of principles such as rule of law, public accountability and an effective regulatory environment.

In the last few years, it has become clear that the political preferences of the Serbian and Montenegrin politicians have ranged from a federal solution to independence, noted Slobodan Samardzic, Political Advisor to the President of Serbia Montenegro. According to him, the Constitutional Charter of the union of the two states has left almost fully up to the republics the arrangement of their constitutional matters. More precisely, the responsibility for building systems of rule of law rests with the two member states.

Mr. Samardzic noted that the Constitutional Charter of Serbia Montenegro achieved the European Union's political goal of preserving this state and, moreover, of stopping the fragmentation of the Balkans into a number of small states. He argued that the European Union could either artificially maintain this state union as long as the EU's security interests require so or, alternatively, use its authority to demand its strengthening by supporting integration forces within Serbia and Montenegro.

In his analysis of Southeastern European countries, **Dr. Andrei Marga, Rector of Babes-Bolyai University in Cluj-Napoca, Romania**, argued that the states in the region still show signs indicating crises of different natures: economic, social, legitimacy and cultural, as well as a crisis of creativity and motivation. The interaction of all these crises creates high demands on policy agendas, as well as internal contradictions.

According to Dr. Marga, there is a need for a type of governance that implies pluralism and democratic control, with a goal of durable solutions and efficiency. He argued that the governance systems prevailing in the former socialist countries of Southeastern Europe have been represented by "democratic populism," in contrast with Central European "pluralist democracies." Due to populism, the rhythm of reconstruction and development in Southeastern Europe has been slower than in Central Europe. Still, Dr. Marga noted, there is hope that, through EU and NATO accession, the countries in the region will be motivated to re-examine their evolution after 1989 and to change their type of governance.

Success in reconciliation among the Yugoslav successor states could be facilitated by the re-examination of dominant narratives about the war and war events (the issue of "truth") and by the successful implementation of the principles of justice, such as prosecution of war criminals, argued **Dr. Nebojsa Bjelakovic of the Directorate for Strategic Analysis, Department of National Defence of Canada**. Contemporary discourses, he added, should be examined in order to position dominant perceptions on war crimes and issues of responsibility in the post-Yugoslav "core states" of Croatia, Bosnia and Serbia. According to Dr. Bjelakovic, there is a need for the International Criminal Tribunal for Former Yugoslavia (ICTY), for the state-sponsored Truth and Reconciliation Commissions, and regional NGOs to complement each other's actions.

The relevance of reconciliation in the former Yugoslavia is pivotal, as the successor states, to different degrees and despite the efforts of national ideologues, remain multiethnic societies and will be more and more so if the freedom of movement and return of private property are achieved. In this context, ICTY should not act as the marker of democracy tests that could actually penalize entire societies for their poor performances. Dr. Bjelakovic said. Instead, it should assist the Yugoslav successor states' institution building by being a partner with their judicial branches.