

Welcome speech and overview

The welcome speech is held by ETD chairman **Reinhard Klimmt**. Klimmt invokes his 1964 visit to Hungary as a student delegate with the mandate to build a bridge between the East and West. Klimmt became acquainted with the Hungarian political situation as well as its party media system. A huge transformation has taken place in Hungary since then. Klimmt emphasizes that this change would be in the centre of the Budapest European Television Dialogue Conference.

Reinhard Klimmt also presents the three main topics of the conference. The first theme is about programming, titled **"Programming as the Basis of Success"** which aims to discover what kind of experiences the Eastern and Western European experts have about television content production and consumption in the different parts of Europe. The second topic is about the financing of programming, titled **"Ratings as the Currency of TV Broadcasters – the Interplay between the Advertising Industry and Television"**. Klimmt underlines the importance of financing other than from public sources or from different funds. The third topic is in connection with the social role of media, **"TV, Media and Democracy"**. According to the Chairman's views, the relation between media and society has always been very sensitive, particularly media's role as a fourth power in democracy. Klimmt points out that in the centre of the debates has always been the influence exercised by the means of media. At the end of his welcoming speech, Klimmt stresses that after the European diversification and integration there is a common voice of Europe besides its valuable diversity. This common voice is important in a world where Europe is in competition with the United States and South-East Asia. At the same time, Europe serves as a benchmark for new markets. According to Klimmt *"Europe has to be based on freedom and discourses."*

Dr. János Schiffer, Deputy Mayor of the City of Budapest, holds the introductory keynote. Schiffer thanks the organizers that they have chosen Budapest to be the

first place of the extension of the European Television Dialogue. He also remembers the past, just as Reinhard Klimmt, describing a detail of a documentary film, which had been taped in 1989 in a demonstration just before the changes. The demonstration had been held on the Hungarian National Day, March 15th, remembering the Hungarian Revolution of 1848 -1849. The demonstrating crowd had demanded "Free Hungarian Television". *"Today this freedom is guaranteed by laws, but in my opinion, we must learn a lot to be able to live better with it."* The Deputy Mayor expresses that Hungary had been a "white spot" in the map of European television broadcasting one and a half decades ago. Today the political, economical and technical background of television broadcasting in Hungary is finely developed. In his view, the technical development has exceeded such a content service, which could be modern and satisfy all needs. Problems emerging from the latter can be experienced for example in cultural programming, the relation between policy and media, financing public service media and regulating commercial communication. Schiffer recalls the fact that the Hungarians lead Europe in spending their time in front of a television set. He also presents positive trends in the Hungarian television system. One of them is that Duna Televízió has been awarded the world's best cultural television station in 1999 from the Camera Society, which operates within the framework of UNESCO. Schiffer also reports the rise and success of cultural programs of the Hungarian public broadcasters. In his interpretation this reflects that a remarkable part of the Hungarian audience is open to high quality programming.

The first panel: **Programming as the Basis of Success** discusses several aspects of the TV Content. It is chaired by **Dr. András Simon**, Head of Cultural Programs of the Hungarian National Television (Magyar Televízió, MTV). The experts are **Gábor Bányai**, Producer of Interaktiv Fiction, **Péter Kolosi**, Programming Director of RTL Klub, both from Hungary, **Jens Richter**, Managing Director of SevenOne International from Germany and **Ryszard Sibilski**, Managing Director of Endemol Poland. Before putting up his first question to the panelists, the chairman recalls one of his experiences in connection with the title of the panel "Programming as the Basis

of Success". Once he had been working in Hungarian Television and had been balancing between the quality, shares and ratings one of his colleagues had told him *"You are as good as your last program."* Simon ends his introductory note and puts up the panel's first and main question: *"Can we speak of a homogenous audience in Europe or are there special audiences according to the different states for example in Hungary?"*

In Péter Kolosi's view there are less and less differences between the preferences of the audiences in Europe. He mentions that we cannot make a difference between Eastern and Western audiences. He would prefer to speak of differences, which were based on cultural aspects. Kolosi distinguishes three types of audiences by regions: Latin Mediterranean, Anglo-Saxon-Scandinavian and Central Eastern European. The success is not guaranteed automatically, he emphasizes, but the chance of a program to be successful everywhere in the same region is major.

Gábor Bányai raises the question for Hungary: *"Where do those possibly successful formats and productions originate from?"* In his opinion the productions coming from Germany and from The Netherlands are generally successful, most of the Mediterranean productions deliver good ratings but the internationally very successful English productions fail. Bányai characterizes the Hungarian audience as a mix of The Netherlands, Germany and the Mediterranean. Poland is mainly a Mediterranean country as far as TV consumption is concerned, outlines Ryszard Sibilski. The Italian, Spanish, Greek and French series are dominantly aired.

The next question is if people loved good stories. In Jens Richter's opinion, good stories and good story telling represents the common language in popularity of films. But some formats which had attracted the viewer's attention in the beginning lost their attraction and popularity later on. This had happened to reality shows that after a while became boring. Kolosi demonstrates that the same kind of trend could be observed in Hungary, *"the same processes took place more rapidly and intensely in Hungary than in Western-Europe"*. The reality shows reached up to 80% of the audience in their best times.

The renaissance all over Europe of American series like CSI is defined as another trend. Kolosi admits that the new American series are of better quality than the old ones.

Taking into account the results of the discussion, the moderator András Simon puts up a provocative question asking *"If there's no substantial difference between the European audiences and the trends are the same in Europe does this mean that it is sufficient to produce one programming which can be used in all European channels? Can this statement be true or not?"* According to Kolosi, although there are only little cultural differences between the European audiences, these small differences have great importance when success is concerned. They have to be accepted and the production has to be adapted to them. Bányai agrees with Kolosi and remarks that in Hungary there was a time when the foreign owners of the new commercial broadcasters had constrained a basic European programming to the channel. He adds that today there is another situation as producers focus the different markets one by one. The chosen program has to be turned into a real Hungarian one. Bányai is positive if someone watches a localized program, he or she will not be able to recognize it as coming from an international license. Ryszard Sibilski joins his colleagues' views and describes the situation from supplier's point of view. A prohibition of change of formats has been abolished at Endemol. This means that every Endemol program shows different local characteristics. The company also relies on local production companies employing local workforce who have the knowledge about the audience. Sibilski gives an example saying that even in case of a program with a very rigid license as Big Brother a little change made it very successful. In Australia, Endemol had only changed one element in Big Brother improving the image of the reality show. Endemol had turned the voting from negative to positive so the question had been *"Who do you want to keep in the house?"*

The next aspect illuminates the educational role of a program. *"Is it enough to survey the viewer's demands for a successful format?"* Kolosi says that a program is intended to be informative and entertaining. Here in Hungary and in the Central-Eastern part of Europe the notion of *"educational"* for a program has an unpleasant

association. Bányai agrees with Kolosi and adds that it was a bad approach when a format is unsuccessful and boring, it is called "*educational*," and when it is successful and amusing, "*commercial*". He also emphasizes: "*What do we qualify as educational?*" As an example he mentions the series "*Desperate Housewives*," under which many young women have learnt how to cheat her husband or how to explain away sticky situations. Speaking seriously, he considers some programs as educational even if they do not aim on this. He also points out that in Hungary there are no "*prestige programs*" which are programmed to improve the image of a channel and where ratings were secondary. In Bányai's opinion these programs will come if advertisers learn to advertise for target audiences.

The panel's participants further discuss the question of success in general. Peter Kolosi's opinion is that the success of a channel can be measured by the viewer's simple act: which is the first channel to be switched on in the evening? Kolosi explains that this is the most important moment in a channel's success. On the other hand, returning to the international formats and trends, he thinks that if a successful format was aired abroad, it is sure that it will come into the Hungarian market. So there is a competition between the different channels for successful content. Bányai as a producer says that one could hardly foresee the viewers demand and name the secret of success. The main point is that channel loyalty has to be built up resulting in the viewers' "trust" in the channel. If a new program is broadcast, the viewer will watch it because he trusted in channel's ability to broadcast quality program, yet without knowing anything about the brand new program. Jens Richter says that Hungary was in a special position as there are two dominant commercial channels that can build up channel loyalty. In other countries, the situation is much more difficult and loyalty does not work so easily. In these markets there is more advertising money, which means more channels, competing for the same audience - therefore the viewers are not faithful: they switch on the TV set for one program and zap through the programs. Ryszard Sibilski believes in a long term planning of programming and in the special role of marketing. He uses marketing as a keyword as the general audience is getting older and the valuable age group for advertisers; the 16-30 year old young people spend less time watching television. Therefore the broadcasters have to reach them in another way, and the tool for doing so is

marketing through communication channels other than television: websites, mobile phones, etc. He stresses the importance by saying *"Marketing as a method of building up loyalty of your viewers can be seen in the websites of big American channels."* Sibilski also draws the attention to the general truth: *"Big marketing spend is not a guarantee for success but you cannot be successful without marketing spend."* Agreeing with Sibilski on the importance of marketing, Peter Kolosi adds that the Hungarian market is getting more fragmented, meaning the audience shares will be taken from the big national commercial channels and loyalty will decrease. Kolosi says that local content is decisive in the competition because it makes the difference between the channels. Answering the moderator's question *"What is more important: the viewers needs or channel competition?"* Bányai expresses that he hates channel competition because it is mostly not in the viewers' interest. Fortunately, a channel as TV2, the other dominant Hungarian commercial channel besides RTL-Klub, had started its daily soap in a different time slot than the RTL-Klub One; in order to entertain all soap fans.

The second panel titled **"Ratings as the Currency of TV Broadcasters – the Interplay between the Advertising Industry and Television"** deals with the financing of television broadcasting.

The keynote to this panel, *"Delight and dangers of the digital future – Who watches who: the viewer the television set or the television set watches the viewer?"* is given by **László Cselényi**, the president of Duna Televízió. Cselényi characterizes the desire for freedom, television-viewing habits, capitalism, political intervention and the activity of commercial televisions in Hungary as wild and strong. He considers these facts as conditions to which we have to adapt ourselves in order to build the future. Cselényi claims that the political decision-makers in the developed world are determined to create the Utopian information society and to reach digital switchover in the near future. He considers this political approach an interesting one as the experiences are showing that the introduction of digitalization in the cable and satellite industry is market driven and primarily based on market strategies. Cselényi

also predicts that definitely market mechanisms will remain important in the future digital television market. The latter makes him raise the question: *"What is going to be the role and motivation system of governmental participation?"* Cselényi is wondering whether it is the leadership in technical developments or to boost public broadcasting or the recognition that a normal state's role will be minimal in a commercial model. *"The market is important so it is a good thing if a state determines the public policy goals, then creates the regulatory background and finally retreats from a direct role in the market!"* Cselényi presents a proclamation in his speech, which is dealing with the relation between Hungarian public broadcasting and politics and where he drafts his vision about the future of Hungarian public broadcasting.

In his proclamation he formulates the following requirements: *"State should discriminate positively public broadcasters."* Cselényi hopes that the proper proportion between public service and commercial broadcasting is going to be developed just like in Western Europe and the anomalies characterizing the Hungarian and Eastern European public service system are going to be eliminated. Secondly the state should recognize that its participation in public broadcasters is important to ensure the achievement of socio-educational targets: mediation of culture and art, decreasing of social differences, ensuring free speech and the diversity of opinions, etc. Thirdly *"The state should make every effort to launch digital terrestrial television to allow public broadcasters to start their thematic channels and different other new services,"* says Cselényi. As far as his channel is concerned, the president of Duna TV hopes that all time power would recognize *"the Hungaricum"* characteristic of Duna Televízió. *"As",* he says, *"Duna TV has no right or left wing just like the Tokay wine!"* In connection with the future's interactive television he hopes that the viewer is going to control the power and not vice versa. Last but not least in his proclamation Cselényi emphasizes that state had to *"give up choking and looting of public broadcasting"*. He also emphasizes that the difference between the television of the past and the future should be only technical: digitalism and interactivity. He says that its core had to remain the same: Liberty! Because: *"We watch the television or the television set watches us."*

The second panel's participants are **Szabolcs Macher**, Managing Director of OMD Hungary, **Katalin Lázár**, the Head of International Relations at Duna Televízió and Vice-Chairwoman of the EBU's Mediaresearch-Group, **Pavel Stantchev**, Managing Director of Nova TV and **Werner Dieste**, Director of the Broadcasting Center Thuringia of the MDR. This debate is moderated by **Tamás Frei**, a respected Hungarian television reporter. The central problem of the panel is the current financing of television broadcasting which is based on the ratings, so the main question is whether the ratings measurement systems will disappear as a result of digitalization? The moderator asks Szabolcs Macher first to explain his views about this topic as he has a very determined opinion. Macher's vision is that today's mass media value based on the ratings is going to disappear. He explains that future's digital television channels' ratings will be so low and fragmented that they will not be measurable. As a representative of the advertisers' interest he reports that the industry does not want to buy audience and ratings often defined as "eyeballs" but advertising impact. Therefore the measurement of the advertisement's impact on the audience gets more important.

Tamás Frei then turns to Pavel Stantchev. He remarks that in Europe there are a lot of different thematic channels but the owners of these are only some players in the market. Disagreeing with Macher's opinion Stantchev gives the example of the United States. He recalls that the proliferation tendency of free television channels has already taken place in the North American market and in spite of that the advertisers are still buying rating points. He explains this with the fact that the American big national television networks are broadcasting programs reaching large masses of people. In opposition he remarks that thematic channels are not able to do the same and big brands want to reach as many people as they could. Stantchev adds that despite the great number of channels a consolidation of media undertakings also has taken place in the USA. On the other hand Pavel Stantchev argues that to defend their revenue and profit margins the incumbent free TV operators who have the financial and creative power to transform their market activity easily adapted it to the market changes. He names the powerful broadcasters' investments in the developed

European markets as an example aiming to buy niche channels or even their competitors.

Concerning the German television market Werner Dieste's opinion is that there will be more television channels but this proliferation does not mean more diversity. According to his forecast, only some big television channels with a broad program schedule will remain and many small thematic channels will be launched in the future. In spite of the increasing number of channels, Dieste does not see the revolutionary contents. Returning to the basic question Dieste says that for a certain period of time the channels will have to battle for ratings but afterwards, agreeing with Macher's prediction, the importance of ratings will disappear. Dieste also underlines that this means that advertising itself will move into the direction of product placement and hidden messages.

From a public broadcasters' point of view, Katalin Lázár explains that both the ratings and the viewer's opinion are important for a television channel. But television treats reach as a "*sacrament*". She raises the question whether surveys on reach reflect the reality. Lázár states that over 90% of the Hungarian population have never taken part in the survey, which raises questions on the reliability of the results. She also adds that this problem exists also in other countries.

Tamás Frei asks Macher whether he can imagine a differentiated playing field for commercial and public broadcasters. The moderator thinks of a market in which commercial broadcasters are realizing only advertising revenues and public broadcasters have only public funding. In Szabolcs Macher's opinion it could be absolutely possible and he says it would be the right way. From a content aspect Macher wishes that public broadcasters should only inform, educate and mediate cultural values. On the other hand, commercial channels should match the interests of companies of the advertising industry with entertainment. Macher points out that such a clear definition would structure the broadcasting landscape. He states that in the present situation there are mix-funded public broadcasters and the viewer can not tell what kind of a television he or she is watching, as there are similar kinds of programming in public and in commercial broadcasting.

Going around the question Tamás Frei asks, "*Should there be any measurement for the public broadcaster?*" Frei means that in a divided system where ratings could not be applied for public broadcasters the measurement of quality could be the replacement. According to Katalin Lázár the audience has to state if a public service television is good and not the television itself. She says that both measurement of rating and quality is needed. Lázár also confirms that for the time being there is no quality ranking in Hungary like in other countries. She adds that there are in-house measurements, which unfortunately have a much lower acceptance than ratings.

Werner Dieste informs the audience that in Germany only 7% of the public broadcasters' revenues are coming from advertising - the remainder is license fee from the viewer. Therefore the German expert thinks that public broadcasters also need entertainment programming contrary to Macher's opinion. But the German viewers already make a difference between public and public television: the information competence of the German public broadcasters is the best so the audience is seeking this kind of programs from public channels.

The moderator asks what the experts of the panel think about the effect of new advertising techniques (branding, product placement) on television business. Frei raises the problem of separation of editorial content and advertisement. Stantchev says that there is a rather clear prohibition in Europe on product placement; in the United States it has a great importance as far as commercial broadcasters' revenues are concerned. He points out that the question of product placement had appeared in Europe as many North American television productions are running on European television channels. Reacting to Stantchev's answer Frei asks whether the new hidden advertising techniques will be legalized in Europe or not. Stantchev recalls that there is a legislative process in the European level in which there is a proposal to legalize product placement and as a representative of a private channel he supports liberalization. He also gives voice to his opinion that this proposal is against the interest of public broadcasters.

Dieste calls the attention of the audience to the great debate last year in Germany on the new advertising forms in broadcasting. Dieste emphasizes that there is only a

slight dividing line between sponsoring, surreptitious advertising and product placement. It depends on dramaturgy, as it mattered how a product fit in a storyline, how long it is shown etc. Answering to Stantchev statement Katalin Lázár says public broadcasters are less concerned by this debate. She argues if public service televisions were funded well enough publicly it was sure that other commercial funding forms would not matter for them. Nevertheless in her opinion product placement is important to commercial televisions and according to her information these players are worrying about product placement as there is the danger that producers would rule over the content instead of the television.

As president of a public broadcaster, Cselényi says that if the liberalization of advertising is going to be a legislative question in Hungary, public television will take part in this debate, as it is a problem of public interest. In his opinion the commercial funding of public television will not disappear in the future even if it is a very small part of its funding sources. He also emphasized that the real lobbying task of public television is that the position of public broadcasting had to be strengthened. The state has to foster the importance and indispensability of public broadcasting.

Pavel Stantchev agrees with Katalin Lázár's opinion on the producers' increasing power in connection with product placement. He predicts a long way of modification of the advertising law. He also draws the attention to the consolidation tendency that had been taking place between the telecom and television industry, the former has been stepping into the latter's territory. In Szabolcs Macher's opinion, the convergence of the different platforms and digitization will change the current landscape. There are already multipurpose devices putting up one important question "*Who will be the winner?*" Supporting Stantchev's opinion, Macher underlines the good position of telecom companies and describes Magyar Telecom's consolidation process in the Hungarian market. One interesting element of this consolidation process is that Telecom has stepped both into the television and the internet content market.

Frei asks Macher to explain his statement that advertisers are eager to get close or even create their own editorial/programming content. Macher declares that some of

the well-known programs was initiated by big brands and sometimes these contents became successful and a good vehicle for the brands themselves. Stantchev's point of view is that advertisers and producers must not exchange their jobs. Only talented producers, directors, actors etc. are able to create quality programming, assuring good ratings for advertisers.

Dieste agrees with the argument that fictional programs are successful nowadays: the key to their success is the quality. Returning to an earlier part of the debate, he asks the panel's experts: *"How can you tell exactly which viewer watches what if the audience avoids answering surveys?"* Answering Dieste's question, Katalin Lázár informs that the present surveys are not appropriate to give a detailed picture about viewers' habits but appropriate to *"give some kind of information about high rated programs of the big commercial channels"*. She also adds that she would not predict the future as the speakers before but the fact that the fragmentation has started does not mean that the revenues of the big commercial channels will be decreasing. *"The main target of advertisers remains the same: reaching the most people with the highest rated programs!"* she emphasizes. Concerning fragmentation and the viability of thematic channels, Stantchev stresses that 10% share do not mean the same in different markets. In Central and Eastern Europe the markets are much smaller than in Germany or even in the United States, where 10% is a viable market share.

Macher reminds the participants that the growing offer had increased the audience's pleasure to make their own choices. His opinion is that the ability to choose the program will go from the broadcasters' hands into the viewer's, whilst in the analogue multi-channel broadcasting world it was just the opposite: the broadcaster had been able to force the choice upon the viewer. He also draws the attention to the correlating trend: more communication channels were developed from lesser owners. This means that advertisers will try to make multichannel and global deals with television channels. Representing a teleshopping company, Branimir Brkljac argues that ratings will be less and less relevant in the future. Referring to the first part of the discussion in connection with fragmentation he states *"Advertisers are paying attention whether the audience meant something to their brands or not."* and adds *"What advertisers are concerned with today: what is the relevant program for*

the audience and not only how many people watch that program." He also emphasizes that viewers will not wait for television to take its step into the future - they will use other communication channels and therefore content becomes more important. In that respect, interactive channels can give what advertisers were seeking: the response of the audience. Supporting Macher's point of view Brkljac says that the main question of the television industry is *"What is the relevant measurement of the program put in the air?"* and adds that this problem goes much beyond the television industry.

Reacting to Brkljac's opinion on ratings Klimmt argues that the importance of ratings will survive in case of programs attracting a significant audience, e.g. the soccer world cup. Gordon Lovitt from the Romanian public television wants to defend public television as he perceives that a very narrow interpretation of public television is taken in the conference: information and education, with no audience. He recalls that public television is for everybody, therefore the license fee is paid and therefore he loves ratings. Lovitt also emphasizes that public television has a different approach to the audience than commercial ones, as they are more analytical and curious about the different groups of the society they serve. Another difference is the measurement of quality and the satisfaction levels of the individual program. Thirdly he mentions the expert analysis as the hardest measurement method to analyze whether the program has achieved the intended aims.

Polemics on the importance of culture in television

The closing panel's keynotes are presented by journalist and writer János Sediánszky who lays down in the beginning of his speech that he has been devoted to cultural programs during his career. Sediánszky recalls that before 1990 he and his colleagues used to consider it natural that the task of a public broadcaster was both to mediate cultural knowledge and to entertain. He also invokes that cultural programs used to be so popular that for example their market share even competed with the popular crime series "Derrick". Sediánszky adds that in those times, political

topics had to be avoided and therefore the television had entertained people with cultural productions. He provokes with his polemics on the disappearance of culture. He recalls that not such a long time ago the Hungarian television broadcasted a poem in the weekend primetime with high ratings while today the international entertainment formats have seduced the viewers, in the same way as everywhere else.

In his opinion, today's main question for the Hungarian public broadcaster is: *"In which way can the Hungarian public television be developed, how can it preserve itself?"* Sediánszky gives the answer himself: *"Public broadcasting has to distribute the values of the Hungarian culture!"*

"TV, Media and Democracy": the importance of the liberty of opinion

The participants are **Cornelia Rabitz**, Head of the Russian programs of Deutsche Welle, **Dr. Jaroslav Sonka**, Director of Studies at the European Academy Berlin in the field of European Integration, Media and Post-Totalitarian Transformation Processes in Central and South-Eastern Europe, **Iryna Kostyuk**, CEO of the media consulting company "Media Resources Management", **László Cselényi**, President of Duna Televízió. The debate is moderated by **Reinhard Klimmt**, Chairman of the European Television Dialogue. The main point of this panel is the role of television broadcasting in the setting up of democratic systems on the one hand and what kind of television broadcasting has been developed in Central and in Eastern Europe after the changes?

In his opening words Klimmt anticipates that after dealing with marketing and advertising this panel is arrived at culture. He also notes that if someone is concerned with media, he/she has not only to satisfy certain needs but also to arouse needs for high culture and has to put up the question: *"Does media have an emancipative role in democracy beyond earning money?"* After Klimmt's introductory notes the experts of the panel examine media's role in democracy in certain Eastern and Central European countries. Cornelia Rabitz starts by giving a comprehensive

picture of the current situation. Rabitz emphasizes that there are great differences between the countries like Hungary, Poland, Czech Republic, Romania, Bulgaria and the less developed ones in terms of democracy like Russia, Byelorussia and Ukraine, even if certain deficits can still occur in the systems mentioned in the first group. As far as Byelorussia is concerned, Rabitz underlines that the United States consider it as the last dictatorship in Europe, which naturally is reflected by its media system. Rabitz explains that Byelorussian journalists who want to be independent have to face extremely hard working conditions. Besides she adds that there are many EU based projects aiming to pass uncensored information to the Byelorussian people in different communication channels, also by Deutsche Welle. With respect to Russia, Cornelia Rabitz points out that after getting to the top, Vladimir Putin has taken control over media, especially electronic media. If journalists report on sensitive topics such as corruption or abuse of power, they expose themselves to severe sanctions and journalists cannot trust in jurisdiction. Rabitz's prediction is that the current situation will not change in the near future even if a much more positive picture is drawn of these countries in Western European media. Reinhard Klimmt compares Deutsche Welle's role to BBC's. In Hungary and Poland, BBC had earlier fulfilled the mission to transport independent information to the citizens who had been deprived from it by the government. Klimmt asks Rabitz whether the same transition can take place in the mentioned countries by the influence of different Western European mediums like it had happened in case of the post socialist countries or Ukraine? Rabitz is skeptic about the "*same success recipe*" and argues that Russia for example is a raw material world power, which helps to free itself from the Western democratizing pressure.

Klimmt asks Iryna Kostyuk whether there are certain media in Ukraine, which can help a robust discussion between the power and people? Kostyuk reports that everybody had expected the total positive transformation of media from the Orange Revolution, but the revolution had had its side effects. One of them was that the freedom had meant: all content could have been broadcasted in television, which sometime brought low quality content on screen. In terms of the relation between media and democracy, a certain kind of an "*orange concept*" had emerged in the

media and had avoided criticism to be articulated against the revolution and the new government. *"Revolution was a great product and sometimes it delivered a low quality content,"* she says. She also adds that certain barriers of market entry and of foreign investments in regulation have to be abolished.

Klimmt asks Kostyuk to talk about the intervention of the government in Ukrainian media. Answering Klimmt's question she states that generally speaking there is no governmental pressure on media and that the TV programs are not biased. Sometimes the owners carry their opinion into their television channel. On the other hand, actually the government has the power to withdraw television channel licenses under certain legal conditions. Kostyuk says that this means that the broadcaster has to remain in latitude and the practice of this latitude is not really regulated yet. Rabitz adds to Kostyuk's overview over the Ukrainian media landscape the fact that there are certain oligarchies in Ukraine investing in media what she does not consider wrong in itself. But Rabitz considers the lack of social control over these television channels bad. Klimmt describes the German media landscape as a kiosk where everyone can chose exactly what he or she needs and that digitization will contribute more to this proliferation of media. He underlines the importance of the European dual media system and the maintaining of the balance between the two parts.

Klimmt asks Jaroslav Sonka to talk about the Czech media system. Concerning the Czech Republic, Jaroslav Sonka points out that we cannot say that a wonderful media system had been formed. According to Sonka *"the matter is that the Czech media system had been formed."* A tendency can be shown in the Czech media with regard to the relation between politicians and media. The behavior of some politicians shows that they worry about not getting influence on media. As a result of this process the performance of politicians in media has become incidental. They want to be present in media by any means, which leads to funny consequences. Sometimes it means that the politician's performance achieves the opposite effect that it was designed before. Klimmt adds to Sonka's description the boulevard tendency in Europe in the presentation of political news aiming to raise the attention

of the audience for political topics. Klimmt's opinion is that this kind of presentation does damage the seriousness of important political debates and decisions.

Concerning the media landscape after the changes in Hungary, László Cselényi explains that although the governmental censorship has ended, self-censorship took its place. The reason of the latter is that the relation between media and politics is based on the "*Comedy of Errors*," as both parties have not learned how to handle each other. Cselényi explains that media considers that politicians are entitled to have a voice for what they did. Cselényi also mentions another peculiarity: Public broadcasting is expected to stand for one of the political wings, meaning if someone does not belong to either of them it is a problem. Cselényi classifies the structure of the Hungarian media institutions as one of the causes of the currently unsatisfactory situation. He points out that both the members of the regulatory authority and the controlling body of the public broadcasters are delegated by parliamentary parties.

Reacting to Cselényi's opinion, Sonka disagrees. He does not see the point to dispute on neutrality of political journalism, as he does not believe in its existence. At the same time he considers to have such journalism where we can clearly see the political aspect, follow the process of the arguments and also the drawn consequences. Sonka therefore misses the analytical journalism in the Czech Republic under which he understands a disclosure of facts. Besides the prevailing boulevard elements in political journalism, Rabitz raises the problem of education of journalists. In her opinion, there is a lack of qualified and well-educated journalists to maintain a high standard of quality. Cselényi says that in Hungary there are a great number of journalists' training and it seems to him that these trainings will become increasingly independent from policy. Kostyuk states that in Ukraine journalist training also exists but foreign trainers are needed as the journalists who had been working in the former political system are still working in the media. Sonka says that he clearly observes deficiencies in the area of training of journalists in the Czech Republic.

In the last part of the panel the experts deal with the people's lack of interest in political journalism and in policy itself and are seeking the ways in which policy can

be made more attractive to the audience. Drawing an example Sonka reports that there are such political programs in Czech television, which contain intense political debates and afterwards the evaluation of the debate. The latter shows that those politicians, who were too aggressive and did not talk about facts, got bad evaluation. Sonka's consequence is that these kinds of political debate programs base on and originate from the pattern of reality shows and they are not sleep inducing as some political programs in ARD. Rabitz supports Sonka's views as she explains that there are surveys showing the dullness and "anemia" of political talk shows in Germany. She thinks that courageous moderators are needed, different from those only capable to let politicians tell their opinion.

Alexander van Dülmen asked the panelists if there are so many boring political programming on television, will television drive away people from political debate, for example in Ukraine. He also asks what can be the proper forum for political debate. Kostyuk remembers that during the Orange Revolution people had followed policy with passion and everyone had been interested in it. Resolving today's problem, she thinks that some elements from show programs have to be used in political programs. Rabitz says that we should not be too demanding, as there is not an Orange Revolution every day. She describes today people as less interested in politics, but political debates are still needed because of the maintenance of democracy. Klimmt draws the attention to some quality channels in Germany specialized in political information programming although their market shares are low. He returns to the question *"Do we accept that people are not interested in politics or is it possible to present politics in television in an attractive way?"* Sonka's opinion is that there is no recipe for how to increase people's interest in political journalism. He mentions politicians' endeavor to get closer to the people as an interesting phenomenon. Sonka shows the usage of tools of infotainment in political journalism to make it attractive but also reminds of its dangers. He summarizes that rigorous information is needed from one side but impulses are needed too, which make people turn into the direction of a political topic to discuss it. Sonka cites Jaroslav Hasek by saying *"We Czechs talk politics while drinking beer, and we finish it after we fall under the table. Hungarians drink wine and they start politicizing*

heavily just after they have fallen under the table.” Gordon Lovitt says that the fact that the young generation is not interested in politics is a general problem. The main question is how to make politics exciting for young people. He thinks that the first step is for politicians to choose topics, which are appealing to teenagers and then start the debate. He also emphasizes the usage of new communication channels such as the internet. Iryna Kostyuk reminds the panelists that in German television, the practice to invite popular people into political programs to comment policy or political events is quite successful.

Resuming the debate of the panel Klimmt says that broadly speaking, we can see a lot of democratic media landscape in the Eastern part of Europe but cannot say the same in case of Byelorussia and Russia. He also points out that the decisive part of the audience watches commercial entertainment programs in television and that politics and culture are marginalized. Klimmt considers this a great challenge for Europe, namely, when can we stop the downward spiral of this trend?

Alexander van Dülmen closes the conference and informs the participants about the next EUROPEAN TELEVISION DIALOGUE on October 17th, 2006 in Munich.