

Opening Ceremony

Sunday, October 21, 2012, Prague Crossroads, 19.00–21.00

Moderator: Jan Urban

Participants: Jakub Klepal, Yohei Sasakawa, Ivan Havel, Iveta Radičová, Joan Baez

Tributes to the late **Václav Havel** included a surprise performance by folk singer **Joan Baez**. Forum 2000 Executive Director **Jakub Klepal** introduced Forum 2000 Co-founder and The Nippon Foundation Chairman **Yohei Sasakawa**, who offered reflections on President Havel, as did scientist **Ivan Havel**, President Havel's brother. *"President Havel, your legacy is alive and well – here, now, at this very moment,"* Mr. Sasakawa said. *"As we move ahead, you will continue to inspire legions. And we know you will continue to look over us as we proceed, responsibly, toward our common goal of realizing the kind of world we want to live in."*

Journalist **Jan Urban** moderated the evening, which he noted paid tribute to *"two old friends, colleagues and leaders,"* referring to both President Havel and **Oldřich Černý**, the former Executive Director of the Forum 2000 Foundation who passed away earlier this year.

Former Slovak Prime Minister **Iveta Radičová** provided the night's keynote address, speaking on the difficulties confronting 21st Century democracies. *"Citizens are becoming alienated from politics and citizens' ability to participate in governing public matters is becoming less of a reality,"* Ms. Radičová said. *"One of the sources of the current democratic deficit is the media-fication of politics."* Ms. Baez concluded the official portion of the ceremony performing three songs, including one of her trademarks, the 1960s American Civil Rights Movement anthem "We Shall Overcome," accompanied by niece **Pearl Bryan**.

Conference Opening and Václav Havel: The Powerful Powerless

Monday, October 22, 2012, Žofín Palace, Forum Hall, 10.00–11.45

Moderator: Gareth Evans

Participants: Karel Schwarzenberg, Yoani Sánchez (video message), Ko Ko Gyi, Alyaksandar Milinkevich, Roger Scruton, His Holiness the Dalai Lama (video message)

The panel focused on the legacy of Václav Havel and his impact in the struggle for freedom and democracy for those living under totalitarian regimes.

Former Australian Foreign Minister **Gareth Evans** began by summarizing Václav Havel's essay *The Power of the Powerless*, as well as the accomplishments of the late president, describing him as a *"brave, passionate, powerful leader."* In a video message, **His Holiness the Dalai Lama** encouraged people to first focus on changing themselves, before trying to change the societies around them.

Czech Foreign Minister **Karel Schwarzenberg** noted Havel's *The Power of the Powerless* was written 30 years ago, and that the world has been altered for the good in favor of the powerless with the advent of new communication technologies. He said that the Arab revolutions have managed to succeed even as the Western world seems more willing to accept totalitarianism than it was in 1989.

In a video message, Cuban dissident **Yoani Sánchez** emphasized Havel's influence on her personal political and moral transformation as a nonconformist. **Ko Ko Gyi** stressed that underestimating the power of the powerless can be very dangerous since even though some people may "*act dumb to minimize their personal risk*," they are still repressed and fighting against injustices in the world.

Belarusian dissident **Alyksandar Milinkevich** quoted Havel in arguing that new governments cannot be built on bloodshed, because such a situation will only lead to more violence. Philosopher **Roger Scruton** talked about the value of truth within any society, most particularly in repressive regimes, and noted that the written word plays "*an important role in creating a space in which people can live in the truth.*"

Václav Havel as a Media Practitioner

Monday, October 22, 2012, Žofín Palace, Forum Hall, 18.00–19.30

Moderator: Paul Wilson

Participants: Karel Hvižd'ala, Michael Žantovský, Jolyon Naegele, Ivo Mathé

Participants discussed Václav Havel's interaction with media at different points in his life. Panelists characterized President Havel as an avid producer and consumer of media, as well as the subject of media attention during his presidency. Moderator **Paul Wilson** opened the discussion by asking if any truth can be gleaned about Havel's view of the media from his last play, *Leaving*. Mr. Wilson described the president as "*a trademark of good sales*" for media, but said he had a "*love-hate*" relationship with the press. "*He never placed himself as a victim*," said **Karel Hvižd'ala**, a Czech journalist and playwright.

The panelists characterized media during President Havel's life as both a "*savior*," especially in the case of Western media, but also as a source of bitterness during his presidency. **Ivo Mathé** quoted Havel's own words: "*I have never failed to be astonished by how much I am at the mercy of the public media.*" Diplomat **Michael Žantovský** described Havel as a "*tough customer*" with reporters, but also noted that the president had many bad experiences with official media, a statement the other panelists agreed with. "*The Idea of spin was as foreign to him as the idea of a desert to an Eskimo*," Mr. Žantovský added. As **Jolyon Naegele** pointed out, "*[President Havel would] rather be king-maker than king.*"

Václav Havel's Civil Society

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Žofín Palace, Forum Hall, 14.15–15.45

Moderator: Jakub Klepal

Participants: Tomáš Vrba, Marta Smolíková, František Janouch, Igor Blaževič, Martin Bútorá

The panel introduced and discussed the legacy of Václav Havel and its impact on civil society organizations. Forum 2000 Executive Director **Jakub Klepal** highlighted that civil society was a key to Václav Havel's agenda. **Tomáš Vrba** pointed out that the Forum 2000 Conference is the main anchor of the Forum 2000 Foundation and expressed his satisfaction with the increased interest in the conference by younger generations. The Forum 2000 conference is designed to bring people from different cultural, social and moral backgrounds together, while engaging in discrete diplomacy, he said. Meanwhile, **Marta Smolíková** introduced the Václav Havel Library as an institution inspired by similar projects in the United States. Václav Havel's wish was for people to meet in the library as well as to create a public space for discussion. The library also holds digital copies of Havel's documents from political as well as playwright episodes of his life.

František Janouch elaborated on Havel's work of establishing foundations and awards that support civil society and open opportunities for the public to participate in politics. **Igor Blažević** emphasized the importance of continuing Havel's legacy. Havel taught Blažević how people "*should not be afraid of power*" and to not be calculating the benefits that might arise from helping or not helping struggling societies but to help them out of a moral obligation "*because it is the right thing to do.*" **Martin Bútor** described Havel as someone who, with a unique voice, brought people together who would usually not come together. He says Havel's "*mission has never been accomplished.*"

Closing of the Conference

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Žofín Palace, Forum Hall, 17.30–17.45

Remarks: Gareth Evans, Aung San Suu Kyi (video message)

Former Australian Foreign Minister **Gareth Evans** began his speech by announcing that the attendance of Monday surpassed the attendance of the entire conference last year. He praised the "*qualitative contribution that will linger in the memory of participants,*" "*the feast of different themes,*" and the "*kaleidoscope of different geographic settings*" featured. He highlighted "*three big issues*" that "*dominated our discussion*" during the conference: the future of the media industry (the discussion of which made it "*very clear there was a hunger among everyone here for the media to survive in at least one form... to act as an absolutely critical ingredient in democratic decision-making and accountability*"), the "*challenges to free and responsible media*" (coming from "*both free and unfree societies*"), and the "*role of new media*" (which he says "*offers tremendous hope of compensating for the challenges*" to media but could also be used by authoritarian regimes and the discussion of which "*starkly revealed the different perspectives that are out there in this event.*"

Mr. Evans also emphasized the continued importance of Václav Havel and his legacy, saying that Forum 2000 "*remains so absolutely, critically important.*" **Aung San Suu Kyi's** video message began with her recounting her friendship with Václav Havel, saying they "*shared a hunger for democracy and human rights*" so they "*became friends across oceans and continents.*" She expressed optimism over the future of her country: "*Human rights and democracy is a possibility now for our country but we cannot claim to have*

achieved everything that President Havel would have wished.” She expressed confidence in Forum 2000 saying it “will do everything it can to realize the dreams of Václav Havel,” which is why she is “proud to be a new member” of its International Advisory Board. She then expressed hope that those watching would be *“inspired to build a world that is rooted in a respect for human rights and democratic institutions.”*

Changing Role of the Media

Monday, October 22, 2012, Žofín Palace, Forum Hall, 12.00–13.30

Moderator: Vendeline von Bredow

Participants: Jeffrey Gedmin, Ingrid Deltenre, Marites Vitug, Valeriu Nicolae

Talk focused on how technology and globalization have influenced the evolution of the media.

Ingrid Deltenre, Director General of the European Broadcasting Union, began by emphasizing the importance of journalism and its role in functioning democracies, even as media business models are changing. Ms. Deltenre detailed the success of Internet-based companies like Google, Apple, and Amazon, which she says are now worth three times more than *“old media companies.”* She highlighted the business model of sites like The Huffington Post, which she says can offer more than news, and which she says is something people (including herself) will be willing to pay for. At the same time, she stressed the importance of public service media, which she said *“works more and more on a globalized level,”* and needs to be protected.

Investigative Journalist **Marites Vitug** detailed the downside of the phenomenon of “churnalism” or “assembly-line” news, which leads to pressure on news sites to attract traffic, and to emphasize *“the popular stuff at the expense of boring but important news.”* Ms. Vitug agreed with Ms. Deltenre on the need for the new generation of media, which she described as *“a hungry beast”* eager for constant information, to find a sustainable business model that would accommodate both serious news and popular topics.

Human Rights Activist **Valeriu Nicolae** argued that mainstream views are warped by depictions of ethnic minorities in the media, citing specific examples from Romanian news. **Jeffrey Gedmin**, a former President of RFE/RL, stressed the importance of media credibility, which he said is *“central... the beginning and end of everything”* for media.

Electronic Activism and Democratization of the Public Sphere

Monday, October 22, 2012, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, 12.00–13.30

Moderator: Zora Hesová

Participants: Tarik Nesh Nash, Sava Tatić, Jaroslav Valůch, Min Yan Naing

The panel focused on the challenges facing electronic activism and the relationship between traditional media and new media technologies.

Zora Hesová opened the panel by referring to Polish sociologist Zygmunt Bauman's idea that Internet activism is for the lazy, but went on to say that the Internet helps to communicate and spread ideas.

Tarik Nesh Nash highlighted the idea that the Internet is a means to involve citizens in democracy. He referred to media as the “*fifth pillar*” of democracy. Mr. Nesh Nash went on to identify media illiteracy and the digital divide as challenges to electronic activism.

Jaroslav Valůch agreed that media illiteracy is a challenge and discussed the need for traditional journalistic skills to be utilized in electronic activism. He added that because “*the geographic division has been replaced by the generation division,*” Internet activism is not entirely representative of the population's desires as a whole. **Min Yan Naing** picked up on this point, highlighting the lack of Internet access and interest in electronic activism in Burma. He discussed the difficulties of mobilizing opinions in a country without an electronic media culture.

Sava Tatić came back to the relationship between traditional and new media, stating that “*the Internet is the glue that makes the network.*” He is hopeful that electronic activism will enable citizens to demand transparency and accountability from their governments.

The Al Jazeera Phenomenon

Monday, October 22, 2012, Academy of Sciences, 12.00–13.30

Moderator: Jan Šnidauf

Participants: Shlomo Avineri, Sultan Barakat, Dan Meredith

Moderator **Jan Šnidauf** began by suggesting that Al Jazeera might be a political tool, and enquired of its overall purpose. **Shlomo Avineri** reacted by praising the network for creating “*a public space not seen before in the Arab world.*” He followed with two critical points, noting that Al Jazeera is wholly funded by the Qatari government, and emphasizing the discrepancy between the English and the Arabic versions. **Sultan Barakat** examined Al Jazeera within the development of the Qatari state, pointing to its role in increasing Qatar's soft diplomatic power. He stressed that it has built its credibility on “*the Arab street*” especially after falling out with the US over wars in the Middle East.

Dan Meredith argued that what is shown on the network is true in-the-field journalism, thanks to resources that enabled Al Jazeera journalists to take investigative risks. He continued that it has the “*potential to be a pipeline for more independent reporting,*” by taking an activist role. Mr. Avineri suggested Al Jazeera may now be over-confident pointing to the so-called “*Tahrir Square illusion,*” a term indicating that many of the images broadcast emanating from the Arab Spring showed Egyptians as unrealistically in favor of liberal democracy, resulting in a surprise after Egyptian elections. Mr. Meredith argued that Al Jazeera's funding and conduct is more transparent than that of American news networks saying that at least the political influence is clear.

The debate closed with Mr. Avineri crediting Al Jazeera with empowering the Arab people after a history without representative democratic institutions. Mr. Barakat agreed that, despite justified criticisms, the network has created a pan-Arab feeling.

Future of Media in Asia

Monday, October 22, 2012, Žofín Palace, Conference Hall, 14.30–16.00

Moderator: Surendra Munshi

Participants: Kiichi Fujiwara, Marites Vitug, Kavi Chongkittavorn, Tomáš Etzler, Jennifer Chou

Sociologist **Surendra Munshi** opened the panel by pointing to Asia as a diverse, populous and emerging economic center. This means that events in the region will have implications not only for the region, but also for the rest of the world. The panelists came to the mutual conclusion that media plays a great role in opening up of Asian societies. However Academic **Kiichi Fujiwara** challenged this statement by retorting: “*People no longer listen to the media that argues against their opinions. Media ceases to be something that opens your mind.*” The panel then focused on the question of how new media promotes democracy. Journalist **Marites Vitug** concentrated on online media in the Philippines and listed their positive and negative aspects, and then talked about the citizen journalism and the media’s role in breaking down the top-down model of producing information.

Journalist **Tomáš Etzler** elaborated that “*the world is going through an unprecedented media revolution*” and becomes a place “*where everyone has limitless possibilities for creating their own media content.*” Journalist **Kavi Chongkittavorn** explored the different media culture of Southeast Asia, where the media imposes self-censorship on domestic reporting, while providing open coverage of international news. **Jennifer Chou**, of Radio Free Asia, talked about media landscape in Asia which is not monolithic, and including both oppressed and also free media environments. The panel then talked about the different faces of social media where information is hard to verify. On one hand it promotes freedom of speech, helps to uncover injustices and change corrupt public policies, and on the other it allows easier access to biased information. Mr. Munshi concluded: “*You can’t have faith in democracy unless you have faith in good will of people.*”

Media Choice, Polarization and Democracy

Monday, October 22, 2012, European House, 14.30–16.00

Moderator: Erik Best

Participants: Ondřej Liška, Nico Carpentier, Mykola Riabchuk, Ondřej Kundra

Journalist **Erik Best** opened the discussion by posing a question about the relationship between informed electorate and democratic participation. Green Party Chairman **Ondřej Liška** then claimed that “*polarization is a necessary precondition for any political decision*” and noted that various issues, including European

Union integration, are presented in a depoliticized manner in Czech media today. According to Mr. Liška, more polarization is needed. He added that it is “*difficult to read the political background*” of most of the Czech Republic’s media, urging a radical rethink of the role of public media and more transparency in political campaign financing is needed. **Ondřej Kundra** claimed that most Czech newspapers are already experiencing polarization and underlined the decreasing readership numbers.

Mykola Riabchuk turned the conversation toward media in Ukraine, which he called an example of an illiberal democracy, a “*democracy without the rule of law,*” where polarization is being refocused along the lines of identity questions rather than political background. The Internet plays a role in this shift as it is not controlled by the government, he said.

Nico Carpentier stressed the role of the media as a defender of diversity in society, but also suggested that media today has a tendency to be governed by commercial logic, which encourages polarization. Mr. Liška then returned to the question of the Internet and noted the danger of it functioning only as a news filter. Mr. Best concluded the discussion by focusing on the question of a knowledge gap, where Mr. Carpentier stressed that ideology is much stronger than information.

Diplomacy in the Age of New Media

Monday, October 22, 2012, French Institute, 16.45–18.15

Moderator: Pierre Lévy

Participants: Vintsuk Viachorka, U Ohn Kyaing, Yaakov Levy, Majdi Abed, Janina Hřebíčková

Diplomat **Pierre Lévy** framed the discussion into three categories: modern communication versus traditional diplomacy, impact of the new media on social movements and the regulation of new diplomacy in terms of freedom of speech. Fellow Diplomat **Yaakov Levy** pointed out that no convention exists on media and diplomacy, but admitted the importance of social media in support of human rights and democracy. He stressed that the new media can be a tool to enforce human rights but also not everybody has access to these tools. **Janina Hřebíčková** noted that traditional diplomacy, public and new social media have to work together, but that traditional diplomacy cannot be replaced by the social media. She views the problem in ownership of the social media and the possibility for social media to transmit nationalist, dogmatic ideas.

Majdi Abed stated that French embassies have a Facebook and Twitter account because they have no choice. He cited the need to engage in dialogue and the ability to be able to inform the public even in difficult situations. Mr. Abed also emphasized that there cannot be a top-down approach in new media diplomacy. **U Ohn Kyaing** described the state of new age media in Burma as at their very beginning, citing oppressive laws implemented by the military junta that made such channels inaccessible to ordinary citizens. While there have been democratic changes in recent months, he said, the media has changed very little. Belarusian dissident **Vintsuk Viachorka** noted that the new information space enriches accountability and responsibility and creates openness that serves as a counter to oppressive regimes. He pointed out that new media activists in Belarus provide a more accurate picture of the country than people who must fear a regime response.

The Role of Social Media in Today's Belarus

Monday, October 22, 2012, Goethe-Institut, 18.00–19.30

Moderator: Rostislav Valvoda

Participants: Ales Lahviniets, Aliaksandr Atroshchankau, Franak Viachorka

The panel discussed the political situation in Belarus, as well as the possibilities for change and dangers of repression added by social media. **Rostislav Valvoda** noted that “social media” has become a buzzword and people started to believe it could be the great hope for bringing down repressive regimes like the one in Belarus.

Franak Viachorka described social media in Belarus as a battlefield, with a battle underway to assemble as many followers for the anti-regime cause as possible. He mentioned that the access of Belarusian populace to the Internet is comparable to the levels in the US, with more than 2 million people using the social network VKontakte. **Aliaksandr Atroshchankau** made a reference to the Belarusian “silent protests” of 2011 whose leaders did not have enough experience in leading campaigns against the regime and made many mistakes.

Ales Lahviniets emphasized that if mobilization within society is low, “*social media can only have a limited impact.*” He also noted that Belarus is a half-closed society and there is a danger media’s creators will trust what they have built too much. It is important to think about what could be done after using social networks to spread ideas and then take measure of such messages’ real impact, he said. Mr. Viachorka noted that there is constant danger of web sites being blocked and summarized that “*social media is not a solution, it is an instrument*” and that Belarus needs citizen journalism to develop, so as to add to social media’s societal relevance. Mr. Lahviniets also warned that the security of social networks for NGOs and journalists is a serious issue.

Media as a Religion

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Žofín Palace, Conference Hall, 10.00–11.30

Moderator: Doris Donnelly

Keynote Speech: Tomáš Halík

Participants: Roger Scruton, Surendra Munshi, Nico Carpentier, Tomáš Sedláček

Sociologist **Tomáš Halík** made the keynote speech, arguing that media serving the role of *religio* in contemporary society, saying that “*what holds a society together is its religion*”. He further elaborated, claiming that the mass media has become today’s arbiter of truth that “*interprets and creates reality*.” Philosopher **Roger Scruton** agreed with the Mr. Halík’s general argument, but also argued that religion is more than just a social unifier. He invoked Plato’s idea of “*care for the soul*” as the purpose of religion, and rather compared media to “*idolatry*,” because it pretends to be divine and doesn’t fulfill the spiritual needs of the individual.

Sociologist **Surendra Munshi** presented religion as reverence to a higher power, which, in his opinion is now represented by media. Media creates reverence and devotion and it creates persons with “*charisma*,” who can be considered objects of devotion. Mr. Munshi further discussed the role of mass media in Indian society, where it becomes the “*vehicle of religion*” as it brings traditional Hindu mythology to spectators. He closed his speech by saying, “*religion doesn’t only bind but it also blinds*,” and emphasizing similar effects within the media. Media Scholar **Nico Carpentier** said that media has taken the role of the center of our society, but that it is only a myth: It gives us the false idea that through media, we have direct access to truth and reality. He urged to need to make media more democratic and to acknowledge the power unbalance that media has created.

Economist **Tomáš Sedláček** claimed that that media lacks some religious archetypes that economics possesses. He highlighted the concept of “*fetishism*,” claiming that what allows us to access truth also prevents us from doing so and that media and economics are over-fetishized in this way. The panel concluded on a note that media, as today’s social religion, has to take on social responsibilities, but panelists were still divided on how to define religion in this context.

Media (R)evolution: Media Changes in Central Europe

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Žofín Palace, Knight’s Hall, 14.15–15.45

Moderator: Michael Žantovský

Participants: Oana Popescu, Aleksander Kaczorowski, Endre B. Bojtár, David Brauchli

The panel started with discussion on the need of quality media and problems with financing it. “*Educating the public is crucial*”, said **Oana Popescu** pointing to the decline of print media and the hole it might leave. “*Advertising in media is becoming more important than the content itself*,” said **David Brauchli** of Piano Media, pointing to rising financial pressures. “*It does not have sense to invest much money into print media... this factor has disastrous consequences for the public debate everywhere*.” According to journalist **Aleksander Kaczorowski** “*We have less freedom of speech in media than 10 years ago*.” He argued that the drive for profits among media in Poland has a constraining effect.

On a more optimistic note, journalist **Endre B. Bojtár** said that “*media should be independent from technology, we should not lose the traditional form of media otherwise we are in serious trouble*.” Ambassador **Michael Žantovský** was very skeptical of digital media and he questioned its quality. “*If you cut up the physical newspaper... it will allow you to have better quality journalism*,” he said. Mr. Brauchli said that the digitalization of newspapers has the opportunity to generate new revenue models to finance journalism. All but the panel moderator agreed that medium through which news is delivered is not important. What does matter is the quality and makes sure the public debate is accessible and affordable to a wide public, and that it can finance work by professional journalists.

Balkans: Changing Role of the Media

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Goethe-Institut, 14.15–15.45

Moderator: Jan Urban

Participants: Fatmir Sejdiu, Gordana Knežević, Sava Tatić, Jeremy Druker

Jan Urban opened the panel by introducing the panelists and the topic of discussion: media professionals in post-war scenarios. Former President of Kosovo **Fatmir Sejdiu** emphasized that media is one of the main pillars of democracy, but that it is also important that media not to be directly involved in daily politics. **Gordana Knežević** from RFE/RL said that a major problem facing media in the Balkans is that many propagandists during the wars of the 1990s are still working educators and journalists, and that past crimes are not being properly dealt with.

Journalist and Online Innovator **Sava Tatić** attributed many of the problems in Serbian media to the fact that the public does not care about the uncomfortable issues, stating “*people don’t like to hear inconvenient truths*”. This comment led to a debate on the issue of the lack of credible and quality journalism (with special mention of the over-preponderance of tabloids) paired with a fragmentation and over-commercialization of media. Ms. Knežević said that “*international reaction helps... Our governments react only under pressure.*”

Transitions (TOL) Founder **Jeremy Druker** outlined three issues plaguing the Balkans: sustainability of independent media, ownership and the incomplete transformation from state run media. Media corruption was also identified as a major problem. Mr. Tatić stressed that journalists in the Balkans are easily corruptible as their salaries are low, to which Mr. Sejdiu added that they are also often involved in politics and therefore cannot be objective. He emphasized the importance of building a civil society as a means of repairing media independence. Mr. Urban concluded that the Balkans represent normal circumstances for a region that has a problematic past, but that there is hope for the future of this region.

Media and Education

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Academy of Sciences, 14.15–15.45

Moderator: Josef Jařab

Participants: Ellen Hume, Jiří Stránský, Min Yan Naing, Valeriu Nicolae

Roma rights activist **Valeriu Nicolae** spoke of taking his young son to a football game where anti-Roma chants made him “*start shivering and crying,*” leading to a popular footballer to begin “yelling” at the crowd. He said that, after discussing this story, he “*saw a switch in the Romanian media.*” **Min Yan Naing** then spoke about what he sees as a broken educational system in Burma where it is easy to get degrees, but they are “useless.” He then spoke about his hip hop music which he uses to encourage the youth to be involved in politics.

Jiří Stránský began by explaining the “*Communist regime did its best to destroy any education,*” and “*when they educated kids they were spoiling their souls... washing their brains.*” He discussed raising his kids where one truth would be taught at home, while another truth would be taught at school and in the media. **Josef Jařab** picked up on this idea – that he called “*educating through stories*” – and explained that during the regime, “*society had no story to tell... the story did not make sense, history stopped.*”

Journalist **Ellen Hume** later explained her view on media: *“it’s [the media’s] job to say what they want to say, but it’s your job to be educating yourself by using media properly.”* Mr. Jařab disagreed with this and said *“many... media men are simply convinced that the number of viewers... is the most important thing; it’s not”* and said there was a *“responsibility of the media in educating people,”* not the other way around.

Media and Freedom

Monday, October 22, 2012, Źofin Palace, Forum Hall, 14.30–16.00

Moderator: Petr Brod

Participants: Lobsang Sangay, Gareth Evans, Dunja Mijatović, Bay Fang, Grigory Yavlinsky

Petr Brod began by introducing the panel and saying that *“free societies... and even people from unfree societies depend on free media.”* Then, **Bay Fang** began by describing her experiences as both a journalist and a diplomat, which she said enables her *“to see things from both sides.”* She outlined two means to limiting media freedom: *“institutional limits”* – using Hungary as her example – and *“intimidation... covert or overt”* (including “self-censorship”) – using Russia as her example.

Next, **Dunja Mijatović** opened by stating a major challenge today is *“to preserve freedom of speech as a human right, freedom of expression, freedom of the media,”* something challenged in both democratic and undemocratic states *“on a daily basis.”* She cites her own country, Bosnia and Herzegovina, as an example of the importance of being free to discuss “sensitive” and “taboo” topics: she said if they were not able to discuss these issues, the country *“would not have overcome”* them.

Former Australian Foreign Minister **Gareth Evans** highlighted Wikileaks as an example of the inevitable “exposure” he said society will see more of, citing younger generations’ failure to understand the concept of a *“zone of privacy.”* Exiled Tibetan leader **Lobsang Sangay** started by saying that China *“spends more on Internet security than on... defense,”* outlining what he called the “Three T’s” – *“Tiananmen, Taiwan, and Tibet”* – that only have Internet search results from *“Chinese media sources.”* He said the Chinese government *“physically censors”* international journalists from reporting on Tibetan issues and *“virtually censors”* by controlling the Internet

Grigory Yavlinsky started with a simple statement: *“No free press, no freedom.”* He said that, in Russia, *“they have freedom of speech, the problem of course is the freedom after the speech.”* He warned that he believes *“deep political and social disappointment”* is spreading, especially in Eastern Europe and that as a result people are turning towards an *“authoritarian approach.”*

The Persistent Influence of State-Dominated Media and the Challenge to Democracy

Monday, October 22, 2012, Academy of Sciences, 14.30–16.00

Moderator: Christopher Walker

Participants: Miklós Haraszti, Yuri Andrukhovych, Hu Yong

This debate very much revolved around the panelists' specific countries of expertise. **Christopher Walker**, the moderator, noted the continuing importance of television as a media source. The panelists began by discussing the role of state-dominated media in their respective countries: Hungary, Ukraine and China. **Miklós Haraszti** agreed that *“TV is still the name of the game, the way by which post-dictatorial democracies have turned into government propaganda machines.”* He argued that a country cannot come out of the illiberal stage of democratization without having an independent broadcasting channel.

Yuri Andrukhovych described the political climate in Ukraine since 2010, when a group with dictatorial tendencies assumed power. The government not only controls television, but hires Internet *“trolls”* to confuse online debates, he said. **Hu Yong** admitted that China is an extreme case with most media outlets state-owned. However, the commercialization of the media has ushered in a *“struggle between the two P’s: profit and propaganda,”* meaning a transition from state-owned institution to a state-owned capitalist entity and a transformation of the media to better service the interest of the audience. The moderator emphasized that authoritarian censorship focuses not on criticism, but on budding topics that could result in collective action. Mr. Andrukhovych stressed that journalism still has some power in Ukraine, having prevented a law against the defamation of politicians. Mr. Haraszti remained optimistic in contending that in ten more years, Internet penetration and bandwidth will override existing control of content.

Censorship on the Internet

Monday, October 22, 2012, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, 14.30–16.00

Moderator: Tarik Nesh Nash

Participants: Michael Anti, Yuri Dzhibladze, Jaroslav Valúch, Dan Meredith

Tarik Nesh Nash introduced the discussion by asking each panelist to talk about their own experience of censorship, before refocusing the debate on what the international community can do and what means can be used to circumvent censorship. **Yuri Dzhibladze** enumerated some of the legal tools of censorship used by the Russian government. He explained that laws written in vague terms, such as the law on *“incitement of hatred toward social groups”* are often used to protect the government or the police. He also addressed the issue of indirect censorship by mentioning that the Russian state uses young people to interfere with discussions on independent social networks.

“Applications like Facebook and Twitter were not designed for activists, and it would be foolish to think they can be used like that safely,” warned People In Need’s **Jaroslav Valúch**. To him, the international community has a role to play in preventing businesses from selling technology to regimes that will use them to monitor and censor, an idea that all panelists agreed with. **Dan Meredith** pointed out that no one on the ground and even among policy-makers really knows the list of everything their country is censoring. He also exposed how, by offering a limited set of predefined emoticons, Weibo (the Chinese version of Twitter) monitors his users' emotions. *“Surveillance equals censorship,”* he said. Alternatively, Chinese

blogger **Michael Anti** asserted that *“censorship is about server control. Where the server stands really matters.”* He noted that because Chinese communications and censorship are so centralized and the country is so big, it is easy to freely criticize local governments. He concluded that the Internet can liberalize people's minds but won't make China a democracy.

Cuba: Public Space in a Closed Society

Monday, October 22, 2012, European House, 16.15–17.45

Moderator: Marek Svoboda

Participants: Rosa María Payá, Yoani Sánchez, Tomáš Klvaňa, Regis Iglesias, Pavla Holcová

In a video message, **Rosa María Payá**, a political blogger and daughter of Oswaldo Payá, a recently deceased political activist, expressed her gratitude and remembrance of the friendship of Václav Havel and her father. *“We would like to ask for your support of an investigation independent of the Cuban government,”* she said, referencing the suspicious death of her father in an automobile accident. She also said that *“The Cuban Democratic Movement has been enriched by players of the virtual world.”* **Yoani Sánchez**, a political blogger from Havana, said, via video, how important new technologies have enabled citizens to express their opinion in Cuba.

Regis Iglesias, a prisoner from the Black Spring, continues to work from Madrid as a journalist and asks the international community to help Cuba by supporting the spread of the opinions of those who want change. *“Cubans want sustainable social services, reduction in poverty, decentralization and capabilities for [obtaining] individual wealth,”* he said. **Tomáš Klvaňa**, a Professor at the New York University in Prague, commented on Cuba's tremendous progress, effects of isolation and brave individual journalists. **Pavla Holcová**, a journalist with experience working in Cuba, pointed to a lack of access to technological equipment and non-existent technological education for individual journalists. Mr. Klvaňa closed the panel by saying that *“the embryo of civil society is already there.”*

Freedom of the Press, Poverty and Democracy in Africa

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Žofín Palace, Knight's Hall, 10.00–11.30

Moderator: Jeremy Druker

Participants: Gwen Dillard, Ruth Oniang'o

The panel centered on ways which media in Africa complements and contests social and political culture. **Nicéphore Soglo**, the former president of Benin, was unable to attend due to illness. **Gwen Dillard** from Voice of America outlined the specificities of African media: widespread governmental repression in many countries, severe lack of non-state resources and the *“sheer danger of the job,”* relating frightful experiences of reporters in contemporary Mali. She stressed the role of media arguing that it has the potential to empower the population when politics fails to do so.

Ruth Oniang'o, who works with rural communities in Kenya, remarked on the contribution of Kenyan media in preventing transgressions to the new constitution, created in 2010. She stated her belief that *“hard-working media go hand in hand with maintaining a responsible government”* and praised Kenyan outlets for uncovering corruption and atrocities. Ms. Dillard noted that reports on politicians' affairs mentioned by her fellow panelist point to the growing confidence of African media. However, she followed by enumerating challenges faced by the outlets, including threats, political pressure and financing, saying that *“the free flow of information isn't free, it's bloody expensive to get it flowing.”* She then focused on new channels through which the media and her own broadcasts get to their audiences, emphasizing the growing importance of mobile phones and individualized reporting.

Opening Closed Societies by Protecting Persecuted Journalists, Editors and Bloggers

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Academy of Sciences, 11.45–13.15

Moderator: Jared Genser

Participants: Aung Zaw, David Keyes, Steven Gan, Tamara Sujú

The panel focused on possible measures to protect journalists, bloggers and other information spreaders facing repression. **Aung Zaw** focused on Burma and political to publishing and prejudice applied on journalists. Even though Burma has decreased it's restrictions on broadcasting, he said, *“Big brother is still watching over your shoulder.”* **David Keyes** spoke of the situation in the Middle East, especially the effects of the Arab Spring. It was widely agreed among the panelists that new media has become a major force for combating dictatorships. Mr. Keyes stressed that the world must spread word of the activities of dissidents, to increase the support of the international public.

Journalist **Steven Gan** reminded the panel of the first rule of journalism, which is *“context.”* Speaking of Malaysia he said: *“There is freedom of speech, but no freedom after speech.”* Mr. Gan also argued that authoritarian leaders do care about their international image, thus further justifying demonstrations to free persecuted journalist and free press. Venezuelan activist **Tamara Sujú** gave examples of broadcasting companies in Venezuela that don't abide to Chávez's restrictions and censorship and how they are in danger. Ms. Sujú suggested three proposals to protect international journalists: Cooperate with international organizations on such measures, train people to teach freedom of expression as a fundamental right and publish names of persecuted journalists in mainstream media. The panel went into discussion with the audience about a *“universal higher truth”* as Mr. Keyes put it, where protecting journalist and bloggers came into conflict with local religion and local politics. **Jared Genser** spoke out of experience and stressed that the international community can help, just by showing support.

Accessing Free Information in China: Challenges and Perspectives

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Žofín Palace, Conference Hall, 14.15–15.45

Moderator: Jennifer Chou

Participants: Michael Anti, Hu Yong, Christopher Walker, Tomáš Etzler, SU Chi

This diverse panel circled around questions of freedom, access and censorship in both classical and new forms of media. Blogger **Michael Anti** stressed the importance of online social networks and explained that social media has created the first public sphere for exchanging opinion in China and has become the media choice of the public. Academic **Hu Yong** predicted that the Chinese language will be the number one language of the Internet because of the sheer number of Internet users in China. Meanwhile, **Christopher Walker** addressed the government censorship process, emphasizing that the Chinese authorities know that they cannot block everything; what concerns them is anything that may lead to collective action.

Journalist **Tomáš Etzler** told of his experience as a foreign reporter in China, having been arrested or detained there twenty-three times. Dr. **SU Chi**, who had no doubt that China is moving in the direction of democracy, contended that two major changes are taking place: commercialization, which is rapidly accelerating, and liberalization, which is progressing much more slowly. Hu Yong expressed that he does not believe that the Chinese people will transform its politics overnight, but they are slowly accumulating social capital to make meaningful change. Mr. Etzler said that as the world's second largest economy, China is becoming a global player, necessitating its adherence to international standards of justice. Mr. Anti concluded by stating that social media may have opened the doors for the Chinese to discuss politics, but there is still no mechanism like an election to turn public opinion into action.

Democracy and Media in Russia

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Žofín Palace, Forum Hall, 16.00–17.30

Moderator: Ondřej Soukup

Participants: Rostislav Valvoda, Jefim Fištejn, Mykola Riabchuk, Alexander Morozov

Journalist **Jefim Fištejn** opened the discussion by remarking that in Russia today, television replaces political life by offering its viewers news that they can easily, passively absorb. He outlined two *“attitudes”* toward media: one, from Lenin, who defined a newspaper as a *“collective propaganda-maker,”* the other, from Lincoln who believed *“if people know facts there will be peace and equality in the country.”* He said that in Russia since the media can be controlled, *“reality can be controlled.”* He and People in Need's **Rostislav Valvoda** exposed some of the recent developments regarding the state's control of media, mentioning new software designed to analyze moods on social networks and able to post comments on forums.

Alexander Morozov started by calling *“the situation in Russia”* a *“paradox.”* He said that while there are about 40 million Internet users in Russia, *“only 5–7% are interested in social and political”* issues and the *“maximum number of people who will read an important text is 500,000.”* **Mykola Riabchuk** was asked by **Ondřej Soukup** if the situation in Russia was comparable to his home-country Ukraine: he said they are comparable, but acknowledged the Ukrainian situation is better. He later said, *“I believe that today, all politicians are in a way products of mass media. There would be no Mr. Putin without TV.”* Rostislav

Valvoda discussed the new law that forces “*all non-profit organizations have to be registered as a foreign agent or they are exposed to the risk of litigation.*” He predicted that the societal changes in Russia will lead to conflict. He said that, for him, “*Putin means instability*” and concluded “*I believe that conflict is inevitable. I believe it will be bloody.*”

The Role of Media in Burma on the Path to Democracy

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Žofín Palace, Knight’s Hall, 16.00–17.30

Moderator: Scott Hudson

Participants: Ko Ko Gyi, U Ohn Kyaing, Aung Zaw, Kyaw Thu

The panel pointed to 2015 as a benchmark in Burma’s democratization process. **Scott Hudson** talked about the possibility that media might not just help Burma’s transition but also harm it. **U Ohn Kyaing** provided a detailed overview of Burma’s path to democratization describing how the dictatorship “*made systematic plans to shut down free media to sustain its power.*” **Ko Ko Gyi** explained the methods of the 1988 uprising when there was no electronic media and discussed restrictive media laws that carry a seven year prison sentence for holding illegally printed papers and another seven years for sharing such papers. He concluded, “*We are ready to accept media liberalization of our country but at the same time we need to be cautious. To make sustainable changes we need to turn our attention to the legislative body.*”

Kyaw Thu explained media access in Burma stating that access to newspapers is limited because the average daily income is \$2, and that a printed newspaper costs about \$0.50. He added that “*political engagement of civil society is growing*” and organizations are working to put media centers in rural areas. **Aung Zaw** spoke of a “*comfort zone between activists and media*” but said, “*it is breaking up because of political opening.*” He also described the problem of self-censorship among the Burmese media and described the government as “*very clever*” citing a two-hour open press conference given by the president and cited six media companies in Burma owned by former military leaders and concluded, “*If you are rich, if you are powerful you can have media freedom inside Burma. If not, forget about it,*” he said.

Today’s Media: Symbol of Freedom or Manipulation?

Wednesday, October 24, 2012, Antiquarian Bookshop Fiducia, Ostrava, 18.00–19.30

Moderator: Libor Magdoň

Participants: Tomáš Etzler, Martin Ehl, Jiří Siostrzonek

Radio broadcaster **Libor Magdoň** opened the debate by asking the participants for their opinion on new media and social networks. Journalist **Tomáš Etzler** described his experience with blogs, micro blogs and social networks in China. In China’s censored media environment, such channels are the only way to bypass official information. Journalist **Martin Ehl** described a Facebook-organized opposition demonstration

in Hungary, which matched in scale a similar pro-Orbán demonstration that was organized using government capacities. Sociologist **Jiří Siostrzonek** analyzed the speed and fragmentation of today's media. Media deliver short messages; have to be "one click" away as the recipients lose their capacity to focus on a longer flow of information, be it an article, book or movie.

The debate later turned to questions of what defines journalism in a world of bloggers delivering real time information earlier than news agencies and the effects on media ethics. Mr. Ehl considers providing context to events and information as the main task of journalists today. He reminded that there are hardly any real investigative journalists in the Czech Republic, as there are in fact very few cases of journalists who have the time and money to undergo a longer investigation for a story in a scale know for example in the United States. Mr. Etlzer said that Czech society has satisfied its post-communist need for free information and is now losing interest in the world. He pointed to biased media not only in places like China, but also in the West pointing to Fox News as an example. He considers the journalist to be a messenger delivering the information while having to do the best possible to keep the facts objective. Jiří Siostrzonek reminded that media after all have two important roles: to cultivate the society and be a corrective element of a genuine democracy.

Open Data: A Tool for Transparent Politics?

Monday, October 22, 2012, Goethe-Institut, 14.30–16.00

Moderator: Jakub Mráček

Participants: Michal Berg, Pavla Brady, Jan Farský

Open access to government data in the interest of transparent politics was the central concern of the panel, which started with an introduction to the Open Data Project by **Jan Farský**, a Czech MP.

Mr. Farský said the project is a means of "*returning government back to the people.*" He stressed that it is not sufficient to just make data accessible to the public, as the public must also learn how to use the information so that the data is not misinterpreted.

Next, Data Journalist **Michal Berg** emphasized the importance of open data for cooperation among multiple actors in modern governments. He further sees open data as "*bringing more efficiency to the work of [government] officers,*" and opening new business possibilities. He noted that digitalization of data does not necessarily bring openness, and that publishing data in an open fashion is crucial.

Pavla Brady, Deputy Mayor Opava, expanded on the topic by reminding the panel that access to open data can serve as an important tool for fighting corruption. In her opinion, "*the public should have access to the same information as the ones who are in power,*" so that they can take part in the decision-making processes. She described her experience with practical implementation of open data, which was made problematic by political resistance, the obstinacy of government employees who are rarely willing to change their routines in order to accommodate new technology, and a lack of sufficient legislation.

Public, State and Government Media: Where Are the Boundaries?

Monday, October 22, 2012, Žofín Palace, Knight's Hall, 18.00–19.30

Moderator: Václav Sochor

Participants: Ingrid Deltenre, Hu Yong, Yusmadi Yusoff

The panel discussed the legitimacy of state media and the differences between private and publicly-funded media. Moderator **Václav Sochor** introduced three alternative ways to fund broadcasts: taxes, advertising and licensing fees. Media Executive **Ingrid Deltenre** examined the merits of different types of media funding, concluding, “*mixed models, advertising, and license fees give you freedom from politicians, but also freedom from advertisers.*” Discussing the need for publicly funded media, Ms. Deltenre said public broadcasting is still valuable, but it requires a balance between news and entertainment. She added, “*You should always listen to your audience, because ultimately that is why you are there.*”

Lawyer **Yusmadi Yusoff** explained the government influence on media in Malaysia. “*Yes, we have freedom of speech but we don't have freedom after speech,*” he said. Mr. Yusoff went on to say that in Malaysia, a broadcasting company cannot be set up without a government license, and obtaining such a license is, “*a highly partisan process.*” Mr. Yusoff added that media independence is paramount and, “*The role of public broadcasting is to enlighten and to educate society.*” Media Scholar **Hu Yong** spoke of recent changes in the structure of Chinese media, including the creation of a number of media groups. He explained that the government does not have much control over the commercial aspects of Chinese broadcast media, and that ratings competition is, “*actually quite fierce.*” He advocated a non-commercial, non-profit public media that guarantees the dissemination of education to all regions of the country, is run by an independent board of directors, is funded by taxes, and is required by law to be independent and impartial before conceding that such a system is not a reality in China.

Human Rights and the Media

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Žofín Palace, Forum Hall, 9.45–11.30

Moderator: Kiichi Fujiwara

Participants: Madeleine Albright, Zygmunt Bauman, Alyaksandar Milinkevich, Abu Bakr Shawky, Marites Vitug, Tarik Nesh Nash

In her opening remarks, Former US Secretary of State **Madeleine Albright** outlined the relationship between media and human rights, saying, “*It is no accident that political confrontations frequently begin with efforts to control the media.*” Ms. Albright warned that while technology is a valuable tool for the media, it can also be exploited and abused. “*Movement towards [truth] hinges on our collective willingness to probe beneath the surface and consider with a critical eye the information that assails us,*” she said.

Belarusian dissident **Alyksandar Milinkevich** described the media situation in Belarus, where he said electronic media is under government control and the media in general is a tool for propaganda. He elaborated on what he sees as the government's abuse of libel laws to silence journalists. Journalist **Marites Vitug** spoke about the Cyber Crime Prevention Act, which was recently passed in the Philippines, and which she said is "*sweeping and sets very strict standards for libel, a criminal offense in the Philippines.*"

Filmmaker **Abu Bakr Shawky** spoke of the problems in mainstream media, arguing that people lose interest very quickly. He added, "*This idea of losing interest is, for me, the biggest problem because it dictates what people will report.*" To illustrate his point Mr. Shawky compared the Egyptian revolution, which lasted eighteen days and was widely covered by mass media, to the Syrian conflict, which is ongoing and does not receive the same level of media attention. Sociologist **Zygmunt Bauman** contradicted the idea that social media facilitated recent mass protests and democratic uprisings around the world. He argued that social media was in fact used by governments to "*nip these popular uprisings in the bud.*" Mr. Bauman continued by echoing Ms. Albright's warning about the dangers of technology. "*We are abusing media while using it,*" he said.

Politics of Image

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Academy of Sciences, 10.00–11.30

Moderator: Ellen Hume

Participants: Enrique ter Horst, Oana Popescu, Tomáš Klvaňa, Jørgen Ejbøl

Journalist **Ellen Hume** began the roundtable by showing photos of politicians to illustrate the impact of images on media consumers. She then introduced the idea of "*resource journalism,*" in which the audience receives information about events both before and after they take place. **Tomáš Klvaňa** focused on how the development of technology led to the prominence of images in media in the past fifty years. The idea of using images for "*political advertising*" was discussed further by **Enrique ter Horst**, who noted that "*one picture can substitute for many speeches.*" He then brought attention to the fact that supra-national structures alleviate the power of demagoguery at the state level, where it used to be easier for the demagogues to distort images.

Jørgen Ejbøl presented a very negative picture of the media coverage of politics in Europe, claiming that the coverage lacks substance. He attributed this lack of substance to the new political generation, which he says wants to control the media and thus needs to create a strong image. **Oana Popescu** expanded on this idea, adding that the constant flow of information from the media affects our ability to process information. "*The bombardment of news makes us wake up every day to a new world with no memory of what happened before,*" she said. Ms. Popescu also stressed the importance of educating on the media market, because only educated consumers can detect distorted information. Ms. Hume then concluded the panel by quoting Mr. Ejbøl: "*Honesty, bluntness and dedication will not be hidden, but will burn through.*"

Do We (Still) Trust Media?

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Žofín Palace, Forum Hall, 11.45–13.15

Moderator: Ivo Mathé

Participants: Iveta Radičová, Franak Viachorka, Adrian Sarbu, Vendeline von Bredow

The panel focused on shifts in public confidence in the media. **Ivo Mathé** began the panel by introducing the guests, before saying that, because of the large amount of information available today, “*we cannot distinguish between facts and fiction.*” Former Slovak Prime Minister **Iveta Radičová** spoke about the “crisis in trust” and “confidence,” said she sees the world facing crises in media, “financial institutions,” and “institutions of democracy.” When choosing certain facts over others, journalists are “forming public opinion,” she said.

Media Executive **Adrian Sarbu** then said “*we have a saying in my country ‘only God knows,’*” before lamenting that, if given a poll, he believes “*we’d discover less people believe in God than believe in television.*” Today, Mr. Sarbu said, “*media is not what we are used to... media is mostly the Internet*” where he says new reporters know “*today the content of media is mostly entertainment... not about information.*” He said that in this new media, the individual is becoming more and more powerful while the “*big media companies... the gatekeepers of information*” lose power.

Vendeline von Bredow, an Editor with The Economist, said that while “*we journalists like to think of ourselves as... the purveyor of truth... we are also in the business of grabbing your attention.*” She noted that, in Western Europe, “*commercial constraints... have increased*” and the “*ownership of media is increasingly concentrated.*”

Belarusian dissident **Franak Viachorka** said he would focus on media in “partly free” and “non-free” countries. Labeling his home country of Belarus as “partly free” he said that both there and elsewhere in Eastern Europe there is a “process [of] re-Sovietization” where there is only “one newspaper.” He detailed the Belarusian regime’s harassment and incarceration of journalists and said that Radio Free Europe in Belarus “*plays [the] same role it did in [the] Cold War.*”

Media, Responsibility and Ethics

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Žofín Palace, Conference Hall, 16.00–17.30

Moderator: Norman L. Eisen

Participants: Josef Jařab, Kavi Chongkittavorn, Zygmunt Bauman, Petr Pokorný, Ahmad Mango

Kavi Chongkittavorn, a Thai journalist, opened the panel with a bold statement, “*I’m a journalist because I have a stupid idea to change the world.*” He compares the ethical quest of journalism to the Thai tsunami of 2005, where lack of knowledge about tsunami warnings resulted in a massive loss of life. Mr. Chongkittavorn then compared this to a story of a little girl who warned the people of the forthcoming tsunami because of her knowledge from school. **Ahmad Mango**, advisor to Prince El Hassan bin Talal of Jordan, stressed the importance in the Arab World of first gaining an understanding of its current situation and then transmitting it to international media.

Josef Jařab, a former Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defense and Security, emphasized that media is far from presenting the truth. “*The media needs to find out what the truth is and*

present it to the people," he said. Mr. Jařab said that journalists do not believe that people are interested in good news. **Petr Pokorný**, a Czech Theologian, said *"I survived two totalitarian regimes with mass media. I feel angry when people talk about the present crisis; mass media is not so bad and cannot be compared to the situation more than twenty years ago."* Meanwhile, **Zygmunt Bauman**, a Polish-British sociologist, distinguished differences between a community and a network. According to Mr. Bauman, a network offers more freedom and less security than a community. He believes that we live our lives both *"offline"* and *"online."* As far as the success of social media is concerned, *"Facebook answers the demand to satisfy the fear of being abandoned or alone,"* he said.

Media, Culture and Civil Society Development

Wednesday, October 24, 2012, Faculty of Philosophy and Arts, University of West Bohemia, Pilsen, 11.00–12.30

Moderator: Přemysl Rosůlek

Participants: Mykola Riabchuk, Shlomo Avineri, Jaroslav Valůch

Political and cultural analyst **Mykola Riabchuk** opened by claiming *"if you have free media you can construct democracy."* He pointed in particular to the importance of media in his own country, Ukraine, as he saw media as the key element of civilian check on government power. He also underlined the role of mass media in civic education because *"we cannot improve the quality of ruling elite without improving the quality of society in general."* Mr. Riabchuk emphasized the importance of culture and political culture and he said that the least successful countries in this field are those who in the past lacked the rule of law, freedom and sovereignty of the individual. According to Mr. Riabchuk, as long as there are free media in the country *"the story is not over"*, and he expressed hope for better future of Ukrainian media.

Professor **Shlomo Avineri** offered wider context to the issue. He talked about post-communist countries and the reasons why some have consolidated democracy, while in others like Russia and Ukraine the situation is problematic. The explanation for this phenomenon is that there was a very little tradition of civil society. *"If you to want to understand developments now, look, among other things, to historical developments... it is a starting point,"* he said. **Jaroslav Valůch**, meanwhile, talked about the increasing need for media literacy and media education at schools, especially in the age of new media. He continued with comparing the traditional role of media and the role of social media in which anybody can become producer and distributor of media content. Mr. Valůch said he realized only after the experience with revolution in Egypt, the limits of the social media and youth activism. He said that real permanent change requires slow, labor and time intensive work in the community itself.

Social Responsibility of the Media

Wednesday, October 24, 2012, Hotel Devín, Bratislava, Slovakia, 15.00–16.30

Moderator: Miroslav Kollár

Participants: Jan Urban, Václav Mika, Matůř Kostolný, Eva Babitzová, Branislav Ondrářik

Chairman of the Council for Slovak Radio and Television **Miroslav Kollár** opened the event with introductory remarks. It is clear, he said, that all media output, both private and public, has a significant impact on society. Media executive **Václav Mika** explained that after working for several years in commercial media, now he is now managing the state television and radio, and he called the Slovak market is, in this field, unique. With a relatively small target group, there is a wide range of television channels. Nevertheless, trends in the private sector – specifically the intense rivalry between two main commercial TV stations – bring benefits and opportunities for public media. There is a gap for serious broadcasting, he said. The challenge for Slovak public media is to create appealing programs, which are in touch with values, social and cultural issues, a process he called “*cultural evangelization*.”

Journalist **Jan Urban** said that rather than the social responsibility of the media, we should speak of the social responsibility of a journalist. This type of occupation provides a sharp and powerful tool for influencing society and people’s lives. A good and responsible journalist is, in his view, a craftsman – educated master beware of principles and thus “*his relation to his job should be based on the fact, that the journalism is essentially value forming activity*.” Newspaper editor **Matúš Kostolný** stressed that any reflections about the social responsibility should take into consideration one basic fact, that’s the number of recipients. “*You can make super responsible medium for nobody – without recipients, you do nothing*.” Radio broadcaster **Eva Babtizová** said she didn’t need to let the market to determine the themes or structure of broadcasts. Finally, Academic **Branislav Ondrášik** declared that media should be aware of their responsibility, and struggle for it, and try to become responsible entities in the eyes of the public. For him, the term “*mediocracy*” is a false one, media does not determine the solutions to the problems of society; politicians do.

Towards a Green Economy and a Sustainable Future: Role of the Media

Monday, October 22, 2012, Goethe-Institut, 10.15–11.45

Moderator: Martina Mašková

Participants: Jan Macháček, Dagmar Dehmer, Rodrigo Russo, James Randerson

Journalist **Martina Mašková** opened the discussion by inviting the panellists to comment on the position the media in their individual countries take towards the green economy. Der Tagesspiegel Editor **Dagmar Dehmer** stressed that the debate in Germany has been prominent since the early 1980s, and currently focuses on the transition period leading up to 2050 where renewable energy should cover 20% of all energy used.

James Randerson, an Editor at The Guardian, commented on the current coverage of the British Climate Change Act, which obliges future governments to reduce carbon emissions by 20% by 2050. In Brazil, the green agenda gained major attention during the 2012 elections, when the Green Party for the first time won 20% of the votes, according to Journalist **Rodrigo Russo**. Mr. Russo went on to address the problem facing developing countries that try to incorporate green energy in the process of creating sustainable economic growth, which he sees as a big problem.

Journalist **Jan Macháček** urged the media to issue critical analyses rather than opinionated or one-sided coverage. *“I strongly believe that media should not be a social activist,”* he said. This opinion was shared by Mr. Randerson, but challenged by Ms. Dehmer, who called to attention the importance of diverse angles in media coverage. Mr. Russo stressed that *“green and sustainable are empty words,”* bringing into light Ms. Dehmer’s conclusion that “sustainable development” means different things in developed and developing countries, saying that *“for some, sustainable means growth.”*

Media coverage of the Rio Conference was widely discussed. Ms. Dehmer then concluded that the conference was not a success because, *“civil society debate doesn’t make much sense when there is no cooperation on the governmental level.”*

Changing Media and Business Models

Monday, October 22, 2012, European House, 12.00–13.30

Moderator: Jeremy Druker

Participants: Ian Phillips, Kavi Chongkittavorn, David Brauchli, Jan Macháček, Klaas Glenewinkel, Steven Gan

Moderator **Jeremy Druker** opened the discussion by asking how quality journalism can survive, and even be profitable, as media outlets struggle for advertising and online readers. **David Brauchli** of Piano Media outlined his company’s experience organizing regional online news sites behind paywalls in Slovakia. *“Paywalls are a reaction to giving away free news. You’re asking people to pay for something they think is valuable. If you convince all of the media in a market to go behind a paywall, then the readers have no choice,”* he said.

Journalist **Jan Macháček** painted a grim picture of shrinking newsrooms and declining journalism standards in Europe as newspapers downsize, while **Kavi Chongkittavorn** and **Steven Gan** pointed to rising newspaper circulation in Asia as literacy rates rise, while acknowledging that Internet penetration remains low. Gan conceded that eventually all news will be accessed online. *“We can perhaps compare newspapers to telephone booths in 1997. Perhaps there are a few more decades for printed newspapers,”* said Macháček, who asserted that the key to driving up paid subscriptions, online or elsewhere, is to again cultivate a culture in editorial departments of breaking news and reporting original stories.

Klaas Glenewinkel discussed the development of media business models in the newly-formed democracies in the Middle East, where he says few newspapers aim to be commercially viable and independent of political parties and religious groups. In addition to paywalls, panelists examined crowd funding business models, whereby news websites are funded through donations, and single-donor models were also touched on. The panelists agreed, however, that media with a single source of funding is at risk for losing independence, as Gan warned, *“There are no tycoons or rich people out there who really are at that stage where they believe in independent media.”*

Media, Economy and Politics

Monday, October 22, 2012, Žofín Palace, Forum Hall, 16.15–17.45

Keynote Speech: Jan Švejnar

Moderator: Hana Lešnarová

Participants: Emil Constantinescu, Tomáš Sedláček

Economist **Jan Švejnar** argued that a competitive market for news reduces government influence and increases the accuracy of information. He noted that the Internet is, on these grounds, a great source of accurate information. He asserted that if *“private lobbying affects media coverage, what the media does affects the economy too,”* and positively assessed influence of international media on political issues. Former Romania President **Emil Constantinescu** drew a rather pessimistic picture of the situation in his country, saying that the media that used to be controlled by supporters of the communist regime now serve as agents for the business oligarchs that own them.

Mr. Constantinescu also suggested that the media has failed in its mission to inform, since Europeans barely know anything about the other countries of the European Union. *“Yes we don't know anything about Romania, but if you give me five minutes I'll tell you even things that you don't know,”* replied Economist **Tomáš Sedláček**, praising Google and Wikipedia and claiming that the media are much better today than ten years ago. He exposed his strong belief that freedom of speech is a good ground for economic growth, not the other way round. Mr. Sedláček and **Hana Lešnarová** agreed that the amount of information available today is overwhelming, although she – unlike him – felt it was a negative thing. One of her interventions focused on the future of the media industry and whether it will have to *“scrap the China wall between information and advertising”* in order to survive. Although no one had a definite answer, all panelists agreed to say that this is the main challenge the media are facing today.

Issues and Solutions for the Bottom Billion

Monday, October 22, 2012, Žofín Palace, Conference Hall, 12.00–13.30

Introduction: Jiro Hanyu

Opening Remarks: Motoshige Itoh

Keynote Speech: Olusegun Obasanjo, Nicéphore Soglo

Moderator: Wolfgang Michalski

Participants: Ruth Oniang'o, Núria Molina-Gallart, Karl Auguste Offmann

The panelists began by acknowledging the failure of globalization to solve the issue of extreme poverty, and in his introductory remarks, **Jiro Hanyu** called for a new international agreement on aid to help reduce poverty.

Motoshige Itoh pointed out the need to refocus international aid on poverty reduction rather than infrastructure development, and to make aid recipients more included in the planning process. **Nicéphore Soglo**, the former President of Benin, emphasized that the issue of extreme poverty should not be neglected even in times of world economic crisis. He brought up historic examples of development aid in Europe like the Marshall Plan after World War II and aid to Eastern European countries after the fall of the Berlin Wall. *“We are waiting for such a global plan in Africa,”* he said.

According to **Olusegun Obasanjo**, former President of Nigeria, the emphasis should be put on trade, with aid acting only as a catalyst. He pointed out the need to assess the failures of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, adding that “*it is in our collective self-interest, for growth and security, to remove extreme poverty.*” **Karl Auguste Offmann** denounced GMO crops and the monopoly pharmaceutical companies have on HIV medication, putting forward the importance of free health and education for all.

Ruth Oniang'o insisted on Africa's great potential, and on the importance of self-reliance, saying that “*when you beg for food, nobody respects you.*” **Núria Molina-Gallart** asserted that although inequality is one of the main development challenges, it is not an inevitable part of economic growth. She mentioned transparency, accountability, good management of natural resources, health and education as contributors to solutions for poverty.

Tibet: A Way Forward

Monday, October 22, 2012, Žofín Palace, Knight's Hall, 12.00–13.30

Moderator: Jaromír Marek

Participants: Lobsang Sangay, Martin Bursík, Jarmila Ptáčková, Ondřej Klimeš

The panel discussed the alternatives for changes in Tibet with respect to human rights, autonomy and personal freedom. **Lobsang Sangay**, Sikyong for the Tibetan government in exile, opened the discussion by expressing his conviction that Tibet is moving forward, despite a difficult political situation at present. He mentioned the Prague Spring as an inspiration for Tibetans use of non-violent resistance. Mr. Sangay expressed concern over the recent spate of self-immolations in Tibet, and stressed that the return of His Holiness the Dalai Lama to Tibet is the priority focus of the exiled government. He said that the exile administration is following the “*middle way policy*,” which calls for a general autonomy for Tibetans within China. He called for “*the Chinese to implement their own laws*,” and guarantee Tibetans basic freedom and cultural autonomy.

Former Czech Deputy Prime Minister **Martin Bursík** also made note of the self-immolations, placing the blame on the Chinese leaders. He stated that companies doing business with Chinese institutions should not compromise morality. Mr. Bursík criticized the current Czech leadership, saying “*Czech politicians should have no fear of Tibet.*” He implored politicians to follow the example left by Václav Havel, and to meet with Tibetan leaders. Tibetologist **Jarmila Ptáčková** made note of the problematic modernization policies imposed by China, which, she said, improve roads, schools, tourism, and the economy of Tibetan areas, but also allow for total military control by the Chinese to the detriment of Tibetan culture. “*These policies do not allow Tibet to adapt in their own way*,” she said. Mr. Sangay debated this point, stating that freedom is more important to Tibetans at this time than material comfort. Sinologist **Ondřej Klimeš** emphasized the need for China to change its policy towards non-Han citizens and to stop the influx of ethnic Hans to Tibet along with the “*cultural genocide*” of minorities in China.

Hungary: Still a Democracy?

Monday, October 22, 2012, Goethe-Institut, 12.00–13.30

Moderator: Martin Ehl

Participants: Endre B. Bojtár, András Stumpf, Miklós Haraszti

The panelists began by discussing how the two-thirds parliamentary majority of Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Fidesz party is impacting the state of democracy in Hungary. Moderator **Martin Ehl** pointed out that Hungary is perceived as increasingly isolated in the European community. Journalist **András Stumpf** posited that if, under the term "*democracy*," we understand a perfect society, Hungary is not a democracy, as no country can be. He also noted that the Fidesz majority is at least unusual, and brought up the issue of restrictions to voter registration, which, in his opinion, is not of major concern noting that such phenomena are found in other democracies as well.

Miklós Haraszti described Hungary as a democracy, but used Havel's words to characterize it as "*an illiberal democracy*," in which, even though the government was legitimately elected, everything depends on the "*capricious, whimsical, supreme will*" of Viktor Orbán. He also underlined the lack of public discourse in Hungary and said the introduction of voter registration was a step backwards. **Endre B. Bojtár** added that it is not only voter registration, but also the question of gerrymandering, or redrawing of electoral districts, that is of concern.

The panelists discussed the role of the media in Hungary. Mr. Haraszti said that broadcasting and media licenses are both fully in the hands of the government, and that Hungary has a typical "post-Soviet media system." He added, however, that because of the lack of freedom in the state-controlled media, the online sphere is thriving. Mr. Stumpf concluded the discussion by saying that despite the current government's practices, the Hungarian media system as such is working, and citizens have the right to change the government in the next elections should they desire.

Prague Enlargement Dialogue

The Role of Enlargement in the Current Strategic EU Debate

Monday, October 22, 2012, Czernin Palace, 13.00–14.30

Moderator: Karel Kühnl

Participants: Karel Schwarzenberg, Štefan Füle, Suzana Grubješić, Vesna Pusić Michael Clauß

The panel discussed the latest European Commission Enlargement Report and its policy implications in the context of the current financial crisis. Czech Foreign Minister **Karel Schwarzenberg** started by remarking on the Nobel Peace Prize recently awarded to the European Union. "*The EU is much more than just a bureaucratic machine*," he said. Mr. Schwarzenberg focused on the vital importance of enlargement as part

of a greater peace project. “*The EU is still not united, but that should be achieved by this generation,*” he said.

European Commissioner for Enlargement **Štefan Füle** denied that the EU has an identity crisis, claiming the union must still be attractive if “*nine countries are knocking on the door of the EU.*” He argued that enlargement is a way to make the EU stronger. Serbian Deputy Prime Minister **Suzana Grubješić** remarked on the importance of showing a united front, especially in the face of economic uncertainty. “*The EU’s power is still alive, and it is our responsibility to prove it even during the crisis,*” she said. From her perspective the process of EU accession itself is of great importance because the candidate countries benefit from the required reforms.

Croatian Foreign Minister **Vesna Pusić** said the two major objectives for Croatia in the EU are state building and achieving long-term stability and security. “*To a large extent, the Western Balkans area is on the verge of making a historical point,*” she said. **Michael Clauß** called for conditional enlargement and deepening integration, saying that “multi-speed Europe” is no option for Germany. In concluding the panel remarks, **Karel Kühnl** emphasized the EU’s success as a peace project and the need to continue the work.

Enlargement as a Part of the EU Growth Agenda?

Monday, October 22, 2012, Czernin Palace, 14.45–16.15

Moderator: Radek Špicar

Participants: Bernadette M. Gierlinger, Peter Balas, Guven Sak, Martin Tlapa

The panel focused on the economic side of EU enlargement. Aspen Institute Prague Director **Radek Špicar** opened the floor by asking the question “*Is it the best time to think about enlargement in a time of crisis?*” **Bernadette Gierlinger** said EU membership was one of the best things to happen to the Austrian economy. “*EU enlargement is a win-win situation; both for the older member states and for the candidate states,*” he said. This positive perspective was generally shared by the other speakers.

Peter Balas said that enlargement leads to “*better cooperation between the old and new members,*” and that “*the market will be more mature and more competitive.*” He also stressed the importance of enlargement from the outside perspective, saying it looks good for the EU’s international partners. **Guven Sak** gave the outside view of an aspiring EU member state. He said Turkey is benefiting in

several areas from cooperation with the EU. “*The EU still matters to Turkey and Turkey still matters to EU,*” he said. **Martin Tlapa** listed several reasons for enlarging the EU, but he also warned of the potential for social instability as a result of enlargement. The panel concluded that there are no constraints to continuing enlargement and also sorting out the crisis.

Women Leaders Panel

Monday, October 22, 2012, Žofín Palace, Conference Hall, 16.15–17.45

Moderator: Oana Popescu

Participants: Iveta Radičová, Josefina Vázquez Mota, Magdaléna Vášáryová, Doris Donnelly, Dunja Mijatović

Moderator **Oana Popescu** opened the panel by introducing the panelists and noting them as inspirations to women and men alike. Former Slovakian Prime Minister **Iveta Radičová** outlined a brief history of how the role of women has changed throughout history, then emphasized that today, “*politics is not only a special position for one part of society, but both parts.*” She commented on the idea that corruption is tied to success, and that we need to move toward a system where morality rules. She further asserted that we need to create a strong support network of women. **Doris Donnelly** addressed how women are perceived in the media, stating that in the United States, strong women are highly publicized. However, issues facing women, such as wage inequality and rape, are not made visible in the media. Ms. Donnelly then gave advice to women, saying “*be candid,*” “*be prepared for competition,*” “*find your vocation,*” and “*don’t crumble into stereotypes.*”

Magdaléna Vášáryová said that women need to participate in politics for democracy to function better, and that women bring life experiences to public life that men do not have. **Josefina Vázquez Mota** commented on the need for education in order to be financially independent, and therefore free, and urged the promotion of education for young women. She further stated, “*Being a woman, I believe, is an extraordinary opportunity, not a tragedy.*” Finally, **Dunja Mijatović** outlined that women need support from their male colleagues, and further stressed the need to focus on other parts of the world where women are not as fortunate as those in democratized societies.

The Nile River: A Problem That is Not Drying Out

Monday, October 22, 2012, Žofín Palace, Knight’s Hall, 16.15–17.45

Moderator: Irena Kalhousová

Participants: Ayman Ramadan Mohamed Ayad, David Grey, Václav Cílek

The panel focused on issues facing countries of that use the Nile River as a primary water source. **Irena Kalhousová** expounded on why the Nile River was chosen as a topic during a conference with the theme

“Media and Democracy,” saying, “*Egyptian dominance is coming to an end or at least becoming weaker.*” Ms. Kalhousová added that water management along the Nile is a problem that needs to be solved, or offers the potential for political problems.

Engineer **Ayman Ramadan Mohamed Ayad** explained that about one-quarter of the water in the Nile River evaporates and went on to say that there are 33 water projects in Egypt, 12 of which are beneficial to both Egypt and Ethiopia. Examples include hydroelectric dams in Ethiopia that can generate power to be sold to Egypt. In short, Ayad said, “*hydroelectric power can aid in development,*” adding that there are two dimensions of the problem: scientific and political.

Academic **David Grey** began by saying, “*rivers are flows of ideas.*” He then provided historical context that pointed to the long term components and complexity of current problems. Mr. Grey highlighted the relationship between science and policy saying, “*Science without policy is science, but policy without science is gambling.*” He concluded that territorial arguments are invalid as water supplies cannot be allocated to one country. Mr. Grey is hopeful that problem solving along the Nile River is possible and will result in further integration of African countries.

Scientist **Václav Cílek** took a more pessimistic view, saying the situation is worsening year by year and that in addition to conflict between Egypt, Sudan and Ethiopia, there is also internal conflict in Egypt. Mr. Cílek predicted that inaction would result in civil war driven by hunger.

Venezuela After the Presidential Election

Monday, October 22, 2012, European House, 18.00–19.30

Moderator: Freddy Valverde

Participants: Enrique ter Horst, Jan Ruml, Tamara Sujú

Tamara Sujú, a human rights lawyer from Venezuela and President of New National Awareness Foundation, discussed unfair media representation during the recent presidential election contest between incumbent Hugo Chávez and challenger Henrique Capriles. Hugo Chávez won the vote out of the citizens’ fear, Ms. Sujú said, adding that “*2.5 million people are paid by the government and are dependent on their salaries.*” In addition, she described the current political system as a modern totalitarian regime. In contrast, **Jan Ruml**, a former Czech politician and human rights activist, noted progress in the Venezuelan political system and is optimistic about the future development of a democracy. In regard to Hugo Chávez, “*his victory may be legal, but certainly not legitimate,*” he said. Mr. Ruml also emphasized the need for structural economic changes and a move away from economic dependence on oil.

Enrique ter Horst, a former United Nations Deputy of High Commissioner for Human Rights, began the panel by quoting Václav Havel, “*If you have power, you should serve the people,*” he said. Mr. ter Horst believes that Chávez’s policies are paternalistic, populist and will dig the country deeper into socialism. According to his personal views, Venezuela is a “port economy” and imports 70% of its food needs with 50% of its people living under the poverty line. As Chávez moves more to the left, there continues to be no rule of law and lack of institutional credibility, he said.

Women's Congress

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, DOX Centre for Contemporary Art, Lecture Room, 9.30–17.00

Moderator: Jana Smiggels Kavková

Participants: Magdalena Środa, Daniela Retková, Věra Budway-Strobach, Miriam Letašiová, Anna Karaszewska

The objective of this Forum 50% open working meeting was to help establish a Women's Congress within Czech politics, **Jana Smiggels Kavková** said. At the beginning of the panel, **Magdalena Środa**, a member of the Polish Women's Congress, shared her experience with what her organization has accomplished for women in Polish civil society. The Polish women's movement has successfully pushed for the ratification of a law which requires a minimum number of women candidates in elections. According to Ms. Środa, there are still a lot of changes that need to be made, however. In the workshops that followed her speech, the participants exchanged ideas and contributions to the first Czech Women's Congress, which is to take place in March 2013. The Women's Congress would like to reach out not only to women in the public sphere in developed cities, but also to women leaders in smaller communities in the Czech Republic. The organization plans to release a list of objectives, which will provide constructive criticism on the lack of women's voices in Parliament and other institutions.

The Future of Education, A Central European Debate: Corruption

Part 1

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Goethe-Institut, 10.00–11.30

Moderator: Erik Best

Participants: Jürgen Marten, Tereza Stöckelová, Mari Kooskora, Ella Salgo

"Are we born corrupt?" was one of Journalist **Erik Best's** opening questions, with *"Can education help prevent corruption?"* emerging as the key question. **Jürgen Marten** stressed that *"we have to make clear what corruption is."* The most criticized parts of society are politicians and private sector firms, he said. *"Corruption is very difficult to penalize, because there are no real victims there are just criminals,"* Marten said, adding that *"corruption also destroys and erodes democracy"*. The freedom of information must be a basic right of every citizen in order to prevent the conditions to corruption. Also the speed of public institutions compared to businesses is of vital importance to avoid tempting situations, Mr. Marten said.

“The prioritizing of the vulnerable by society is the basis for fight against corruption,” said **Tereza Stöckelová**, who went on to heavily criticize the corruption in higher education and research in the Czech Republic. **Mari Kooskora** said that the raw model for our behavior is based on what we see around ourselves as children. She also pointed out the legacy of former authoritarian regimes in Europe. **Ella Salgo**, on the other hand, focused on the conditionality of corruption, claiming that education is the right platform to start fighting against corruption and raise awareness. *“Young people tend to trade integrity for social security,”* she said while evaluating the situation in Hungary. *“I am very skeptical about changing the situation solely by education,”* Mr. Marten concluded.

Part 2

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Goethe-Institut, 11.45–13.15

Moderator: Šárka Daňková

Participants: Magdaléna Klimešová, Rytis Juozapavičius, Kilian Kirchgessner

Kilian Kirchgessner began the panel by presenting the idea that ethics are taught in Germany. He placed the topic of the anti-corruption education into the wider perspective of necessary replacement of formerly religious education. *“Education will not solve everything but it can plant a seed in the students’ minds,”* **Magdaléna Klimešová** said, as she presented her project for educating high schoolers in the Czech Republic on moral values. *“Education can play an indispensable role by creating a fair environment and help fighting against corruption,”* she added. From the Lithuanian perspective, **Rytis Juozapavičius** pointed out that the trust among people is of a key importance in the fight against corruption. *“School children should focus on the simple definition of bribery and its negative effects”,* he said.

The development of a good climate for corruption was seen as one of the contributing factors among the panelists. *“We have to be optimistic innovators in order not to corrupt,”* Mr. Juozapavičius added. *“The possibility to address this phenomenon at school is here and it should be used,”* **Šárka Daňková** said. The ensuing discussion proved fruitful and one of the observers, **Martin Hausenblas**, pointed out that where there is a missing elite there is no excuse not to start fighting the corruption from the bottom. Panelists agreed on this point and Mr. Juozapavičius stressed that these civil society groups and businesses need to speak out.

Multispeed Europe and the Eurozone: A Central European Perspective

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, European House, 10.00–11.30

Moderator: Jan Macháček

Participants: Aleksander Kaczorowski, Martin Ehl, Roman Joch

This panel focused on the approach and relation of Central and Eastern European countries to Eurozone and its future. Journalist **Jan Macháček** opened the discussion by commenting that Central European countries seem to be at crossroads in their attitude towards the European project. Journalist **Aleksander Kaczorowski** claimed that Poland has “*no chance to join the Eurozone in the upcoming years*” and that the question is not even on the table now. Also, he said that Poles are no longer Euro-enthusiastic as the EU today looks as a “*club of losers*.” Generally, in his view, the influence of the EU on Central Europe – with the exception of Slovakia – is waning, as is proven by the example of Hungary and its tightening relationship with China.

Journalist **Martin Ehl** noted that Baltic countries see their membership in the EU mainly in terms of security and therefore want to integrate. The Czech Republic, in his view, would do best if it was at least “*passive and loyal*” in its approach to the EU. Political Analyst **Roman Joch** underlined the plurality of approaches towards the EU in Central Europe. Mr. Kaczorowski claimed that a European federation is a utopia and Mr. Joch added that there are two major problems that hamper the creation of “*a United States of Europe*,” one being the proof of security and the other the division of powers. Mr. Macháček also opened the question of “*à la carte integration*” with Mr. Joch claiming that “*we cannot avoid multispeed Europe*” as there are different approaches and expectations. Lastly, Mr. Ehl claimed that multispeed integration could cause problems as the periphery might be getting less money than the core countries.

The Changing Role of Intellectuals in Today's World

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Žofín Palace, Conference Hall, 11.45–13.15

Moderator: Pavel Fischer

Participants: Surendra Munshi, Shlomo Avineri, Roger Scruton

Moderator **Pavel Fischer** opened this panel mentioning that this panel has been conceived by Professor Jiří Musil shortly before his death and is a tribute to his lifetime achievements. **Shlomo Avineri**, professor of Political Science at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, suggested that the role of intellectuals in the world is an old issue, and has been the central topic of Thomas Moore's *Utopia*, where we can find a polemic over whether philosophers should be involved in state matters. This argument prevails till now, but contemporary civil political philosophers take better into account *therealpolitik* and realize what its limits are, he said. Unlike many others Avineri thinks Vaclav Havel was a representative of a man of ideas who was able to implement general ideas into practical steps in politics.

Indian Sociologist **Surendra Munshi** stressed the importance of intellectuals as fighters for a free and just society who give their best for the cause they believe in. He pointed out at the link between Václav Havel, Mahatma Gandhi, and Aung San Suu Kyi and that were all devoted to faith in humanity and truth. Philosopher **Roger Scruton** differentiated between an educated man and an intellectual. He also said that most intellectuals do not live by their ideas. Mr. Scruton sees intellectuals as those who have interests of people at their heart, and serve their nation with a sense of responsibility. He mentioned that the political class that often passes laws which are not in the interest of the nation is unfortunately not synonymous with the intellectual class, and that this points to a situation where intellectuals should intervene.

Democracy: Challenges from Demagoguery and Extremism

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Žofín Palace, Knight's Hall, 11.45–13.15

Moderator: William Cook

Participants: Jan Fischer, Jørgen Ejbøl, Valeriu Nicolae

Moderator **William Cook** began by invoking a search for the truth, recalling remarks made earlier in the day by former US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. Roma rights activist **Valeriu Nicolae** offered accounts of demagoguery and prejudice against Roma and Jewish minorities in several EU countries. He called for direct work on social inclusion and incentives to reject demagoguery, highlighting cases of blatant racism and extremism with people holding public office. Media Executive **Jørgen Ejbøl** warned that these confrontations are unavoidable because everyone holds different values and norms.

Former Czech Prime Minister **Jan Fischer** provided an extensive contemplation on the roots of demagoguery and fundamentalism, identifying them in the lack of communication and the inability and unwillingness to look for truth, calling on Václav Havel and Jan Hus as archetypal defenders of truth. He explained that freedom is used by everyone, even enemies, but rationalized that liberal democracy is not to blame, and determined personal responsibility to be the best defense.

After Mr. Cook stopped to define fundamentalism as a rejection of debate, the panel turned to the question of whether extremism is on the rise in Europe. Mr. Nicolae and Mr. Ejbøl disagreed on the issue, the latter denying the contention that extremism was spreading because fringe groups exist everywhere. Mr. Nicolae ultimately asserted that the fact that the majority believes something does not make it right, explaining that *“extremists have a cheaper and easier truth to use than we have. We may want things to be simple and fast but the truth is not simple; it has many facets.”*

Ukraine: Democracy on the Borderline

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, European House, 11.45–13.15

Moderator: Rostislav Valvoda

Participants: Yuri Andrukhovych, Mykola Riabchuk, Ondřej Soukup

The discussion focused on the political structure of Ukraine and whether it is directed towards Western Europe interests or contrarily towards a Russian model. People in Need's **Rostislav Valvoda** opened the panel with a note on how pressure on Ukraine's civil society has increased, on the growing number of arrests of political opponents, and on how the upcoming elections may further influence this. Writer **Yuri Andrukhovych** turned the focus of the panel away from the problems of Ukraine and toward solutions to those problems. He stressed the division of the society towards the pro-Russian or the pro-European model and that Ukraine will have to "slowly and gradually introduce little changes towards a democratic system."

Mykola Riabchuk pointed out that Ukraine is a hybrid regime, in other words a democracy without the rule of law, where democratic procedures are imitated but each stage of these procedures is corrupted. Government dominance is imposed by sophisticated yet not political means. Repression is disguised by criminal justification like "*state black mail*" composed of three pillars: Widespread corruption, surveillance and selective application of the law. Journalist **Ondřej Soukup** noted that there are no classical politics in Ukraine designated by right, left and center divisions. Elections are based on Russian versus European orientation or cultural divisions. At present, there is a prevalent stalemate because of competing centers of power in Ukraine. Since 2010, President Viktor Yanukovich used two major events to show western orientation the European football championships and the EU accession process, which has since been put on hold because of the arrest of Yulia Tymoshenko.

The Role of Civil Society in EU External Relations

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, European House, 16.00–17.30

Moderator: Jeff Lovitt

Participants: Yuri Dzhibladze, Susi Dennison, David Nichols, Karina Chircu, Jan Marian

Jeff Lovitt opened the discussion by arguing that if a high number of coordinated civil societies pursue the same goal, they can make a change. **Yuri Dzhibladze** said that NGOs are more efficient when working within a network, and stressed that democracy is an ongoing process that is never perfect, and has to be promoted in one's country of origin as well as abroad. Tackling the issue of human rights necessarily requires political influence, he said, which is where the solution-making slows down. Dzhibladze argued that it is the task of civil society to intervene and change this decision-making inertia. The European Council on Foreign Relations' **Susi Dennison** called for quality research on the way policy is received across Europe in order to communicate effectively. She admitted that it is particularly difficult for the NGOs to intervene in decision-making regarding the so-called big partners (USA, China, Russia) and strategic actors (Egypt, Algeria).

David Nichols of Amnesty International pointed out that even though the European Union consults NGOs on topics such as human rights and development, they do not involve NGOs in crucial topics regarding "*hard politics*." He said it is critical for the NGOs to share information as much as it is possible, and behave proactively in respect to the hard politics decision-making. **Karina Chircu** explained that the term "civil society" encompasses cooperatives, foundations, media, NGOs as well as indigenous peoples'

organizations. She described how communication between local, regional, national and international NGOs works in a pyramid, which in the end helps to strengthen civil societies.

The Czech Female President Platform

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, DOX Centre for Contemporary Art, 18.00–20.00

Moderator: Jana Šmídová

Participants: Anna Hogenová, Adriana Krnáčová, Zuzana Roithová, Marie Čermáková, Klára Samková, Táňa Fischerová, Růt Kolínská

Jana Šmídová, a journalist from Czech Radio 6, introduced the panel stating that this is the first time Czech Female President Platform is included in the Forum 2000 Conference. **Marie Čermáková**, sociologist from the Academy of Science, focused on the future of the Czech Republic that is only realizable through negotiation and mutual understanding, she also pointed out that there should be more investments in education and research. She strongly supported the presence of women on the Czech political scene and notified that women's contribution to the democratic system needs to be made visible. **Klára Samková**, lawyer and presidential candidate, presented two definitions of home country; home country as a place where one earns money, which is an easily transferable home, and so-called "mental home," which stands for culture, tradition and language.

Professor **Anna Hogenová**, a phenomenologist and presidential candidate, used Aristotle to explain what her approach to the role of president would be. Women are ideal candidates for president, because they naturally live with risk all their life, she said. **Adriana Krnáčová**, President of RESTART, focused on values like education, health and state development. According to her, health is a key concern of every single person. The expenses on dispensable health care should drop, so that there is no financial shortage for indispensable health care.

Rut Kolínská, a presidential candidate, drew attention to people's distrust in politics which is reflected in the collection of signatures for president petitions. She stated that media should help and educate people on democratic principles. **Zuzana Roithová**, a presidential candidate speaking via video recording, said that the new direct presidential election is a big change, made even bigger if a woman was elected. **Tat'ána Fischerová**, another presidential candidate speaking via video, said she sees the president as a mediator and commentator of developments in the society.

National, European and Human Security: From Co-existence to Convergence

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Karolinum, Small Hall, 15.00–17.00

Moderator: Jan Ludvík

Participants: Daniel Anýž, Miloš Balabán, Kateřina Bocianová, Pavel Seifter, Marco Overhaus, Petr Pavel, Libor Stejskal, Lubomír Zaorálek, Jiří Parkmann

This presentation examined the book of the same name published this year with the help of contributors from the Charles University Center for Security Policy. The book analyzes the security strategies of individual European countries, and evaluates them in the larger context of European security as a whole. Panelists explored challenges in both national and human security currently facing Europe, including migration and other demographic shifts, European integration, and cyber threats. **Petr Pavel** sparked a heated discussion when he asserted that migration poses one of the primary security threats to Europe. *“There is one single threat prevailing in Europe which we are usually reluctant to speak about, and that is the threat associated with demographics in terms of minorities. Soon 50 million Muslims will be living in Europe,”* he said. Other panelists were quick to disassociate themselves from Mr. Pavel’s view, but largely agreed that migration poses a difficult security problem for Europe. Panelists then briefly discussed the idea of a European-wide armed force and the role of NATO

Marko Overhaus made the case that in recent years economic problems have tended to sideline security concerns. He listed three trends that he says are currently hindering international cooperation on security. *“The first is the debt crisis. Economic aspects are increasingly dominating the thinking on security. The second is the rising inwardness of member state governments. The third trend is renationalization spilling over from the crisis,”* he said. **Miloš Balabán** brought the discussion back to the nature of the EU, questioning whether the institution is legitimate for most citizens. *“There should be an all European referendum on the EU. Everything should be put on the scales and we should see how the citizens respond.”*

Ukraine Near and Far: Where Does the East Actually Begin?

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Langhans, People in Need Center, 19.00–20.30

Moderator: Radka Denemarková

Participants: Yuri Andrukhovych, Mykola Riabchuk

Radka Denemarková, a Czech writer and translator, began the discussion by stating that if a society forgets its past, it is a sick society. She added, *“Europe is dragging along unresolved labels from past trauma.”* She went on to say that the interlocking of business to politics has rerouted people’s ambitions. In her next point, she complimented writer **Yuri Andrukhovych** on his playfulness and *“positive arrogance,”* but criticized his lack of courage in describing the actual daily life situation in Ukraine. **Mykola Riabchuk**, a Ukrainian poet and analyst, stressed that the European model not only incorporates inclusion, but at the same time exclusion, which he said is dangerous. He said the Ukrainian constitution lacks legitimacy, and was structured on the assumption that citizens are *“sleeping beauties”* and good by nature.

Mr. Andrukhovych read three of his poems. The one he emphasized was dedicated to a journalist friend who he says passed away suspiciously. He went on to say that the Ukrainian people are in a state of normalization, in other words, people are becoming more and more socially isolated because of the current regime. His concluding remarks described the East as a *“combination of ruins and McDonalds.”*

Monday Breakfast

Monday, October 22, 2012, Žofín Palace, Conference Hall, 9.00–9.50

Introduction: Tomáš Vrba

Remarks: Vesna Pusić

Monday's opening breakfast featured a short introduction by **Tomáš Vrba**, followed by remarks from **Vesna Pusić**, the Croatian Minister of Foreign and European Affairs. Pusić began by praising Václav Havel for his vision of a brighter future for Europe, even in the Communist Czechoslovakia in the late 1970s. The minister contrasted Havel's ideals with the current state of affairs in contemporary Europe. She went on to criticize Europe and the European Union in particular, for its focus on economic problems over political issues.

Pusić said that today, we have "*almost lost the political vision... [are] almost completely focused on our economic problems.*" Ms. Pusić said she believes European politics have become lost because people are no longer asking "*what kind of societies we've become*" or "*what kind of political future... we want*" and have become more focused on "*more selfish issues*" like austerity. Pusić called for better political leadership in the Europe, saying the project Havel started has not yet been completed. "*We now have the task of recognizing the possibility that we could have a better future now,*" she said. Pusić continued to elaborate on Havel's aspirations for Europe, namely his view that the whole project has little value without the "*two basic concepts of individual dignity and equal human rights by every person.*"

Gala Dinner

Monday, October 22, 2012, Mlýnec, 20.00–23.00

Introduction: Jakub Klepal

Remarks: Paul Wilson

Forum 2000 Executive Director **Jakub Klepal** began by unveiling the Declaration related to the 2012 conference. The document outlined the commitment of the organization to maintain and advance Václav Havel's legacy in human rights, opposition to tyranny, promoting democratic values, engaging in open dialogue and respect for varied cultures. That document would go on to be signed by most of the conference delegates. Mr. Klepal then introduced **Paul Wilson**, a Canadian writer, radio producer, editor and translator of President Havel's works. Mr. Wilson addressed various components of President Havel's legacy. "*Civil society in this country was totally destroyed. One of the most radical things to do was to bring people back together again,*" he said.

Tuesday Breakfast

Tuesday, October 23, 2012, Žofín Palace, Restaurant, 9.00–9.45

Introduction: Ivana Štefková

Remarks: SU Chi

Dr. SU Chi began the breakfast meeting by describing East Asia as, “a *geographical concept, not a political concept.*” He argued that East Asia is a heterogeneous region with no recognizable political union. Dr. SU spoke of the region as “*peculiar,*” saying it is “*a miracle that we have seen peace and stability in East Asia for the last thirty years.*” He attributes this stability to the “*abiding and overwhelming desire for economic growth*” in the region. He went on to list three factors that he believes have led to recent unrest in Asia: The rise of China as an economic power, surging competitive nationalism and the Obama administration’s recent “*rebalance*” in global policy toward Asia. With regard to competitive nationalism, Dr. SU said that media is an important part of this phenomenon.