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The first decades of the 21st Century have demonstrated that it is more important than ever that we are able not only to address immediate crises as they arise, but that we are able to look beyond them, to the world we want to see. Our response to these crises can, we believe, be part of building a new architecture of international relations – one that stands upon the conviction that democratic, technological, and economic advances are compatible with mutually respectful and inclusive societies, and that civic institutions can play a more meaningful role in shaping these possible futures.

The challenges seem greater than ever before. And in many ways, they are. But they are not entirely new. Fifteen years ago we recognised that if we were to be able to solve these problems, we would need an approach that enabled interaction to take place outside the ever-present shadow of mutual suspicion – one that allowed people with radically different worldviews to come together and work for the common good.

The concept of the ‘dialogue of civilizations’ came into being at the turn of the twenty-first century, under UN auspices. This was soon followed by the establishment of the World Public Forum by a circle of likeminded people including the late Indian Prime Minister Inder Kumar Gujral, the American businessman Nicholas Papanicolaou, and myself. Jagadish Kapur, an Indian
entrepreneur and visionary, argued then that attempts to harmonise diverse cultures and religious traditions are hindered by an unsustainable global power structure that aims for a single universalist approach. This quest for ways to apply the concept of dialogue to the major areas of human activity – politics, society, and economy – gave rise to the first Forum on the Greek island of Rhodes, an ancient cradle of democracy and a crossroads of world cultures.

So much has changed since those early days. Our Dialogue in Universities initiatives (Diaversity) offer a practical introduction to the principles of dialogue, and are based in many educational institutions worldwide. Our annual Rhodes Forum, which some have compared to Davos, has developed over its fifteen-year history into a strong platform where world scholars, businessmen, policy-makers, and heads of government debate the most pressing issues of the day. The distinguished collection of recipients of the Dialogue Award – in recognition of their major contributions to the cause of peace and reconciliation between peoples – now includes the Presidents of the Czech Republic, Miloš Zeman, and of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev; and the former Federal Chancellor of Austria, Alfred Gusenbauer.

The 2017 15th Anniversary Rhodes Forum Multipolarity and Dialogue in Regional and Global Developments: Imagining Possible Futures, as in previous years, was focused not only on a discussion of the problems we face but on the development of applicable solutions founded in our shared core values of equality, mutual respect, and understanding. The decision-makers, business people, civil society representatives, and thought leaders attending the forum also took part in two focal events: The Summit on Globalisation and the Future of Democracy, and the Summit on Global Infrastructure Development Scenarios. There may be questions as to how the former is tied to the latter – but our research shows that infrastructure development can be used to reduce inequality and is therefore instrumental in efforts to foster the wellbeing of any nation or region. A newly introduced platform, the Leaders Club Summit, brought together former heads of state and government, alongside other world-renowned experts, in an attempt to develop concrete recommendations for the UN over the role of NGOs in conflict resolution.

Thus, through our expert endeavours, we help open up paths to decisions that are otherwise obscured.

New technologies mean that we hear about new confrontations within seconds of them occurring. With social media and the 24-hour news cycle, our responses and reactions are also increasingly immediate. A recent example: a rocket is fired from North Korea, and the Twittersphere discussion happens within seconds of the Japanese warning sirens being sounded.

It is only natural for the initial reaction to be one of worry, trepidation, or concern. Amplified by traditional media as well as social media, we are all too often pushed into knee-jerk responses. Public fear and outrage have become powerful parts of the political discourse. Yet another sign of how new media are important is that the catchment of our Institute’s social networks is accruing several thousand followers weekly.
A dialogue of civilizations means disengaging with this rhetoric of clash and conflict, and instead focusing on cooperation to respond to existing, new, and emerging challenges. The more alarmist the public discourse – for example the way we see Islam discussed in the context of terrorism – the greater the need for the ‘still small voice of calm’, i.e., the greater the need for dialogue.

The Dialogue of Civilizations has come to be an intellectual and practical response to the Clash of Civilizations thesis proposed by Samuel Huntington a quarter of a century ago. While we take up his definitions of key terms such as ‘clash’ and ‘civilization’, we disagree with his fundamental conclusions. We are not government funded – though many of us have worked at senior levels in national governments and taken leading roles in business circles or public life – and it is not our role to take sides in internal political issues in particular countries.

Our role is much more specific – we exist as an affirmation that, as the frequency of conflicts has steadily risen over the past century and a half, there is almost always a path for civil society to ensure responses rooted in an understanding of our common humanity. For however simple it may sound – ‘a common response to common threats’ – this is founded upon a meticulously developed methodology, the ‘dialogue index’, which helps us measure the depth of a conflict and estimate the chances of easing it. It has worked on numerous occasions, as in 2013 when a Sunni–Shia conference we hosted in Rhodes brought tangible results in relations between the two arms of Islam widely believed to be fundamentally opposed. In fact, the basic rule of dialogue has always been simple: neither the World Public Forum nor its successor, the DOC Research Institute, has ever taken an ideological approach to membership or participation, the sole criterion has always been, and will remain, the ability to listen. Not surprisingly, the Forum is now more frequently approached by entrepreneurs and policy-makers – the capability to understand the nature of tensions and to extend unbiased expertise is an important factor in the increasingly intense spheres of business and trade relations.

In all areas of our operations, we are continuing to develop. We do not claim to have solutions to all the mounting problems humanity faces. What we do offer, though, is a tried and tested approach to engaging multiple parties in work to find these solutions, in work to bridge the divides that weaken our societies, and in work to reinforce an international agenda of positive and respectful interaction that builds a fairer and more prosperous world.
Held annually on the Greek island of Rhodes since 2003, the Rhodes Forum has brought together leaders and experts from around 70 countries to debate crucial issues facing the world. Known for its capability to engage multiple parties in work to find solutions, the Rhodes Forum seeks to reinforce an international agenda of positive and respectful interaction that builds a fairer and more prosperous world. Throughout its history, its hallmark has been the pioneering spirit, inclusiveness, and moral resilience of its participants in their work to tackle the problems we face.

**Selected dates**

**2001**
Following an initiative by Iranian leader Mohammad Khatami, UNESCO member states unanimously adopted the “UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity” and the UN General Assembly presented its Global Agenda for Dialogue Among Civilizations.

**2002**
World Public Forum Dialogue of Civilizations is founded by Jagdish Kapur, Vladimir Yakunin and Nicholas Papanicolaou as a practical endeavour to implement this initiative. It will be headquartered in Vienna, Austria.

**2003**
The 1st Rhodes Forum convenes, becoming the annual event of the World Public Forum Dialogue of Civilizations.

**2006**
The Rhodes Forum warns of the pending global financial crisis, which will finally occur in 2008.

**2008**
WPF Dialogue of Civilizations establishes the International Dialogue of Civilizations Award for fidelity to the ideas of justice and unity and for outstanding contributions to strengthening peace and harmony among people.

The Dialogue of Civilizations Award is given to the Federal Chancellor of Austria, Alfred Gusenbauer.

**2011**
The Dialogue of Civilizations Award is given to the President of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbaev.
2012
10th Anniversary Rhodes Forum

2013
The Rhodes Forum warns of the inevitable migration crisis; the European refugee crisis will finally begin in 2015.

2014
The Dialogue of Civilizations Award is given to the President of the Czech Republic, Milos Zeman.

2016
Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute is founded in Berlin, Germany, by Vladimir Yakunin, Walter Schwimmer and Peter Schulze, building on the legacy and expertise of the World Public Forum Dialogue of Civilizations. Its regional offices include Moscow, Vienna, and Delhi (starting from 2018).

Henceforth the Rhodes Forum becomes the annual event of the DOC Research Institute.

2017
15th Anniversary Rhodes Forum: Multipolarity and Dialogue in Regional and Global Developments: Imagining Possible Futures
The Forum receives support from about 20 partners around the world, including Greek and Chinese state television, and initiates partnerships with 12 international organisations.

The 1st Leaders Club Summit meeting is held within the Rhodes Forum agenda, bringing together acting and former heads of states and governments in attendance for an informal exchange of opinions and expertise aimed at increasing the role of civic institutions in policy-making.

Rhodes Forum awards Ruben Vardanyan for his philanthropic activity in the social sphere.

2018, 5-6 October

Following a suggestion of several African leaders, a Summit dedicated to Africa is due to convene on October 6 as a focal event of the Rhodes Forum 2018.
“We are searching all around the world for some sort of intermediary forces that could bring people together to start the dialogue and to discuss substantial issues that are the underlying causes for the conflicts that we are in right now. That is the role of the Rhodes Forum.”

Alfred Gusenbauer
Federal Chancellor of Austria (2007-2008)

“It takes a lot of courage to come up with thoughts and this is what this Forum is all about: to challenge existing structures and to challenge things that seem to be carved in stone.”

Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg
Federal Minister for Economics and Technology (2009), Federal Minister of Defence (2009-2011) of Germany

“I appreciate organisations such as the Rhodes Forum for stepping in to fill the gap, with programmes that promote understanding, unity, and equality. Advocacy by the Rhodes Forum and similar organisations is exceedingly important because they provide neutral platforms for advice on global issues.”

Goodluck Jonathan
President of Nigeria (2010-2015)
“We are here to enter into a dialogue amongst peers, a dialogue amongst countries, amongst continents, and our only objective is to share: to share a world, a place where we will improve the quality of people’s lives. The Forum allowed me to enrich myself from the exchanges of very high level with the participants of proven expertise. The Rhodes Forum is both a dynamic and a spirit to be preserved.”

Dioncounda Traoré
President of Mali (2012-2013)

“I believe that leaders need to come together, despite how different we are, despite how we can disagree we need to learn to talk to each other. I am going to wish the DOC to continue this Forum in the same direction, keep the development of the discussions and research and audience, and I hope we will continue meaningful meetings in Rhodes for many more years.”

Ruben Vardanian
Social entrepreneur and impact investor, president of LLC Vardanyan, Broitman and Partners, co-founder of RVVZ Foundation

“It makes sense to go to the Rhodes Forum. You understand a number of things there, see them in a different light, from a different angle. This motivates you to look for and formulate new answers.”

Vaclav Klaus
President of the Czech Republic (2003-2013), Founder of the Václav Klaus Institute
“We should enrich our diversity and we should celebrate our diversity, and at the same time find a way how to understand each other. This forum has played a crucial role the last years how to bridge the gap among different cultures, different ideas, different religions.”

Gholamali Khoshroo
Deputy foreign minister for legal and International Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran (2002-2005)

“The Forum made weighty contribution to the development of inter-civilisation communication, strengthening trust and mutual understanding between peoples. The Rhodes forum has become an authoritative discussion floor for consideration of urgent problems of evolution and interaction of civilisations.”

Sergey Lavrov
Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia

“In our world of “the winner takes all” it is critically important for any public event to have “stars” among its participants. That is why the 15th Rhodes Forum was clearly a major success for all its participants and supporters. All sessions of the forum had high-level discussants, and we were all particularly proud to attend top quality plenary and policy sessions. The Rhodes Forum of the Dialogue of Civilisations Research Institute has all chances to be established as the one of the most influential public forums around the world.”

Djoomart Otorbaev
Prime Minister of the Kyrgyz Republic (2014 - 2015)
“My colleagues told me about important ideas this Forum generates for the global community. I read the outcomes of previous Rhodes Forums and am excited to see how dignitaries representing different cultures and civilizations in this great Mediterranean atmosphere will discuss pressing global issues.”

Matthias Platzeck
Minister President of Brandenburg (2002-2013), chairman of the Social Democratic Party (2005-2006)

“Problems now have no borders, we have to find solutions together. This Forum is something that is global.”

Eva Kaili
Member of the European Parliament for Greece, PASOK

“I am very impressed with the openness and the real dialogue at the Rhodes Forum. I learned a lot here.”

Armen Sarkissian
Prime Minister of Armenia (1996-1997), ambassador of Armenia to United Kingdom

“Dialogue of Civilizations’ Rhodes Forum is a great opportunity to enhance collective thinking on multilateral issues and solutions to the major challenges of our time.”

Dominique de Villepin
Prime Minister of France (2005-2007)
“After 15 annual Rhodes Forums the name of this beautiful island has not only come to represent an inspiring event, but also a community, a movement seeking to change the world for the better. This movement is open to anyone who believes in the power of dialogue.”

Walter Schwimmer
Secretary General of the Council of Europe (2004-2009), co-founder of the DOC Research Institute

“Thanks to Mr. Yakunin for bringing us together and for making this conference an important annual global event.”

Strobe Talbott

“This Forum has benefited from the most valuable experiences and wisdom of great thinkers and scholar in addressing global challenges and promoting dialogue and justice in the world.”

Mohammad Khatami
President of Iran (1997-2005)

“For me, the Rhodes Forum is a very refreshing place where I can meet a lot of interesting people with great personalities – people who have achieved a lot and are extremely successful, yet they are not at all arrogant or pretentious.”

Milos Zeman
President of the Czech Republic
GLOBAL OUTREACH

MORE THAN
3 000 000 PEOPLE
FOLLOWED THE FORUM’S ACTIVITIES
ON SOCIAL MEDIA

AN ESTIMATED
150 000 PEOPLE
WATCHED THE FORUM’S
OPENING PANEL LIVE TRANSMISSION

OVER
400 PUBLICATIONS
THE WORLD MEDIA

COVERAGE IN LEADING MEDIA

Financial Times
Reuters
Bloomberg
The Economist
BBC
CNBC
Politico
Les Echos

La Croix
Valeurs actuelles
Deutsche Welle
Die Welt
Tagesspiegel
Xinhua
China Daily
CGTN

ANI
Kommersant
TASS
RBC
ERT
Helsinki Times
Česká televize
TASR

Rhodes Forum 2017 edition

See page 65 for the Rhodes Forum 2017 press review
PARTICIPANTS FROM MORE THAN
30 COUNTRIES

Algeria  Argentina  Armenia  Austria  Canada  China  Czech Republic  Denmark  Ecuador  Egypt  France

Germany  Greece  India  Iran  Ireland  Italy  Japan  Kyrgyzstan  Lithuania  Malaysia  Mali

Nigeria  Nepal  Pakistan  Poland  Russia  Slovakia  Switzerland  Turkey  The Netherlands  United Kingdom  USA

Rhodes Forum 2017 edition
During the opening panel, “Multipolarity and Dialogue in Regional and Global Developments: Imagining Possible Futures,” former Nigerian President Goodluck E. Jonathan argued in favour of rethinking the role of the UN, most notably through the reconfiguration and democratisation of the UN Security Council. Rather than providing answers to the issues it sought to resolve, the UNSC has opened new frontiers for conflicts, Jonathan said. He highlighted the effective restructuring of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), which helped to reduce conflicts significantly after it was transformed into the African Union (AU), coupled with the formation of regional blocks such as the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), ECOWAS, and SADCC.

We live in a world of risks, many of which are resulting in wars that have affected millions of people worldwide was one point made by Dominique de Villepin.
These risks, he continued, have been increased by the politics of today. Instead of addressing conflict with constructive dialogue, we have seen warmongering and unilateral interventions that set us further back. De Villepin argued that a multilateral approach is the key, one that includes policy-makers and actors not only from Western countries.

Using terrorism in his home country, Mali, as an example, Dioncounda Traoré emphasised the importance of dialogue and the need for common efforts amongst the international community in tackling crises. Traoré explained the spread of Islamist terrorism in Mali, which initially was portrayed as a Tuareg problem. In fact, the conflict has an international dimension since the Islamist objective was to establish a sanctuary in the north of Mali from where forces would be trained and supplied in other regions around the globe. Therefore, as President Traoré argued, the involvement of the international community, including ECOWAS, the African Union, and the EU with France leading the negotiations, was critical.

Ian Goldin’s talk focused on how the current moment is more complex than any previous moment in history, because there are more actors engaged from more places. In a wide-ranging address, Professor Goldin considered the positive potential and present risks in the world today. In particular, he shone a light on the nature of the interconnection that defines so much of our society and economy. And despite the many problems we face, he stressed that there are numerous reasons to be optimistic, and that we live in a time in history which can solve many of the greatest challenges which have faced humanity for time immemorial. And yet, Professor Goldin argued, the great contradiction of our age is that, despite this positive potential, we remain fearful and afflicted. Professor Goldin looked at previous eras of momentous and lasting impact – the Renaissance, the Gutenberg press, drawing parallels where appropriate with the rapid development of modern technology. He also highlighted rapidly growing global inequality as a defining trend of our age that finds its expressions everywhere in our societies – from public health and the ballot box. This global inequality is, he highlighted, part of the “butterfly defect” of globalisation, which is systemic risk, which comes out of interconnected systems. In conclusion he outlined that the solution is not to be found in withdrawal, protectionism, nationalism, or xenophobia but in cooperation and working together.

Natalya Kaspersky warned about the dangers the new technologies bring together with the benefits and particularly stressed the limitations they impose to personal privacy, diversity of opinions and national sovereignty.
For a more efficient United Nations

Let me first commend the Rhodes Forum for advancing the philosophy of Dialogue of Civilisations (DOC) this past 15 years. I also wish to thank the Forum for inviting me to share my ideas with the highly intellectual discussants at this year’s programme, taking place in Greece; a nation deservedly recognised as the cradle of Western civilisation, the birthplace of the Olympic Games, as well as democracy.

I consider the theme for this year’s summit, ‘Multipolarity and Dialogue in Regional and Global Developments: Imagining Possible Futures’ quite pertinent, in view of the prevailing dynamics in global politics. It is a topic suitable for interrogation by academics, civil society, technocrats and politicians, in order to provide a clear direction for the world, as it seeks a path to sustainable peace and development.

I will leave the theoretical concepts of historical global power formations for my co-discussants who are in academia so that I can quickly share with you what I consider practical issues that are critical to advancing peace in the world.

I will also share with you what I did with my fellow African leaders to bring peace (in Africa) at the continental, sub-continental, and national levels.

Even then, I have to state that at different times, the world has witnessed various power configurations which started in the modern world as a multipolar arrangement, which became bipolar after World War Two. This eventually morphed into a unipolar sphere of influence after the collapse of the Soviet Union.
about two decades ago, before other power centres emerged in the twenty-first century to define what we have now as the return of multipolar formation.

That the world needs peace is a declaration no one ever contests, given what the absence of peace portends. That the only road to a peaceful world is through dialogue is also incontrovertible. What then raises a valid contention is the argument over the steps taken by leaders towards realising peace. Are they the right or wrong steps?

At the end of World War Two, 51 nations came together to form the United Nations on 24 October 1945. The UN Security Council was also formed the same day. The UN was set up principally as a replacement for the ineffective League of Nations, in order to prevent another world war and guarantee world peace.

In terms of carrying out the mandate to prevent a Third World War, we could say the UN has done exceptionally well up to this moment. However, we cannot say the same thing over its mandate to ensure world peace as it is obvious that the UN has not achieved much in this regard. From 1945, when 51 nations came together, to now, when the UN has 193 member states, the world has not known real peace.

The late Fela Anikulapo-Kuti, a Nigerian philosopher and musician of international repute, tried to rebrand the UN in his own way, by calling it ‘Disunited Nations.’ He might have exaggerated. Nonetheless, his complaint was that nations going through bitter conflicts were all members of the UN. Yet, the global body, primarily set up to guarantee world peace, appears not to have been able to muster the required willpower to resolve issues that cause conflicts, and this has been the case for decades.

Over time, since the establishment of the UN, the world has seen conflicts within and among nations of catastrophic and tragic dimensions, without the global body living up to its billing to provide far-reaching solutions. For instance, East Asia and the Korean Peninsula have not known real peace for 60 years because South and North Korea have remained technically at war since the Korean War (1950–1953), after the warring sides failed to sign an armistice.

We have similar situations between India and Pakistan, and in the unending Middle East crisis, which is at the heart of endless bloodshed. There was also the Rwandan genocide as well as the specific cases of Bosnia, Somalia, and Darfur in Sudan, which unravellled with so much loss of life.

In each case, the UN was helpless in resolving the conflicts. The ongoing wars in Syria, Iraq, the distressing Rohingya dilemma in Myanmar, as well as the threat of conflicts and wars in other parts of the world, are all signs that the UN is failing the world.

Besides the influence of the superpowers are other power centres and regional blocs like the European Union, the Arab League, Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), Organisation of American States (OAS), African Union (AU), the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC), and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). There is no doubt that
all these groups have been pivotal to peace and economic development in the countries within their spheres of authority. However, they have apparently been helpless, in view of disputes between nations within their fold and those outside their influence. This is where the role of a reorganised UN, one that inspires trust among these blocs and all nations, is most required.

The truth is that despite decades of efforts at the multinational level towards ensuring peace, the world has remained mired in developmental challenges that question man’s ability to govern, collaborate, and unite to make the world better. Those are challenges of poverty, healthcare, inequality, and conflicts. This is because the world has not matched this zeal for organisation with a corresponding gusto for organisation with a corresponding gusto for trust, good faith and the will for productive engagements, negotiations, and dialogue.

I believe in the UN as an effective global body that should lead the quest for the peace we desire. I am also convinced that for the organisation to bring about world peace, the UN method and approach to dialogue must be reviewed. It is important that all member nations of the UN have faith in the organisation, and believe that it is fair and representative enough to protect them. The Security Council, which is the most powerful UN organ, with “primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security”, cannot inspire that confidence, because of the way it is presently configured.

The present situation, whereby one nation, out of 193 nations, can upturn decisions of the Security Council, has not been helpful in galvanising the confidence and mutuality necessary to bring peace to the world. If anything, the system, which has remained unreviewed in over half a century, has been more effective in opening new frontiers for conflicts, rather than providing answers to the ones it has sought to resolve.

The UN method of dialogue must therefore change.

The Security Council of the United Nations must be democratised, in view of new global realities, in the interest of peace. As presently constituted, the UN is portrayed as a platform where nations come to quarrel and display their might, instead of its being seen in light of statutory role, as a forum for unity and world peace.

I appreciate organisations such as the Rhodes Forum for stepping in to fill the gap, with programmes that promote understanding, unity, and equality.

However, for the world to experience sustainable peace, effective leadership must come from the UN, the flagship global organisation. A UN that would inspire this kind of leadership should ensure equity, with leading nations and power centres representing different regions of the world sitting at the Security Council as permanent members.

In Africa, the restructuring of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) as the African Union (AU), coupled with the formation of regional blocks such as the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), ECOWAS and SADCC, has helped reduce conflicts significantly. This has given the continent
a glimmer of hope in the way it applies dialogue as an instrument of regional peace and development.

In West Africa, where I come from, ECOWAS and my nation Nigeria has resolved, as well as prevented, many conflicts and stabilised and strengthened democracy in many countries in the region. Some of the countries we were able to stabilise are Liberia, Sierra Leone, Niger, Cote D’Ivoire, Mali, Guinea Bissau, Burkina Faso, and The Gambia. We were able to achieve this because of intense and purposeful dialogue.

In ECOWAS, we have not only adopted dialogue as a productive means of resolving political conflicts and violence but have also advanced many steps towards economic integration. I believe that successes have been recorded in this regard with the policy on free movement of persons and goods, similar to what occurs within EU countries. We were able to achieve all this through a process of sincere dialogue.

When I was in office as president, I championed the cause of good governance, transparent elections, and peaceful power transfers, because I also believed that at the heart of the dialogue for a more peaceful world is the need to cultivate a culture of democracy and good governance at the national level. This is a good way to reduce the local tensions that possess potential for blossoming into global crisis.

Dialogue is a formula that serves any community well, in preventing or resolving conflicts. In Nigeria, through a process of dialogue, we arrived at an amnesty programme that brought an end to the crisis in the Niger Delta, an oil-rich region in my country that accounts for all the oil wells that remain the mainstay of Nigeria’s economy.

Sometime in 2014, I had a thought in my mind. Nigeria is easily the most ethnically and religiously heterogeneous society in Africa, and one of the most diverse nations in the world. Many times, these different ethnic groups pull in diverse directions that as a leader, cause you to experience the genuine fear that the centre may not hold.

At that time, I asked myself, how can I as president, help build a more harmonious union in Nigeria? One based on the words of our national anthem, which ends with ‘to build a nation where peace and justice shall reign’.

To address this, I convened a national conference where the various ethnic groups and other stakeholders deliberated for five months on the future of the country. They had the mandate to discuss and advise the Government on all matters pertaining to our nationhood, except the sovereignty of the country.

On Thursday 21 August 2014, I received the report. Our general elections came up six months after the national conference. The confidence and national goodwill the conference inspired helped bring down the tension during and after the general elections. It was a confidence-boosting outcome, despite the predictions by some international bodies that Nigeria was going to disintegrate in 2015.
There is one important point people often overlook whenever the issue of global peace arises. There can be no peace at the global level if there is no peace in the heart, conscience, and character of leaders of nations.

I spoke recently at another event about my belief that the best leadership flows from inspiration and not from power or force of arms. Conscience-based leadership builds nations and ensures peace while ego-based leadership throws nations into conflicts and chaos.

In closing, I have to make one thing clear: irrespective of centres of control, it is only genuine dialogue that can bring peace to the world. A peaceful world will reduce financial crises, armed conflicts, terrorism, unchecked migration, religious conflicts, and secessionist agitations.

It is obvious that investments thrive, and economies grow better in peaceful environments, leading to improvement in education and other social investments and a reduction in poverty.

Advocacy by the Rhodes Forum and similar organisations is exceedingly important because they provide neutral platforms for advice on global issues. However, for the world to experience lasting peace, there must be fairness, equity, and justice in the UN Security Council.

I say this because I envision smaller or hitherto less powerful nations acquiring new capacities and capabilities, in this age of technology’s boundless potential, with which they may even challenge the superpowers for relevance. Only a democratised United Nations where every nation or power bloc truly commits to processes for sustainable peace could eliminate the possibility of such an apocalypse.

So when I am asked to proffer solutions for achieving global peace and sustainable development, I will say that the answer lies in genuine dialogue. This entails negotiations, hard bargaining, inclusivity, persuasion, and confidence building.

*The views and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the original author(s) and do not necessarily represent or reflect the views and opinions of the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute, its co-founders, or its staff members.*
Multilateralism: The antidote to uncertainty

I would like to warmly thank Vladimir Yakunin for his invitation to this edition of the Dialogue of Civilizations’ Rhodes Forum. This is a great opportunity to enhance collective thinking on multilateral issues and solutions to the major challenges of our time.

We’ve just heard a strong voice from Africa, a continent that is dear to me because I was born there.

Africa is one of the places in the world where it is indeed possible to imagine a better future, where imagination can make the future better.

This is good and much needed news, because imagining possible futures has become today a difficult task; even a scary task.

Uncertainty has become the trademark of our time. It is true in international politics, with the unpredictability of Donald Trump’s administration upsetting international order by dismantling global agreements and favouring the rhetoric of war over the rhetoric of peace. It is true in national politics, with the rise of populism revealing new cracks within groups of people and competing with values of openness, sharing and common good. It is also true in economics, with repeated economic crises threatening global stability and the dominance of the dollar binding us to the fluctuations of American currency.

Escalation, war, and conflict are – undoubtedly, to most minds – possible futures for our world. Even the daily threat of nuclear weapons has come back.
We must learn to live in a world of risks.

The mix of globalisation and multipolarity has opened an unprecedented era of uncertainties. Although we might have believed that the end of the Cold War would open an era of global governance, we are actually facing a time of global disorder. Failures of regulations have led to a capitalism of cyclical crises driven by risk and increased competition. Everywhere you look, new bubbles are appearing – real estate, sovereign debt, shadow banking, student loans, etc.

With amazement, we have discovered widely expressed populism in liberal democracies, and the progression of radical political ideologies around the world is a major concern. Climate challenges urge us to face up our responsibilities, while we have just been experiencing unprecedented cyclones and seismic movements in recent months.

Forced migrations and refugee crises are creating despair, fear, and need. The global population of political refugees and displaced persons is higher today than the population of my country, France. Last, but not least, terrorism represents the opportunistic virus of this uncertain, globalised world.

We are facing multidimensional crises that are becoming increasingly complex to deal with, some of which have escaped from international media attention: Yemen, in the Middle East, has been forgotten – due to a global focus on ISIS and the Syrian crisis – with 6.8 million people sent back to the Middle Ages by war; The Central African Republic is becoming the blind spot of its region, despite the strong presence of the international community in the country; In Myanmar, we have had to witness images of hundreds of thousands of displaced people before the treatment of the Rohingya minority has even begun to be considered.

Risks have been increased by politics, because dialogue has been overshadowed by a spirit of warmongering. What must be said again and again, is that putting military options before politics has fed a vicious circle of multiplying both military interventions and transgressions of democratic processes.

Instead of engendering political solutions to conflicts, military interventions tend to worsen the situation and make dialogue impossible. We have seen this with Western interventions in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya. We can see it now in Yemen, where the Sunni Arab coalition is failing to curb the crisis, and in Qatar, where Gulf states have preferred coercion to dialogue. The same is true within nations where the temptation of authoritarian rule leads not to stability, but to more risks of civil wars and violence.

This is a real challenge in Burundi today, where political dialogue has been under lock and key by those in power, under the watchful gaze of the impotent international community. There is a real risk of violent explosion in Burundi, which could reawaken war in the Great Lakes region. Let’s not repeat a familiar mistake, while Kenya is going through a troubled election period, laden with hopes but also with tensions. Close international follow-up of the electoral process is needed, as well as strong monitoring by the African Union.
The risk of escalation has not been as high for decades as it will be in the coming months, with the rhetoric of war outweighing peaceful dialogue within the world’s principal superpower. In a way, the world’s sheriff seems to be going rogue. The North Korean crisis is all about the display of power and credibility, opposing Donald Trump and Kim Jung-Un in a counterproductive face-to-face. The same process is happening with Iran: Donald Trump has launched a war of words with the Iranian government, embodying a kind of ‘constant unpredictability’. We must be aware that in a few days – on 15 October – he may choose to reject certification of the 2015 JCPOA, which would represent a major risk of escalation.

Multilateralism today is the key to managing uncertainty. The question of our time is how to avoid uncertainty. We must give priority to politics.

In times of escalation, we cannot take the risk of frozen conflicts heating up at any moment. The first tool should be a contact group, like the Minsk Group on the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan. It is in these small working groups, gathering goodwill and ideas, that peace is most likely to progress. These contexts bring the main actors and influencers to the table, away from the cameras and away from international pressure.

The second tool at our disposal is mediation, a role which is traditionally ascribed to the UN, and a role I believe to be the calling of France, which is able to speak to all. Even though we have seen in Libya and in Syria how extremely difficult, and how unsuccessful, this work can be, mediation remains an indispensable process. That’s why I support the efforts of French mediation carried out by President Macron, who last July gathered the Libyan leaders, Fayez al-Sarraj and Khalifa Haftar.

We must also give priority to regional actors and solutions. In many situations, the involvement of the international community leads to a takeover in terms of responsibility, and to a short-circuiting of regional and local voices. Look at the crises in Afghanistan or Libya, where Western interventions have allowed neighbours and regional actors to remain inactive, or have prevented them from playing a positive role. Look at all the regional powers and peace-brokers asking for more involvement and more influence, as in the case of South Africa. Dialogue and multilateral action cannot only be set up in Paris, Washington, or Berlin.

Regional organisations have a key role to play in bringing about peace. They are the natural players in terms of stabilisation and first response. The involvement of regional structures, such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the Collective Security Treaty Organization headquartered in Moscow, or the ECOWAS (Community of West African States), embodies a hopeful and dynamic multilateralism. These arenas of regional integration are more and more eager to take over responsibilities. We saw this in Gambia in January, when ECOWAS observed the electoral process and forced the former dictator Yahya Jammeh to leave power after his refusal to accept the results of the election.

In order to deal with systemic regional crises like in Eastern Europe, the Middle East, or North Korea, we must build new international security architectures.
Such architectures would prevent military escalations by setting regional security milestones, as well enabling cooperation and efficiency in the fight against terrorism, a common danger faced by us all.

Regarding Ukraine, designing a new cooperation and security architecture between Europe and Russia is essential, in accordance with the framework of the Helsinki conference that took place in 1975 and imposed a framework of a stable cohabitation.

As we notice rising tensions in Eastern Europe, evidenced by new large-scale military exercises, we need to think over our relationship with Russia by taking into account Russia’s fears and expectations. This will favour de-escalation rather than fuelling escalation. Today, promoting Ukraine’s neutrality at an equidistance from both Europe and Russia is our only tool if we want to preserve Ukraine’s territorial integrity and support its rebuilding process.

In the Middle East, we have to defuse an upcoming conflict between Iran and Saudi Arabia, which would cause devastation to the region for decades. Iranian-Saudi rivalry has led to a new crisis in Qatar, which has been ostracised by its Gulf neighbours.

This is why I believe that we could promote a structure inspired by the European ECSC – a Helsinki Conference of the Middle East – gathering Iran and Saudi Arabia around oil and gas interests. The sharing of energy rents would constitute an effective factor of rapprochement, with economic cooperation today being the best shield against war.

As we witness the tragic increase in the volume of North Korean missile launches, it is imperative that we find a peaceful and multilateral way out. The first step would imply endorsement of the Russian-Chinese ‘double freeze’ proposal: a freeze of nuclear and missile testing tracked against a freeze of American and South Korean military exercises.

The second step would be to design a dedicated common security architecture gathering Russia, China, Japan, North Korea, and South Korea: This would seek an alternative to war with the North Korean regime, which is looking for lasting security guarantees.

We must build peace with new responsible stakeholders. I want to stress here the role of China in organising harmonious coexistence in the future.

China’s President, Xi Jinping, after the 19th Congress of the CPC – on 18 October – which will renew his mandate, will be the main actor on the international stage. China needs a recognition of its new status and its need for national security in a dangerous environment.

It would be unreasonable to provoke escalations in the South China Sea, where the issue should rather be the provision of security guarantees to all parties. It would also be unreasonable to foster economic confrontation with China over investments and trade, when it is possible to build rules in common on foundation of reciprocity.
China has the keys to many regional conflicts in Asia, because of its influence and proximity. This is true with North Korea. This is also true with Myanmar.

China also has the ambition of being a responsible stakeholder for world peace. China is now the primary contributor of troops to the UN. China is now increasingly involved in regional crises like those in the Middle East.

I also want to stress the role of Russia as a crucial actor for world order. We see this with its strong involvement in the Astana process, furthering political solutions in Syria and building on local ceasefires. We also see this with Russia’s role in the east of Europe and in crises situations like North Korea.

The time has come, I believe, for a multilateral shift.

Momentum exists for a renewal of organised multipolarity. Global disorder and unpredictability call for more balance and multilateralism.

As President Macron clarified at the UN, the majority of the issues we face are global in scope. When the weaknesses of the UN are increasingly criticised, this provides momentum for addressing UN reform, especially concerning its Security Council, which, as you know, is strongly supported by France.

International influence is restructuring around regional powers, with a shift from Western to Eastern countries. We can see this with the Astana process in dealing with the Syrian Crisis, but also with initiatives from both Russia and China in reducing pressure on the North Korean issue. This has to be good news, because we need both more and new responsible stakeholders in the world community.

I believe Europe can become a key player in this multipolar world, and the main protector of the spirit of multilateralism.

Europe has been at the forefront of the fight against climate change, with COP21, and it must continue to be influential, above all through its example. Europe must provide proof that democracy and dialogue are able to overcome their own weaknesses when dealing with inner turmoil in Eastern Europe or in Western European elections.

Europe must demonstrate a way of demanding cooperation that always puts progress before sanctions. International relations are not about upholding your own moral self-image; it is about guaranteeing the security of your people. Today, multiple risks are seen at the doors of Europe: in Ukraine, in Turkey, in Syria, and in Libya. This means that Europe simply hasn’t done its job. We need to put politics first again.

We must bet on cooperation through multi-stakeholder projects if we wish to give substance to multipolarity. Such projects are the concrete core of multipolarity. They must gather both public and private actors, and be able to mobilise common will and energies.
The New Silk Road is a promising project led by Chinese authorities in response to the major challenges of global connectivity, inclusiveness, and development.

By financing and building infrastructure from Asia to Europe, but also Africa, this project is likely to develop and stabilise the countries and the regions it will cross. The most important challenge will be creating synergies and shared experience between new tools like the AIIB and old institutions like the World Bank and the IMF.

I am convinced that it is in our interests to enhance common reflection and to enhance participation with this initiative – which is providing a new vision for global development – in order to make it a shared project. That is why I created – alongside high-level former political figures – the International Marco Polo Society, aimed at raising interest in the Belt and Road Initiative.

Within this framework, we could also work towards creating the outlines of a large political, economic, and cultural partnership between Europe and Africa. We are used to seeing Africa as the continent of problems, when I think Africa can become the continent of solutions.

Such a partnership would be an opportunity to overcome a painful colonial past and to unite our efforts in the face of common imperatives: security crises, refugee crises, growth, and environmental challenges. This could also be a way of involving and leveraging the experience of high-profile former African leaders in a constructive project for future generations.

This would imply common financing and development of infrastructure that is dramatically lacking on the other side of the Mediterranean, but also promoting economic diversification as well as intercultural dialogue.

Climate change should be the essential field of multilateralism, as it has become a global security risk. From threatened islands to the shores of our continents, climate change concerns us all and its regulation cannot be the prerogative of a few powers ready to make it a priority. We need everyone’s contribution to this area, and our response to the climate change challenge must be convergent, otherwise it will not be effective.

That is why initiatives like the Paris climate agreement of 2015 must be maintained and enhanced. We must set up strong mechanisms to monitor this agreement and ensure that it will be thoroughly implemented in the coming years.

Dealing with climate change also requires innovative and sustainable financing, such as ‘green bonds’, to direct investment towards a low-carbon economy, in line with the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals.

A stable world cannot be ensured without monetary stability. This stability cannot be obtained without fostering better dialogue between the main financial institutions, as well as better cooperation between the three main world currencies: the dollar, the euro, and the yuan. This is why we might envisage the creation of a G3: a new cooperative architecture gathering governments and...
central banks, dedicated to dealing with crisis situations and to coordinating monetary policies.

We also need a tool to assess risk, which involves a more balanced credit-rating system. This is still dominated by American agencies. Bringing forward the emergence of Asian credit-rating capacity would be a good start towards addressing the challenges of the global economy.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear friends,

Responding to the challenges of multipolarity starts with better regulation of everything that pertains to the common goods of mankind, or that deals with human security and sustainability. A joint initiative by a few large countries in order to reflect together on the new multipolarity, on the role of states in achieving global equilibrium and peace, and on the necessary reforms to promote peace in crisis areas, would provide a useful contribution. This would also be a way of reviving the power of dialogue, which is, more than ever before, a global necessity.

The views and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the original author(s) and do not necessarily represent or reflect the views and opinions of the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute, its co-founders, or its staff members.
Terrorism in Mali: An issue that affects everyone

I should like to begin by thanking those in charge of the Institute for having honoured me with this invitation to the 15th Rhodes Forum. This is the 15th Forum and great work has been done since 2002. The Forum’s area of operation is not an easy one – it works in the area of dialogue between peoples, to the great benefit of the entire world. To all of the panellists of my group I should also like to express just how pleased I am to be here this morning. This is a chance for us, in the spirit of this forum, to dialogue together.

During this panel we have the great honour of exchange with people from different places. We are different, we are from different continents, and we are here blind to race, religion, and age, and this bodes very well for the quality of dialogue we will have.

We are here to enter into a dialogue amongst peers, a dialogue amongst countries, amongst continents, and our only objective is to share: to share a world, a place where we will improve the quality of people’s lives.

Now the subject of our discussion this morning is ‘Multipolarity and Dialogue in Regional and Global Developments: Imagining Possible Futures’. This is a broad, tricky, and relevant subject. We will have the great opportunity this morning to embark on a discussion of this topic, but of course we will never be able to exhaust the discussion.
At times perhaps we will utter platitudes, and we may even feel that we are stating the obvious, but no matter. We may consider it an exercise in auto-suggestion, but it is a chance for us to do everything we can possibly do and perhaps we shall have the opportunity to banish ‘the savage’ and re-kindle the humane.

Whatever the case may be, we are not exclusively looking for what is unique. After all, we all know that the lives of billions of men and women offer little in the way of originality. We also need to look to those lives, to collect best experiences and learn from each other.

On the contrary, our approach is a laborious quest for the survival of hundreds of millions of individuals, and it is made up of routine, of short periods of hope, and of course of protracted periods of disarray. There are glaring shortages in some places of the world and lands of plenty elsewhere; bread for some – hunger for others. This amounts to legitimate fears in the face of false assurances and real threats.

And yet we all live in the same world, we are all in this together, and we will not be alone. That is why it is of great importance that the debate on the future of humanity be maintained and broadened. It must be inclusive, it must take place in palaces, offices, factories, in the metros, and in the fields.

It is crucial for people to question themselves, re-evaluate themselves, and to think more about their neighbours, and we might especially meditate on Baudelaire’s anguish, that is to say, that tragic fatality may be seen both at once “the wound and the knife, the executioner and the victim.”

Ladies and gentlemen, I should like this morning to be able to illustrate my point by giving you an example – an example from my country. For some who observed the situation in my country the conclusion they drew was that this was just a Tuareg problem. Others felt that it was a problem of governance. And still others thought it was a political problem. For the majority, the belief was that it was a security problem. And everyone thought that it was a Malian problem, and that the Malians would therefore need to resolve it themselves, perhaps with financial help from ECOWAS, or in the final instance, from the African Union.

But what they did not understand was that one doesn’t occupy two thirds of the country without background thinking. They didn’t see that there was a greater threat that was affecting our country, in addition to drug trafficking and irredentism.

But what they particularly did not understand was that in Mali, Al-Qaeda, Boko Haram and other ruthless Islamists were just one tentacle of a great monster that in reality aimed not to protect Islam, but to destroy civilisation as we know it and to bring us back 1,500 years in time. They did not understand that this was a global threat financed by a well-known global coalition and could only be successfully opposed by another coalition.
The Islamist objective was to establish a sanctuary in the north of Mali where all of the forces needed to plan for expansion to other countries around the world could be developed, supplied, and trained.

Now, the rescue coalition was only able to be united through dialogue. Dialogue in ECOWAS, dialogue in the AU, and dialogue in the EU. Dialogue in the EU was spearheaded particularly by France and François Hollande, and of course then there was dialogue with the UN. Through this dialogue we were able to better understand the fact that through helping Mali everyone was helping themselves, and that they were fighting for and championing the cause of civilisation itself.

A red line was thus defined, and it was clear that in no case should the jihadis cross it. The UN developing and passing the necessary resolutions was especially important here.

The jihadis, however, who had taken control of northern Mali, had done so with surprising ease, which emboldened them and they decided to try to expand their control to the whole country, before aiming to spread terror in the sub-Saharan African region, the rest of Africa, Europe, and the entire world. Mali was but one venue of their action. They had a target, and that target was democracy; it was the civilisation that we share. It was our freedom that we hold so dear, it was the state as we know it, and it was the respect for human rights.

Their plan was not to showcase enlightened Islam. It was not to showcase the Islam of love, of fellowship. They meant to promote an Islam of darkness, pitting Takfirism against Tanwirism. This satanic ambition was to kill, and to do so by killing themselves to destroy our values and everything we believe, because for them the absurd represents salvation.

Fighting these individuals in Mali, in Niger, in Nigeria, and in Cameroon, is a way to slow their expansion against the Western world. Because Maiduguri, Kidal, Mosul – these are all part of the same plan as Bataclan and Barcelona.

Therefore, my decision as the head of state, with complete understanding of the situation, was to make overtures for international assistance, specifically to François Hollande. I would like to pay homage to François Hollande here today, he was one of the first to understand the global character of this threat and the true nature of it.

You, ladies and gentlemen, know the rest.

The purpose of my comments here this morning is to show how important dialogue is to building shared understanding, to better comprehend the real nature of threats and what we can do to pool our resources to find some way of recovery. What I should like to say is that dialogue is a way to prevent and to spare us from, tragedy – tragedy in this globalised world, a world that is so small, and yet so interconnected.

Ladies and gentlemen, my dear friends, I should like to put to you, for your wise consideration, the following thoughts – I hope our debate can address the following issue: Jihadi activity, be it via AQMI, Boko Haram, or ISIS, or other
retrograde forces that aim to compromise peaceful development, derives a large part of its strength from the perversion of three great universal achievements.

First, the technological revolution that democratised the use of GPS and cell phones. Second, globalisation, which has established a new type of citizen; citizens who are as at ease in LA as they are in Bangkok, and who have an increasing number of rights and a decreasing number of responsibilities – global citizens. And third, the free circulation of goods and peoples, which is the cornerstone of new regional integration. That has meant that people were able to strike in Brussels after Paris, and Ouagadougou after Bamako.

Ladies and gentlemen, dear friends, civilisation will prevail over false truths. However, this will take time. And the amount of time that it takes will depend on the quality of the dialogue of cultures and civilisations that we are going to open up and attend to here. This dialogue must be uninhibited and it must be authentic, it must be permanent and it must lead to an obligation that pools our means of solidarity and enhances our ability to share.

If we are not able to share now, we will be on a suicide mission for the world. This is because we do not live in a sustainable world. Nothing is being left to future generations because our collective capital has been frittered away through carefree consumerism. Our world is one where ‘the half’ have nothing to eat, no access to schooling or medicine, and where the migrating hordes of ‘have nots’ have no alternative but to jostle for entry at the gates of the ‘haves’ or end their journey in the sea – this is not a sustainable world.

Ladies and gentlemen, the imperative to act with integrity in the governance of resources is non-negotiable, because we need to be able to build infrastructure whereby countries that have less will be empowered in the future. However, this imperative should not hide the revolting egotism, even the absurdity, of a situation where a dozen rich people, as revealed by an Oxfam report, grab the majority of the wealth of the planet. Again, dialogue around solidarity and sharing is the condition for our survival as a planet.

This dialogue should not be hidden by selfishness or a lack of trust. Once we have understood the importance of this trust we must make sure we continue to build and rebuild it, because it constitutes the majority of our capital, the link that we have between us.

We all have the same red blood coursing through our veins, whether we live in Africa, Europe, Asia, America, or Oceania. Here in Rhodes, you understand that, we understand that, and therefore we must be cognisant of it, and find a way to facilitate an echo of our work around the world, to make sure that this forum is one that will contribute to that amazing leap forward, to dialogue between our societies for a new, better humanity.

The views and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the original author(s) and do not necessarily represent or reflect the views and opinions of the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute, its co-founders, or its staff members.
Ian Goldin, vice-president of World Bank (2003-2006), professor of Globalisation and Development, Oxford University

The “butterfly defect” of globalisation: Responding to systemic risk in interconnected systems

It’s a huge privilege to be on this panel and to be able to reflect on this extraordinary time in human history which we live in.

Trying to make sense of this time is more complex than at any previous moment in history, because there are more actors engaged from more places. We’ve moved to a world of over six and a half billion out of the seven and a half billion in the world now connected, shaping our lives, and this makes this the most optimistic time in human history. There are more reasons to be cheerful, there are more reasons to be optimistic that we live in a time in history which can solve many of the greatest challenges which have faced humanity for time immemorial. There is no reason why cancer cannot be cured in our lifetimes. There is no reason why poverty cannot be overcome. There is no reason why any of the great challenges we face cannot be addressed, and the reason I’m optimistic is because there is more brainpower in the world released, there is more creativity. There is more genius unlocked. There are more teams working on problem-solving than ever in history, and we know more.

We have lifted our veil of innocence. No-one can say they do not understand what is happening in the world. No-one can pretend that people are not dying of starvation. No-one can pretend that inequality is not growing. No-one can
pretend that climate change is not happening. No-one can pretend that the oceans are not being wrecked, biodiversity not being destroyed. The science, the evidence, the expertise that we have at our fingertips is greater than ever in history. And so we live in this paradoxical moment – where we know more, where we have more capability, and yet we are more confused.

We are not optimistic. We fear the future. We wonder, whether this indeed will not be our best century, but perhaps our final century, in which we destroy each other and the planet in ways which were unimaginable in the past. And so this paradox between huge potential to resolve problems, and knowledge which gives us the means to do so, and the dangers that we face makes this moment the most precious one in human history. Our choices are more important than the choices that our parents and grandparents and their previous generations faced, because our power is greater; because our knowledge is greater, and because with that comes the potential to do great good and to do great harm.

One of the great changes that we face, is that now as individuals we have powers that only nation states had before. Small groups of individuals and indeed even a single individual can now create a bio pathogen like measles or smallpox on a drone, and fly it down our high streets, our banking sectors and create a global pandemic. Small groups of individuals can destroy the internet; small groups of individuals can create problems which destroy big institutions, like Volkswagen, like Barings Bank, like Lehman brothers, like so many others.

And with this comes a responsibility and a recognition that our own actions spill over into the world of others in new ways. When we were poorer, when we lived in villages, our actions had little effect on those in the world, but now that we are wealthier, now that we are more connected, everything we do has an impact on others, and so this tension between individual and collective outcomes is more acute than ever in history.

When I decide to have sushi, that’s a wonderful freedom of choice, that my income level and the diversity of the world gives me, but at the same time my choice is affecting the future of tuna in the oceans. When I decide to fly to this wonderful place of Rhodes, my decision is impacting on carbon emissions and therefore climate change. When I decide to take antibiotics, it’s a great thing that will improve my life and those of all the loved ones around me, but that decision will raise the prospect of antibiotic resistance in the world. And so this tension between our own decisions and those of others becomes more acute, and that’s why the tension between the market and freedoms, and responsibilities becomes more acute; because as we become wealthier and more connected, our freedoms are associated with others’ constraints. And so how we think about ourselves in the future, and how we think about our countries – because what operated the individual at a community level is of course amplified at the country level – becomes more and more acute.

We’re in a period of history which I think of as “Globalisation 2.0”, and the first great period of globalisation was of course the first Age of Discovery. It was a period that we celebrate 500 years later, because it led to the spread of creativity, of technologies, of transformation, that moved this part of the world, Europe,
from being one of the most backward places in the world in the 1450’s, to by far the most advanced by the 1550s. And this of course was the Renaissance.

It was an age of discovery, which we celebrate because it changed perspective; it changed not only the perspective of art, of creativity, the Michelangelo’s, Da Vinci’s etc, it changed our perspective of our place in the universe. From being Earth-centric, Copernicus and others discovering that we went around the Sun and the Sun around other stars, that there was a Universe. And of course it led from a flat Earth, to Mercator’s projection and total circumnavigation. It was a time of magnificence; it was a time that led to a huge change in the way people thought, driven by an information revolution.

Then it was the Gutenberg press. Before that, the Catholic Church had a monopoly of knowledge. Very few hand-written manuscripts existed; most people could not read and write. But with this information revolution there was a democratisation of knowledge and that’s why we had the Renaissance. And that’s what’s happening today. We’ve moved to a world where everyone can get information, and with that a release of genius, a change of perspective, which will be as significant and much greater than the Renaissance of 500 years ago.

Now, what we often don’t think about the Renaissance is that it ended in disaster. It ended in the ships that went to the New World spreading diseases that killed most Native Americans. It led, of course, to extremists taking over from the Medicis in Florence – burning books, the bonfire of the vanities, the inquisitions, and religious wars. And what it led to, of course, was a contest of ideas. It was a contest of ideas in which corruption was challenged, and in which knowledge and fake news spread, and in which some benefited greatly and others lost out due to globalisation. The spices that came back from the New World, the furs and the gold, were not enjoyed by most people, and the scribes were put out of work.

Today, we face the prospect of the internet and connectivity leading to leaps in creativity. Artificial intelligence and robotics, we estimate in the Oxford Martin School will put up to half of US workers out of work within the next 20 years. About 40 percent of Europeans are vulnerable to machine intelligence and robotics. A much higher share of people in middle-income manufacturing countries like China and Mexico, South Africa, and others are vulnerable. Over 60 percent. We’re in a world of such rapid change that far from it becoming more “flat”, as my friend Tom Friedman suggests, it is becoming much more mountainous. Being in the right place at the right time with the right skills, having flexibility to change your profession, get to the cities where the dynamism is, is more important than ever.

In this mountainous world, inequality is growing extremely rapidly. All places experiencing rapid integration – call it globalisation if you want – are experiencing rapidly-rising inequality. This not simply income inequality, it is health inequality too. If you want to understand why people voted for Trump, it’s because their chances of moving home are lower than their parents’; their life expectancy in the Midwest, as Angus Deaton and others have shown, is lower than their parents’. Globalisation has been extremely beneficial on average, but it has created much more uneven distribution of outcomes. This is true across
Europe as well, at least not the places in the dynamic cities like Paris that voted for Marine Le Pen, or New York and San Francisco that voted for Trump, or London that voted for Brexit, or Berlin, Munich, and Frankfurt that voted for AfD.

It is the places locked out of change. People are not rejecting change; they are rejecting the lack of inclusion of this process, and the increasing uneven consequences of globalisation. They’re also rejecting experts because the experts don’t know how to manage integrated complex systems. It was the best expert’s system in the world – finance, with our central banks, with our treasuries, our IMF and other wonderful institutions, highly paid, with a very narrow mandate, financial stability, that brought us the financial crisis. Over twenty thousand PhDs even from great institutions like Oxford, brought you the financial crisis. And so when people distrust authority and experts and they look at the absolute scandal of the European Union and its relationship with Volkswagen diesel emissions, and say “We don’t trust experts, we don’t trust authority, these people do not know how to manage globalisation.”

And they’re right. We don’t know how to manage it. We don’t know how to manage either the rising inequality it brings because the world is more mountainous, or what I call in a previous book, the “butterfly defect” of globalisation, which is systemic risk, which comes out of interconnected systems. Now the solution is not to be found, I believe, in a withdrawal, in protectionism, nationalism, xenophobia. There is no wall high enough that will keep out climate change. There is no wall high enough that will keep out a pandemic. There is no wall high enough that will keep out the biggest risks but the good ideas is what they keep out. And they keep out the technologies and people that will help us find solutions. Most of all what high walls keep out is the most important way we can resolve these problems, which is cooperation by working together. And what worries me about this tendency we’re seeing in the world at the moment, is it’s reducing our ability to cooperate.

So my hope for the future, building out of this wonderful forum, is that we can work together, because the opportunities are greater than ever, and the risks are greater.
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Personal privacy and national independence in the digital era

I have been working in IT-security for 23 years and witnessed how the technologies grew, evolved and changed our lives. Unfortunately, together with all the benefits, the new technologies brought to the world a new order. The ability to control and manipulate people has grown tremendously – from imposing certain predefined “values” into human heads to a possibility to orchestrate so called “colour” revolutions and massive unrests and then support them by information campaigns in media and social media.

The more data and the better technologies for analysis – the more possibilities to manipulate and impose a will of those who possess the technology. The idea of getting to know everything about everybody is so attractive that I don’t believe that technological giants, which gather most of people’s data in the globe, will ever stop at some point. Instead, they will imagine and create even better and more innovative ways to assemble data from people and use it successfully.

Let’s see a recent initiative in China, which announced that it will implement a scoring system for 700 million Chinese citizens. The system will add a plus if a person does something ‘right’ and a minus if he or she acts wrong. But who will decide what is wrong and what is good? Would it probably be an artificial intelligence? An AI instead of God to judge good or bad and to put a mark on a person. Unfortunately, I believe China will not stay alone in this, predicted by George Orwell, way.
Modern technologies not only spy on people. They also spy on many industrial objects. And with the development of 4th industry revolution they will be implemented in most of the plants, factories, energy stations, etc. Already now there is no need to start a nuclear attack or a military operation. It is possible to remotely blow up a plant or an energy station by using internet sensors, which are now connected to most of those objects to remotely control security. The Internet of Things provides wonderful opportunities to both hackers and technology providers.

So, when we are talking about the future, I can imagine the future world will:

- Have no place for a privacy;
- No chance to express an opinion which contradicts to the ‘right’ one;
- No chances for local governments to conduct an independent politics.

The thoughts and ways of the countries development will be decided by some country, which possesses most of global technologies. Countries which do not have a digital sovereignty will be in a vulnerable position and will unavoidably fall under a digital colonisation. The digital colonisation is a new form of colonisation which allows for the control of countries governments, their elites, and even their citizens through modern technologies much better than any weapons beforehand.

What can be done to prevent such a scenario? The countries, which want digital independence for themselves and their citizens should join forces to create or replicate their own technologies, which will handle the benefits of new ITs, but contain less risks for surveillance and remote control from the outside.

Some speakers before me mentioned creation of regional organisations. I believe that a very important task of them must be discussion about joint development of the new technologies.

Ladies and gentlemen, we still have a small chance to create a multipolar world, where personal privacy and right of a nation to choose its own way will still be possible.

*The views and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the original author(s) and do not necessarily represent or reflect the views and opinions of the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute, its co-founders, or its staff members.*
Summit 1: Globalisation and the future of democracy

MODERATOR:
Vaclav Klaus, president of the Czech Republic (2003-2013)

PANELLISTS:
Walter Schwimmer, secretary general of the Council of Europe (2004-2009), co-founder of the DOC Research Institute
Keping Yu, dean of the School of Government, director of the Research Center for Chinese Politics, Peking University
Jan Figel, special envoy for the Promotion of Freedom of Religion or Belief Outside the EU, European Commission
Abouzar Ebrahim Ebrahimi Torkaman, head of the Islamic Culture and Relations Organisation (ICRO)
Themis Papadimopoulos, consultant; former ambassador, Youth Time - Greece

The panel began by addressing the failure of existing economic models in meeting expectations, while slow, non-inclusive economic growth and the decline of global trade demonstrate that self-regulated open markets have not become the growth engines for economies as was expected. Keping Yu advocated for new forms of cooperation, arguing that existing models of global governance fail to meet the needs of globalisation. Jan Figel called for the need to respect plurality, emphasising that freedom of religion is an essential element of human dignity.
Fighting ignorance and tackling the absence of reason are duties of modern religious leaders, Abouzar Ebrahimi Torkaman stressed. Walter Schwimmer pointed to the growing influence of populist parties as resulting from a lack of inclusive domestic policies, and warned against the power of fake news in the era of digital media.
Leaders’ club meeting

MODERATOR:
Vladimir Yakunin, co-founder and chairman of the Supervisory Board, DOC Research Institute

PARTICIPANTS:
Goodluck Jonathan, president of Nigeria (2005-2010)
Dioncounda Traoré, president of Mali (2012-2013)
Vaclav Klaus, president of the Czech Republic (2003-2013)
Walter Schwimmer, secretary general of the Council of Europe (2004-2009), co-founder of the DOC Research Institute
Jan Figel, special envoy for the Promotion of Freedom of Religion or Belief Outside the European Union, European Commission
Ian Goldin, professor of Globalisation and Development, Oxford University, Vice-president of World Bank (2003-2006)
Ruben Vardanyan, social entrepreneur and impact investor
Peter W. Schulze, professor, Georg-August University of Göttingen, co-founder of the DOC Research Institute

This first inaugural Leaders Club meeting addressed the fundamental importance of education as the key to a sustainable future for humankind.

Goodluck Jonathan and Dioncounda Traoré both stated that the increased dissemination of knowledge is vital to unlocking the vast potential of their continent’s young generation. They also stressed that broadening access to scientific research and factual information must be accompanied by the transfer of an ability to discern value. Confronted with the threat of Boko Haram, a
jihadist group that fundamentally opposes “Western” education, Goodluck Jonathan advocated “religious literacy” as an educational objective in its own right.

Ian Goldin stressed that education, in particular post-secondary school education, should not be seen as a panacea for all of society’s ills. If it is not accompanied by a sense of perspective and an overall scenario of growth and development, education can even backfire. He pointed to the relatively high percentage of university educated individuals among suicide bombers and jihadists.

The level of complexity around the issue became clear during the discussion of migration and its causes. Walter Schwimmer gave the example of an Austrian-financed university in Burkina Faso as proof that a properly educated young generation is less prone to leave their home country and emigrate. Graduates of that particular institution, Schwimmer said, instead seek to pursue their careers in Burkina Faso and can be seen in leadership positions throughout the country.

Others, such as Jan Figel, were more sceptical, and stressed the fact that with higher education comes the ambition to improve one’s position in life. If their home country does not offer the anticipated opportunities, the lure of greener pastures elsewhere becomes almost impossible to resist.

Dioncounda Traoré gave a powerful description of the pulling power that an education and a life in France or the US effect on his young compatriots. He also said he views the concept of transnational citizenship and identity as matter of fact. Migration is, he said, the hallmark of our age, whether we want it or not.

Ruben Vardanyan, who the day before received an award for his special contribution to the Dialogue of Civilizations, pointed to his fellow Armenians as example of a people who are highly skilled at adapting to new challenges. He said that, due to historical circumstances most Armenians live outside their homeland, and they remain both faithful to their Armenian roots and responsive to their foreign environment, be it Singapore, France, Iran or the USA. Ruben Vardanyan in particular noted that global citizens who have a local identity and education play a key role. This means that teachers bear particular responsibility for preparing coming generations for this globalised world.
Summit 2: Global infrastructure development scenarios: where the interests of banks, industries, governments and societies meet

MODERATORS:
Dmitris Psarrakis, economic and monetary policy advisor, European Parliament
Djoomart Otorbaev, prime minister of the Kyrgyz Republic (2014 - 2015)

PANELLISTS:
Vladimir Yakunin, co-founder and chairman of the Supervisory Board, DOC Research Institute
Santhosh Jayaram, partner & head, Climate Change & Sustainability, KPMG
Vicky Kefalas, investment committee member, European Fund for Strategic Investments, European Investment Bank
Ian Goldin, professor of Globalisation and Development, Oxford University
Ruben Vardanyan, social entrepreneur and impact investor
Li Xiguang, director, International Center for Communication, Tsinghua University
Richard Werner, chair in International Banking, University of Southampton
Andrey Klepach, deputy chairman (chief economist) and board member, Vnesheconombank

The summit explored the most ambitious current projects for reaching regional cooperation agreements on economic, political, and governance issues. These included the potential of the One Belt, One Road (OBOR) initiative, and possibilities for how Public Private Partnerships (PPP) can contribute to states’ infrastructure development goals, as well as bringing together the interests of banks, industries, governments, and societies.
Vladimir Yakunin noted that infrastructure development has to be based upon long-term development goals and take into account all effects it has on various industries of the economy and on the society as a whole. Therefore, he advocated, global civil society should provide its expertise and advice as to what infrastructure projects would better serve people’s needs. Ian Goldin drew attention to the fact that PPP projects can, in fact, incur far greater liabilities and costs than if governments are solely responsible for them. Andrey Klepach made the point that Russia has the opportunity to offer an alternative system for cyber security to the US. Richard Werner argued that small and medium-sized enterprises need external funding. This could be provided by small, not-for-profit banks.
Politics panel (challenges): *Never again: people’s demand for a new global security architecture*

**MODERATOR:**
Walter Schwimmer, secretary general of the Council of Europe (2004-2009), co-founder of the DOC Research Institute

**PANELLISTS:**
Vladimir Yakunin, co-founder and chairman of the Supervisory Board, DOC Research Institute
Hans Köchler, president, International Progress Organization
Sergey Markedonov, associate professor, Russian State University for the Humanities
Piotr Dutkiewicz, professor of Political Science, director, Center for Governance and Public Policy, Carleton University
Kumiko Haba, professor, Aoyama Gakuin University, and vice president, International Studies Association
Claude Béglé, member of the Swiss Federal Parliament

The guiding principle of the panel was that in view of the crises that the unipolar hegemonic order has generated, only a multipolar constellation can guarantee peaceful relations within the international community.

The first step towards achieving a sustainable transformation must be the “renovation of terminology”, as advocated by Vladimir Yakunin, who warned against using old phrases for describing new events and socio-political
developments in the global arena. Part of the transformation of the global order must be the stronger involvement of civil society in the construction of a new political architecture, he insisted.

The crisis we are witnessing is structural, not personal or situational, explained Piotr Dutkiewicz. Therefore, trust-building and fear-reduction are crucial tasks at the international level. With regard to possible means of cooperation between Russia and the West, Dutkiewicz suggested creating an OSCE-like organisation, devoted to combatting terrorism. The need for multipolarity as the only alternative to the hegemony of one superpower was also emphasised by Hans Köchler, who expressed the view that the lack of a system of enforceable norms with a clear mechanism of enforcement is one of the key reasons for the numerous predicaments within the international community. In this sense, a reform of the UN such as through the enlargement of the UN Security Council will not solve the essence of the problem.

Outlining a possible common security agenda for relations between Russia and the West, Sergey Markedonov advocated a realistic assessment of the current state of affairs, calling for the rehabilitation of ‘Realpolitik’ as an approach. Markedonov insisted that national interests, geopolitical concerns, and spheres of influence are recognised as legitimate elements of state policy. Along with this line of thinking, he urged the public and political representatives not to be “hostages of political correctness”.

Kumiko Haba spoke of the need to institutionalise security in Asia in order to avoid war between nations in the region and to strengthen cooperation between them in the sphere of economics and security, and between civil society actors, including think tanks.

Another key issue mentioned during the panel by Claude Béglé is the disconnect between the legislator and reality, which proves particularly problematic when policies that require technical expertise must be implemented, such as policies to address cyber threats, low-technology terrorism, and climate change.
Politics panel (solutions): Beyond the world of clashes: Towards a multipolar order

MODERATOR:
Raffaele Marchetti, senior assistant professor in International Relations, LUISS University

PANELLISTS:
Peter Schulze, professor, University of Göttingen, co-founder of the DOC Research Institute
Jia Qingguo, dean of the Department of diplomacy, School of International Studies, Peking University
Richard Sakwa, professor of Russian and European Politics, University of Kent
Alexey Malashenko, chief researcher, DOC Research Institute
Adrian Pabst, reader in Politics, University of Kent
Alexander Dubowy, researcher, University of Vienna

The ongoing transformation of the global order and possible ways of cooperating on the international level towards achieving a multipolar order were discussed in detail at this panel. The panellists agreed that the United States’ quest for unipolar dominance is increasingly being challenged by new actors who demand an equal role on the international scene. Richard Sakwa spoke of an emerging ‘anti-hegemonic alignment’, formed most notably by China and Russia, as a bloc that rejects the idea of blocs in their entirety, and not as an ‘anti-Western’ bloc.

Referring to the ongoing discussions within think tanks around the world about the future orientation of Russian domestic and foreign policy, Peter Schulze
warned about the risk of Russia’s self-isolation and militarisation of its society and politics. Changes in relations between Russia and the West will be of particular importance to future developments of the European order, he argued.

The argument about the severity and complexity of the current crisis was shared by Adrian Pabst according to who we are witnessing a ‘meta’ (not cyclical) crisis, characterised by political insecurity, the lack of economic prosperity and a contest of values and ideas (both within countries and on the international level). These economic and security concerns are responsible for the citizen revolts against the liberal world order that we are witnessing.

A critique of the universalisation of values also came from Jia Qinguo who advocated for the need to respect values that are characteristic of specific countries. In light of the current developments and international players’ diverging interests and visions regarding the future order, the panellists showed restrained optimism regarding finding a common project.

Despite the worrisome state of affairs and dim prospects for solving the crisis anytime soon, growing regional competition, as Alexander Dubowy put it, does not exclude global cooperation, and must be strived for by all means.
Society panel (challenges): Social mobility and migration: Through the prism of values and cultures

MODERATORS:
Brunson McKinley, former director general, International Organization for Migration
Anne-Marie Buschman-Petit, co-chair, Association for International Mobility

PANELLISTS:
Vaclav Klaus, president of the Czech Republic (2003-2013)
Ruben Vardanyan, social entrepreneur and impact investor
Anatol Lieven, senior researcher, New America Foundation
Demetri Papademetriou, president, MPI Europe
Catherine Walsh, professor, Universidad Andina Simon Bolivar
Ivan Juric, advisor, John Latsis Foundation

The panellists offered their views on migration and its impact on societies, with diverging views coming to the forefront of the conversation. Special attention was paid to the interplay between migration, social mobility, and common values; questions of cultural and religious identity; the future of migration policies; and media coverage of migration and refugee flows.

Opinions on the topic ranged from sceptical attitudes towards receiving immigrants and the probability of integrating them, to a more nuanced stance
towards migration that reflected the complexity of the issue, rather than boiling it down to a dichotomy.

The current refugee crisis in the Mediterranean revealed substantial policy conflicts within the European Union between those countries which are in favour of an open-door policy and those rejecting multiculturalism, said Anatol Lieven. According to Anne-Marie Buschman-Petit, the degradation of women’s rights in Western societies that host a large number of Muslim immigrants, societal divisions, and progressing ghetto-isation is troublesome and should not be ignored.

Nevertheless, as Ruben Vardanyan pointed out, migration will continue and must be accepted as a given fact. Efforts to stop migration have largely failed, an example of which is the Roman Empire. Therefore, rather than trying to prevent migration, a sustainable approach towards integrating immigrants must be developed. The need for effective management of migration by governments was acknowledged by Demetrios Papademetriou who warned that dismissing the people’s concerns regarding mass migration provides fertile ground for nationalism and populism.
Society panel (solutions): Challenges to humanity — traditionalism vs. postmodernity

MODERATORS:
Nataliya Yakunina, chairman, Board of Trustees, Sanctity of Motherhood All-Russian Programme
Larry Jacobs, managing director of the World Congress of Families

PANELLISTS:
Jean-Christophe Bas, founder and president, Global Compass
Brian Brown, president, World Congress of Families
Fred Dallmayr, professor of philosophy and political science, University of Notre Dame
Irina Nikiflina, president, Musical Olympus Foundation
Igor Ashmanov, managing partner, Ashmanov and Partners
Scherto Gill, executive secretary and research fellow, Guerrand-Hermes Foundation for Peace
Theresa Okafor, director, Foundation of African Cultural Heritage

Fred Dallmayr opened the session, stating that dialogue is needed more than ever and the newly established DOC RI, situated at the heart of Europe, can play an important role in fostering mutual understanding and dialogue. Dallmayr is convinced that the unipolar world order is ending and that we are witnessing the emergence of a multi-polar world with powerful actors like the US, China, and Russia.
Scherto Gill asserted that values grow from the distillation of everyday rituals and the traditions of families and societies, modified on a daily basis by the development of our knowledge, allowing each generation to build on the knowledge and wisdom of the generation before. According to Gill, the crisis of postmodernity does not necessarily arise from a loss of traditional values, nor the foundations that give rise to these values, but instead, it is due to the multiplicity of moral sources that determine what count as good.

Theresa Okafor talked about what she refers to as a ‘new global ethics of totalitarianism in the West’. The rejection of Western values, according to Okafor, is at the root of the cultural and civilisational foundation behind the resilience of many African countries. Irina Nikitina gave a brief presentation, featuring video clips of various initiatives that used music as a means to either foster dialogue or unite diverse groups of people around a social cause. For instance, a collaboration between young Palestinian, Lebanese, and Israeli musicians resulted in an orchestral performance that brought awareness to the conflict in that particular region.

Jean-Christophe Bas spoke about how new technologies, the globalisation of the economy, and migration have impacted relations and interaction among people, sometimes generating hate speech, radicalisation, and extremism. However, he also said that technology and globalisation allow direct connections, exchanges among different societies, and fill cultural gaps.

Igor Ashmanov had a more critical viewpoint regarding the post-modern relationship with technology. He argued that younger generations, and more liberal populations, have in fact embraced technology, specifically social media, as a new form of God. Brian Brown said that the heteronormative, traditional concept of family is the only acceptable makeup of a household. He also discussed how pro-family, pro-life, and anti-gay marriage organisations and activists in the US are continuously attacked for their beliefs by the liberal, pro-choice, pro-gay marriage groups.
Economic panel (challenges): *The impact of new technologies and digitalisation on society*

**MODERATORS:**
- Eva Kaili, member of the European Parliament (PASOK), Greece
- Rob van Kranenburg, digital entrepreneur

**PANELLISTS:**
- Natalya Kaspersky, president, InfoWatch
- Spiros Margaris, founder, Margaris Advisory
- Vinod Pandey, head of government and external affairs, BMW India
- Wolfgang Pinegger, founder and CEO, GLBrain
- Jens Wendland, lecturer, University of the Arts and Humboldt University

The panel addressed the potential value and possible challenges of new technologies. The main discussion was about how new technologies and complex phenomena such as Big Data could be used for the common good. Eva Kaili opened the panel by pointing out that there are strings attached to new technologies like geo-blocking and price discrimination.

Overall, Kaili emphasised the need to embrace new technologies and to get the best out of it for users. Rob van Kranenburg talked about the disruptive force of this wave of technology, which has accelerated after storage capacity dramatically increased in the 2000s. Spiros Margaris discussed the opportunities
that can be derived from technological advances and how the fintech industry could contribute to the common good via fairer bank fees and interest rates.

Jens Wendland reflected on how the discourse about digitalisation and globalisation will fundamentally change. He noted that geopolitical shifts will move digitalisation away from the domination of the US towards a multipolar digital world order. This will be marked by the rise of the new economic, political, and military power of China and the strengthening of the BRICS group.

Wolfgang Pinegger presented his ideas on how the internet could help bridge the gap between developed and developing regions. He argued that the internet can enable local economic development. He stressed the fact that Africa, and India to some extent, will see the greatest increase in internet usage.

Natalya Kaspersky began by stating that she dislikes new technologies and if she had the choice she would prohibit them altogether. She expressed doubts that international treaties will stop the criminal use of technology, because important stakeholders, such as multinational corporations, are driven by wishes for dominance and profit from unrestricted access to Big Data.

Vinod Pandey spoke about new trends in mobility, especially with regards to his company BMW. In his presentation, Pandey talked about the new directional shift in mobility – with electric mobility, shared mobility, and digital gadgets being the most prominent developments.
Economic panel (solutions): Alternative economic models – curbing inequality

MODERATORS:
Fred Harrison, director, Land Research Trust
Manuel Montes, senior advisor on Finance and Development, The South Centre

PANELLISTS:
Holger Heims, CEO, Falcon Equity Group
Ian Goldin, professor of Globalisation and Development, Oxford University
Daisuke Kotegawa, senior advisor, PWC Arata, and research director, CANON Institute for Global Studies
Vladimir Popov, research director in Economics and Politics, DOC Research Institute
Jayshree Sengupta, senior research fellow, Observer Research Foundation

The panel dealt with the question of how the current global economic system needs to be adjusted in order to tackle the challenges of rising inequality and political disenchantment of parts of the population. Manuel Montes opened the discussion with the statement that the conclusion of a number of investment treaties that also included the protection of intellectual property can partly be blamed for existing inequalities between the Global South and North. Ian Goldin began his speech by stating that the world economy has been quite prosperous in recent decades and that this was related to the spread of markets in almost all parts of the world. He underlined the roles of India and China in pulling millions of people out of poverty. Goldin acknowledged that recent growth is extremely
unequally distributed, with the top one percent of the world’s population profiting the most, and rural regions increasingly losing out. Vladimir Popov argued that intra-country inequality has been on the rise since the 1980s in a majority of countries worldwide. He provided historical data on the relation between the income levels of the wealthiest vis-à-vis per capita GDP and showed that today’s super wealthy are far richer in relation to average income than before. Jayshree Sengupta was highly critical of the role of the IMF as a loan-making institution. When India received loans the IMF ordered the Indian government to reduce the budget. This resulted in less spending on education, health, and agriculture and was hard on the weakest link in Indian society: the lowest castes were left behind.

Daisuke Kotegawa agreed with the criticism of the IMF and stated that during the Asian financial crisis in 1997 the IMF opposed the introduction of capital controls although this would potentially have been proven an appropriate measure to curb the crisis. He further stated that for the sake of economic progress the world requires fewer investments into questionable financial documents, but rather a return to commercial funding and manufacturing.

Fred Harrison presented ideas on the future of economic development and the possibility of another global economic crisis in the next eight to nine years. In particular, he argued that in many countries today essential changes and reforms are needed. Firstly, to improve the intolerable living conditions for most of the world’s population, even in wealthier countries. Secondly, ill-informed decisions made by governments have persuaded people that there is something fundamentally wrong in the approach of policymakers. Holger Heims singled digitalisation out as the main driver of inequality. He argued that investments in knowledge and infrastructure are key to economic success, especially for African countries. However, these investments should not just be made by the private sector, but national governments have to be involved too and have to be accountable for the outcome of these investments.
Special session (Europe refugee crisis): Crisis response from rhetoric to reality

Moderated by writer and broadcast journalist Mary Dejevsky, this special session was comprised of humanitarian workers who have direct experience with the refugee crisis. The first speaker, Jana Boulus, Programme Coordinator for a Palestinian organisation, Humanity Crew, spoke about her direct experience in Greece working with refugees coming primarily from Syria. She emphasised the point that the ‘European refugee crisis’ goes beyond Europe, as Syria’s neighbours have far more refugees within their borders. Fintan Drury, a former journalist, businessman, and volunteer who worked in Greece and the Balkans with refugees, argued that a more human-focused approach to refugee work needs to be employed, as it is Europe’s duty as fellow human beings. Lucy Popescu, a writer working with refugees resettling in the UK, also stressed the point that refugees from Muslim countries are no different from Europeans when it comes to their basic needs, wishes, and goals in life. Therefore, we should reconsider approaching refugee crises in such a Eurocentric manner.
Closing panel: **DOC as a global think tank**

*MULTIPOLARITY AND DIALOGUE IN REGIONAL AND GLOBAL DEVELOPMENTS: IMAGINING POSSIBLE FUTURES*

**MODERATOR:**
Jiahong Chen, research director in Society and Culture, DOC Research Institute

**PANELLISTS:**
Peter Schulze, professor, University of Göttingen, co-founder of the DOC Research Institute
Alexey Malashenko, senior researcher, DOC Research Institute
Vladimir Popov, research director in economics & political science, DOC Research Institute
Raffaele Marchetti, senior assistant professor in international relations, LUISS University

The priorities of the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute were discussed during the final panel, “DOC reflection as a global think tank”. The session introduced the DOC’s research in critical areas such as the importance of inclusive infrastructural development, the need for alternative economic paradigms, the role of civilisational values in combating terrorism, and the vitality of restoring innate human values in societies across the world. It also provided an overview of the DOC’s research output since its launch in July 2016.

The panel brought together leading experts from the organisation to analyse major economic, political, and social trends and offer their insights. Peter Schulze, who has significant expertise in European–Russian relations, emphasised that as an international think tank, the DOC aims to address pressing social and political issues from a global perspective.
Alexey Malashenko shared critical thoughts on religion, conflict, migration in Europe, and the post-Soviet transition. His future research will investigate ways by which conflicts in the Middle East can be defused during a period of civilisational transition and will explore how Islam can contribute to world peace.

Vladimir Popov warned that rising income inequality over the last three decades in most countries has created favourable grounds for the rise of nationalist and anti-globalisation feelings. When globalisation is properly managed, it is good for growth and income distribution and does not lead to ethno-populism and nationalism, he argued. But if it is accompanied by a decline in real incomes for a large mass of people, nationalist political forces gain additional arguments for instigating anti-globalisation and isolationist sentiments.

Raffaele Marchetti said that migration should be seen as a major topic for DOC Research Institute. In cooperation with DOC, he launched the World Politics and Dialogue of Civilizations series – the first issue of which is Debating Migration to Europe – shortly before the Rhodes Forum.

All panellists emphasised that through our major areas of research, the DOC will continue to promote dialogue as a means for the protection of humanity’s future.
We want to conduct charitable projects which will impact Armenia’s future, helping it shift from the model of survival, which dominates today, to one of prosperity. We’re trying to restore people’s belief that the impossible is possible by creating mechanisms to implement complex, massive projects...

I like social entrepreneurship. I like to create a chain reaction. However, it’s very important to make it self-sufficient, like a business. Just giving money is not enough; you need to provide execution, execution, execution...

I don’t think charity is just emotions, you need to do something that is self-sustainable. It needs to be very professional, very systematic and results orientated...

Ruben Vardanyan
Ruben Vardanyan is an Armenian-Russian impact investor and social entrepreneur, co-founder and chairman of RVVZ Foundation. Previously, he served as CEO and chairman of Troika Dialog, one of the oldest and largest investment banks in Russia and the CIS, before the merger with Sberbank in January 2012. He serves on the advisory boards of the IFC (World Bank Group) and Fundação Dom Cabral business school in Brazil. He is also a board member at Ameriabank (a major Armenian bank), SOLLERS (Russia’s auto major) amongst a host of other companies, NGOs, public and professional organizations. Mr Vardanyan is a board member at numerous entities in Russia and abroad, including universities and business schools in Japan, Brazil and Russia. He is a founding partner of Moscow School of Management SKOLKOVO and vice-chairman of SKOLKOVO International Advisory Board.

An active philanthropist in both Russia and Armenia, developing a commercial approach that relies on involving blended financing to find solutions to social problems, Ruben Vardanyan is engaged in a number of development projects and is leading several initiatives aimed at advancing Armenia, including helping to open UWC Dilijan College, a world-class educational institution in Armenia. Opened in 2014, UWC Dilijan, the first UWC college in Eastern Europe and the CIS, has today students from 72 nations. It has become a catalyst for change not only for the town of Dilijan but also for the entire region.

In 2015, Ruben Vardanyan co-founded the Aurora Humanitarian Initiative on behalf of the survivors of the Armenian Genocide and in gratitude to their saviours. The Initiative seeks to empower modern-day saviours to offer life and hope to those in urgent need of basic humanitarian aid and thus continue the cycle of giving internationally. It includes the Aurora Prize for Awakening Humanity, the Aurora Dialogues, the Aurora Humanitarian Index, the Gratitude Projects and the 100 LIVES Initiative.

Ruben Vardanyan has been actively involved in the WPF Dialogue of Civilizations, the DOC Research Institute and the Rhodes Forum development. He has received numerous awards and honours and has been recognized for his leadership and reputation within the financial community.
SPEAKERS
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Spiros Margaris, founder, Margaris Advisory – Greece
Sergey Markedonov, associate professor, Russian State University for the Humanities – Russia
Brunson McKinley, co-chair of the Association for International Mobility – USA
Walter Mignolo, director, Center for Global Studies and the Humanities, Duke University – USA
Manuel Montes, senior advisor on Finance and Development, the South Centre – USA
Irina Nikitina, president of Musical Olympus Foundation – Russia
Theresa Okafor, director of the Foundation for African Cultural Heritage – Nigeria
Adrian Pabst, reader in politics, University of Kent – UK
Vinod Pandey, head of Government Affairs, BMW – India
Demetrios Papademetriou, president of MPI Europe, president emeritus of MPI – USA
Themis Papadimopoulos, consultant; former ambassador, of the Youth Time – Greece
Wolfgang Pinegger, founder and CEO, GLBrain – Austria
Lucy Popescu, writer – UK
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LA CROIX (France), 10 October 2017
Rhodes Forum acknowledges that “international relations are being controlled by fear”
“A lack of trust and fear is controlling international relations” stated Piotr Dutkiewicz, university professor from Ottawa, from the podium of the 15th Rhodes Forum. [...] Something of a mini-Davos with a view of the Turkish coast, the Rhodes Forum annually brings together politicians, former leaders, researchers and the heads of business circles from across the globe. [...]

BNE (UK), 30 October 2017
Rhodes Forum 2017 - a blueprint for dialogue
This year the Rhodes Forum turns 15 years. Ordinarily, one would not consider the mid-teenage years as an age of great maturity. But then, the Rhodes Forum is not an ordinary forum, and the 21st century – itself only in late adolescence at 18 years old – is no ordinary century [...]

LES ECHOS (France), 7 October 2017
De Villepin: The world is facing a serious threat of nuclear weapons proliferation
[...] In an interview at the 15th Rhodes Forum held on Friday and Saturday by the Berlin think tank Dialogue of Civilizations and presided over by Vladimir Yakunin, the former Prime Minister of France (under President Jacques Chirac) Dominique de Villepin, asserted that this refusal would “lead to completely opposite results in North Korea” [...].

BNE (UK), 10 October 2017
The quiet thunder of Ruben Vardanian
[...] The leitmotif of Vardanian’s career has been wealth creation. We met on the sidelines of the Dialogue of Civilisations annual meeting on the island of Rhodes where academics and leading politicians meet to discuss the world’s ills. [...]

LA CROIX (France), 10 October 2017
An ambiguous message for North Korea
[...] The 15th Rhodes Forum was held on the island of Rhodes, in Greece, from Friday, October 6 through Saturday, October 7 [...] Former heads of state, experts, university professors, high-ranking international officials and business executives from more than 30 countries discussed the risks and prospects of a world characterized by the emergence of new centres of power and a relative weakening of US dominance [...].

LES ECHOS (France), 6 November 2017
Africa’s unsolvable demographic equation
“If we don’t reduce the size of our families, our country will continue to suffer from poverty, because available resources will no longer be able to satisfy our needs”. This warning, which was made in October by Goodluck Jonathan, former president of Nigeria, at the Rhodes forum held by the Dialogue of Civilizations
Research Institute, clearly indicates how this question is worrying leaders on the African continent [...].

**BNE (UK), 9 October 2017**
De Villepin says Ukraine should declare itself neutral
[...] “We live in a world of distrust. There is tension between Europe and Russia, between the countries on the shores of the South China Sea. Dialogue is the key. If you understand the fears of the person in front of you then you have made a huge step towards finding the solution to your problems,” de Villepin told bne IntelliNews on the sidelines of the Dialogue of Civilisations’ Rhodes Forum on October 6. [...] 

**BNE (UK), 8 October 2017**
**Ian Goldin, at Oxford University**
After a summer hiatus bne IntelliNews podcasts are back from the Rhodes Forum that hosts the Dialogue of Civilisations conference that brings together academics, top politicians and civil activists to discuss the problems of the world. Our editor–in–chief Ben Aris met with Ian Goldin, former vice–president of the World Bank and now a professor of Globalisation and Development at Oxford University. [...] 

**LA CROIX (France), 9 October 2017**
“*The results of the French intervention in the Sahel are very positive*”
Dioncounda Traoré, the president of Mali between 2012 to 2013, was the guest of the Rhodes Forum, organised by the Dialogue of Civilizations Research institute. This Berlin–based think tank is headed by Vladimir Yakunin, former head of the Russian Railways [...].

**BNE (UK), 13 October 2017**
**Djoomart Otorbaev, ex–PM Kyrgyzstan (2014–2015)**
Things are moving very fast in Central Asia. Following the death of Uzbek president Islam Karimov that country is rapidly opening and beginning the process of improving political and economic ties with its neighbours. [...] bne IntelliNews editor–in–chief Ben Aris sat down with Djoomart Otorbaev, former Prime Minister of Kyrgyzstan, at the Rhodes Forum that hosts the Dialogue of Civilisations conference to discuss all these issues. [...] 

**ERT TV (Greece), 8 November 2017**
The New World Order and Chinese Influence
Talk-show involving international personalities recorded on the sidelines of the Rhodes Forum. Co–production of ERT TV and the Chinese TV channel CGTN, presented by Fanis Papathanasiou and Yang Rui.

**ERT TV (Greece), 15 November 2017**
The New Silk Road and Greece
Talk-show involving international personalities recorded on the sidelines of the Rhodes Forum. Co–production of ERT TV and the Chinese TV channel CGTN, presented by Fanis Papathanasiou and Yang Rui.
ANI (India), 11 October 2017
Rhodes Forum warned against migration crises two years ago
Chairman of the Supervisory Board of the Dialogue of Civilizations (DOC) Research Institute Dr Vladimir Yakunin has highlighted Rhodes Forum’s ability to resolve and predict crises by citing the instance of European refugee crisis. […]

ANI (India), 9 October 2017
Education and migration: Challenges of our age
Political and Business leaders discussed the connections between terrorism and education and the challenges posed by migration at the 15th Rhodes Forum organised by the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute (DOC). […]

XINHUA (China), 6 October 2017
Former French PM underlines crucial role of China, Russia in world affairs at Greece forum
“International influence is restructuring around regional powers, with a shift from Western to Eastern countries,” Dominique de Villepin said at a prestigious international forum on the Rhodes Islands in Greece. […]

CAIXIN (China), 6 November 2017
Kaspersky chief: Tech firms need to consider political factors when expanding
[…] Natalya Kaspersky said on the sidelines of the Rhodes Forum which was held on the Greek island Rhodes that “the US didn’t say data breach, but potential data breach. The important word is potential.” […]

CHINA DAILY (China), 9 October 2017
Former PM underlines role of China, Russia
[...] De Villepin addressed the two-day 15th Rhodes Forum that opened on Friday, gathering politicians, thinkers and business leaders from some 70 countries and regions to discuss multipolarity and dialogue in regional and global developments. […]

CGTN (China), 24 November 2017
Multipolar world order: Opportunities and challenges
The current global order, established by the hegemonic US and founded on liberal institutions and universal values, is now being challenged by nascent counter forces. Is a multipolar world order emerging in the near future? Can the polycentric global order provide security and welfare for the international community? The questions are explored on CGTN’s Dialogue. – Talk-show involving international personalities recorded on the sidelines of the Rhodes Forum. Co-production of ERT TV and the Chinese TV channel CGTN, presented by Fanis Papathanasiou and Yang Rui.

CGTN (China), 24 November 2017
Dialogue with the world in Greece: Values under new global order
The cradle of Western civilisation, Greece has a long-established connectivity with China via the Silk Road since ancient days. Time flies. The world order is changing. And the two old civilisations have become even closer to each other under the Belt and Road initiative. For its first episode, Dialogue with the World travels to the Greek island of Rhodes to explore issues of common concern with
a group of outstanding expert commentators. Is the world going multi-polar? And what values should be put first for the well-being of all civilisations? – Talk-show involving international personalities recorded on the sidelines of the Rhodes Forum. Co-production of ERT TV and the Chinese TV channel CGTN, presented by Fanis Papathanasiou and Yang Rui.

Dialogue of Civilizations Rhodes Forum

THE PUNCH (Nigeria), 6 October 2017
Goodluck Jonathan calls for UN reform
Former President Goodluck Jonathan has called for the reform and democratisation of the United Nations in order to make it more representative and responsive to security challenges. Jonathan made the call on Friday while presenting his remarks at the opening panel of the Dialogue of Civilisations Rhodes Forum’s 15th Anniversary Summit in Greece. [...] 

VANGUARD (Nigeria), 27 October 2017
Jonathan leads NDI observation mission to Liberia’s presidential run-off
[...] Ex-President Jonathan who was initially invited as co-lead of the NDI team for the 10 October Liberian elections could not honour the invitation because of his earlier commitment to attend the 15th Rhodes Forum in Greece, where he presented a paper on ‘Multipolarity and Dialogue in Regional and Global Developments’. [...] 

CHALLENGES TN (Tunis), 5 October 2017
African leaders shine spotlight on international cooperation at Rhodes Forum
[...] The Rhodes Forum opens on Friday with a diverse array of high-profile international speakers to discuss and seek practical solutions to major global challenges being faced today [...] 

LE COMBAT (Mali), 11 October 2017
Barkhane despised in Mali: Professor Dioncounda Traoré plays the card of appeasement
[...] Invited to the Rhodes Forum, organised by the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute, a think-tank based in Berlin, Germany, the acting president of Mali at the time of the French intervention against the jihadist groups, in January 2013, presented a position contrary to those which, last Monday, manifested in Kidal to demand the departure of the French forces [...]. 

RIA NOVOSTI (Russia), 7 October 2017
Participants in the Rhodes Forum discussed morality and a multipolar world
[...] According to the ex-president of Nigeria (2010–2015) Goodluck Jonathan, the best leadership is based on conscience and inspiration, not on the strength of weapons. He also called for the reform of the UN system and its Security Council, so that more “interests of all regions of the world” were taken into account. The call for conscientiousness was supported by many forum participants from other countries of Africa, Asia and Europe, including Russia. But on the margins of the forum certain ideas of the UN reform were viewed critically. [...]

Dialogue of Civilizations Rhodes Forum
**IZVESTIA (Russia), 19 November 2017**

“We cannot hope that the Trump administration will do everything for us”

[...] Where the European Union is now, what can be the impact on it of the extravagant policy of Trump and the rise of China, on the margins of the Rhodes Forum, organised by the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute, Izvestia spoke with former French Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin. [...] 

**PRAVDA (Slovakia), 15 October 2017**

Kaspersky: It is a mistake to think that in social networks you’re only seen by your friends

At the recent annual, already the 15th Dialogue of Civilizations forum on the Greek island of Rhodes, Natalia Kaspersky, a successful entrepreneur in the field of antivirus programs, was one of the most interesting speakers. She did not theorise, but shed light on the current problems of cyberattacks and the security of ordinary mortals in the use of complex communication technologies. [...]

Former French Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin speaks to DOC TV about the future of Europe and predicts that the continent is on the road to recovery.

Former Nigerian President Goodluck Jonathan told DOC TV about his vision of global and regional governance and stressed the importance of education to sustainable development.

Professor Ian Goldin of Oxford University believes pandemics are the biggest global threat, and analyses the trust deficit in today’s politicians.

Businessman and investor Ruben Vardanyan, the laureate of the 2017 Dialogue Prize, explores how the power of education can be harnessed to drive global change.

See the DOC Research Institute’s website for full interviews: www.doc-research.org
Eva Kaili, Greek PASOK MEP, talks about how technology can help create more growth drivers and why Europe needs to work together more

Mali’s former President Dioncounda Traoré told DOC TV about his country’s experience of combatting terrorism and why hard work is the key to Africa’s future

Kyrgyzstan’s ex-Prime Minister Djoomart Otorbayev discussed the importance of China’s Belt & Road initiative to Central Asia, and why the region may be looking to international capital markets

Professor Jia Qingguo, Dean of the School of International Studies at Peking University, gives his views on the future of globalisation, and analyses potential developments of the North Korean crisis

Gakuin University Professor Kumiko Haba says a new round of six-party talks are needed to get North Korea back to negotiation, and discusses establishing a new security system to ensure global peace
Based on research conducted by the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute and contributions made by panellists and moderators during the 2017 Rhodes Forum, the DOC suggests the following policy recommendations for further development and proposal to the relevant entities.

Though not exhaustive in scope, we believe these suggestions provide a concrete starting point for future policy analysis and development.

The following policy recommendations are based on values rooted in the concept of a ‘dialogue of civilisations’, and will help guide key players in the international community towards more inclusive, equitable, and effective positions on a number of central issues.

**Institutions**

1. **Creation of civic councils**

Assemble civic councils comprised of experts, scholars, and individuals with a background in governance, who can contribute their knowledge and experience to discussions of pressing global concern and create links between countries and with international organisations.

The goal of these councils is to develop practical policies which can be realistically implemented. Civic councils will be flexible enough to respond to fast-changing events because they will represent civil society, rather than being state organisations burdened by inefficient and bureaucratic processes.

At the same time, civic councils will still have the ability to propose solutions in highly sensitive areas. Such councils should be formed for limited terms only, with a clear and specific mandate to address a precise and particular issue or conflict. They should be invariably dissolved once a plausible solution has been identified.
2. Support for global infrastructure projects similar to the One Belt, One Road/Belt and Road model

Apply the OBOR/Belt and Road as a model for further trans-national, multi-stakeholder development initiatives in a number of crucial geographies. Frameworks like OBOR/Belt and Road provide the best opportunity for a ‘win-win’ development scenario for all stakeholders, as it is a model that does not feature a dominant country.

The most important challenge will be establishing coordination and collaboration between new institutions like the AIIB, and timeworn ones like the World Bank and the IMF.

Security and conflict

3. Creation of a ‘Helsinki Conference’ for the Gulf region

Build a structure inspired by the OSCE that could help support, maintain, and extend stability in the region while also serving to reduce local powers’ engagement in proxy wars.

One key goal would be diffusing tensions between Iran and Saudi Arabia, which is a central destabilising factor in the broader region. We suggest establishing a structure inspired by the OSCE – a Helsinki Conference for the Gulf region – that would bring Iran, Saudi Arabia and other Gulf countries together to discuss the best interests of all regional powers and how to ensure cooperate in actuality.

4. Implementing the North Korean freeze plan

Build momentum towards implementing concrete de-escalation measures for the Korean peninsula. These measures would see North Korea agree to freeze nuclear missile tests in exchange for comprehensive international economic aid, to help de-escalate the situation in the immediate term.

Negotiations would follow on from a common security architecture, between Russia, China, Japan, North Korea, the United States, and South Korea. The guiding principle of this initiative is to establish an alternative to war with North Korea, which is seeking lasting security guarantees.

5. Prioritising bilateral and multilateral initiatives which address the root causes of terrorist activity

Current approaches to preventing and fighting terrorism have proven to be inadequate responses to the changing tactics of terrorist groups, and much of this is due to lack of communication and coordination on the international, national, regional, and local levels. Initiatives require nimble response from counter-terrorism related personnel across borders and between all levels of government. Counterterrorism programmes should train international groups of personnel dealing with terrorist threats, and focus on frequent and
effective dialogue between these workers, and most importantly the sharing of intelligence so that coordination efforts are streamlined.

6. Introduce cybersecurity and data protection legislation

Legislation that provides the public and governments with cyber-defence and digital sovereignty technologies, so as to safeguard against cyber security risks, should be prioritised. This legislation would include data protection laws which ensure both net neutrality and freedom of information protection.

7. Establish an international code of ethics and common rules for the use of artificial intelligence

Draft a code of ethics, establishing it via signatories and then collectively work towards outlining measures for prosecuting violations.

Economic inclusiveness

8. Creation of a balanced credit-rating system

Because of the globalisation of banking systems, there needs to be a universal tool created to assess global financial risks in a standardised and impartial way. This would be an important step in diversifying approaches to international credit rating. This would also offer the opportunity for the elements of the ranking to be considered from multiple fresh perspectives.

9. Introduce reformed protections for intellectual property rights and technology transfers

The global system of protecting intellectual property could greatly inhibit industrial development and technological adaptation in the poorest countries, where lawmakers advocate for the local implementation of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (1994).

10. Increase government support for the development of digital infrastructure

The market alone will not deliver the necessary investment in developing countries to create an adequate digital infrastructure.

In order to narrow the digital divide and bring access to poorer and middle-class communities, some public-sector spending is necessary. However, because government resources are limited, the public sector should seriously consider working with tech start-ups, as they have a more innovative capacity and ability to scale results faster.
11. Form a working group of international experts to bring together research into possible new scenarios for inclusive global development.

Research carried out under DOC auspices indicates growing global interest in new approaches to economic development, as communities and businesses look to new models to help reinforce those areas that work and identify ways of improving the economy’s resilience.

There are areas of our economies and societies that are underserved by existing models, and areas of untapped economic potential continue to be overlooked or ignored worldwide. A working group would help further work in the areas of development and economic modelling.

Migration and refugees

12. Managing the asylum process

European Union Member States’ asylum systems have been strained by the 2015-2016 influx of refugees and migrants, but so has the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) as a whole. Nations that are a part of supranational unions, such as the EU, and which voted for the adoption of common asylum rules, have to abide by them. However, they should not be subject to pressure on behalf of other Member States, in cases where there is no established procedure to tackle refugee crises of today’s scale, stemming from the ongoing wars in the Middle East and North Africa.

The European Union should acknowledge that different member states have different interests and approaches in the field of migration and integration and should have the right to develop their own policies democratically, despite their legal obligations to respect EU treaties.

Society and culture

13. Incorporate spiritual and religious leaders in conflict resolution within communities

In cases where spiritual and religious issues are of particular importance, as in instances of inter-faith tensions or community isolation, there should be established mechanisms by which civil society organisations, governments, community leaders, and spiritual and religious leaders can work together to identify and implement solutions.

Much of this work is presently carried out in parallel, with little interaction between the key players or institutional pillars. By establishing a mechanism of cooperation, communities would be better able to come together in tackling these issues.
14. Promotion of SMARTE-based programmes

Civil society organisations and members of the community, including private patrons, should fund initiatives that facilitate intercultural understanding and preserve cultural heritage based on Sports, Music, Art, Theatre, and Entertainment (SMARTE).

15. Further support for youth exchange programmes

The EU, as well as civil society and community members should continue support for youth exchange programmes and initiatives, such as Erasmus+, to boost the spirit of dialogue among young people around the world. This could be especially beneficial if there is a focus on EU countries and non-EU countries, such as Former Soviet Union.

16. Cultural education

State and local governments, local communities, education patrons, and faith leaders should work closely with one another to develop school curriculums for national and international use that include a set number of courses focusing on cultural education – which could include reading classic texts from different cultures – in order to increase cross-cultural understanding and awareness of shared values. This would help build social cohesion and understanding among communities in any one society. Due to its global nature, the course could be modular and developed along set lines – applicable in any geography.

17. Form an expert-level international working group looking at the position of families in the current economy and society

Research carried out to date by DOC has highlighted areas where supporting families as social and economic units can bring additional societal benefits – both economically and relieving pressure from state welfare systems. Families form both a central unit in our societies and a key element in any economy. As societies and views of the family evolve, this working group will bring together international insight into the role of the family.

The 2017 Rhodes Forum addressed many pressing issues, and the policy recommendations were developed combined with the DOC’s research over the past year. Clearly, current policies – at all levels of governance – are in need of reform and innovative solutions that will help the world move in a more equitable and inclusive direction. Within the dialogue of civilisations framework, and guided by further research and collaboration with experts, we will work to develop and refine comprehensive policies to do just that.
Founded in 2016, the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute is an independent think tank that researches and develops proposals that address the key challenges faced by the international community.

Rooted in a tradition of seeking dialogue-based solutions to humankind’s most pressing issues, Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute builds on the World Public Forum Dialogue of Civilizations’ (2002–2016) legacy and expertise, bringing together global thought leaders from academia, public policy, business and civil society to debate and develop practice-based policy advice. Its vision is rooted in the understanding that an open, mutually respectful and equitable dialogue is the fundamental prerequisite for effective cooperation and partnership between civilizations.

DOC Research Institute carries out research into the causes of tension and identifies opportunities for conflict resolution. It provides an independent forum enabling people around the world to work together, through the fundamental principles of dialogue, to develop applicable analyses and practical solutions for national and international policy-makers and institutions.

The Institute funds its activities with the Dialogue of Civilizations Endowment registered in Geneva, through private donations and grants, as well develops its own revenue streams through membership fees, E-library fees, conference fees, and sponsorship. DOC Research Institute is a non-partisan organisation and is independent from any national government.

It is headquarteried in Berlin, with offices in Moscow, Vienna and Delhi (starting from 2018), and counts 35 permanent employees.

DOC special reports, expert commentary, and analysis are available on its website: www.doc-research.org.
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