Victor OSIPOV, Parliament Apparatus, Moldova, Main Councillor, Party «Alliance Moldova Noastră»

Ms Liliana PALIHOVIC, Liberal Democratic Party of Moldova

Mr Vitalie PASCARU, Party of Social Democracy, Member, Political Bureau, Secretary Executive

Mr Sergiu RABEI, Christian Democratic People's Party, Vice President, Youth organization «Noua Generatie», President Youth organization, Chisinau Branch

Mr Eugeniu REVENCO, Programs Director, Association for Foreign Policy

Mr Vitalie ROTARU, PRONIS&Co LTD, Owner

Ms Ana RUDICO, Projects Co-ordinator, Institute of Political Policies

Mr Ruslan SINTOV, Centre of Analysis and Sociological, Political and Psychological Investigations CIVIS, Executive Director

Mr Lilian SPINU, Information and Security Service, CAT Deputy Chief

Ms Sorina STEFARTA, «Timpul de dimineata» Newspaper, Co-ordinator Chief Editor

Ms Tatiana TIBULEAC, Reporter, News Host, PRO TV Chisinau

Mr Ion TOMA, Democratic Party of Moldova, Secretary Executive, Youth Organization, Chisinau, Member of the National Bureau, Member of the National Council

Ms Cristina TOPA Party of Social Democracy, Vice President Youth Organization, Chisinau Branch

Mr Radu TURCANU, Law Court, Botanica Sector, Chisinau, Jugde

Mr Igor VOLNITCHI, «Profit» Magazine, Deputy Chief Editor

Pristina Institute for Political Studies

Ms Leonora KRYEZIU, Pristina Institute for Political Studies Executive Director

Ms Arjeta HASAN, Pristina Institute for Political Studies Project Co-ordinator

Mr Bashmir XHEMAJ, Pristina Institute for Political Studies Communication Officer

Mr Driton AVDIU, Member of the Presidency of the Movement «LEVIZJA PËR BASHKIM»

Mr Rinor BEKA, Legislative Program Officer – National Democratic Institute

Ms Xheraldina CERNOBREGU, Development & Outreach Communication Specialist, USAID

Mr Artan ÇOLLAKU, Senior Officer for European Affairs – Prime Minister's Office

Ms Mjellma HAPÇIU, Senior Program Officer – National Democratic Institute

Mr Medain HASHAN, Deputy Director at the Municipal Assembly of Ferizaj & Chairman of Political Party ORA

Ms Violeta HYSENI, Journalist, BBC Correspondent, Kosovo

Mr Ramadan ILAZI, Director of the Local NGO «Initiative for Progress» INPO

Ms Sebahate JONUZ, Manager of Division for Human Resources – Kosovo Anti Corruption Agency and member of LDK In Vushtrri

Ms Florije KQIKU, Inspector for Construction & Spatial Planning Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning
Mr Memli KRASNIQ,I Member of Parliament, Kosovo Assembly PDK
Mr Kushtrim MEHMETAJ, Managing Director of the Local NGO «ROGER»
Mr Berat MIFTAR,I Journalist for the Local Radio Station «Blue Sky»
Ms Manushaqe MUCAJ, Member of the LDK, Prizren, Ministry of Justice
Mr Alban MURIQI, Senior Legal Officer – Central Election Commission
Ms Merita MUSMURATI, Program Assistant – United States Office in Prishtina
Ms Latife NEZIRI, Captain – Chief of Liaison Office for Local and International Cooperation, Kosovo Police Service
Mr Agim NIKA, Deputy Director-Kosovo Customs Service
Ms Shqipe PANTINA Senior Program Officer of the Advocacy Organization IREX
Mr Xhemajl REXHA, Journalist and Editor TV Station «KTV»
Mr Avni SAHITI, Director of Procurement Department – Ministry of Local Governance
Mr Edi SEJDIU, Director of Prime Minister’s Agenda – Prime Minister’s Office PDK
Mr Zejdush TAHIRI, Family Medicine Doctor, Member of the LDK Presidency, Gjilan
Mr Sejdë TOLAJ, Member of LDD Presidency LDD
Mr Valon TOLAJ, Government Security Officer – Member of AAK Youth Presideny AAK
Mr Driton VATOVCI, Deputy Project Co-ordinator – GTZ
Mr Qazim VESELI, Police Inspector – Ministry of Internal Affairs
Mr Gëzim VISOKA, National Program Assistant – UNFPA
Mr Petrit ZOGAJ, Co-ordinator of the Movement «VETEVENDOSJA», Malishevë

Skopje School of Politics

Mr Gordan GEORGIEV, Executive director
Mr Norik SELIMI, Programme Co-ordinator –School of Politics
Ms Esma ADILOVIC, Civil Servant in the General Secretariat of the Government of the Republic of Macedonia
Mr Hisen AMETI, Student at Ss. Cyril and Methodius University – Skopje
Ms Bojana BABUNSKA, Secretary of the Chamber of Enforcement Agents of the Republic of Macedonia
Mr Zoran BIKOVSKI, Sociologist and Co-ordinator in NGO
Ms Aneta DIMOVSKA, Head of Unit for Coordination of Economic Policies and Reforms
Ms Maja FUZEVSKA, Adviser in the Secretariat for European Affairs
Ms Rada GRUBOVIK, National Institute for Transfusion Medicine
Mr Muamet HODZA, Journalist
Ms Hazbije IBISHI, Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia
Ms Samira IBRAIMI
Ms Julijana ILIEVSKA, Associate in the Secretariat for European Affairs

Mr Umit KASUM, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Macedonia

Mr Aleksandar KRSTEVSKI, Head of Unit for Human Resources Management – IPARD Agency

Mr Ramco KUNDEVSKI, Durable Solutions Assistant, UNHCR Skopje

Ms Elena KUZMANOVSKA, Director of Finance – Public Enterprise for Management with Housing and Business Premises of Republic of Macedonia

Ms Rilinda MAKELLARA, Referent at T-Mobile

Ms Ilina MANGOVA, Assistant Program Officer at International Republican Institute

Ms Ermira MEHMETI DUI, Spokesperson

Ms Lulzime MIFTARI, Ministry of Local Self Government

Ms Cvetanka MIHAJLOVSKA, Project Assistant

Ms Roza MIHAJLOVSKA, Graduate Jurist – Working in Parliament of R. Macedonia

Ms Ljubica MISHEVSKA, Graduated in Law and Politics

Mr Naser MUAREMI, Ministry of Local-Self Government

Mr Djuneis NURESKI, M.A. of Turkish Language and Literature, Professor in Elementary School

Mr Slagjan PENEV, Foreign Policy Editor in Forum plus weekly Magazine

Mr Ljupcho PRENDZOV, Counselor in the Cabinet of a Mayor of municipality Suto Orizari

Ms Zaslina PROSAROSKA, Police Adviser

Mr Xhezmi RAMADANI, Professor, Immigration Officer Norway Embassy Skopje

Ms Mihaela RISTOVSKA, Legal Expert on World Bank Project

Mr Spiro RISTOVSKI, Deputy Director, Agency for Supervision of Fully, Funded Pension Insurance

Ms Pavlina SIMONOSKA, Media Adviser in the Central Board of the Socialdemocratic Union of Macedonia

Mr Predrag STERIJEVIKJ, Employee in the Embassy of the French Republic

Mr Ivan TALESKI, Advisor in the Skopje Commission for the Protection of Competition

Mr Trajce TEFOV, AD «ELEM» HPP Tikves, Department for Production-Chief

Ms Ana VASILEVSKA, Journalist in Forum Plus weekly Magazine

Mr Zoran VASILEVSK, Director on Service Centre Automakedonija

Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence

Ms Sonja LICHT, President, Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence

Ms Biljana DAKIC-DJORDJEVIC, Development Director, Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence

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

Mr Filip ABRAMOVIC, Chief of Staff of the Speaker of the Belgrade City Assembly, DSS

Ms Sandra ARSENOVIC, Member of the Women Network Presidency, G 17 plus

Ms Mima BLASKOVIC, Women Youth Network Co-ordinator of the Democratic Youth of Belgrade Presidency, DS

Ms Maja BOBIC, Secretary General, European Movement in Serbia

Mr Branislav BOGAROSKI, Vice-President of the LSV Board

Ms Irena CEROVIC, Program Co-ordinator, Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence
Mr Janos CIKOS, Deputy Secretary of the Provincial Secretariat for Sports and Youth, SVM
Ms Tanja DOKMANOVIC, Member of the Executive Board of the Provincial Board, DS
Ms Diana DUDAS, Associate at the Cabinet of the Vice-President of the Vojvodina Provincial Assembly, SVM
Ms Jovana FA, Member of the Political Parties' Youth Branches Advisory Council at the Ministry of Youth and Sports, G17 plus
Ms Zeljka JEVТИC, Journalist, Blic Newspapers
Mr Aleksandar JOVANOVIC, Member and President of the LSV Parliamentary Group in the Novi Sad City Assembly
Ms Maja LAUSEVIC, MP at the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia, DS
Mr Nikola LAZIC, MP at the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia, DSS
Mr Pavel MARCOK, MP at the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia, DS
Mr Dejan MARKOVIC, Roma Issues Adviser, Serbian Government's Agency for Human and Minority Rights
Ms Vesna MARTINOVIC, MP at the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia, DS
Mr Djordje MICIC, Author and Host of Political Talk-Show «DIREKTNO», RTV Studio B
Mr Nenad MILENKOVIC, MP at the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia, DS
Mr Zoran MISCEVIC, Mayor, Sremska Mitrovica Municipality
Mr Relja PANTIC, Regional Media Associate for the Sumadija County at the DSS Executive Board
Mr Nikola PAPAK, Press Officer in Chief of the G17 plus Secretariat
Mr Zarko PIVAC, MP at the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia, DS
Ms Dragana RADIVOJEVIC, Women Network Co-ordinator at the Municipal Board, G17 plus
Mr Enver RAMADANI, Member of the Presidency of the Youth Forum of the Municipal Board, PDD
Ms Konstantin SAMOFALOV, MP at the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia, DS
Mr Zoran SESIC, Judge, The First Municipal Court
Mr Hivzo SKRIJELJ, Vice-President of the Municipal Board, SDP
Ms Jovana STANISLJEVIC, Chief of International Cooperation Department, Megatrend University
Mr Zivojin STANKOVIC, MP at the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia, DS
Mr Goran STOJKOVIC, MP at the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia, DS
Mr Nikola TARBUK, Program Manager, Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities
Mr Milorad VESIC, Editor of the Politics Section, Politika Newspapers
Mr Miroslav ZIVKOVIC, Member of the Educational Council of the Municipal Assembly, SPO

Academy for Political Development (Croatia)

Ms Nevena CRLJENKO, Executive Director of Academy for Political Development
Mr Nikola BUKOVIC, Programme Assistant of Academy for Political Development
Mr Dragan BAGIC, Assistant, Faculty of Philosophy

Mr Davor BERNARDIC, MP (SDP)

Mr Gordan BOSANAC, Programme Manager, Center for Peace Studies

Ms Maja BUKSA, Advisor, Government of Croatia, Office for Human Rights

Ms Zeljana BUNΤIC-PEJAKOVIC, Programme Manager, CSO CENZURA

Mr Tedi CHIAVALON, Secretary General of IDA (Istrian Democratic Assembly)

Mr Hrvoje CIRKVENEC, Journalist

Mr Stjepan CURAJ, Member of Osijek City Council (HNS)

Mr Vladimir CVIJANOVIC, Assistant, Faculty of Economics & Business

Ms Iva FRKIC, Civil servant, Central Office for Development Strategy and Coordination of EU funds

Mr Ognjen GOLUBIC, Journalist and Editor, Croatian television

Ms Ivana GRLJAK, Parliamentary Advisor (SDP)

Mr Darko LABOR, Editor, Croatian Radio

Mr Marko LACKOVIĆ, Key Account Manager, Huawei Tech. Investment Co.Ltd

Ms Sladjana LUCIC, Journalist, RTL Croatia

Mr Stjepan MANDIC, Director of Financial Direction, Croatian Postal Bank

Ms Sandra PERNAR, Program Co-ordinator and Administrative Director in CSO GONG

Mr Teodor PETRICEVIC, Finance Manager in CSOs

Ms Magdalena PETROVIC, Producer, Fade In

Mr Denis RUBIC, Owner and Senior Consultant, DALMACONSULT

Ms Jelena SIMINIATI, Advisor, Croatian Competition Agency

Ms Sladjana STOJANOVIC, Office Manager, Vukovar Institute for Peace Research and Education

Mr Hrvoje STOJIC, Head of Economic Research, Hypo Alpe-Adria-Bank

Mr Dejan VINKOVIC, Assistant, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Kinesiology

Mr Bernard ZENZEROVIC, Head of Mayor's Office, City of Pula

«Ovidiu Șincai» European School (Romania)

Ms Anne Rose Marie JUGANARU, Director of the «Ovidiu Șincai» European School

Ms Diana TIRZIU, Project Assistant, «Ovidiu Șincai» European School

Mr George-Vadim TIUGEA, Project Assistant, «Ovidiu Șincai» European School

Mr Florin ALEXE, Local Councilor, Vice-president of the National Liberal Party, 3rd District Organization, Bucharest

Ms Codruta Claudia ARVINTE, President, Greater Romania Youth, Bacau

Mr Daniel Ionut BARBULESCU, Vice-President, Democratic Liberal Party

Mr Cosmin BELACURENCU, Competition Inspector, Bucharest Council of Competition

Mr Adrian BUCUR, Editor, Prima TV

Ms Adriana BUNEA, Stagiaire, European Commission

Ms Maria-Manuela CATRINA, Parliamentary Adviser, Chamber of Deputies

Ms Maria Magdalena CEAMURU, Marketing Responsible, BRD-GSG
Ms Oana Dana GAITA, Executive Secretary, Democratic-Liberal Party, Timis County
Ms Zsuzsanna GYARFAS, Member of Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania
Mr Andrei IORDACHE, Manager of the Scornicesti Hospital, Olt County
Ms Csilla LORINCZ, Councilor, Ministry of Development, Public Works and Housing, Member of Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania
Mr Claudiu LUKACSI, Editor, Producer, Moderator, Bucharest National Television
Ms Roxana Andreea MANASIA, Political Consultant, Social Democratic Party, Timis County
Mr Bogdan Alexandru MARTA, Editor, Banateanul Newspaper, Timișoara
Ms Ligia Catalina MATEI, Publicist Commentator, Rompres News Agency
Mr Cristian MATEI, Legal Advisor, Member of the Conservative Party
Ms Carmen Mihaela NICA, Assistant Manager, National Liberal Party, Lasi Territorial Organization
Mr Marius Florinel NICOLAESCU, Superior Councilor, Territorial Inspectorate for Woods and Hunting, Ploiești
Ms Raluca PETCUT, Romani CRISS Organization
Mr Georgian POP, Councilor of the President of the Social Democratic Party
Mr Alexandru Ion POPESCU, Senior Trainer, PETROM SA
Ms Loredana POPOVICI, Deputy Chief-Editor, Flacara Iasului Newspaper
Mr Nicusor Cosmin PURIS, Investigation Journalist, Faclia de Cluj Newspaper
Mr George RADULESCU, Chief of Internal Politics Department, Adevarul Newspaper
Ms Henrieta Anisoara SERBAN, Researcher, Political Science and International Relations Institute, Bucharest Academy
Mr Codrin STEFANESCU, Vice-President of the Conservative Party
Mr Alexandru Ion STERIU, Chief of the Sugar Service, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Payment and Agricultural Interventions Agency
Mr Octavian Ionut TUDORACHE, President of the Greater Romania Youth Organization, Tulcea County
Mr Doru Cosmin URсу, Lawyer, Bucharest Bar
Ms Sabina Maria VARGA, Editor, Realitatea TV
Mr Ioan VULPESCU, Parliamentary Expert, Bucharest Senate
Ms Maria Gabriela ZOANA, Lawyer, Arges Bar

Yerevan School of Political Studies

Mr Armen ZAKARYAN, Yerevan School of Political Studies, Director
Ms Elina MKRTUMYAN, Yerevan School of Political Studies, Project Co-ordinator
Ms Alisa ALAVERDYAN, Eurasia Partnership Foundation, Communications Officer
Mr Artak ASATRYAN, Human Rights Defender's Office, Senior Assistant to the HRD
Mr Karen BEKARYAN, «European Integration» NGO, Chairman
Mr Vahagn DABAGHYAN, «Kyavar» TV Company, Editor in Chief

Mr Grigori DOKHOYAN, «Nairi Soft Inc.» Firm, Programmer

Mr Hrayr GEVORGYAN, National Assembly of the Republic of Armenia, External Relations Department, Leading Specialist

Mr Petros GHAZARYAN, Multi Media Kentron TV, Political Analyst

Mr Robert GRIGORYAN, Metsamor Mayor's Office, Director of the Information-Analytical Center// Yerevan State Agrarian University, Chair of Jurisprudence and Political Science, Lecturer

Mr Sargis GRIGORYAN, «United Labour Party of Armenia», Responsible for Youth Affairs

Ms Lilit GYOZALYAN, National Archives of Armenia, Department of Usage of Documents, First Class Specialist

Ms Meri HAKOBYAN, Embassy of France in Armenia, Press Attaché

Mr Mihran HAKOBYAN, Yerevan State University, Head of Student Department

Ms Tsovinar HARUTYUNYAN, OSCE Office in Armenia, Senior Democratization Assistant

Mr Levon HOVSEPYAN, Institute of Political Research, Expert

Ms Gohar ISKANDARYAN, Institute of Oriental Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of RA, Scientific Researcher on Iranian Studies, PhD, Associate Professor

Ms Liliya ISRAYELYAN, Embassy of France in Armenia, Consular Agent

Ms Marine MALKHASIAN, UNDP Office in Armenia, Protecting Human Rights and Promoting Human Rights and Human Rights Education in Armenia, Project Co-ordinator

Ms Yevgenia MANUKYAN, «Press Club Ararat» NGO, Programme Manager

Mr Suren MANUKYAN, Yerevan Genocide Museum-Institute, Deputy Director

Mr Armen MARTIROSYAN, National Assembly of the Republic of Armenia, Member of Parliament, «Heritage» Party

Ms Lilit MARTIROSYAN, Embassy of France in Armenia, Consular Agent

Mr Suren MURADYAN, Municipality of Town Charentsavan, Press Secretary

Ms Lusine PETROSYAN, «Eurowagen», LLC, PR Manager/«World of Light Child and Youth Centre» NGO, President

Ms Meri POGHOSYAN, Habitat for Humanity Armenia, Resource Development Manager

Ms Zaruhi POSTANYAN, National Assembly of the Republic of Armenia, Member of Parliament, «Heritage» Party

Mr Artak SHAKARYAN, Institute of Oriental Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of RA, Senior Researcher, Scientific Secretary

Ms Lilit SIMONYAN, Constitutional Court of the Republic of Armenia, Judge Assistant

Mr Armen SOGHOYAN, Yerevan Municipality, Head of Health and Social Affairs Department

Mr Manuk SUKIASYAN, «Armat» NGO, Board Member

Ms Rusanna TSATURYAN, Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography, National Academy of Sciences of RA, Department of Ethnography, Research Assistant

Mr Sergey TUMANYAN, «National Democratic Party of Armenia», Member

Ms Gayane VARDANYAN, «Protection of Consumers' Rights» NGO, Projects Co-ordinator/Advocacy Specialist

Mr Artak ZAKARYAN, Republican Party of RA, Co-ordinator of External Relations

Ukrainian School of Political Studies

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

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

Ms Svitlana MATVIIENKO, Informational Manager, Ukrainian School of Political Studies

Mr Oleksandr BABYCH, Deputy Head of Department for Territorial Organisation of Authorities and Local Self-Governance, Regional Policy Department, Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine

Ms Zoryana BORTNOVSKA, Assistant to the First Deputy Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Ukraine

Mr Anatoliy BOYKO, Head of Odesa Oblast Organisation of the Committee of Voters of Ukraine

Ms Maryna CHERENKOVA, Member of Donetsk Oblast Council, Deputy Chairman of the Permanent Commission for Administrative and Territorial System and Modern Models of Regional Development, Director of WTD, President of the Prychetnist Charity Foundation

Mr Oleksandr DANUTSA, Leader of Our Ukraine Faction in Kirovohrad City Council, Head of Kirovohrad City Organisation of Our Ukraine People's Union, Chairman of the Board of Ves Kirovohrad Media Group, President of Kirovohrad Oblast Charity Foundation for the Support of Independent Press

Ms Iryna FEDORIV, Director of the News and Analysis Department of IMC-CTV (Vikna-Novyny)

Mr Ivan GAYVANOVYCH, Journalist of the Deutsche Welle Radio, Observer of the Eurasian House News and Analysis Portal

Mr Oleksiy GRYTSENKO, Director of Department for Business Development, EnranTelecom, Expert of the Razumkov Centre

Mr Oleksandr IAREMA, Executive Director of the Ukrainian Foundation for Support to Reforms, Member of the Board of the Reforms and Order Political Party, Head of the Executive Committee of Kyiv Oblast Organisation of the Reforms and Order Political Party

Mr Oleksandr ISYP, Mayor of Kobelyaky Town

Ms Yuliya KOVALEVSKA, Director of the Training Centre of the Party of Regions Head Quarters, Member of the 5th Parliament (Party of Regions)

Ms Alina KOVYLINA, Chairman of the Board of Slavutych Invest Ltd

Mr Andrii KOZIURA, Leader of Our Ukraine Faction in Lutsk City Council, Member of Board and Presidium of Volyn Oblast Organisation of Our Ukraine People's Union, Deputy Head of City Organisation of Our Ukraine People's Union, Lawyer

Mr Oleksandr KRUKIVSKYY, Head of Municipal Development Department of Zhytomyr City Council, Member of Zhytomyr City Council, Chairman of the Permanent Commission for Housing and Municipal Economy, Public Welfare, and Environment, Director of the Innovation Institution

Mr Yuri KUSHNIR, Partner and Director of Kushnir, Yakymyak and Partners Law Company

Mr Vadym LYAKH, Director of the MSP Company, Member of the Slavyansk City Council, Deputy head of the Committee on Municipal Property

Mr Oleh MAKAR, First Deputy Head of Mostysk District State Administration, Member of Lviv Oblast Council

Mr Hennadiy MAKSAK, President of Polissya Foundation of International and Regional Studies, Think Tank, Member of the Board and Executive Committee of Chernihiv Oblast Organisation of the People's Party

Ms Olena MASLYUKIVSKA, Senior Lecturer of the Environment Chair of Kyiv Mohyla Academy National, Lecturer of Kyiv Mohyla Business School, Director of the Representative Office of the Foundation for Support to Chornobyl Children in Ukraine

Mr Volodymyr MEREZHKO, Deputy Chair of the International Cooperation and European Integration Department of Vinnytsya Oblast State Administration

Mr Dmytro MURASHKO, Director, Chairman of the Board of Rusal Social Programmes Centre

Ms Mariya ORLYK, Attorney-at-law of the CMS Reich-Rohrwig Hainz

Mr Dmytro PAVLOV, First Deputy Head of the Youth and Sport Department of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast State Administration, Member of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast Council, Chairman of the Permanent Commission for Science, Education, Family and Youth, Deputy Head of the Youth Union of the Regions of Ukraine, Member of the Executive Committee of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast Office of the Party of Regions

Ms Nataliya PECHERSKA, Director of the Internal Policy Department of Kharkiv Oblast State Administration

Ms Tetyana PECHONCHYK, Head of the PR Section of Glavred Media Holding, Editor of the Human Rights News and Analysis UNIAN Project

Mr Stanislav POGREBNYAK, Assistant Professor of the State and Law Chair of Yaroslav Mudryi National Law Academy, Member of the Editing Board of the Buhgalter Magazine

Ms Olena POMAZANOVA, Deputy Chairman of the Board, Investments into Ukraine Company

Ms Yuliya PUSHKO, Director for Relations with the Government, Willard Group International PR Agency (Burson Marsteller Subsection)

Ms Anna RADCHENKO, Senior Researcher of the Presidium of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Academic Secretary of the Research and Publication Council of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

Ms Maryna RYMARENKO, Director for Marketing, DEOL Partners

Mr Oleksandr SHATKOVSKYY, Head of the Law Support Department of the State TV and Radio Broadcasting Committee

Mr Igor SHULGA, Director of the AVK Export Department

Ms Kateryna SMAGLIY, Political Analyst of the Political Section of the US Embassy to Ukraine

Ms Iryna SOLOHENKO Director of the European Programme of Renaissance Foundation

Ms Roksolana STADNYK, Head of Division on PR & Mass Media, Ministry of Economy of Ukraine

Mr Mykhailo STRASHKIN, Chairman of the Board of Dniprovs'k Association for Regions' Development (NGO)

Mr Oleksandr SYNOOKYI, Deputy Chairman of the Board, Agency for Legislative Initiatives (Think Tank)

Ms Tetiana VALKOVA, Program Co-ordinator of Institute of Political Education

Baku Political Studies Programme

Mr Ilgar MAMMADOV, Director of Baku Political Studies Programme

Ms Liaman ALIYEVA, Programme Assistant, Baku Political Studies Programme

Mr Farid ABASOV, Legal Advisor, «Nobel Oil Ltd» Branch Office in Azerbaijan

Mr Fakhri ABBASOV, Political Assistant, The Embassy of the United States of America, Baku

- Ms Ulviyya ABDULLAYEVA, Legal Expert, EU-Azerbaijan Partnership and Cooperation Agreement
- Ms Gulara AFANDIYEVA, Primary Healthcare Services Expert, Ministry of Health, World Bank Project
- Mr Dadash ALISHOV, Associate, Booz/Allen/Hamilton Azerbaijan
- Mr Jafar ALIYEV, Country Manager, RRC Enterprise Networking Group
- Ms Gulnara ALIYEVA, Head of HR and Legal Department, Xalq Insurance Company
- Mr Kanan ASLANLI, Editor of the «Budget & transparency», and «Oil contracts in Azerbaijan» Quarteries, Public Finance Monitoring Center (PFMC)
- Ms Matanat AZIZOVA, Director, Woman Crisis Center
- Ms Nargiz BAGHIRLI, Counsellor, Economic Department, Ministry of Industry and Energy
- Mr Kamil BAGHIROV, Senior Adviser, International Cooperation Department, Ministry of Emergency Situations
- Mr Fikrin BAKTASHI, WTO-Accession Legal Expert, Chemonics International, Trade and Investment Reform Support Project in Azerbaijan
- Ms Elnara GARIBOVA, Co-Founding Leader of the «Ireli» Youth Movement
- Ms Aynur GULIYEVA, Legal Assistant, the OSCE Office in Baku
- Mr Akif GURBANOV, Member of the Central Election Commission of Azerbaijan Republic
- Mr Elchin HAGVERDIYEV, Political Security/Risk Analyst, BP Exploration (Caspian Sea) Limited
- Mr Rahman HAJIYEV, Claims Director, MBASK Insurance Company
- Mr Ilgar HASANLI, Program Officer, Eurasia-Azerbaijan Foundation
- Mr Akram HASANOV, Board Member, AF-Bank
- Mr Ulfat IBRAHIMOV, Lecturer at the University of Foreign Languages
- Mr Ulvi ISMAYIL, Project Management Specialist in Democracy and Governance, States Agency for International Development (USAID)/Azerbaijan
- Ms Khadija ISMAYILOVA, Head of the Baku Bureau of Radio Liberty
- Mr Natig JAFAROV, Chief Economist, «Azersu» Corporation, Economic&Political Blogger
- Ms Shahla MAHMUDOVA, Project Co-ordinator, International Foundation for Electoral Systems
- Mr Mahir MAMMADOV, Lawyer, Member of Bar Association
- Mr Vusal MAMMADOV, Chief of Legal Department, Trade Union of Public Servants
- Mr Anar NAGHIYEV, Country Co-ordinator, Regional Library and Internet Access Training Program, IREX
- Ms Leyla OSMANOVA, Director, SMG LTD Publishing Company
- Mr Mutallim RAHIMOV, Deputy Chairman of Edalet Party
- Mr Elchin RIZAYEV, Program Assistant, US International Republican Institute
- Ms Aytan SHIRINOVA, Executive Director, «Azerbaijan Social Development» Charity and Social Programs NGO
- Ms Aysel SULEYMANOVA, Member Relation & PR Manager, American Chamber of Commerce in Azerbaijan
- Ms Zarema VALIKHANOVA, Co-ordinator for Azerbaijan, South Caucasus Radio Project

Mr Teymur VALIYEV, Economic Adviser to the Head of Executive Power of Sumqayit City

Academy for Political Excellence (Sarajevo)

Mr Zdravko GREBO, University Professor

Mr Miroslav ZIVANOVIC, Librarian

Ms Sanja ALATOVIC, Civil Servant

Mr Adis BESIC, Professor of Philosophy and Sociology

Mr Bojan BOSNJAK, Political activist/MP

Mr Darko BRKAN, NGO Activist

Ms Danijela BUGARIN, Journalist

Ms Aida BULJUBASIC, Political Activist

Mr Miralem CANDIC, Economist

Mr Igor COCIC, Economist

Mr Sinisa CVIJIC, Architect

Ms Minja DAMJANOVIC, NGO Activist

Mr Dalibor DJERIC, Economist

Ms Almedina DURAK, Civil Servant

Ms Zehra GILIC, Civil Servant

Mr Bojan GOLIC, Civil Servant

Ms Maja KREMENOVIC, NGO Activist

Mr Goran KUCERA, Student

Mr Slavisa LUCIC, Police Officer

Ms Nina MALOVIC, Political Activist

Ms Lejla MAZLIC, NGO Activist

Ms Marina PELEMIS, Student

Ms Paula PRANJIC, Student

Ms Lejla SAKOVIC, Civil Servant

Ms Tanja SKRBIC, NGO Activist

Ms Erna SKULIC, Journalist

Mr Adi SMAJIC, Economist

Ms Mirna SOJA, Journalist

Ms Nina STEVANOVIC, Student

Ms Amela SULJIC, NGO Activist

Mr Vladan TRIVKOVIC, Civil Servant

Ms Nermina VOLODER, Journalist

Albanian School of Political Studies

Mr Olsi KEDOVI, Director ASPS

Ms Ledi JAHJA-MUCA, ASPS Staff Member
Ms Arbana DIBRA, Executive Director Civil Society Development Center
Mr Remzi ALIAJ, General Director for Employment Office in Vlora
Mr Erion AVLLAZAGAJ, Lecturer at Elbasan University
Mr Erlis CELA, Journalist at Standard Newspaper
Ms Sanije FATKOJA, Branch Manager Opportunity Albania
Ms Evis FICO, Lawyer at the Ministry of Labour
Ms Nahle FICO-BEJLERI, Sociologist at the Ministry of Labour
Ms Klodiana GJINAJ, PR Director Electric Power Company
Ms Edlira GJONI, Journalist at Tirana Observer
Mr Ervin KARAMUCO, Ombudsman Commissioner
Mr Olsi KARAPICI, IT Director for Council of Ministers
Ms Brasena KOKA, Community Development Co-ordinator
Mr Bledar KURTI, University Lecturer in Tirana
Mr Rezart LAHI, Journalist Shijak TV
Ms Edlira MALI, OGJLVI General Manager Tirana
Mr Marin MEMA, Journalist at Top Channel TV
Ms Eralda MET-HASANI, Lecturer at Tirana University
Ms Brunilda MINAROLLI-PECI, Desk Officer in MFA
Mr Flir MOSHO, Investment Director at the Ministry of Finance
Ms Ivis NOCKA, Head Project Manager at the Ministry of Defense
Ms Edlira PAPAVANGJELI, Helsinki Comity Project Co-ordinator
Ms Vilma PREMTI, General Director at the Ministry of Labour
Ms Genta RAMADANI, Woman to Woman NGO Director
Mr Klodian RRJEPAJ, Medical Doctor IPH Tirana
Ms Beslinda RRUGIA, Ass.lawyer
Ms Monika STAFA, Journalist at Top Channel TV
Mr Gjergji TANE, General Director for Employment Office in Korca
Mr Erion TASE, Journalist Newspaper
Mr Elson THANA, Judiciary Police Officer
Mr Arben VATA, Chief editor in Klan TV
Mr Gjok VUKSANI, Member of Parliament
Ms Elvana ZHEZHA, Chief Cabinet for MFA
Ms Elda ZOTAJ, Business Manager

School of Democratic Leadership (Montenegro)

Mr Boris RAONIC, SDL director
Mr Dalibor PRELEVIC, SDL Administarive Manager

Mr Miodrag BABOVIC, Daily Newspapers «Vijesti», Journalist
Ms Hidajeta BAJRAMSPAHIC, SDP, MP
Mr Zeljko BURIC, Syndicate, Deputy Secretary General
Mr Robert CAMAJ, Democratic union of Albanians, Secretariat of Tuzi
Ms Isidora DAMJANOVIC, MfC, President of Womens' Organization
Mr Goran DASIC, SNP, Member of Main Board
Mr Velimir DJOKOVIC, SNS, Member of Executive Board
Mr Emin DURAKOVIC, Movement for Changes, MP
Ms Edina HASANAGA – COBAJ, YIHR, Executive Co-ordinator
Mr Goran JEVRIC, DPS, Member of Executive Board
Mr Slavenko JOVANOVIC, DPS, Secretary of MPs Club
Mr Milos KONATAR, Movement for Changes, President of Youth
Mr Dragan KOPRIVICA CDT, Deputy Director
Mr Emil KRIJESTORAC, Vice-President of Executive Board of People Party
Mr Vuk MARAS MANS, Co-ordinator
Ms Violeta MARNIKU, Student of Political Studies
Mr Ljubomir MAZALICA, Peoples Party, Member of Executive Board
Ms Sanja MIHALJEVIC, SNP, Youth Organization
Ms Marina MIKETIC, TV IN, Journalist
Ms Ljiljana MILIC, RTCG, Journalist
Ms Vera MILJANIC, Liberal Party, Secretary General
Ms Jelena MITROVIC, SDP, International Officer
Mr Suljo MUSTAFIC, Bosniak Party, Spokeperson
Mr Ljubisa PEJOVIC, Radio Antena M, Editor of Informative Programme
Mr Vukomir RADENOVIC, Daily Newspapers «DAN», Journalist
Mr Rajko RADEVIC, CEDEM, Co-ordinator
Mr Miroslav SCEPANOVIĆ, NDI, Co-ordinator
Mr Mirko STANIC, SDP, Secretary for Information
Ms Milena STESEVIC, SNP, Alumnus of IV Generation
Mr Kemal ZORONJIC, Bosniak Party, Vice-President

East European School of Political Studies (Belarus)

Mr Serguei PANKOVSKI, Director of the East European School of Political Studies
Mr Alexander DABRAVOLSKI, Chairman of Board of EESPS, Member of Political Council of United Civil Party
Ms Valentina POLEVICOVA, Co-ordinator of the East European School of Political Studies
Ms Sviatlana ASTROUSKAYA, Head of Document Operations Division of Vnesheconombank, Master in Economic Science

Ms Liudmila BALITSEVICH, Senior Lecturer of Juridical College of Belarusian State University
Mr Siarhei BALYKIN, Private Entrepreneur, Journalist, P.G. of Minsk Management Institute
Mr Yauhen BANDARETS, Senior Program Specialist of Mogilev City Committee of Belarusian Republican Youth Union
Ms Tatyana CHULITSKAYA, Lecturer of European Humanities University, Co-ordinator of Students' Activity
Ms Maryna DANILEVICH, P.G. of Belarusian Music Academy, Bachelor of Arts
Mr Henadzi FARYNO, Engineer of Minsk Branch of Belarusian Railroad
Mr Yury KARETKAU, Private Entrepreneur, Leader of Youth Organization «Right Alliance»
Mr Sergei KEDYSHKO, Private Entrepreneur
Ms Tanya KOROVENKOVA, Editor of Information Agency «BelaPAN»
Ms Yuliya KOTSKAYA, Journalist, «RADIO RACIJA»
Mr Andrei KUSIALCHUK, Independent Analyst, Journalist, Political Scientist
Mr Siarhei MAHONAU, Private Practicing Lawyer, Member of Brest Regional Association of Legal Advisers
Ms Katsiaryna MARSINOVICH, Art Editor of «BelKP Press»
Mr Aliaksei MIADZVETSKI, Erasmus Mundus Master in Journalism and Media Within Globalization, P.G. Student
Ms Nadzeya MILIUTS, Economist, Marketing Specialist of Enterprise «Minsk Plant of Wheeled Tractors»
Mr Sergei MUDROV, Lecturer of Foreign Languages Faculty of Baranovichi State University, Master in Humanitarian Science
Ms Natallia RABAVA, Deputy Director of «Info-Stalking» Ltd.
Mr Siarhei RASHCHENIA, Senior Scientific Fellow of Institute of System Analysis
Mr Siarhei SALASH, Deputy Director of Information and Analytical Agency «European Wave»
Mr Andrei SCHUMANN, Docent of Belarusian State university, Ph.D.
Mr Aliaksandr SHARAFANOVICH, Engineer of Minsk Tractor Plant, Activist of Belarusian Popular Front Party
Mr Artyom SHARKOV, Head of Organizational Department of Republican Confederation of Entrepreneurship, Assistant to Chairman of Minsk Capital Union of Entrepreneurs and Employers
Ms Olga SHPARAGA, Docent of Philosophy Faculty of European Humanities University, Editor Internet Journal «New Europe» www.n-europe.eu, Ph.D.
Mr Aliaksandr SHUMKEVICH, Private Entrepreneur, Leader of Youth organization «Young Democrats»
Mr Aliaksandr STRALTSOU, Editor of «Our Choice» Newspaper of Minsk City Coalition of United Democratic Forces, Deputy Chairman of Minsk City Organization of Belarusian Social-Democratic Party «Hramada»
Mr Andrei STSIAPANAU, Lecturer of European Humanities University, Master in Political Science
Mr Maksim VARATSILIN, Director General of Private Enterprise «Belideal» – AVIS Licensee in Belarus
Mr Uladzimir VUYEK, Chairman of Regional Organization «Young Democrats»

Mr Uladzimir YALENSKI, Private Practicing Lawyer

Mr Dzianis YUBITSKI, Private Entrepreneur

Mr Aliaksandr ZALATAR, Deputy of Fanipol Municipal Council

Ms Svetlana ZINKEVICH, Organization development Specialist of Representation of Corporation «Christian Children's Fund Inc», Master in Humanitarian Science, Political Scientist

Annex III: Final Declaration

Third Summer University for Democracy (Strasbourg, 30 June to 4 July 2008)

We, the 650 participants of the Third Summer University for Democracy, representing the Council of Europe's Network of 16 Schools of Political Studies:

- Reiterate our strong commitment to the promotion and safeguard of the fundamental values embodied in the Statute of the Council of Europe and shared by its member states and peoples: pluralist democracy, the protection of human rights and human dignity, including the rights of minorities, respect for diversity and the upholding of the rule of law;
- Recall that pan-European unity is our common goal and that, as the last generation who bore witness to a divided Europe, we emphasise the importance to continue promoting a Europe without dividing lines and to act in its favour for future generations, on the basis of these aforementioned values;
- Acknowledge that today governance is a significant resource in policy-making and policy implementation at local, regional, national, European and global levels and that it poses unprecedented challenges to contemporary leaders and decision-makers;
- Express the concern that governance sometimes leads to incompatibility with democracy, the crisis of governability, questioning the legitimacy and representativity of institutions, and a lack of respect for the rule of law, which have been the major points of discussions in our working sessions this year;
- Consider that, as an exercise of power and as an instrument of political action, governance has the potential to contribute to our goals of achieving stability, economic prosperity and social progress, but that it must be strictly framed within our common values and conform to the model of democratic government that we advocate;
- Reaffirm that democratic consolidation depends upon the continuous dialogue between public authorities and civil society; the holding of free, fair and regular elections, the safeguarding of the principles of freedom of expression and freedom of the press; and the promotion of local self-government that permits decisions to better reflect the needs and concerns of the people;
- Commit ourselves to engage, individually and collectively through our current colleagues and alumni, in the promotion of the aforesaid ideals, in the pursuit of creating a more democratic, united and inclusive Europe;
- Express our conviction that the organisation of bilateral and regional meetings in this year's conference, as well as outside the sessions of the Summer University, has proven to be a rewarding and rare platform to discuss pressing issues that concern our countries and hope that these will be further developed in future;
- Express our solidarity with the participants of the Belarusian School of Political Studies and all young citizens of Belarus who have been expelled from schools and universities and who have had legal proceedings brought against them for their political beliefs. We encourage the media and human rights organisations to monitor and raise awareness on the human rights situation in Belarus, in particular in the pre-election period;

- Call for the elimination of barriers erected by the Belarusian authorities, against the registration and activities of NGOs, including the School of Political Studies in Belarus. We ask for the abolition of Article 193-1 of the Criminal Code that criminalises participation in and activities of a non-registered organisation;
- Look forward to the day when Belarus will be ready to join the Council of Europe as a fully-fledged member state;
- Welcome the recent creation of the “European Cyprus Forum”, an initiative sponsored by the European Commission and the Council of Europe, inspired by the model of the Council of Europe’s Schools of Political Studies and hope that this Forum will contribute to better mutual understanding and co-operation between the two main communities in the still-divided island;
- Encourage the Council of Europe, the European Union, the governments of the member states, observers and all public and private partners to continue and increment their support for the further development of the network of Schools of Political Studies, a unique project that seeks to ensure that democratic values, institutions and practices become a reality across the European continent;
- Welcome, in this context, the establishment of the European Association of the Schools of Political Studies, an initiative aimed at enhancing the visibility, growth and consolidation of this project, and thank Catherine Lalumière, former Secretary General of the Council of Europe, for accepting to chair the Association;
- Welcome the ever-closer collaboration between the Council of Europe and the European Commission and hope that this partnership will continue to thrive in the coming years to the benefit of the Schools and their participants;
- Express our gratitude to all the prominent personalities, speakers, experts and institutions (local, national and international) who have contributed to making these past five days of constructive debate a rare opportunity for sharing experiences and ideas;
- Look forward to the Fourth Summer University for Democracy in 2009, which will coincide with the 60th anniversary of the Council of Europe and the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall, as well as the beginning of the reunification of our continent.

Strasbourg, 4 July 2008