

**TRANSCRIPT:
DEMOCRACY DAY – PANEL 3:**

DEMOCRACY VS ECONOMIC POWER

**AT CGDC ANNUAL MEETING 2012
05-18-2012**

PANEL LEADER:

Hans DEMMEL
n-tv, CEO

PANEL SPEAKER

H.E. Ilir META
Prime Minister of the Republic of Albania, 1999 – 2002

Ingrid DELTENRE
European Broadcasting Union (EBU), Director

Begümhan DOGAN FARALYALI
Dogan Holding, Chairwoman

Dr. Claus RAIDL
Oesterreichische Nationalbank, President

Duma Gideon BOKO
President of the Botswana National Front

Gail M. ROMERO
MBA Women International, CEO

Hans DEMMEL:

Thanks a lot for that kind introduction and thanks a lot Mr. Schwimmer! I started also, or I want to start also with a little quote, it's not Churchill, I think there are also some other quotes about democracy that we all know; it comes from a German author, Bert Brecht, and it says: "first comes food, then comes morality". In German, it's even more drastic. The original quote is, for all people here who speak German, is: "erst kommt das Fressen, dann die Moral". What does it tell us? And what's important today for us? It's the quote per se, yes, it's the philosophical idea behind it, but what's more interesting at the moment is, it comes from 1929. The late 20s in Germany, you remember the famous Weimar Republic, a weak economy, an extremely weak economy, a weak democracy. This is what we would say bad moon rising, it was really the rising of anti-democratic movements in Germany.

And now let's make a huge jump, not even geographically to the Maghreb states, to the Arabian Spring. What have we seen there? What has fueled these liberation movements? Was it the wish for democracy? Yes, but wasn't it also the huge unemployment rates that we've seen there, especially among young people? Is this really what we talk about? Dictatorship is cruel in these countries, and what we know and what we see, what we can follow now, is Syria: people who are fighting and people who are willing to die for freedom, for freedom of speech, for democracy. Is it hope? Is it desperation, what brings them forward to ask for democracy, to postulate it? And what's the role of media in it? Is reporting, is true reporting possible in non-democratic systems? I don't say no, but this is one of the questions that we will face later. Was the Arab Spring a Facebook revolution? Was it the new media, social media that played an important role there, or was it more people's revolution and all this new media were tools to connect them? And what is, or what will be, what can be, what should be in an ideal world the role of the banks, the role of the banking system? Are they, as it was the original idea, service provider for the economy, for companies, for the industry, or are they economic unit of their own only interested in creating value by themselves, for themselves, with themselves? What drives politics? What helps democratic movements or is democracy another word for swarm intelligence?

These are a lot of interesting questions that we see here. We have more or less than 2 hours and I'm really convinced, really convinced that we'll have an excellent panel here, very sophisticated and I hope all the members of the panel can enlighten and explain the different angles of vision. The first of them, and I'm really very happy to see him here, is His Excellency Ilir Meta – one of the most influential politicians in the post-communist era in Albania. He was Prime Minister from 1999 to 2002, and he was Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Secretary of State from 2009 to 2011, and he is also Chairman of the Socialist Movement for Integration. Please, welcome His Excellency on stage. I would ask you for little 5-6, 7-minute statements. Please, come on stage.

H.E. Ilir META:

Good morning to everyone! The question of whether economic power exercises pressure upon democracy by compromising its fundamental values is a highly complex issue which requires deep analysis, but also empirical evidence. Considering the economic power for the sake of this debate, as a political power coming from the influence of the big business or the ruling elites, I believe that the prosperity of the citizens is the real economic power of a country, which has, in fact, much to do with the sustainable aspects of economic and social development, with the position of the middle class in the social structure of the country, with the distribution policies and equality in the society, with the accountability of the elected to the electors, with the role of the state to guarantee fair play in the market. I come from a country and a region where democratic changes have brought huge economic benefits. Albania and other Western Balkan countries have witnessed an immense positive transformation, as they are all presently engaged in the pre-accession process with the European Union. EU integration is based upon strict conditions of democratic changes, and we have seen how the strengthening of democracy has brought a wider prosperity for our citizens and more economic power for each of our countries.

The challenge for us all today is how to sustain our growth performance, and I'm convinced that this is a common shared goal with our European partners. Nevertheless, this overall progress, the consolidation of the free market, the growth of big business, has witnessed friction between this power of money and the pressure of dominance over the political decision-makers. What are the problems here? First of all, it is a matter of legitimacy, since politicians and decision-makers are elected by the voters, whereas those who have the power of money are not. It is a matter of facing the power of media which often serves to the interest of those capable of financing it. It is a matter of distribution policies, the model of distribution that creates the accumulation of economic power versus the policies of better distribution of the wealth, policies which, if not appropriate, could assist in unjustly accumulated economic power to the detriment of the rest of the society. It is also a matter of unbalanced and unsustainable development which has the main negative impact on the development of society. Here are some of the remedies to these issues:

First, we need to have the premise of a democratic system, democratically elected decision-makers that are accountable to their voters, not to the markets per se; empowering the citizens is fundamental, important. There is a role played by the state as far as the supervision on the market, fair rules of play in competition, as well as a mechanism that guarantees these rules and the transparency of the markets. There must be an appropriate mix of economic policies which ensure equality of opportunities and fair share of the benefits for all. Bridge the gap between the very poor and the rich by fighting poverty, stimulating full employment,

promoting social solidarity, and supporting a growing middle class. Strengthen the rule of law, especially combat corruption and trafficking of influence through better legislation and stronger institutional safeguards. Thank you!

Hans DEMMEL:

So, thank you and let me mention here an Albanian author. This is what I wanted to tell you, I started with a quote from a German author, but I personally confess my most favorite author comes from Albania. It is Ismail Kadare, I think you know him. Whenever you want to read great books, try them. Next here on stage is Beguemhan Dogan – a young lady as charming as powerful. And this is the moment where I would like to thank the organization team for the gender-balanced panel that we have today. I think you should give the organization team a little applause for that [Applause].

Ms Dogan is now Chairwoman of the Dogan Holding in Turkey. She has left the Stanford University not so long ago, made a determined career, has launched a TV channel in Romania. She assumed the presidency of Dogan TV Holding and I think it has been quite a windy time, quite a stormy time for her company over the last years. It would be great from you also to get a little statement and you are a media person and you stand for economy. So there is a lot of press on economic pressure also on media, on newspapers, and it would be great to hear your opinion to that. Welcome on stage Ms Dogan.

Begümhan DOGAN FARALYALI:

Thank you, Hans, for that introduction.

Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen!

The question of our panel, “Will democracy prevail over economic and media power?”, assumes a confrontation, a contradiction between democracy and media power. I want to start by saying that I disagree with this assumption. I’m the President of the largest media group in Turkey, and I know that our group can survive only in truly democratic environments. And we suffer most when democracy is interrupted or its basic rules are ignored. In my view, democracy and independent media are like Siamese twins: they cannot be separated of each other. There can never be a real democracy in a non-democratic country and we cannot talk of independent free media in non-democratic countries.

Let us think for a moment about the role of media. First and foremost of all, media provides a communication platform for politicians and the public. It provides critical information and news to the public. It hosts different views and discussions to help people form their opinion;

their opinion - free from manipulation, and provocation, and misinformation. It uncovers, exposes corruption and enables people to hold governments accountable. All of these are, in my opinion, very important for a functioning democracy. Defining democracy simply based on how a country chooses its government is too narrow. In the absence of balance of powers and institutional checks and balances, even a democratically elected government can turn into an authoritarian nightmare. Independent judiciary system and parliamentary control are two important factors of democracy; and the third one is the free media. It is these three that provide the important checks and balances for genuine democracies to exist.

The first thing Chaves did, when he came to power, was to take over the independent media. Or take, for instance, China: the Chinese government has long tried to keep the traditional and new media on a short leash to prevent any challenges to its political authority. This has often entailed strict media control using monitoring systems, shutting down publications or websites, and jailing dissident journalists and bloggers. All authoritarian regimes apply strict control over their media outlets. They even ban foreign media which they fear can contaminate their public. But here, another question arises: can free media be a threat to democracy? In my view no. As long as there are ground rules, a code of conduct, and rule of law that applies to all citizens, media can never be a threat to democracy. All democratic countries, in view of the special role of the media, have taken measures to prevent concentration of media and encourage the diversity of views in media. Sometimes such a concentration can lead to distorted information in favor of special interests or values. Pluralism in media ensures a healthy exchange of ideas which feeds democracy. As we all know, media is going through a transformational change with the fast spread of internet and mobile devices. In the past, we were comforted by the thought that truth will prevail one day. In today's world, truth does not even wait one day to surface. Reality is surfacing immediately. Arab Spring is partly the product of internet and the social media. Satellite TV, mobile phones, tablets, and, of course, internet, inform and connect people. The new media world is a more democratic world. In this new transformed world people on the street have more and louder voices than they ever did. Until I finish my sentence at least 10,000 tweets, hundreds of video footage, millions of pictures are circulating in the cyber space. Thousands of people across the globe will express themselves with words, videos, and pictures. This pluralism is healthy for democracy. But we also have to bear in mind that the rules between this new media and democracy is not clear yet. In the old days, media was controlled by big corporations and they had some ground rules. For instance, on matters perceived as national security media acted as a single voice and communicated the official line without much questioning. This was especially true for some key foreign issues or domestic issues, in order not to hurt the economy or the social order, media exercised kind of an auto-control. One cannot expect such restraint from the new media.

Another point to be made about new media is the accuracy of the news. Big media corporations had assumed a responsibility for double-checking the sources of their news. They knew that their credibility would be severely hurt by false reporting. In the new media no such constraints exist and the ground rules are yet to be set. But this murky environment does not change how effective and how impactful the new media is. With social media, now more people can access, create, and distribute information. Ideas are spreading faster, pushing the boundaries of freedom of expression and opening up new possibilities for change and reform. Social media has the potential to be a catalyst for democratization.

Throughout the last half of the 20th century liberal thought emphasized the linkage between democracy and the economic progress. We were told that the modern economic progress is based on free entrepreneurship, freedom of thought and freedom of belief. But nowadays some of the most successful economies in the world are the product of non-democratic regimes. And most democratic countries in the world are going through staggering economies. In some places free thinking is losing ground, media liberties are residing. Some people now have the courage to ask: is democracy really the right way? Despite these few examples of economic success in authoritarian countries, I believe that sustainable economic development and human progress can only happen in a free environment. Europe's successful recovery out of this financial turmoil is not only very important for the world economy, but for the future of the democracy as well. I have full faith in democracy and the important role media plays in promoting democracy. The solutions to our problems cannot be found by restricting the participants, but by involving every responsible citizen in the decision-making process. Together only free media and democracy can build societies worthy of human dignity. Thank you!

Hans DEMMEL:

I have to announce another charming lady. Ingrid Deltenre is Director General of the EBU – European Broadcasting Union, what's a combine of all the publicly-funded TV and radio stations. Here, in Europe she has made an impressive career at the Swiss TV and now she is also a bit more in the managing than in the journalistic business. Let me tell you a little story about her. We've been on a panel two or three years ago, you remember that. And if you have these panels on a national or on European side, there are always these little elbow checks between private TV and public TV. It was not that case with her. With her dialogue is possible, and this is one of the reasons why I'm really very happy to have her here. She can listen, but you should also listen to her. Please, come on stage.

Ingrid DELTENRE:

Well, good morning everybody and thank you for this flattering introduction! The topic Democracies versus Economic Power – that is the title of our panel this morning and this is of course a provocation. It sounds good, but as so many provocations, it is, of course, not true. Of course there are some very fortunate countries which are ruled by a feudal system, by dictatorship and still do economically well, because their economic power is built on natural resources such as oil, gold, or gas. But even those countries, unless they do not develop strong democracies and strong democratic institutions, I believe, we they will not prevail over time. Why is this so? It is so because sustainable economic power and wealth, not only for a small elite on the top, but for the majority of the people are always built on education, innovation, and on hard work. These qualities will not thrive in countries which are ruled by absolute power that suppress the people. Dictatorships, which try to control their people in an undemocratic and inhuman way, will not allow education with unlimited and uncontrolled access to knowledge. Dictatorships, which try to control their people in undemocratic and inhuman ways, do not accept the spirit of culture and innovation. Dictatorships, which try to control their people in undemocratic and inhuman ways, do not reward individual achievements based on work. And this is why all such countries have failed to generate wealth for their people; and I think they continue to fail doing so unless they develop into democracies. To educate well, you need to open the gates of knowledge beyond your own borders. To create innovation, you have to allow that everything is questioned, including yourself. You have to allow that people think out of their box, and above all, that they make mistakes. To be willing to work hard, you have to have the opportunity for a fair reward, a reward that is based on your own achievements and actions, instead of just the protectionism by those who hold power. It is democracies which allow and foster these qualities. And this is the reason why in democracies the gap between the rich and the less rich in general is much smaller than in non-democratic countries. Therefore, to construct the divide between the political and economic forces in a democracy is not only fundamentally wrong, but is also dangerous. In today's times of major political and economic uncertainties, it might be tempting for politicians and media to create such antagonism, but by doing so we risk undermining our own political system and the foundation of the advancement of our people. Because both powers, political and economic ones, are part of the same equation. Only when they are both strong, will the result of the equation be an improvement of the quality of life of the people.

Of course, I'm aware that not even in all Western democracies with our market economics, we don't live in a perfect world. Instead in times with many imperfections such as we can see just right now, some examples have been quoted by speakers before me. I think this is including also, which has not been mentioned, the obscene bonuses of some top managers

as of today. But notwithstanding these faults our democratic world is still, I believe, is infinitely better than the one in countries which until recently were or still are governed by dictators or other rulers with absolute powers. Therefore, instead of talking about democracies versus economies, I would rather like to focus on the question what are the fundamental prerequisites for a sustainable democratic political system that can foster economic growth, and with it the well-being of the people. I think, in essence, there are 5 things, it's of course the strong political institutions, it's the strict separation of powers, it's well-trained and educated people able to form their own thoughts, it's a set of laws and of course a judiciary system which allows these people to freely express their thoughts, it's strong independent and relevant media to make sure that all this happens.

Since I'm the Director General of a media organization – the European Broadcasting Union, some of you might better know it under the name Eurovision, which is not only about the song contest, of course, but also. I will focus, of course, on the role of the media that they should play in this role. Why are such media fundamental for democracy, and why will they contribute to the positive development of the society? Well, strong independent and relevant media, that means media that take their task seriously, and employ journalists with a high ethical and professional standard, they are the watchdogs. They hold the political and economic elites accountable and help to establish a sound balance between the two of them. This is not a theory, this is a fact. According to our surveys, there is a strong correlation between the media freedom and corruption. In general, countries with more media freedom show less corruption, while countries with strong censorship and media controlled by the state are more corrupt. That is a strong indicator we have. Therefore, strong independent and responsibly acting media have a direct impact on the overall improvement of society, but to be able to fulfill this mission, the media and their representative – the journalists – need to be protected by the law as well. Speaking here in Austria or in Switzerland, the country where I'm living, or in most other Western European countries, we take this for granted, but it isn't. In many countries it still can be deadly to report about the abuse of power, whether it is of political or economic nature. According to the organization "Reporters without Borders", in 2011, 66 journalists have been killed just for doing their job, 71 had to flee their country, 1,044 have been arrested, and 1,959 journalists have been harassed. In the end, all these misuses of power had one clear goal: they wanted to send a message to the journalists in the field, and to their colleagues in the newsrooms, and to their superiors, and upper echelons of their organizations "Don't mess with us! Go somewhere else and let us do what we want to do". If we allow this, we allow the destruction of democracy and our way of life.

Another way to pressure critical and independent media is through economic means. At the commercial media this is done through threatening to reduce advertisement spending. At public media, such as the members of our organization, it is done by threatening to reduce

license fees, taxes, or the mixture of both. Today you will find quite a few markets where politicians or business leaders try to make media their accomplice by exerting pressure on them. Fortunately though, it's also true that in more and more countries such a misuse, especially against public media, is less and in an increasing number of countries, I must say, they have started to implement new laws that protect free media. So, there are signs of hope; but there is still too many that don't. Of course, governments do not always embrace these developments freely, but because they are forced to do so.

One of the most important factors to help create independent media is technology. Why? Because modern media technology makes consumers and citizens more independent. Thanks to platforms such as Google, just founded in 1998, or Facebook created just a couple of years ago, in 2004, and thanks also to television distribution via satellite, and the immense launch of new news channels. We have more possibilities to inform ourselves and many more different sources than ever before and we can use many of these channels to make our own voice heard and to tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of other people's as well. In countries which suppress their own newspapers, radio, and television the distribution of news through the internet, social media, or international satellite television programs plays a very important role in reforming society and bring dictatorships to an end. As the Arab Spring that has been mentioned and other recent examples have shown. Social media such as Facebook or Tweeter are often perceived in such countries as more reliable sources than the national media, which should give us something to think, I guess. That is why, governments are jamming satellite signals and try to block access to the internet, but whatever they try to keep independent information away from their citizens, in the end they will fail. In today's world you cannot keep people away from looking for the truth. And this is very healthy for democracy, and that is why we at the EBU support this development with various actions.

The most important initiatives are to defend the freedom of expression and the independence of the media directly by approaching governments in those countries where they are threatened, to ensure sustainable and sufficient funding of public media, to safeguard the openness of the internet, including open and interoperable technical standards, and of course to help educate journalists and support media organizations in countries where the media do not yet have the knowledge – the means necessary for good independent journalism. So,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Let me come to an end and summarize what is not only my personal belief, but also at the core of our organization – EBU or Eurovision. We believe that strong and independent media are one of the cornerstones of modern democracy; but we are equally convinced

that a modern democracy needs a strong economy to help improve the people's life. It is the most important task of us, the media, especially if they are public, like the members of our organization, to make their audiences understand the importance of politics and economics, and to watch over these two powers, so that they work to the benefit not only of a happy few, but for the society as a whole. In other words, it is our mission to make public service media indispensable because public service broadcasting is good for democracy, is good for the economy, and above all it's good for the people. Thank you very much for your attention!

Hans DEMMEL:

We've heard a lot of interesting statements about the importance of free independent journalism and there's another question that we'll see later on, this is not only the way how media, how information is produced. Another interesting question is the consumption of media. But now this is the point to come to the other half of the discussion and I'm very happy to announce Dr. Claus Raidl. I got to know him this morning and he is a very very friendly guy, but he also is known as outspoken. He has stressed several positions in Austrian industry, has worked as a consultant, he was Chairman and CEO of Böhler-Uddeholm, and now he is the Head of the National Bank of Austria. A banker? I'd like to hear your opinion on that!

Dr. Claus RAIDL:

Well, thank you very much for this nice introduction Mr Chairman.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Let me first say, almost all things have already been said, but not by all people. This is why I have the honor to stand up here. Now, the topic is Democracy versus Economic Power. In my 5 minutes I would like to answer the following question: do democratic institutions deteriorate under the pressure of economic power, or of big companies, or of big interest groups? This is the question I'll try to answer and I will say right away it's not a YES or a NO answer, because you have to look at this very detailed. Let me start, because the problem is not new, let me start when after World War II the first time in political science literature and in the political discussion this problem was addressed. I remember in the 1960s, to be more precise the generation of (19)68, especially in the German Federal Republic and in France, and also a little bit in Austria, in those years the question was do we really have still a democracy, or do we have a mock-democracy, or a pseudo-democracy, and some people pronounced this word "demo-crazy", the crazy demos - the Greek word, demo-crazy, and those were the

discussions we had, because everybody had to see that big interest groups distorted laws, prohibited laws, and Parliament very often only formally decided on laws that were already decided in the “ante-chambre”, in the rooms before the Parliament, to be very precise. In Austria we had a specific situation, which is for instance completely un-understandable in Sweden that the chairmen, chairwomen – no it was all men in those days, the chairmen of the big interest groups were members of Parliament, were members of the Government.

The President of the Austrian Trade Union then was President of the Austrian Parliament, the President of the Chamber of Commerce was Member of Parliament, the President of the Chamber of Labor was Member of Parliament. So, today the General Secretary of the savings banks union or interest groups, he is a Member of Parliament, he’s a good man. By the way, I know him, he’s a very good man but in Austria, and this is a very special thing, we never had a sharp line between interest groups, which we need in a pluralistic society, who have of course to write down their points and to propose their ideas to Parliament, but they were themselves the law-makers. So, this is a very shadow thing and it still does exist here in Austria. But this is my first point, do we have a real democracy or are the institutions alright – we have the Parliament, we have elections and so on and so forth, but the laws are done somewhere else and the discussion, in those years, it has changed a little bit, was that this is just a mock-democracy; and in Parliament people just say YES to laws that have been prepared and formulated somewhere else.

The second point, this is now the more optimistic point, the second point I want to point out is: then came new parties, thanks God, then came new parties – good ones and bad ones, in my personal opinion. The Greens – I would put them on the good side – the Greens, who said: look, we have to decide all this in Parliament and we are not bought or financed by some special interest groups. I forgot the farmers; the farmers of course had a big lobby in Austrian Parliament; they are 4% of the population, but I think 30% of the members of Parliament, just to give you an idea how distorted everything is. But then came the Greens, then came the far-right, especially in Austria, the far-left in Germany, but that helped to make Parliament, as I see it again, more the place to decide upon laws and not just a place to raise your hand. I think, and the old power brokers in the big parties, the traditional parties I might say, lost a lot of the influence, which, I think, was not bad. It was a more lively thing, you had to convince now even Parliamentarians, and the scene changed, democracy to come back to the title, revived and was more lively and more accepted.

The third point, I think, a big push for democratic institutions and democratic thinking, was when the communists fell down and real democracies were established in the old Eastern or Central European countries. This, I think, if made in the West, rethinking about the importance of the democratic institution, the necessity of democratic institutions, I think, this was even for the West a very very positive influence.

Now to the present time, we have now the big discussions about the huge influence of the financial industry on democracy. Why do we or why are we not able to decide very quickly upon new regulations on the financial industry? Why is it so difficult to make laws concerning the bonus system, because Mr Chairman you mentioned it, concerning financial institutions? Why are we so hesitant to implement let's say Basel III or the regulations formulated by the European banking authority? And here I don't just mean Austria; in all our countries. And here you see, democracy and politicians are really challenged to show who decides. Who decides? Are the politicians still able to decide how the country is being run; and in this financial sector it's a good test; or do, I say it more general now, private interest groups decide on that? Or do we have a democracy for the elites? Not for the people, but for the elites. These, I think, are big questions. All politicians and law-makers should think about much more in depth, because we always have the problem that we do have political parties in different countries, who quite openly say what do we need all this, what is the sense (I mean the far-right). So, here we really have to be very very careful that our democratic institutions fulfill their task to make laws and decide. This is a very, I see it in Western Europe particularly, a very crucial point. I can give you a lot of examples. Look at the nuclear power lobby, but there I must say, the politicians made the decisions (when I look at Germany, or here in Austria it was 30 years ago or 40 years ago) we step out of this. This is was a political decision and we all know how the power brokers of the lobbyists, of the nuclear power people, what they all tried to change or reverse or to try that these laws to go to be decided upon. So, here I have a positive example in my view, but let's see the next months, the next years how other pressure groups are able to fulfill, or are able to get their idea through.

I think, in Western Europe the discussion is two-fold. The one point is we are running in a discussion to give more instruments directly to the people – referendums and things like that, “referendas” to take the Latin word in plural; like Switzerland – it's a completely different historical background but I just mention it. The other point is: will we try to roll back the influence of the interest groups? Is changing of the electoral system... this is a typical Austrian / German question, not so much in the Anglo-Saxon world, not at all, because in the Anglo-Saxon world, as you know, you have an electoral district and you vote for the man or for the woman, and he or she is elected; and you can do it differently like in France, but you have this. In Austria and Germany – Germany a little bit different – you vote for the party and the party decides who comes into Parliament, which is horrible. Because you have people there who depend 100% on the political party, which is not good, because they are not able to discuss freely their opinion, because then they don't get on the list next time. Some former Parliamentarians are sitting here and they, I think, are of the same opinion. And in Austria, and in other countries, we say let's make the Member of Parliament more independent from

his party, which I think is very very good, but who finances him? And then all the big questions of campaign funding come up, what we have in the United States; or the big question comes up – whose interests are then be considered in the parliamentary process and who finances whom?

I'll give you an example: the American Bar Associations, this is the lawyers' associations, are most of the time the biggest spenders to both parties – republicans and democrats, because they are afraid of certain legislations, particularly for the litigation lawyers without going into details, who pays for whom and so on. So, I think, before we change things, we always have to ask us one question: what is good for the democratic process? For the rule by the people for the people to quote something very well-known and of course always above all the rule of law, which was already mentioned a couple of times. And in this process with other instruments to make the democratic process more lively, we'll observe only one thing: how brave are politicians to do things when they are afraid of losing voters? And this is a lot the influence of the newspapers because it was already two times mentioned. I mean, in many countries – I know, of course, Austria good and Germany – a lot of politicians do not ask themselves what's good for the country; they ask themselves what's the headline tomorrow in the newspaper?! I could mention some titles now of newspapers, but out of politeness I don't do it for Austria, Germany, or the United Kingdom. And this, I think, is the biggest threat in a democratic process when the politicians don't ask themselves what's good for them who elected me, but what's good for me to stay in power and the instrument that helps me to stay in power are the newspapers, or TV stations, or talk shows, all those things we see 24 hours a day. And this, I think, we should try to discuss more deeply, because you don't get a very special phenomenon which we have in Austria in 1 state (you know we have 9 states which it's called federalism, but it doesn't matter now) in 1 state we do reforms, quite deep-reaching reforms of the political system of that state or province (province would be the better word), but who does it – the Heads of two parties who said we are not going to run for the election again. And they don't care what's the headline in the paper, or what's the report on TV or radio but if this is the way to get in Western democracies reforms done, I think it would be the wrong way, because then you educate the wrong politicians but this is the topic we can't discuss, because I have already done more of my time. Thank you very much!

Hans DEMMEL:

I guess he shouldn't leave the stage, because it will be really very interesting what he has to tell us in the discussion. Didn't I promise you an outspoken guy? There are some questions, what I really would be interested, what would you think if political party, like the Pirates in Germany, would come to Austria, but we can discuss that later; and also the question:

was that, what you described, still a democratic or is it already a post-democratic system. Coming from that, we come into growing democratic system and I'm very happy to ask Duma Boko to us. He is a human rights lawyer, defender, and activist. He is the leader of the Botswanian opposition. He had great success over the last months to umbrella three opposition parties, so he is also someone who can talk about dialogue and I'm really pleased to have you here. It's your stage.

Duma Gideon BOKO:

Thank you very much to the leader of the panel! Thank you very much, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, for having me here today.

The leader of the panel applauded the gender balance of the panel; I would like to start off by applauding something else about this panel, and it is the fact that it has an African voice in it. That I'm able to appear here, before you, and tell a bit of the African story in so far as it relates to democracy and economic power. I'm most grateful for this opportunity. I must indicate that I speak as a person who at some point appeared in the High Court of Zimbabwe, when a judgment in a treason trial involving the current Prime Minister of Zimbabwe, Morgan Tsvangirai, was to be handed down. I appeared as an observer for the International Bar Association, to observe whether the Rule of Law was truly alive and well in Zimbabwe. I remember that not too long after that I had to return to Zimbabwe, leading a delegation of lawyers from Southern Africa, who had been sent to carry out an investigation into assaults and brutality, unleashed by the Zimbabwean government on the legal profession in Zimbabwe. I went again to investigate whether the Rule of Law was still alive and well in Zimbabwe. And I carried out these assignments with some enthusiasm, because I understood that Zimbabwe as a neighbor to Botswana, where I come from, with the challenges that they were facing, challenges that had been long in coming, challenges that were looming large on the horizon in relation to my own country, it became imperative for me to be present, to observe, to document, and to speak out for and on behalf of the legal profession in Zimbabwe, and ultimately for and on my own behalf as a legal practitioner in the country of Botswana. So it is critical for me that when I speak on these matters, I speak not from the perspective of abstraction, but I speak as an engaged sometimes enraged participant in this quest for democracy, for the broadening of the democratic space and processes in Africa, more particularly in Southern Africa.

Botswana has been hailed over the years as an oasis of peace and stability, in an otherwise turbulent part of the African continent. In critical part because it has held elections every 5 years and for many, the holding of elections every now and then has become the sum total of what democracy is all about. I must indicate to you that there are serious systemic and

other challenges in relation to the development and entrenchment of democratic practices and institutions in the whole of the African continent including Botswana, which has become such a darling of the West. And I'd like to indicate to you that some of these challenges that we saw in relation to the countries in the Arab region, the Arab Spring, were not problems that rocked up overnight. These are problems that had been simmering for a very long time, and very little attention was at the most critical of times paid to some of these problems. The result of paying little to no attention to some of these problems while they can be contained and properly canalized and managed, is that one situation is created where the people on the ground develop some measure of disenchantment with the so-called "democracy". Because they ask themselves simple questions about how this democracy has transformed for the better their lives. These are serious questions for them, bread-and-butter issues, and when they fail to find answers in the institutions they are faced within their countries, they lose faith and confidence in these structures; they lose faith and confidence in what we describe as democracy. These are the realities. And so, this dialogue today becomes truly global, because of the presence of this voice, representing the African continent on this panel. And it is important to understand what role the developed democracies can play in ensuring that democracy takes route in some of the less developed democratic countries and places of the world. And so it is a challenge to this organization to ensure just as when the alarm bells ring in Syria, and when they rang in Libya, the international community was mobilized, they intervened, in some instances decisively, in other instances less decisively than in others.

But the critical point is when they get mobilized, they try and find the alternative voice in the particular country or community, they find the opposition. And I'm the trumpet voice of that African opposition that seeks to be found, that seeks to be nurtured, that seeks to be supported, in order to enhance accountability on the African continent; and in order to ensure the re-energization of democracy in Africa and, indeed, the world. We must appreciate that when the wheels of commerce are rolling, dictators are given a free ride. It is only when they begin to affect the commercial interests of some of the West European countries, that some decisive action is taken. We need to put an end to this. We need to create a democratic ethic calculus that enables us to monitor and ensure that democracy subsists every day, every minute, for the vast majority of the people of these countries. And the framing of the question for this panel, which is Democracy versus Economic Dominance or Power, acknowledges what often is a conflictual relationship, where economic power conducts business and its activities in a manner that's inimical to democratic processes and conduct. Business interests often bankroll dictators, the result is that when the dictators have long seized to care and count, the debts that they would have created during their tenure in office remain holding these developing countries hostage. So we need at a certain point to appreciate that the disenchantment will result in a situation where Greece says "I'm not paying", or some

African country might say “I’m not paying”, and that would adversely affect business. So in order for business, in order for the economics of the equation to be adequately secured, it is important that we secure the fundamental rights, the democratic rights of the ordinary people of some of these least developed regions of world; and that also involves finding the opposition, ensuring that the opposition as a meaningful alternative voice is nurtured, supported, so that democracy can be enhanced and re-energized.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

let me pose that fine thank you for your kind and attentive listening. Thank you!

Hans DEMMEL:

Really, really impressive! And I think we will get a lot of new ideas and what I see it’s becoming more and more complicated with each statement that we have. This was an African voice. We also have an American voice here, but it’s not the official America. It’s Gail Romero who is joining us. She has worked as a consultant for more than two decades for NGOs, non-governmental organizations, and now she is Chairwoman / CEO for company MBA Women International. She will explain that to us and she is also heading a company that’s called Rainmaker TV, whatever it is, she will explain it to us. Please.

Gail M. ROMERO:

Thank you!

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, and my esteemed panelists,

I’m the wild card today, and I’m very very pleased to be here. I think in order to explain a little bit more about me; I should give you a little background to put it in context. As Hans mentioned, I have been in consulting for many many years, and working with women and girls – that has been my passion. I understand that they are 50% of the population and often not considered to be 50% of the solution. And so that’s why it has been so important for me to be part of that. Through this entire process I have also with my husband, we have decided that we wanted to give back; we wanted to do something special. And so we started Rainmakers TV. And Rainmakers TV was about those people doing great things in the world, the beneficiaries who took advantage of the opportunities, and those corporations and philanthropists who made a difference to help those things happen. Rainmakers TV has been invited to the Clinton Global Initiative for several years now, and we have interviewed some amazing people – Cherie Blair who was here last year, Muhammad Yunus who will be talked about later today, as well as a number of people that you would never have even imagined that are doing

wonderful things; one of the people who is here today - Linda Lockhart with the Global Giveback Circle. In the process of the interviews, I had an opportunity to meet Stamen and Petar who talked about this wonderful organization called the Center for Global Dialogue and Cooperation. I did not know what they did, and so when we got into the interview, we started asking questions, and I found out that it was really about not only cooperation and dialogue, but about leadership. And the question today is about democracy or economic power, and I think with democracy and economic power comes responsibility. I took this away as we finished the interview and that was in September of last year. In November I happened to be walking through an airport and I'm an avid reader, so I was going through the bookstore to find something for the airplane; there was a book called "The Coming Jobs War" by Jim Clifton, he is the Chair of Gallup. And I picked the book up thinking this ought to be interesting, and got halfway through it on the airplane, could not put it down. I was so enthralled with this and went back to the thought that Stamen and Petar had said about dialogue and cooperation and leadership. It became so important to me I could not let it rest.

I just went out and bought half a dozen books, and gave them away to people that I knew that were in political leadership, CEOs of companies, and I said "you have to read this book". I mailed it out everywhere, I went and bought another couple of dozen, and then I bought another, I ended up buying almost a hundred books and giving them away because the message was so important, and tied in so importantly to dialogue and cooperation and leadership. And then I finally said, OK, I've got to meet the man. So I called up Jim Clifton and I said "Jim, can we spend an hour or two together and talk about what it is that you think we need in this world?" He said: "Leadership" and he said "we not only need leadership at the highest levels, we need to teach leadership at middle school, we need to teach it in high school, we need to teach it in the universities, and we need to teach it within our corporations". And later in November, I was approached by an organization called National Association of Women MBAs; and they said: "Gail, our organization, we need to revamp itself, we've been around for 30 years. We were started at Horton University by two MBA women who realized they needed a dialogue with other women, because they didn't understand the leadership thing that was going on around them, and they didn't know how to get in to leadership. They knew it was important, but how do you get the opportunity?"

So, 30 years later they contacted me and said: "You know, we've been sitting at the same stage for a long time. We have 72 university chapters, we have 20 professional chapters, and we have this enormous request from around the world to join our organization, and we don't know what to do with this." And I said I will be willing to do this, I will leave my corporation, my own company after over 17 years, and I will take this on as my legacy. I handed my husband the keys to the organization and said I guess you are not retired anymore and immediately

took over as the CEO for MBA Women International. We changed the name because we had so many women around the world who wanted to belong and they wanted a voice. They wanted to understand about leadership, dialogue, and cooperation; they wanted to understand about economic power and democracy; and we realized at that point that we needed to do something more. And again, I go back to what happened at CGI talking to Petar and Stamen, and understanding the importance of leadership, understanding the responsibility that you take on when you take on that role. So, I did an audit and I went around to all of our major corporate partners – Intel, Deloitte, Ernst & Young, Humana, the list goes on and on, a Fortune 100 companies who partner with us because they understand that over the last 30 years we've been building leaders, women-leaders; and they needed a pipeline of women leadership to fulfill their obligation of gender parity. And I'm looking at this and I'm realizing we have more to do, because we can teach them how to build an organization, and work within the confines of boards, but we are missing the boat. We have great responsibility for economic power. We have great responsibility for leadership.

So today, and this is our first, I guess, announcement to the press and everyone else, we have made a commitment, not only to the Center for Global Dialogue and Cooperation, but to the world, that we are going to be starting a Leadership Academy for Women. It will be launched in October of 2012. We have brought on board major Fortune 500 leadership, universities from around the world to help us design the program, so that we can provide the right kind of leadership. And I made a few notes as my colleagues were talking about the importance of what does this look like; and it's about integrity, it's about honesty, it's about leading with passion, perseverance, it's about understanding who you are internally, so that you can lead yourself, lead others and lead leaders. This is not a small task. What I ask of you today, is to check back with me in September, when we are ready to launch, look at the agenda, and understand that what we are going to be doing is providing a leadership certification. It will take them two years, they will absolutely, whoever goes through the program, will come out having read some of the best books on leadership skills, soft skills, presentation skills, the ability to go forward and make a difference. This is about the future. We heard about the way things are today, we have the questions about what happens tomorrow. I believe that if we have the right leadership that we will make a difference. And again it is the responsibility of democracy, and it is the responsibility of economic power. Thank you!

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION PANEL 3

Hans DEMMEL:

Gail, please join us here. We have another hour now for discussion and I would like to invite all of you, if there is a question – ask it. As we've seen, we have a lot of different issues. I'd like to start, let me add one little word, if all our answers are as long as our opening statements, it will be hard to see at 12 o'clock what's behind this curtain. I know you're also interested in it but I'd like to start with a short view on the media issue. Today is Facebook day, as we all know, we heard what the influence of Facebook on Arab Spring. My first question is: Mr Boko, can Facebook, can its global network help you with your postulation, with your idea to bring the African world closer to people, closer to the Western world?

Duma Gideon BOKO:

Thank you very much. Yes, Facebook can, and I believe in the unfolding future, will impact most positively in terms of bringing the African story to the world but it is also important to appreciate that connectivity in our part of the world remains very very low. So it's important firstly to invest in ensuring access, so that the story can be told live and raw by the people at the front line of brutality sometimes, of poverty. It is these people that must be able to tell their story. So, I think it will certainly. Thank you very much.

Hans DEMMEL:

Ms Dogan, that question to you as a media professional: think about the situation in your country, what's from time to time not as democratic as we see it from Central European or from Western European standpoint? Are all these new media – YouTube, Facebook – helpful for democratic movements or can it also, on the other side, endanger the people who are on these platforms?

Begümhan DOGAN FARALYALI:

Unfortunately, Turkey has been criticized a lot by European Commission, by United States, a lot of countries do a lot of reports on the issue of freedom of media. There are 92 journalists in prison today in Turkey. It ranks number 1. I think part of the problem is also our laws, because of the definition of anti-terrorism in the law; the judges interpret it so widely that it restricts freedom of expression in certain cases. And for Turkey I really hope that having an independent free media stops being a brave reaction and becomes normal. And I believe

we are doing a lot of progress, but we still have some way to go. In terms of whether, I didn't understand your question, whether that could be a risk? What do you mean?

Hans DEMMEL:

We've seen in several Arab countries that you could follow the people who've posted whatever videos or stuff like that and the authorities followed their routes and brought them to prison. That's the standard instrument in YouTube and Facebook.

Begümhan DOGAN FARALYALI:

Of course, Turkey is in a much more progressed state than the Arab countries, also on the issue of freedom of press. We still do write news etc. so that's not a danger in Turkey.

Hans DEMMEL:

Maybe there is another danger connected with the information we have here, YouTube, we get a lot of stuff, we get a lot of information and mostly from groups; we have a lot of sympathy for all these freedom movements, but how can we, how can you use, as classical media, the material, the videos, the information that you, that we get from all these new sources? Ingrid, please.

Ingrid DELTENRE:

Social media play nowadays a crucial role for almost every newsroom I'm aware of. All newsrooms have established journalists that deal only with social media information, or in newspapers, even more in radio, but also in television. And of course first of all is have proper training, because dealing with videos or information coming out of social media platforms means there is of course a big threat to get or to actually use and spread information that is basically wrong; and a lot of information is wrong, and is biased and has some particular interest, of course, in the back. So every newsroom has established a special unit trained to control, to look for evidence, to evaluate the sources, to also become aware of eventually other sources that might eventually contradict this kind of information; so training newsroom people, having a dedicated staff on one side is extremely important to make sure that that what you actually then use to make a report, that it is accurate. And of course the other thing is, it has, especially in times when newsrooms have been reduced, it is a fantastic source to get to new information, to also get new facts that eventually you were not able to evaluate and to dig out yourself. So, it is not only, and I think it is really today

already enriching many newspapers, radio and television programs by having just much more sources, providing much more information, and many more views on things that happen.

But of course, at the end of the day, you have to make sure that this information is correct and I think this is probably the most difficult thing to find out, but there are special techniques to do this and they are quite advanced. But I think when it comes to trust, this is the most important good or value; it's like money probably for banks, for media – it is trust. To be a trusted source of information, this is what you should not play with. And I'm aware also of, and that should give us something to think, I'm aware of polls especially in Austria, Germany, and Switzerland and the people are asked: "What according to you are the most trustful professions that you are aware of?" and then the people start saying firemen, doctors, nurses, so they are the most trusted and then the list goes on and on, and then sooner or later you come to, very low already at the bottom, car sellers, sorry, BMW, politicians, taxi drivers, and journalists. They are all in the same range and I think this is something we should really pay attention to. And therefore, I think it is good that we have additional sources that enrich our media as of today.

Begümhan DOGAN FARALYALI:

Can I just add; we talk about social media and social media's impact on democracy and the Arab Spring a lot, but we haven't mentioned another point. What happened in the Arab world that then people want to change? They want to change because they complain about their situation, about the corruption etc. but another important factor media can have is through entertainment TV, because recently in the last couple of years, in these Arab countries, the Turkish series are very popular. In these Turkish series, of course, they see different lives, different type of... you know, women are very suppressed in Arab countries, they see strong woman leadership examples, women are out there working by themselves etc. and all these inspire the women in the Arab world and the population in the Arab world to start asking for change. I have been contacted by many woman organizations asking us to do more TV production because entertainment TV, as you know, can inspire the masses. It's not only by news, but it's also by showing these role models and different lives that media can have an impact.

Hans DEMMEL:

I think you are absolutely right and this is what we've also seen in Germany, during the German Democratic Republic that the so called West TV has influenced a lot in that country. Ilir, one question to you: go 20 years back, would you have wished to have Facebook at that time and could Facebook have accelerated the process of democratization in Albania?

H.E. Ilir META:

I come from a country which is in the heart of Europe but which 22 years ago could be considered without exaggeration as the North Korea of Europe, because our communist regime couldn't be compared with that of former Yugoslavia, or even Romania etc. One of the main encouragements for the changes in Albania, because isolation was very dramatic, people couldn't travel abroad, also the private property was not existing. Our communist regime was going to collectivize even the cows in the villages. So, if someone was having a bicycle in the city, he was an important man; it couldn't compare. There was only one state channel, totally controlled, and people were trying to communicate with the world illegally through RAI, the Italian television, and also it was not permitted, you could have consequences, and people were punished for that. In (19)89 probably it was, to dream for democracy was not easy and no one could expect that in one year Albania to make such a big change and to introduce political pluralism and I'm proud to be one of the representatives of this student movement that brought the democratic change.

But considering what my colleague was saying about entertainment influence, inspiring changes for the people, I can say that the Albanian people were following Italian TV in particular, were really inspired from this life, were inspired from the music, were inspired from sport, were inspired from such life which was completely different from ours; and people understood that Albania was going to have fast changes and also, I think, the leaders of the communist regime, when two Italian singers came to Albania and it was permitted to have big concert, Albano and Romina, Albano Carrisi, he is very known in Italy and Romina Power, and all the stadium was singing with them all their songs. So despite that everything was not, was such a strong isolation, the people were demonstrating strong will for change. And in short time we had many big changes and then student democratic movement. So it was not Facebook inspiring us 22 years ago, but I think that media again, not free media, because we, people, were not having such free media, but again the communication despite of the difficulties, Italian media for example was inspiring such big changes, because people were understanding that we were not the richest country in the world. Thank you!

Hans DEMMEL:

Thank you for that! I would like to come a bit more to the question of the economic influence, Dr. Raidl. The question to you. If you think about all the developments, especially in the Arab Spring, also if you have a look to Greece and to Spain, how does economy, unemployment, what we see in Spain, what we see in Greece, and what we see in the whole Maghreb, fuel on the one hand democratic movements, on the other hand in existing democracies maybe endanger them? What we see in Greece now?

Dr. Claus RAIDL:

To the Greece situation and hopefully not in a few months in Spain, we see the following: we have the policy which, I think, is necessary on the one side to reduce sovereign debt, public debt. This has to be reduced because when a country has public debt on a level where nobody else gives them money they have to do something. And this is the situation in Greece. So, the European Union or the ESM – the European Stability Mechanism, or the EFSF, which would then be followed by the ESM, they supply Greece with money but they, of course, have rules under which the money is given; and these rules have as a consequence unemployment, negative growth rates, so the economy is shrinking, which we all knew. But the situation for the Greek people is, since they cannot devalue their currency, because they are in the European Union, they haven't changed in the last year their habit; let's take as an example the wages. When you look at the wages in Germany and Austria, the last ten years they were going more or less flat, in Germany even more flat than in Austria, they had some years of negative income, of income losses, on a real base when you deduct inflation. And the Greece's were going up, the Spain's were going up, the Italian's were going up and in the old days they devalued. And now when you can't devalue, to be more competitive you have to cut wages, because devaluation was for a worker the same, when he bought an imported good, he had to pay more in his local currency because the price went up after devaluation, not for the internal goods.

So, what we see now is that the acceptance of these measures has come to a limit, which I understand. You cannot ask from Greece or Spain. Let's take the Greeks that every year wages have to go down by 10% or 20% and so on and there, you have then the question: how does this affect democracy? And then they have an election, completely democratic election, which did not make it possible to form a government obviously, I mean I'm not an expert on Greek politics, what I read in the paper and see on n-tv. What we are doing now, let's vote again. And they hope, well, second time, third time, perhaps there's a majority in Parliament that accepts the measures of the European Union, which I personally do not believe. Now we have the discussion of a growth pact, you have to reduce the debt and at the same time you have to find some stimulus for the economy. There is always the question, but who finances this stimulus? Because the old Keynesian, that you on the demand side, increase demand so that economy goes moving who gives you the money for increasing the demand. So, we are thinking about special instruments, European Investment Bank, funds in Brussels, Cohesion Funds, and you don't want co-financing so at least you don't have to spend money. But what is the conclusion out of this? By the way, I have to say, because this is very often sometimes misunderstood; the Greek or Spanish or whatever, does not show that we have a crisis of the Euro. The Euro is a means of financial transaction as money, or

as means of saving; it's not endangered at all. The Euro is fully accepted by everybody. What we have is not a Euro crisis, but a crisis of state debts and the financing of states. I think, this is just a little bit of a commercial for the Euro, but I have to say it, because this is very often misunderstood. But coming back to this phenomenon and democracy, what I'm afraid of is, are there new phenomena or even political parties that in the end threaten democratic development? I personally always believe in the concept, it's an old concept of John Kenneth Galbraith, of countervailing powers. When one gets too strong, the producer gets too strong; the consumer starts to do his own associations, that's what John Kenneth Galbraith in his book 40 years ago very nicely explained the concept of countervailing power. And I hope that in this situation concerning the democratic institutions that this will help, but I am not going to give any forecasts what happens, I do not know it, since I'm not a politician so I do not know it. But one thing we have to be very careful in European thinking, especially Northern European thinking, that you say to country if you don't accept it, you have to vote so long till you accept it. This is not going to happen. And there I see quite a problem in the relationship within Europe; I mean, we have to accept democratic elections. And now I give you another example, far away from us, the Hamas in Palestine. There was, as I see and read, a democratic election, but was not accepted, particularly not by certain states in the West. And here, I think, we have to be very careful that some democratic elections are bad and those who convene the Western world are good. I mean, there I see big problems, but I do not have the solutions; I can just talk here about the problem. Thank you very much.

Hans DEMMEL:

Thank you for that. Let me try to make it even a bit more complicated. Can it be, Gail, there global response to all these questions at all? If you think about the US and Western Europe, there are so many differences between the countries, between the cultures; we are talking now about the whole world, about the global world. Does not have every country, every state has to find its own answer and what can globalization help?

Gail M. ROMERO:

Right now we know it's not working. We know that. There are a lot of ideas out there about how to change it. I don't think one country can tell another country what they should do. It has to be something that democratically is embraced. It's difficult, but if we continue to go on the same path that we are now; we are on a path of destruction. We have to start paying attention, we have to start looking to leadership, we have to start demanding accountability and transparency, and we have to be careful when we vote. Because we listen to politicians who can tell us all sorts of things, but what have they actually done, what kind of background, how can we judge them carefully? That's where media can be extremely helpful by doing the

research that we alone can't do. Now, mind you, Facebook is good, going back to the social media. You can sort of track the way people react and respond on Facebook or LinkedIn, I'm a proponent of LinkedIn, Facebook – not so much, because it's more business-oriented, you can kind of see people's dialogue, you can track their comments. I think those are the kinds of things we need, and I think media plays a big part in the research and the background checks, again that we can't do ourselves.

Hans DEMMEL:

Another question, coming back a bit more to the issue of economy and economic power; the question is to everybody, and I'd like to start with Mr Boko. Which regions will and can dominate the world in 10 years? Do we talk about countries that are strong because of their democratic system or strong of their economic power; so they had what more or less has China and what does it mean for your country?

Duma Gideon BOKO:

Well, it's difficult to say which regions will dominate. It's easier to say which regions at the present moment are having any impact, in my case, on the African continent; and China is certainly making very serious inroads into the African continent. A lot of these inroads pretty much self-serving; serve the interests of the dominant economy, more than they do the interest of the countries where these companies do business. So it is important, I think, to impose certain requirements, to redefine the rules of engagement to enable the investing economy to have a certain baseline of observance of fundamental rights of ensuring empowerment of the population of the place where it is doing business; and as I sought to propose, to develop leadership for democracy. Developing leadership for democracy is doing something slightly different from what is en vogue, where you invite the ruling parties, those in government, to sit with them, and hear from them, and plan with them. It is important to find these alternative voices which also need to be empowered, which also need to be developed because they also will at some point provide leadership, whether by design or by default, they will provide leadership. And when their time comes, you need to be able to trust that they will discharge the obligation of leadership with integrity. Thank you very much.

Hans DEMMEL:

Dr Raidl, I wanted to ask directly the question, think about China, isn't their stable political system even the better way to enforce economic power?

Dr. Claus RAIDL:

That's the point of the question. The question was which region will in 10 years be very important. And the standard answer on all talk shows and newspapers is China, India, Brazil because those people just look at the demographic development, China going up, India, China perhaps not so much with the "One Child Policy" will cause the other side, India going up, Brazil going up, Europe going down or stable, America going up. And when, I think, in 20 years European will only be 4% of world population, now we are 8 or 12%; and I tell you why this is wrong. First of all, a country like China does not have the technological base as the United States for instance, or as Europe. And China is for the moment stable, or we say China is the most capitalistic society, it's more capitalistic than here; we have 20 companies in China. When you want to fire somebody China, perhaps it's a little bit better now, but two years ago you could do that via sms, you are fired, thank you; the old capitalistic Manchester liberalism, as they called it. So, on the surface this is a stable thing and the capitalistic economic system made this great jump and huge development, growth rates and all that. But this is not sustainable. Because what we said first also the Chinese read books and see TV and Facebook and all that. So, I believe China will be economically still going upwards for the next 10 years, but sooner or later you will have the situation that people want democracy and freedom. And the Chinese people are all very well-educated, they are very diligent people, they are perhaps a little bit greedy, as capitalists have to be; so this is why you need strong laws, to keep greed in boundaries, within limits, what in America the laws are too soft, in Europe I hope we get new laws to make the greed a little bit less important and to set the frame.

So, I believe that China has economically done a big thing the last 20 years, or last 30 years, but the big country that will still dominate will be the United States, for two reasons: when they get really the new energy base with the fracking gas, I know about the environmental problems and all this but I just say some facts, they have after all a political system that makes changes that you don't have the problem that the nomenclature dominates the country, every 8 years, every 4 years they make a change (to Gail - I would be interested what you would vote for, but this is not the question). So this dynamic society also in business in the States, in Europe we tend before a company goes bankrupt you help them, public funds and give them some money, and another step, nonsense. We throw good money to bad money. In the States the people say: OK we have lost it, write it off, that's it, let's do something new. And this is why I believe that in 10 years the United States will economically and politically be even a bit stronger than today. Because the others, only demographic developments, do not have the democratic base, you have that in India but not in China, and do not have the knowledge base. I stop now. Thank you.

Hans DEMMEL:

What I understood is that growing income in China will fool democracy?

Dr. Claus RAIDL:

I'll give you a historical example, look at Chile. Chile and Pinochet was a right-wing dictatorship, very brutal as we know, and they had the Chicago boys for a very capitalistic society, and what came democracy then had the breakthrough, although they had a good nice development - economical and so on and so forth. And they are same, China (population) is more than a billion, and Chile I don't know - 50 million or something, I don't know. But the breakthrough was inevitable; it had to go - the dictatorship. And this is why I believe, it's important to have something to eat, eating and then comes moral and then comes perhaps democracy, but when the economy works well, this does not hinder the people to look for democratic institutions. I could go more in detail but this is the main phrase, so to speak.

Hans DEMMEL:

I'll come to you back whether this is a good vision for the US or not. But first, is it a great vision for Albania growing well, growing income, stable economy, can it help democracy in your country?

H.E. Ilir META:

Before answering to your question, I want to go back to China, because Albania and China had the closest relations 40 years ago, and today all people in China that are over 50 (years old) can sing Albanian songs. But unfortunately, going back to our North Korean regime, in the moment that China started the reforms, Albania cut the relations also with China and we denounced them also being revisionists, something like that; and I want to underline that, first of all we have two tendencies, one that is economic power, that we have a shift of economic power from the West to the East, and China is an example of that, or from the North to the South, and Brazil also is another case. We should not forget that China couldn't be as it is today economically, if it is not also passing through some political reforms. Because today, and this is the provocative moment, we can have leaders in Europe that are having four terms as a Prime Ministers or in democratic countries, elected; but in China thanks to the reforms undertaken from Deng Xiaoping, if we see despite of the fact that there is still one ruling communist party, there is a rotation. There are fixed terms for the leaders, there is a kind of sharing of power, it's not like it was during Mao Zedong. So things

are different, there is a certain democracy, which enable also these economic reforms etc. of course. It is not a European democracy, and it is not the model that we wish. But these economic reforms couldn't happen without some political reforms. And about Albania, Albania is the best case where democracy and economic development are going hand in hand and also media freedom. We have increased 20 times the GDP per capita in 22 years, and also we are a country which is now NATO member, and which is working to get the candidate status this autumn. We are a country, which in these turbulent economic and financial times, is proving to be a stable economy with a growth of about 3%, which is not too bad, comparing with many other countries, but which is not very good for us comparing with some years ago and with our potentials that have not been exhausted. So in the case of Albania, I think there was a very close connection between democracy, media freedom, and economic prosperity for the people.

Hans DEMMEL:

Thank you. Gail, you wanted to answer and this was what Dr. Raidl said is very interesting, so this is different from that we've already heard over the last years in the media, so that the United States will have the global role as an economic superpower. I don't know. But there's a question is it good or is it bad for the world? And what's more important, how much responsibility for a superpower is connected with it and do you see that this is that will be fulfilled or do you have so strong national interest in this huge country?

Gail M. ROMERO:

I honestly disagree with you (Raidl), in due respect, I seriously think that the United States is not going to be able to sustain the leadership role. I just don't see that happening. Right now we are suffering at 8.8 – 8.5% unemployment rate, but that does not include the people who no longer have an employment, or who have given up looking for a job. It's not a good economy right now, I'm not saying that it's dead, but it's not a good economy. I strongly believe that we can make changes, but we need stronger leadership, we need to, and I'm not saying anything about our President and I'm not going to tell you (Raidl) who I'm going to vote for either, I actually lean as a conservative democrat or a liberal republican, so I kind of go between the two, but I do believe that if we don't start building leadership within our middle schools and high schools, we are not going to be able to even be a contender. And I do believe that China has started to embrace some rule of law, now it doesn't necessarily filter all the way down to the land rights in every circumstance, but they do have long-term land leases now, that it's starting to build a middle class. They do have access to capital, they can actually, if they decide to go into an urban city to work, they can trade their land, they can

mortgage it out, if you will, lend it out. So I think there's opportunities there, I do think we have an opportunity to maintaining a leadership role, I don't know that we'll be number one.

Hans DEMMEL:

Before I come to my last question, and try to combine the American and Western European media with that issue, Dr. Raidl has asked for a minute, and a minute is 60 seconds.

Dr. Claus RAIDL:

First of all, I'm not an American. I went to school there and graduated from a high school, so I think I know America. Why do I believe that America will get stronger? They will get a much stronger manufacturing base in 5 years than they have today. They will have much more ability to change quickly to new situations, and they have by their system a leadership, if you believe or not, if you vote or not. But the American President is by constitution, the leader, the chief executive as they call him in their newspapers. And this economic base, the system, the readiness to change, and the military power; if you don't want it or if you want it, I don't care; for the good or for the bad, a lot of things from the States are coming to Europe; if you want it or not, doesn't matter, but they will be in 10 years at least as strong as today. I can't vote. I'm not a member of the Tea Party.

Hans DEMMEL:

We have to come to an end because I think you are really interested in what's behind that curtain. My last question is: if we talk about Western media, American media, Western Europe media do we report enough if you think of issue like global dialogue and cooperation, do we report enough on international issues?

Duma Gideon BOKO:

Well, I think it certainly has improved over the last couple of years. There was a time when CNN was almost exclusively American. It now covers, I believe, a fair spread of the world, including telling the African story, and in certain instances through the authentic African voices. So the Western media is certainly doing a great job, it still can do more, I believe, but I think we need to acknowledge that they've played an increasingly important role. Thank you.

Begümhan DOGAN FARALYALI:

I think there's a difference between American media and the European media. I think American media reports a lot less about international issues; American news channels – CNN International reports more, but that's not what people see in the States. They see CNN local and that's pretty much very local and therefore the awareness of the general American people on international issues is very low, I would say. Europe does a better job than this. I think the emergence of Al-Jazeera is a good thing for good quality reporting from less developed parts of the world. They give a, you know, a fair division of their news hours to Arab and African issues, I think, and that's a good thing. In Turkey we could do a better job, but also what the public wants to read also kind of decides what you print, so it's kind of a vicious circle.

Hans DEMMEL:

This is the situation you are in as a journalist, as a media person and as someone thinking of these issues also from an economic standpoint. But we've talked about America, Gail, do they report enough?

Gail M. ROMERO:

No. We don't watch personally in our home, we don't watch the standard news, because it's fluff. It's not real; it doesn't tell us what's going on in the world. So thank goodness for satellite, because then you can get a real example of what's happening, you can find out economics and politics, and all sorts of meaningful and important things, because the world is flat, the world is no longer, we are not separated any more. So I don't think the American media does a good job, but again we have access to other news that helps us.

Hans DEMMEL:

So let's take Dr. Raidl's 60 seconds, Mr. Meta are you underrepresented in Western European and American media? Do you feel underrepresented?

H.E. Ilir META:

I want to answer in a different way, we are happy sometimes that we are not very present, because also the international media is following for bad news and the fact that we are not so present means that we are in the right way. And of course we need to be more present for what Albania can offer for tourism, for culture, for other things, but is not so easy to be present, because the news are limited, you need really big news to be present. Fortunately, we are not very present, once again, which means that we are in the right way.

Hans DEMMEL:

Thank you and I think I'd like to give the last word on this issue to one of the most powerful women in European media. Ingrid, do you understand what Ms. Dogan says there's also an economic pressure for publishing houses, for TV stations to report on the issues people want to read and not to give them the issues we think that they should learn? And aren't you in a better situation or are you following the same idea, we have to give the viewers what they ask for, means more local-centered information?

Ingrid DELTENRE:

Thank you for giving me the last word. I'll try it in 60 seconds as well. For me the two related issues, one is really reporting about news and not only what the people want to hear, but what we think they should know at least; that's one thing, and the other one is the way we are doing this. I can't blame any commercial media to actually produce what they think they can sell, that's the pressure of the economic system; how they are financed and that's probably how they should do it. But therefore you have the public media, they are financed in a completely different way and I think there should be an obligation to actually produce news and to give information that help the people to understand the world. I think there is an obligation and this means to be able to live up to this expectation and obligation you have to have the funds. And by having such a special finance system like license fee or tax, or combination of it together with advertisement, I think this obligation and responsibility comes with it; and that's also why you see usually when you do the statistics that public service media do more and report more on political issues in general and also report more on let's say international affairs. Of course it shouldn't be only taking agency news, but having correspondents, having your own voice, having your own intelligence in the various markets. And again, the better your financial situation, the more you can do.

Because reporting on Albania is as expensive for the BBC as it is for a small channel like ORF, so it comes together with an obligation, or N-TV of course. The other thing is, are we doing it good? Could we do better? And to be very frank, I think we are sometimes not that good as we think we are. And it comes a lot together with the way we are, the specialization, the knowledge within the editor in the newsrooms, because the newsrooms have been reduced, so having the knowledge and understanding of what's going on and having the know-how also to transform this information into a story that is really interesting for people and people want to know about it, want even more to know about, and think that's the other part which is not such an easy thing to do, because the world is becoming the more and more complex, as you have probably found out listening to us. So I think again there is an obligation not only to report, but also an obligation to train the journalists, to provide information and education that they are able to deliver to this important topic, because the

world, as you (Gail) have said, is flat and is becoming more and more and I think we should respond to this with an increasing education in newsrooms, and there again I think you can all help us with background workshops, with interviews, with giving us the knowledge we actually need to do this better.

Hans DEMMEL:

I want to make it short: we have touched a lot of issues, a lot of difficult issues, we had a lot of questions and we didn't find the answer per se. But I think what we found out is that dialogue and cooperation is more necessary than ever, if you want to see the development of strong economic and strong democratic countries all over the world. Thank you to the organization team that gave us the chance, the opportunity to sit here and discuss these issues. Thank you for your patience and thanks to all the members of this panel. I think we didn't find the absolute answer, but we have added some new aspects to the discussion. Thank you for that!