

Welcome Speech by Dariga Nazarbayeva at the Third Eurasian Media Forum Almaty, April 22, 2004

Dear participants and guests to the Third Eurasian Media Forum, dear colleagues!
I am sincerely happy to see you.

Despite all those things happening in the world the Forum is taking place in Almaty for the third time. It brings together journalists, writers, politicians, political scientists, government officials, philosophers, economists - i.e. everyone willing to comprehend the most critical issues faced by the mankind today. It looks like the relatively smooth and safe after-war period of the last half-century is coming to an end. There are numerous signs showing that we are now in historical turbulence. When entering the new century four years ago we could not imagine that in the era of Internet, cloning and interplanetary flights, events of medieval barbarism and ferocity would be possible.

It looks like we are completely unready for such a turn. Instead of deeply analyzing the principles of these tragic occurrences, we have invented labels like "international terrorism" and "war of civilizations". These phrases give only a superficial description of the phenomena. They are far from defining their nature. The current situation should not be dramatized excessively. But it is possible to suppose that September 11th was like the appearance of the mystical and ominous signs on the walls of Balthazar's palace. At the first Forum we spoke about inter - culture and even inter - civilization dialogue. But the prospect of war in Iraq, though very vague, could already be discerned. Closing the Forum, we wished each other that the war would not begin after all. However, when we met a year later, the major topic on our agenda was the Iraq war, where the ruins of the "quick" victory were still smoldering.

While planning this forum, we knew that we would be discussing the reconstruction of Iraqi society. But the tragedy has kindled anew. Every day we are watching the war on TV. But the fact that the technology and journalists make it possible to watch it live is a poor consolation.

For mass media the year 2004 is a Year of Big Elections. This year presidential and parliamentary elections will be held in sixty-nine countries; in Russia the elections have already been held. How do the mass media analyze and cover elections? How to differentiate between independent evaluations and political advertising? What is the price of journalists' responsibility to the society?

Discussing these questions is critical during the election campaigns. It is very important what the media tell the society and how they do it. This is the issue of journalists' responsibility to the society. Bernard Shaw said, "Freedom means responsibility. That is why everybody is so afraid of it". We should not be afraid of freedom, but act out of moral and ethical principles. Absence of moral restrictions generates instability and injustice. I am convinced that the question of professional ethics in journalism is now timely as never before. This is the issue we should all be discussing and analyzing now.

The issue of freedom of speech, journalist activity in emergency situations and the restriction of reporter activities under conditions of terrorist threat is becoming increasingly urgent today.

Many countries have made amendments to their media legislations regulating journalists' behavior when covering anti-terrorist operations. The tendency of these amendments is to tighten control over media. This is not the problem of emerging democracies only. It contains a lot of food for thought. And I am sure this problem will be raised by the participants during the Forum.

The issue of media control, the role of media and freedom of speech has gone beyond academic discussions. It has become one of the most urgent items on many countries' national agenda. History has posed us a challenge - to find the balance between protection from terrorism and freedom of speech. I believe that this Forum will substantially help us meet this challenge.
Thank you and good luck!

Message from the President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin to participants of the Third Eurasian Media Forum

I welcome the delegates of the Third Eurasian Media Forum conference.

This respected meeting is of great value to promoting dialogue of mass media on the continent. The Forum raises such important issues as cooperation in the humanitarian field, building common information space in

the region, understanding the role of media in modern global and regional development processes.

It is important that the Forum's agenda puts special emphasis on the task of uniting the international media community and joining their efforts in combating international terrorism, extremism and drug business. This kind of cooperation is of vital importance today.

Good luck.

"Security and Prosperity in Eurasia" Dr. Armen Sarkissian's address to the Eurasian Media Forum Almaty, Kazakhstan, 22 April 2004

Dear Mr. President,

Dear Dariga Nursultanovna, Your Excellences, Ladies and Gentlemen!

I am delighted to address the Eurasian Media Forum again this year and bring you greetings from the Eurasia Centre at the Judge Institute of Management, Cambridge University's Business School; Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government; and the World Economic Forum in Davos. Since our first gathering two years ago, unprecedented events have taken place in our world. Turbulent regional and global developments had presented us - and continue to present the international community - major challenges that require visionary leadership, creative thinking, courage and cooperation on all levels.

The unraveling of recent events in this region draws our attention to Eurasia, one of the most significant regions in the world today. Indeed, the challenges of security and prosperity in this region are not only significant for the millions of people living in Eurasia, but also for the larger international community.

Security and prosperity are interlinked. As the events of recent years have shown, the issues of physical security and protection cannot be addressed in isolation. Political stability, fiscal reforms, distribution of wealth, and the rule of law are essential pillars in any new "security architecture".

It has become very clear that poverty, ethnic or religious tensions, political powerlessness, suppression of human rights and civil liberties, arrogance and illiteracy are breeding grounds for various kinds of fanaticism. Nation-building, security and prosperity require collective engagement of all stakeholders. In the short term, success is measured by the levels of cooperation, trust, transparency, fairness, justice, competence and respect for collective human values. In the long term it takes visionary leadership to create the conditions and the environment for wider participation. As Winston Churchill put it: "Success is never final. Failure is never fatal. It is courage that counts."

The challenge to us all is to find a balance between security and prosperity. In an environment of open political dialogue pro-market conditions should be compatible with other social and institutional reforms. Alleviation of poverty, investment in education and human talent, strengthening of rule of law and, yes, development and strengthening of independent media are crucial criteria for success.

I believe, Kazakhstan, this beautiful host country in the heart of Eurasia, is a prime example of how stability and prosperity could complement each other.

In the last short decade, Kazakhstan has adapted itself to changing times; it has established a farsighted course for state-building; and has shown healthy economic growth.

Indeed, it is possible for countries in the Eurasia region, like Kazakhstan, to engage in a bold and challenging task of nation-building, while preserving the unique moral and historical essentials of culture and national ethos.

George Bernard Shaw once said, "We are made wise not by the recollection of our past, but by the responsibility of our future". I believe, the immense opportunity for dialogue and open discussion that this conference accords us is a good starting point to address the challenges we all are facing and will face in Eurasia and the world for some time to come.

Welcome Address by the General Secretary of the Eurasian Economic Community (EEC) Grigoriy Rapota at the Third Eurasian Media Forum April 22, 2004

Your Excellency!

Dear Forum organizers and participants!

Let me welcome you on behalf of the international economic organization, which I have an honor to represent here. It is noteworthy that its name - Eurasian Economic Community - is consonant with the name of the Eurasian Media Forum. The issue of Eurasianship - as a set of views on human history, as a characteristic of the people inhabiting Eurasian continent, and as a sphere of economic interaction - has long been a subject of research for historians, journalists, and politicians.

The development of the issue was given renewed impetus 10 years ago, when in his speech at Moscow State University the President of Kazakhstan Nursultan Nazarbayev indicated major principles of the political, economic, and cultural interaction of the Eurasian nations aimed at building the Eurasian Union. In 2000 the idea was implemented in the Agreement on Establishing Eurasian Economic Community.

Thus, Kazakhstan leadership stood at the cradle of our organization and is still one of its most active members. EEC has proven its viability over three years of its history. At the same time development of dynamic and efficient cooperation between the EEC member-states is unlikely without the common and properly organized information space.

Mass media play a significant role in reinforcing integration processes of five EEC member-states: Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, and Tajikistan. The path to integration is thorny and requires enormous patience and readiness to overcome serious obstacles.

The global experience shows that it is not peculiar to our organization only. It is something that all integration structures go through. And all of them engage such efficient tool as mass media to resolve emerging problems. EEC is not an exception. Within the framework of EEC an intergovernmental agreement on cooperation in disseminating public information was enacted in 2002.

According to this document, member-states take upon the responsibility to create favorable conditions for activities of joint ventures, established on the territory of the EEC countries and engaged in publishing and distributing media products; as well as promote large scale and free multilateral information exchange with the aim to deepen the knowledge on EEC states.

We have always devoted significant attention to the work with mass media and acknowledge them to be an essential element of the civil society. Media have to play a key role in integration processes, first of all, as a subject of integration, and secondly, as a creator of the information space.

We feel acute lack of qualified analysis of EEC activities, which does not necessarily mean positive assessments only. There is a need for a view from the outside, unbiased analysis, and dialogue. This dialogue is building up. There is an increasing interest among journalists and within our societies in interaction with the neighboring states.

We are open to the press; we do cooperate and are ready to collaborate even more actively with the mass media. I do hope that the Eurasian Media Forum will give powerful impetus to further development of such cooperation.

I wish the Forum successful and fruitful work!

Message of UNESCO Director General Koichiro Matsuura to III Eurasian Media Forum Almaty, Kazakhstan, 22-24 April 2004

It is my distinct pleasure to greet the distinguished audience of the Eurasian Media Forum. Let me congratulate the organizers for their ongoing efforts to strengthen the development of the Eurasian media and promote an international understanding of Eurasian issues.

While focusing on the role of the media in Central Asia, the overall aim of the Forum is to enhance the understanding of East-West and global issues. Central Asia, as much as any other region in the world, is in need of dialogue, cooperation and understanding. To address regional challenges is a first and indispensable step in tackling these challenges, especially in this age of globalization, so as to learn to live together and to prevent the emergence of new ignorance and obstacles to international cooperation. UNESCO has recognized the need to accelerate dialogue among cultures and civilizations. Over recent years, the Organization has broadened the scope of dialogue, with a view to making it more relevant to contemporary problems and challenges.

On 16 October 2003, the Organization's 32nd General Conference unanimously adopted a landmark resolution which endorsed the results of two important high-level meetings on the dialogue among civilizations: the "New Delhi Declaration" and the "Message from Ohrid". The resolution stipulated that UNESCO's actions should henceforth place emphasis on pursuing concrete activities - in the domain of

education, especially through the pursuit of the six Education for All goals; in the area of sciences and technology, including the role of traditional and local knowledge systems; in the field of culture, especially in terms of cultural diversity in all its dimensions, including world heritage; and in regard to the media and information and communication technologies.

Indeed, the media are an important contributor to all effective dialogue among cultures and civilizations through the promotion of universal principles, ethical values and human rights. For UNESCO, this engagement is clearly linked to respect for freedom of expression and the free flow of ideas and knowledge as well as unfettered access to information. These principles have been advocated by the Organization at the World Summit on the Information Society at its meeting held in Geneva on 10-12 December 2003, where they were fully endorsed and included in the WSIS Action Plan. No doubt they will also be on your agenda during this Forum.

Due to its historical, cultural and linguistic diversity, as well as its common heritage, the Central Asian region is uniquely placed to help advance the dialogue among cultures and civilizations - and, above all, a peaceful development. I am pleased to announce that UNESCO and the Government of Kyrgyzstan will jointly organize a High-Level Conference on the theme "Eurasia in the 21st Century - Dialogue of Cultures or Conflict of Civilizations?" in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, on 10 and 11 June 2004. Several Heads of State of the region and of neighbouring countries are expected to attend this important event, as are a wide range of eminent scholars, decision-makers and experts.

The Conference will address a complex range of socio-political issues and parameters such as shared values, cultural diversity and heritage, and water and sustainable development. These issues overlap in important aspects with your concerns, which is why I am sincerely interested in the outcome of your meeting. Likewise, I hope that you will be able to cover, if not attend personally, the Bishkek Conference. It will be a unique event in the region, which merits and calls for a full reporting of the issues and discussions. I personally look forward to visiting the region again in June.

Please accept my best wishes for much success with your deliberations
Welcome address by President of the Republic of Kazakhstan Nursultan Nazarbayev at The Third Eurasian Media Forum Almaty, April 22, 2004

FOUR DILEMMAS OF THE CHANGING WORLD

Good morning, dear Ladies and Gentlemen!

With great pleasure I once again welcome participants and guests of the Eurasian Media Forum, which for the third time have gathered here in Almaty. The Eurasian Media Forum has become a good platform for exchanging views on the most challenging issues that the regional and global community is facing today. I believe that the present forum will keep up the high standard set by the previous meetings.

Inside the chaotic conglomeration of facts, which we call modern history, the future is shaping up more and more clearly. It is not the "linear future", which was predicted by the followers of "the end of history" theory a decade ago. On the contrary, it is the future full of threats and challenges, opportunities and technological hitches, the future, which is unstable but predictable. In short, a living history, not an abstract cabinet scheme.

Once Schopenhauer noted that "every man takes the limits of his own field of vision for the limits of the world." Probably, every era takes the limits of its comprehension for the limits of the world as well. Meanwhile, the 21st century has shaped new dilemmas, and without analyzing them it is difficult to predict even the closest events.

I believe that there are four latent structural directions that determine what we call global society. First, this is the clash between modern civilization and forced responses, which go beyond the limits of any morality or law. Simply, this is the choice between civilization and violence. Outbreaks of terrorism, regional wars, and ethnic genocide - these all are links of one chain. We should not blame one side only. Violence always generates violence. It is a bitter axiom, well proven over centuries.

However, the problem is significantly deeper than it appears at first sight. The thing is that the modern world has a significant potential for tension, provoked by fundamentally different trends of development in various

states. And this is not about the conflict of civilizations at all. It is about the growing gap in quality of life, level of economy, quality of education and health. It also means an increasing gap in prospects for development, prospects for the future generations. Until we all understand that the fight between civilization and violence is not a result of the power of one religion or weakness of another, until we stop using abusive cliches, like "Islamic terrorism," until the main structural problem of the modern world - the increasing gap in life quality - is resolved, the world will be doomed to repeatedly act out the same scenario.

I watched one TV news story on one of my foreign trips. During an interview a young terrorist was asked to name the reasons behind his decision to join a terrorist organization. The answer was simple, but terrible. He said: "I would never dare to kill a person, even if I would die of hunger myself. But I can no longer look into the eyes of my hungry children." And this is happening at a time, when, as John Galbrath admits, in developed countries people die because of overeating rather than starvation. Can such a world be stable? For many years, from 1992, speaking from many tribunes, including those of the United Nations and all major international political bodies - NATO, the OSCE, the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-building Measures in Asia, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and others, I have been emphasizing one thing: the key reason, which generates violence, is the structural imbalance of the world. We will really have to solve this dilemma - either by searching for the mechanisms to overcome the growing gap between different parts of the mankind, or by forcing confrontation between them.

Secondly, this is a contradiction between political interests and standards of the international law. Today, it is obvious that the laws regulating international relations in the second half of the last century were developed in accordance with the existing balance of powers at that time. It is also clear that this balance of powers has considerably changed and this requires a careful review of some norms of the international law. Certain changes to the approaches are also needed. After all, the post-Yalta world was formed in compliance with the geopolitical interests of the leading powers, not as the result of the free will of wise politicians. However, the problem of the 21st century is that the level of control in different parts of the world is weaker compared with the one in the bi-polar era. The world is facing new non-traditional threats, and we are witnessing the emergence of all-sufficient regional powers, making quick progress towards high standard military and economic development.

At the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis, the good will of presidents Kennedy and Khrushchev saved the world from the Third World War. I guess that was the time when John Kennedy said: "It is better to meet at summits than on the edge of a downfall." Today we are unable to solve the issue of global terrorism so easily. If we take into account all these factors, it becomes clear that the violation of international law, which, nevertheless, remains a base of compromise for different geopolitical, regional and economic groups, is fraught not only with local, but global destabilization. I believe that the dilemma of international law or geopolitical interest will be a key issue in this decade.

Third, this is a contradiction between globalization and national statehood. The phenomenon of globalization, well studied in economic theories, is entering the political agenda today. The distinction between the internal and external policy of states is being eliminated, forming "a global civil society" instead. Real integration means voluntary narrowing the sovereignty of national states. We have to accept and comprehend this. The best example of this is the united Europe, where the role of super-national institutions in the decision-making process has significantly increased. All this poses critical and often dramatic questions to national states. The choices, which political leaders should make, depend on many circumstances. To put the problem aside and take an ostrich's position would mean nothing but failure. The Great Chinese Wall became an out-of-date, historical example of a successful tool for civilized survival, which does not work today.

The only rational model is the gradual adaptation of national states to global trends. However, it is important to take into account that newly independent states, in contrast to the states which gained independence 50 years ago, have no such durable resources and longstanding experience of their own political infrastructure, political traditions and political culture. Sadly, this is the reality, which slows down the pace of our adaptation.

There is another factor faced not only by us. These are topical issues of regional security. There are two different interpretations of the ratio between liberalization and security in our part of the world. One of them states that liberalization is dangerous in the environment of real threats of terrorism, drug trafficking and religious and political extremism in the region. This assertion is quite reasonable, because, unlike experts who never faced the necessity of safeguarding the population, we fully understand what a crackdown of extremists on the legal or political field of our country would mean and what a state should then do to

overcome this. People want to live in peace.

Another interpretation is connected with the belief that without liberalization it is impossible to solve the main issues to ensure security; to create a strong civil society, which would be able to oppose all challenges to regional security. I think that, from the strategic point of view, this is indeed the only rational alternative. However, we must also have a clear vision of the existing problem: the difficulty of liberalization against the background of serious regional threats. We are witnessing huge problems faced even by countries with longstanding centuries-old democratic traditions. They are forced to introduce some limitations to civil rights in order to insure security of their populations - toughening the control over migration, creating new law enforcement structures, banning religious clothes at schools, implementing elements of informational censorship. This is the reality and, in general, it is an understandable reality, which, unfortunately, is remote from liberal canons.

Fourth, a gap is visible between technological power and cultural tolerance. It was known long ago that "we do not see things as they are; we see things the way we want them to be." The technological power of the modern world - from the military to the information sphere - may bring us to a deadlock if intercultural interaction is more of a clash than dialogue.

One of the greatest achievements of the Western culture in the second half of the last century was the profound understanding of values of other, non-western cultures. Consequently, it was reflected in education systems, in numerous humanitarian projects, in the movement of millions of people from West to East in search for spirituality. However, most importantly this had an effect on western societies themselves, which became truly multicultural. If to measure progress not by achievements in producing computers and missiles, the spiritual development of the West in the second half of the last century became one of the most important progressive achievements in human history over the last two millennia.

Despite all the hardships of the last epoch, the attractiveness of this model of development was indisputable. But growing technological power on the one hand and increased non-traditional threats on another, unfortunately, provoke the growth of intercultural tension. Increasing cultural intolerance and attempts to identify an enemy by the colour of his/her skin or by religion are no longer archaisms; they are acting terms for politicians and theorists. The main danger is that the cultural elevation, which was and still remains a platform for constructive dialogue, may collapse within a few days. My personal belief is that Kazakhstan has to work on establishing and maintaining better interaction between the cultures and faiths.

If we accept the postulate of the founder of cybernetics Norbert Winer, who believed that "community stretches only to that limit, to which reaches the real transmission of information," then it becomes clear that the key role of mass media in settling all these dilemmas is undisputable.

Of course one can assess the media situation in Kazakhstan differently. I prefer to deal with facts. Today, we have over two thousand mass media outlets registered in the country. Opposition newspapers operate legally in the Republic; any of you can confirm this. For the purpose of providing economic support to the press, we have not levied value added tax on print media for four years; we have been decreasing the annual fees for the use of radio frequencies from year to year. We use the mechanism of state order to provide coverage of the most important issues facing Kazakhstani society in all mass media, irrespective of the form of their property. The number of applications for such state orders has grown within the last four years by more than 10 times - from 13 to 150.

Positive trends of developing mass media in Kazakhstan are related to expanding the activities of public journalist institutions, including the Congress and Union of Journalists, the Association of TV and Radio Broadcasters, and support funds for mass media and journalists. The Public Council on Mass Media under the President of Kazakhstan was established in 2002. This body serves as a mechanism for direct consultations between the state and the press and helps facilitate better interaction between them.

The discussion of a new bill on mass media stimulated active public discussions. Completely contrary points of view were expressed. I consider this to be a sign of real democracy in our society. The positions of the government and parliament are understandable; I would like to thank them for energetic and thorough work on the bill. However, the position of the opponents is also reasonable. This is an absolutely normal discussion.

But today the issue on the law "On Mass Media" moved to another level and concerns primarily its legal dimension. As you known, the bill was sent to the Constitutional Council for consideration. Yesterday evening, having returned from a foreign trip, I received the Constitutional Council's decision, which declared some provisions of the bill to be unconstitutional. But this doesn't mean anything yet. It is known that as the

head of state, I have the right to introduce objections or veto the Constitutional Council's decision. If the Constitutional Council does not overrule my veto by a two thirds vote, then the law will be considered to be adopted. This must be done in ten days. Having considered the legal aspects of the situation and taking into account the opinion of the public and journalists, I decided not to introduce objections on the Constitutional Council's decision. So, the new law on mass media is not adopted.

Unfortunately, journalists are always more interested in sensational news. Probably this is justified to some extent. However, it escapes their attention that Kazakhstan is the leader in reforming its economy and society among all post-soviet states, that Kazakhstan sets an example of successful management of a very complicated system of modernization within a very short period of time. Kazakhstan has achieved impressive progress within such a short period. This is recognized far beyond our country's borders. Those who often travel abroad are well aware of this. I understand that good news is no news for the media, but there are things that we should not simply talk about, but should be repeating them day after day. People's blood is shed in the most horrible ethnic, religious or separatist conflicts in different parts of the planet, not far away from us; many people speak of the clash of civilizations as something unavoidable. At the same time, we enjoy peace and trust between people here in Kazakhstan - the country, which is home to 130 nations and 45 religious groups. We secured probably the most important people's freedom in the modern world - the freedom from fear.

This is why our country became the place to hold the Congress of the World Traditional Religions. There is no other place in the world where leaders, not only ordinary followers, of all religions would sit at one table. As you know, in September 2003 seventeen delegations representing leaders of all traditional religions of the world sat at one table here in Kazakhstan. Leaders of Islam, Orthodoxy, Judaism, Buddhism, Catholicism, Shinto spoke one language - the language of culture and dialogue. They adopted a document called the Declaration of participants of the First Congress of the World Traditional Religions. All the leaders made a decision to hold the Second Congress not somewhere else but in Kazakhstan, and they asked me about this.

The first Conference on Security and Confidence-building measures in Asia took place in Kazakhstan as well, with participation of 16 heads of states and governmental delegations of the Asian continent, a large continent with great human resources, with the greatest natural resources, but also with the greatest number of military conflicts.

And finally, it was Kazakhstan, which set the world an excellent example voluntarily denouncing its nuclear arsenal and closing the world's largest nuclear testing site. This way Kazakhstan made a tremendous contribution to preserving the global stability. We were first in the world to take such action, and considering the scale of the world's nuclear potential we can say that no other country would voluntarily refuse from such weapons.

I am sure that if mass media could... All right, you may not report what we are good at, talk about the country's success in improving the quality of life; people can see the results of the undertaken reforms themselves. This might be no "good" news. But in the situation when we see more and more bloodshed, escalation of wars, when people keep confronting each other, I believe it is important to tell people about Kazakhstan's experience in making these humane steps. I believe that for local journalists as well as for foreign correspondents this is the example, which could be the light in the end of tunnel for many, the example to follow. This would also be useful information for those who consider the situation of increased terrorist threat, fear, ethnic hatred, and expansion of nuclear club to be hopeless.

We realize that inter-confessional dialogue represents only a small part of what one can do to settle conflicts. The Process of political regulation in the Middle East, where the situation is taking more and more dangerous shapes from day to day, relates to many different problems. The most authoritative politicians of the world are searching for possibilities to resolve the conflict, but so far with no success. Probably purely political settlement of the issue is within competence of the region's countries themselves and the world's biggest powers that can influence the situation by their authority. But all the countries and all of us should not distance ourselves from the problem, which is threatening to develop into a global conflict. Our idea concerns not political settlement of this very complicated issue, and we do not consider this issue to be easy to solve. Our idea is to bring together main religious leaders of Jewish organizations of the world and key religious figures of the Islam world in order to discuss this problem and call their peoples for peace. Kazakhstan can again become a place for such meeting and we invite them for this kind of dialogue.

Arthur Sulzberger, who has been the New York Times publisher for a long time, once said: "We, journalists, tell the public which way the cat is jumping. The public will take care of the cat". I believe that the present media forum is the platform where journalists can exchange opinions on what politicians all over the world, from Washington to Tokyo, are driving at. And viewers and readers would determine the direction of the flight. I wish you all fruitful work on the Kazakhstani land. Thank you for your attention, all the best.