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The Rhodes Forum has been held annually on the Greek island of Rhodes since 2003. It is organised by the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute, previously the World Public Forum. The Rhodes Forum has brought together leaders and experts from around 70 countries to debate crucial issues facing the world.

Known for its capability of engaging 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.
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.

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.

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

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

The Dialogue of Civilizations Award is given to the President of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbaev.

10th Anniversary Rhodes Forum

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

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

The 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.

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 as part of the Rhodes Forum agenda, bringing together acting and former heads of state and government for an informal exchange of opinions and expertise aimed at increasing the role of civic institutions in policymaking.

The Dialogue of Civilizations Award is given to Ruben Vardanyan for his philanthropic activity.


The Dialogue of Civilizations Award is given to Professor Fred Dallmayr for his longstanding dedication to dialogue.
On 9 November 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 Civilisations, setting out the principles of intercultural dialogue to be defended and objectives to be achieved. The Dialogue of Civilizations emerged as a practical endeavour to implement this initiative.

Since 2003 the ‘Dialogue of Civilizations’ has held more than 250 conferences, seminars, roundtables and lectures around the world, and published more than one thousand scientific articles, reports and books. The annual major event – the Rhodes Forum – brings together experts from across the globe to address some of the most complex issues facing humanity and is attended by 300 to 600 people from more than 50 countries.

In 2013 the ‘Dialogue of Civilizations’ has enjoyed UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) Special Consultative Status, and also collaborates with UNESCO.

On 1 July 2016 ‘Dialogue of Civilizations’ announces the launch of its international think-tank in Berlin, the ‘Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute’ (DOC).

The DOC is an independent platform for dialogue that brings together diverse perspectives from the Western and developing worlds in a non-confrontational and constructive spirit.

Its goal is to forge shared worldviews through dialogue, and to contribute to a fair, sustainable and peaceful world order.

To achieve its goals, the DOC believes that globalisation is not just about setting standards – it should have humanity, culture and civilisation at its heart.

Our work focuses on three main areas:

- **Cultures & Civilisations:** Promoting understanding and cooperation, while accepting differences
- **Economy:** Seeking inclusive, innovative and fair development models that benefit everyone
- **Governance & Diplomacy:** Developing policy proposals for international actors and exploring new diplomatic avenues

**Dialogue creates a fair and sustainable world without conflict**
2018 marks 73 years of peace without a major global war, but those living today should understand and remember the unbelievable price for our wellbeing. Over 60 million lives were lost during World War II (the USSR lost 26.6 million; Germany 6.9 million; China, 15.5 million; Yugoslavia, 1.1 million; Poland, 5.7 million; France, 0.7 million; Great Britain, 0.5 million; and the US lost 0.4 million lives). During this same period the world suffered through more than 50 regional and local wars and conflicts. During the Cold War, the death toll is estimated to be the same as the total number of lives lost during World War I.

Within this context, Samuel Huntington’s concept of ‘clash of civilisations’ emerged in the early 1990s as a final warning sign of a possible global catastrophe. As a response to this dichotomous and divisive paradigm, a sense of public responsibility for the future of humankind sparked an initiative that began 16 years ago, named the World Public Forum ‘Dialogue of Civilizations’. In 2016, the annual Rhodes Forum evolved into the think tank, Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute (DOC RI).

The transformation of the world order over the last decade has brought about uncertainty and even mistrust in the global power structure. The progress needed to make a truly inclusive multilateral system work is hindered by lingering issues: protracted conflicts continue to inflict suffering on civilians in many regions of the world, intertwined with new forms of terrorist activity that threaten us all. An unwillingness by many international leaders to cooperate with one another on a variety of issues remains, rather than a focus on shared interests and collaboration. In emerging economies, infrastructure is giving hope for such cooperation, however it is evading certain regions, such as the African continent. Addressing these issues, among others, forms the basis of DOC RI’s work. While there is still much to be done, the world is now witnessing the emergence of an age of multilateralism where dialogue is the most efficient and perhaps most valuable way of easing tensions and preventing major conflicts. As the number of global powers gradually increases, more players from different regions are joining in and forming a new multifaceted reality of international politics, global economic development, and conflict resolution.

One of the main aims of the Rhodes Forum this year is to support the emergence of new international institutions, which could facilitate peaceful interaction between major parties and stakeholders in the formation of a shared future for humanity. Changes in the global security architecture on the one hand, demonstrate double standards and hegemony at the international level, but on the other hand, these changes present an opportunity to build a different, inclusive model of peaceful relations between key players. Designing an acute and palpable multilateral system is one of the top priorities at the Rhodes Forum and for DOC RI’s development of a worldwide dialogue network.

Civil society networks may pick up where official diplomacy has left off and could provide local, regional, and international platforms for debate and discussion. These networks could be entirely focused on developing practical policies that can be applied to real-life situations. The critical function of a ‘dialogue of civilisations’ approach in developing these policies is to prevent the transformation of political tensions into inter-societal, cross-cultural or interpersonal conflicts. Authentic dialogue between stakeholders is one way to support multilateralism and inclusivity in all circumstances, when traditional forms of cooperation seem to fail.

Due to their design and composition, dialogue-based initiatives and programs in international policy-making are flexible enough to respond to fast-changing events, yet still have the gravitas required to push through solutions in highly sensitive areas. It is envisaged that they could well be established around particular issues or conflicts, to achieve specific goals and can be disbanded once solutions have been found and/or applied, and peace is restored.

One example of how a multilateral ‘dialogue of civilisations’ approach can help solve persistent issues of underdevelopment and conflict is in Africa. It is widely known that many of the continent’s countries face
the challenges of security and sustainable development. In addition to the national and regional dynamics, Africa appears as a chessboard of complex struggles for influence among external actors, including not only Western countries, but also Asian powers. This raises the question of how to give African countries, which combined are home to 16.6% of the world’s population, a stronger voice in international institutions.

Another way that a dialogue-based approach can address geopolitical imbalances is in facilitating the engagement of countries in harmonious decision-making processes. A multipolar architecture is a de facto characteristic of inclusive and amiable policy-making and diplomatic procedures. Countries that make up a particular region and share similar norms, levels of socioeconomic development or historical civilisational self-identification are now seeking institutionalised cooperation at the international level (for example, the Eurasian Economic Union, SCO, APEC, ASEAN, etc.). It is extremely crucial that new paradigms of peaceful development take into account the interests of all parties involved. This kind of inclusivity is the core component of the ‘dialogue of civilisations’ framework, and is already manifest in Chinese infrastructure projects, such as the Belt and Road Initiative.

A pressing issue of particular complexity is the rapid emergence of new forms of information communication technology (ICT). They are often used as tools of influence by global powers and as a way to exacerbate conflict by malicious actors. But ICT can also help democratise access to information for the world’s citizens and offer solutions to issues of human development. And most importantly it can enhance dialogue and meaningful interaction between civilisations if used in a positive and inclusive manner. Finding ways to prevent threats to global stability, peace, and prosperity while also utilising the benefits of ICT is a challenge that must be considered by dialogue-based networks and organisations such as DOC RI.

Building an international model based on consistent and open coordination between leading powers and their allies demands a certain level of trust. We can see how lack of trust has been exacerbated by ‘information wars’, as media and other agents misrepresent facts to suit a particular agenda. This in turn leads to a tragedy of global misunderstanding and an unwillingness to listen to possible partners in dialogue. In this regard, it is particularly critical for all dialogue-oriented institutions and organisations to present unbiased information on situations in different regions of the world, especially conflict regions. The work presented in this volume uses such an approach to address pressing global issues.

Dialogue-based research organisations and public foundations are capable of overcoming egocentric geopolitics in favour of multilateral cooperation and dialogue at the theoretical and practical levels. DOC RI’s mission is to readjust existing policies and develop new ones that will guide policy-makers, corporations, and civil society in tackling the challenges and prospects of globalisation – to help make our world more sustainable, inclusive, and fair for all of humanity. We believe that mutual understanding is the fundamental prerequisite for humankind’s inclusive development and that open, respectful, and equitable dialogue is essential in these times of drastic global change and uncertainty. It is in this spirit that the 2018 Rhodes Forum was organised, which addressed some of the most pressing issues in our rapidly changing world and how the emergence of a multilateral world order is not only needed, but inevitably on its way.
We are living in a world of transition. The order that has prevailed in recent decades is going through profound changes in (geo-)political, economic, and social realms, with shifting power relations and the emergence of new actors that are reshuffling the cards of international politics and altering its main points of reference.

While one can acknowledge that we are gradually moving away from the unipolar order that emerged after the end of the Cold War, and towards a multipolar order, we do not yet know what kind of world will emerge in future as a result of current changes. It remains unclear how the main powers – whether they be established or emerging – will interact with each other, which alliances they will forge, how they will pursue them, and how non-state actors will influence dynamics.

Multilateralism is increasingly under strain from a renewed emphasis on state sovereignty, rising nationalism, protectionism, and unilateral preferences in the shaping of foreign policy. The reasons for these developments are multiple and complex. What seems to be clear, however, is that the international policies that underpin the current order – despite having enabled significant human progress – have failed to allow for an equal share in the benefits of globalisation, as well as having failed to address numerous problems of the globalised world in a satisfactory manner.

Global issues that plague the world, including hunger and poverty, war, conflict, social and economic inequality, radicalisation and international terrorism, pandemics, climate change, and migration flows, as well as new developments evoked by rapid technological advancement, require global attention and multilateral responses. The cross-border character of these challenges, and a world shaped by interconnection and interdependence, makes it impossible for states to act unilaterally and in complete isolation. Even the most powerful states, with various capabilities at their disposal, cannot resolve such problems alone, nor can they attain security and prosperity by acting on their own.

Global dialogue and international cooperation is therefore not a matter of choice, but one of necessity. For multilateralism to work effectively, the existing tools and formats of cooperation will have to be reformed and new ways found to renew states’ commitment to international cooperation. In other words, the current system is in dire need of reinvention.

The biggest challenge of today’s world is that real solutions and clear visions of an alternative system that would better respond to the ‘spasm of globalisation’, are widely lacking, and in this vacuum, the risks are real. As Antonio Gramsci wrote, “The old world is dying, and the new world struggles to be born; now is the time of monsters”. Rather than navigating blindly through a sea of challenges and tensions with no sense of direction and rather than letting ‘the monsters’ arise, new and transformative ideas are needed.

It is against this background that the 2018 Rhodes Forum, ‘Making multilateralism work: Enhancing dialogue on peace, security and development’, took place. Building on its 16 years’ experience of offering a platform for diverse voices and multiple perspectives, the Rhodes Forum is a unique venue to address issues that underlie the transformation of the contemporary world. This was in line with the DOC’s mission to provide a platform for dialogue between the mainstream Western world and the rising world so that they can shape a fair, sustainable, and peaceful new world order together. The objective of the 2018 Forum was to better understand world’s unfolding changes with the aim of providing policy recommendations and pragmatic insights on the possible developments of current events, a perspective aiming to go beyond the dark scenarios often painted in heated public debates.

The world needs innovative ideas and strategic change. We can no longer remain passive while watching and waiting to see which developments will emerge next. The time to take responsible action towards creating a better future for generations to come is now.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 16th Rhodes Forum, organised by the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute (DOC) on the island of Rhodes, Greece on 5-6 October 2018, was based around the theme of ‘Making multilateralism work: Enhancing dialogue on peace, security, and development’. Drawing together policymakers from a wide variety of countries, renowned experts from different disciplines, and representatives from international media and the business community, the Forum offered a platform for multiple perspectives on global issues and possible future trends.

The objective of the Forum was to present fresh ideas and practical solutions for the world’s most pressing challenges, and to develop concrete and actionable policy recommendations. The Rhodes Forum examined the threats faced by multilateralism and developed ideas on how cooperation can be revived in areas that require global attention. One major topic of the Forum was also the challenge and impact of rapid technological change on societies.

Several keynote speeches, a leaders’ club meeting, panels, roundtables, and press conferences filled the two days of the conference.

Speakers at the Forum included Joschka Fischer, Foreign Minister and Vice Chancellor of Germany (1998-2005); Ehud Olmert, Prime Minister of Israel (2006-2008); Ibrahima Kassory Fofana, Prime Minister of Guinea; Vera Songwe, Cameroonian economist and Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa; Mario López-Roldán, Secretary of the OECD-Greece Joint Steering Committee; Dominique de Villepin, Former Prime Minister of France; Dimitris Avramopoulos, Greek politician and EU Commissioner for Migration, Home Affairs, and Citizenship; Samia Nkrumah; President of the Kwame Nkrumah Pan-African Centre; Mikhail Bogdanov, Deputy Foreign Minister of Russia and Special Representative of the President; Mary Dejevsky, writer and broadcaster for The Independent and The Guardian; Sophie Hackford, CEO of data and AI company 1715 Labs; Rob van Kranenburg, Co-founder of Bricolabs and Founder of the IoT Council, the largest independent IoT think tank; Justin Lin, Chief Economist and Vice President of the World Bank (2008-12); Mehdi Sanaei, Iranian Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; Georgios Katrougalos, Alternate Minister of Foreign Affairs of Greece; Robin Wright, Senior Fellow at the United States Institute of Peace; Renaud Girard, International columnist at Le Figaro; Angelos Pangratis, Adviser to the European External Action Service; and Stefan Grobe, Chief Correspondent for Euronews in Brussels.

The opinions presented during the conference on different topics varied, yet the message which all agreed upon was clear. In many respects, globalisation has not lived up to its promise of delivering economic wellbeing and progress for all. Policies of the past few decades have failed to address the problems of the 21st century in a systematic and strategic way. Tendencies towards unilateralism, driven by opportunistic self-interest at others’ expense, as well as a lack of strategic long-term thinking, have generated a variety of intertwined problems, which today make continuing on the same track impossible. New challenges, conflicts, and economic, political, social, and cultural changes are shaping the world in a way that is becoming more complex, insecure, and unpredictable.

The main message of the Forum was that resolving the world’s most pressing problems – from poverty, inequality, and climate change, to protracted conflicts, mass migration, and religious extremism – requires enhanced cooperation and solidarity between global actors. It was acknowledged that multilateralism can only truly work if it is inclusive and beneficial for all. A more balanced world order and a multilateral system that allows equitable participation, diversity of values, and nurtures an atmosphere of dialogue is the only possible way to achieve peace, stability, and prosperity. A key factor in achieving this is responsible and committed leadership around the world that will guide the process of change which today’s world is going through.

The importance of inspiring figures in promoting peaceful changes and the idea of dialogue is enormous. One such person is Professor Fred Dallmayr, an American of German origin. He is a professor of Philosophy and
Political Science at the University of Notre Dame, and a long-time Rhodes Forum participant. During the opening gala on the evening of 5 October 2018 at the Palace of the Grand Master of the Knights of Rhodes, known as the Kastello, Professor Fred Dallmayr received an award for his longstanding dedication to the idea of dialogue. It also happened to be his 90th birthday. In his introductory remarks, Dr Vladmir Yakunin called Professor Dallmayr the father of the idea of dialogue between civilisations and someone who has contributed substantially to its development. “Dialogue of civilisations has never been chitchat for us, but a real effort to understand where the other is coming from, to show respect, and to understand one another’s deepest intentions and potential”, Professor Dallmayr said when receiving the award. He stressed the importance and centrality of humanity in any political and economic endeavour. “When we talk about development, the emphasis is on economic, material, or military development. Yet, what the core of it really is, is human development”, Dallmayr said. Learning how to become a proper human is what really matters. His words echoed through the castle: “Hic Rhodus, hic salta!”, Dallmayr exclaimed, “Go beyond yourself, to the best of your possibilities, the best of your potential!”

In a world of multiple tensions, with persisting inequalities in both developed and developing countries, and unwillingness from many political leaders to cooperate with one another, the opening session addressed the question what kind of governance is most conducive to sustainable and inclusive development.

The moderator of the opening session, Renaud Girard of Le Figaro, invited Vladmir Yakunin, chairman of the DOC Research Institute’s board, to deliver his introductory remarks.

Referring to the past 15 Rhodes Forums, Yakunin underlined the collegial and friendly atmosphere that had characterised previous events. Despite the wide range of personal backgrounds and diverse nationalities, there has never been a conflict or clash among the participants – a fact that justifies attributing the forum the character of a family meeting. A further distinguishing feature of the past and the present Forum meetings is the fact that participants have not just sought discipline-limited solutions (economic, political, social, etc.) to problems of conflict and war but have approached
these problems from an organic perspective. None of the debates and contributions has ever been staged or pre-negotiated. Speakers have always been entirely free to express their positions and make them known to a broad audience.

The remarks by Dr. Yakunin were then followed by a statement by Ibrahima Kassory Fofana, the prime minister of Guinea. The prime minister argued that despite manifold efforts to promote Africa, the continent’s countries continue to have significant problems making their voice heard in the international arena. Notwithstanding the growing relevance of the region in social, political, and economic terms, he called for more appropriate representation in the General Assembly and Security Council of the United Nations. Even if multilateralism can be taken for granted, multilateralism should be made fairer and more just by considering the needs and interests of all countries equally.

Joschka Fischer, the former foreign minister and vice chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany (1998-2005) addressed the question of whether multilateralism is actually in decline given the present drive towards retreat and nationalist propaganda in a great many countries all over the world. Fischer’s response was straightforward: “Multilateralism is the political strategy of the 21st century”. Multilateralism has replaced different forms of nationalism in the past and will remain the guiding principal of international relations, notwithstanding developments in the US, in the UK, in Central and Eastern Europe, and in parts of southern Europe. The European Union will survive these attacks and, indeed, has been and still does represent the world’s most advanced example of multilateralism.

Robin Wright, a senior fellow at the US Institute of Peace and a distinguished scholar at the Woodrow Wilson Center, continued by looking at the fate of multilateralism from an American perspective. Clearly underlining that she does not represent the official position of the US government, she pointed to the tremendous effects of the current US leadership’s attempts to undermine all existing forms of mutual exchange and equality in international relations and international trade. The US today represents the world’s most corrosive force when it comes to true multilateralism, both inside the country and beyond. A limited leadership with few ideas, having adopted crude language and crude tactics, has helped in the diffusion of ever more divisions and thereby dismantled common meeting places. All this has happened notwithstanding the outstanding role of the US in the immediate post-War period in establishing and bolstering multilateralism by creating international institutions and establishing common visions.

Contrary to the previous speakers, Mikhail Bogdanov, the special representative of the president of Russia for the Middle East and Africa and a Russian deputy foreign minister, represented the official position of his country. Pointing to a couple of successful attempts at making multilateralism work, such as the Budapest agreement reached by the US, the UK, and Russia in the early 1990s, Bogdanov asked what has actually gone wrong since then. His response was clear: the main reason for current conflicts between the major players in international affairs is the persisting attempts of the US and its allies to maintain hegemony. This undermines the principles of the post-war settlement and advances a unipolar model. This is counterproductive, especially in light of the growing importance of newly emerging powers such as the BRICS countries, and of international bodies like the G20. We are therefore facing a choice: either we continue wasting resources by further promoting instability and conflict or we agree to work within the United Nations, an institution that is clearly in need of more competences and capacities to support and regulate multilateral endeavours. In general, Russia is open to strengthening dialogue and cooperation along these lines.

Justin Yifu Lin, the former chief economist and senior vice president of the World Bank (2008-12) and honorary dean at the National School of Development (Peking University), also stressed the importance of multilateralism. Seeking to promote peace and prosperity, China fully supports that strategy. Only multilateralism will enable people to pursue their own ways of developing their economies without intervention by external forces. This should have been the case with much of the development assistance given to countries of the so-called third world in much of the post-war period. Misleading advice that did not take account of the specific local exigencies of individual countries did not help in moving less developed
countries from agrarian societies towards industrial economies. That has clearly changed today with China investing in infrastructure projects in large parts of the African continent, for example, which really help these countries to develop by following their own specific path.

**Dominique de Villepin**, the former prime minister of France (2005-07), joined the opening session via video link. Just as his fellow speakers had done, he stressed the importance of further developing and consolidating multilateralism, especially in the face of recent attempts by the US to regress into unilateral forms of domination and rule. Villepin particularly pointed to the Iran Nuclear Agreement, the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, and recent trade troubles in the WTO. Considering these most recent events, what we currently need is new ideas, new visions, and new methods to overcome worn-out unilateral concepts.

**Mehdi Sanaei**, Iranian Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Founder of the Institute for Iran-Eurasia Studies (IRAS), addressed the crucial role his country played in establishing the dialogue of civilisations. It had indeed been President Khatami that launched the idea which was then taken up by a group of senior officials when setting up the ‘World Public Forum – Dialogue of Civilizations’. Pointing to the history of ancient Iran and to traditional Iranian culture, the ambassador underlined the importance given by his country to training and education in developing a culture of dialogue. If this were systematically adopted by other countries as well, then the breach of international law and the bypassing of established international organisations could be avoided.

**Ashok Sajjanhar**, the former ambassador of India to Kazakhstan, Sweden, and Latvia, also pointed to the role of history. We should recall the significance given by Nehru to the principle of dialogue in 1955. We should also recall the fact that India was founded on the principal of peace by Mahatma Gandhi, whose 150th birthday has just been celebrated. While nobody actually believed that democracy was sustainable immediately after 1947 in a country where poverty and underdevelopment had been so pronounced, India today has become a leading power both with respect to economic development and to democratic achievements. The country is now in a position to play a crucial role both regionally and internationally. The shift towards a multilateral world order, however, has not sufficiently been accounted for by some of the most important international organisations. The UN, for example, is still working with instruments designed for the 20th century. These instruments clearly need to be changed and appropriately adapted, especially the proceedings and mechanisms of the General Assembly and the composition of the Security Council.

**Gustavo Martinez**, managing director of the Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales (CARI), addressed the question of why multilateralism has had such a hard time in large parts of Latin America. In his view, this has mainly been due to the persistence of core concepts such as independence and autonomy during the period consolidating democracy. These core concepts have survived the transition period and continue to be crucial ingredients of most countries’ political economies. This, at the same time, may be one of the reasons why attempts in favour of stronger integration, such as MERCOSUR, have been less successful than comparable exercises in Europe. Overall, however, just as in the cases of India and China, the role of Latin America is clearly increasing. This is documented by Argentina assuming the presidency of the G20 meeting in 2017-18.

Asked by the moderator, **Renaud Girard**, whether the solution to the country’s recent debt and financial crisis has actually benefitted from multilateral forms of assistance and help, **Georgios Katrougalos**, the alternate minister of foreign affairs for Greece, replied that this has clearly not been the case. In his view, multilateralism is not congruent with homogeneity but has rather turned out to be a battleground. The specifics of the Greek crisis, and the necessities of resolving it, have clearly been disregarded by institutions such as the IMF, which largely ignored the regulatory framework of the EU. In general, though, Katrougalos was confident and shared the optimism advanced by Joschka Fischer. If it were possible to reverse the neoliberal assault presently characterising many national and international authorities, then we might witness a resurgence of what the EU really stands for: the soul of Europe and the promise of a good life.
Angelos Pangratis, advisor for European economic diplomacy for the European External Action Service and a member of the high-level board of Global Trade Governance at the Bertelsmann Foundation, underlined that the current trade war between the US and China could be read in terms of a “multilateralism paradox”. The most significant characteristic of that paradox is that in a period when there is an ever increasing need to cooperate, a growing number of states have started to withdraw from cooperation, thus threatening the fate of multilateralism. According to Pangratis, this is not specific to our contemporary period of history. Neither does it result from mere technicalities, but it is essentially a question of interests. A return to fully-fledged multipolarity, therefore, is no easy task. This is because of growing complexities and because of a dramatic acceleration in the nature of change, not least in organisations such as the WTO. What is needed, therefore, is a significant change in structures and a change in the logic governing both the WTO and other comparable international bodies.

Mario Lopez-Roldan, secretary of the OECD-Greece Joint Steering Committee, Office of the Secretary General, started by pointing to the achievements of international forms of cooperation since World War Two. What has been achieved is a linking of economic cooperation to the maintenance of peace and stability. Yet, at the same time, the OECD continues to be a relatively restricted club with many emerging countries still excluded. We have just started to recognise that globalisation has not been an entirely fair process. We have also come to understand that classical neoliberal programmes have often not achieved their objectives. One of the first tasks for the future, therefore, is to connect multilateralism to the people. If this is not properly done, societies may develop antibodies that are dangerous to further development. Representatives of civil society should therefore be included in the process; especially trade unions, business associations, social movements, and NGOs. Secondly, we must acknowledge that there is no one glittering path to economic development. We need to take account of the specificities of each country. We need to accept these specificities and cannot simply impose recipes taken from the global north and impose them on the global south. Each country’s specific experiences are embedded in its own sovereignty.

Policy recommendations

More appropriate representation in the General Assembly and in the Security Council of the United Nations. This means the proportionate representation of developing countries to developed, as well as more representation of ‘less powerful’ countries.

An interdisciplinary (economic, political, social, etc.) approach to analysing conflicts and developing appropriate solutions. Councils or programmes that involve policy-makers, civil society, private sector representatives, and scholars/experts should be established.

Development policies should be based on the specific circumstances and contexts in countries and regions, rather than a ‘one size fits all’ approach. Countries should pursue their own ways of developing their economies without any intervention by external forces. Misleading advice, often given in the past, has not really taken account of specific local exigencies of each individual country and did not actually help in moving less developed countries from agrarian societies towards an industrial economy.

More appropriate representation in the General Assembly and in the Security Council of the United Nations. This means the proportionate representation of developing countries to developed, as well as more representation of ‘less powerful’ countries.
Renaud Girard

Key-points

A new European conference on security is needed.

Cyber warfare should be controlled and regulated by an independent authority.

Diplomatic approach of NATO should remain undivided.

Summary

Renaud Girard, international columnist for Le Figaro, argued that due to the unfavourable international context in June-July 2018 NATO leaders didn’t prepare a plan that could have been presented during the summit in Helsinki. This plan should have been designed to enhance security in Europe. France could have used its special sense of independence within NATO and could have pointed out to its allies that “security is not always synonymous with weapons, but security can also be synonymous with treaties”.

As pointed out, France could have suggested – to NATO partners and to Russia – the creation of a large conference for security in Europe that could have focused on three difficult issues:

- medium-range nuclear missiles;
- the imbalance between the conventional forces of different countries;
- military manoeuvring – by all sides – and cyber war.

Girard also touched on cyber warfare as a new kind of conflict, which means that you can pursue policies using different means because cyber warfare is very quiet and it is capable of disorganising an adversary.

Speaking to various other situations, Girard shared his opinion that the Donbass situation represents a strategic mistake by Russia and gives a bad reputation to the country. To give back border control to Ukrainian forces, Russia needs a general amnesty and recognition of Russian as a second language in the region. Having said that, there is no leader in Ukraine who is powerful enough to make a deal with Russia in the interest of the country.

On the US and Europe, Girard said that although America seems to have dropped multilateralism, it cannot work without its allies in Europe. We may have America back in the multilateral fold very soon.

Europe needs to be stronger and needs more unity. Europe will need to pay the costs of its own defence and not everybody in Europe understands that or is ready to make this effort.

“Just because positions are currently very different, it does not mean that the new conference will not be a success.

History has proven just the opposite: we have seen that in international conferences, depending on the overall climate that is created within the conference, simply because people are ready to talk to each other – that is a good enough reason to move ahead and to get results.”
Policy recommendations

Create a new European conference on security that could adopt a code of conduct whereby countries agree not to attack each other using information technology.

NATO should not expand further eastwards.

Russia should withdraw its troops from the Donbass region and acknowledge the possibility of an overall amnesty.

Europeans should hold out their hands to the American president and help him to be successful in diplomacy and in negotiations with Russia. In this diplomatic approach, NATO should stand undivided.

A new treaty to create a new form security should be structured with the following pillars: the production of weapons; the co-management of military operations; and the creation of a European authority to control cyber activities.

Key-points

The Middle Eastern conflict will not end soon.

Political Islam will remain extremely relevant to the end of the Syrian conflict.

In Syria we are witnessing the emergence of a ‘second’ Middle Eastern conflict.

The power of superpowers is much more limited than we used to believe.
Opening the panel, DOC chief researcher Alexey Malashenko, who was moderating the panel, noted that the Middle East conflict may well not end soon. Regarding the Syrian crisis, Malashenko assumed that political Islam will remain very relevant in the future, including the participation of Islamists in the country’s governance at the end of the crisis. Given that, it is also possible, according to Malashenko, that Syria probably won’t survive as a single political entity. Such a prospect partly became possible due to the fact that the Syrian crisis emerged and developed within a multipolar moment with many external actors engaged. In dealing with the Syrian war, Malashenko argued, we are possibly witnessing the emergence of the ‘second’ Middle East crisis.

Co-moderating the panel was i24news channel journalist Eylon Levy. He claimed that the Middle Eastern conflict can’t possibly be resolved. Analysing Israel’s policy, he claimed that the Israelis try to shrink the conflict, although it’s still impossible to end it. He applied a medical metaphor to the situation by saying that while some diseases are incurable, they don’t have to be fatal so it is worth while trying to make them ‘merely’ chronic.

Seasoned Indian diplomat and Indiana University professor Rajendra Abhyankar shared his view of the phenomenon of multilateralism. It can only work, he claimed, if it is inclusive and profitable for all, but today it is Western-oriented. Switching to Syria, Abhyankar pointed out that to solve the Syrian crisis it is necessary, among other things, to realise and recognise that Sunnis constitute a visible majority in the country. Along with that, he didn’t hesitate to insist that the international community has to rebuild Syria as closely as possible to how it once was. One of the country’s precious advantages, he claimed, has been that it was a successful combination of diverse religious and ethnic traditions.

Senior Fellow at the US Institute of Peace Robin Wright suggested that multilateralism is at work in Syria, but this is a multilateralism of a special kind. There is the multilateral Astana process on one hand, and the multilateral cooperation of Western countries on the other hand. That Syria has become a proxy battleground is one of the most substantial obstacles to finding a solution. In order to end it, the cooperation of the international community as a whole is required. Wright was optimistic about the Iranian issue, maintaining that while Iran and the US have different agendas, the principles of the JCPOA are still alive, despite the US withdrawal from the agreement. She also added that the majority of the population in the Middle East is educated now, people have the technical possibility of circumventing imposed systems of information control and receiving diverse streams of information, which, in turn, leads to the high probability of younger generations in the region making substantial changes in the future.

Professor at Tajik State National University Muzaffar Olimov presented Tajikistan’s experience of counteracting religious extremism. The issue has recently become internationally relevant because Central Asians have become involved in terror attacks all over the world. Olimov speculated on the interesting case of the Islamic Renaissance Party of Tajikistan, which was the only legal Islamic party in Central Asia prior to its prohibition in 2015.

Senior Fellow at the Atlantic Council Ariel Cohen shared his perspective on external actors’ involvement in the Syrian crisis. He claimed that neither Russia nor the US have vital interests in the Middle East. It is therefore not worth either power taking the risk of military conflict because of their involvement in regional affairs. Analysing American and Russian policy in Syria, Cohen argued that while the US is striving to keep the status quo in terms of its previous status in the Middle East, Russia is trying to come back to the region as a great power for the first time since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Talking about Turkey’s role in the process, Cohen said that such commitment is not there. Such a solution would be crucial not only for Israel and Palestine, but for the whole region and its multiple crises.
while for the US, Turkey is an ally but not a partner, it is partner but not an ally for Russia.

During the discussion that followed, Ehud Olmert pointed out that to resolve the conflict with the Palestinians, Israel needs neither Russian nor American help. He added that the power of the superpowers is much more limited than we have believed. He also said that while there is not so much space for political trade-offs in the region, when it comes to the Israel-Palestine conflict, without courageous leadership ready to risk their positions to attain a tangible result on both sides, it will not be possible to achieve any stable solution.

Robin Wright shared her perception of the current political situation in the US. According to her, there is great mood change in the country regarding US involvement in Middle Eastern affairs.

Policy recommendations

Policies should reflect the sectarian divisions in Syria – is something like Lebanon’s government structure feasible or desirable?

Governments in the MENA region should reduce its expenditures on armament and proxy wars and allocate funds to education, job creation and poverty abatement.

It is necessary to implement policies and programmes that systematically encourage the empowerment of the MENA region’s women and youth, who represent untapped sources of knowledge and expertise. Investment in all levels of education, from early childhood to secondary and higher education, to adult education and retraining of the existing workforce, if needed.

The physical and psychological health needs of victims of war and conflicts in the region should be addressed. Investment in programmes for mental health recovery should precede many of the above recommendations.

Governments, civil society, and the private sector in the MENA region should establish a Water Commission for the basin of Tigris and Euphrates.

Something akin to the Peace of Westphalia or Congress of Vienna could establish a new order in the region. The question is, how can external (great) powers help facilitate this process without bringing in their own interests or is it optimal to exclude them from the process altogether.

Governments, civil society, and the private sector must address how to improve and expand land, air, and sea transportation systems within countries, regionally, and internationally.

The establishment of stabilisation and reconstruction programmes is needed (for Syria, Iraq, Yemen, and Libya).

An economic confederation for the MENA region should be considered.
From deadlock to solutions. Towards a comprehensive Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian peace and security order

Key-points

The absence of political will from both Russia and the West, the EU’s lack of strategic autonomy, and the political warfare in the United States are key obstacles to overcoming the deadlock in Russia-West relations.

Addressing the future of the ‘states in between’ is key to building a new European security order.

The formation of identities and geopolitical orientations in post-Soviet countries is still in process.

The Western Balkans is a region with high potential for conflict.

Summary

Moderated by Mary Dejevsky, writer and broadcaster for The Independent and The Guardian, and Peter W. Schulze, a professor at the University of Göttingen, the panel addressed the state of the current European security order and explored mechanisms through which a further deterioration of relations between Russia and the West can be avoided and a more inclusive and comprehensive European security framework built.

In his introductory remarks, Peter W. Schulze outlined the numerous mistakes and missed opportunities that have led to the crisis of the European security order. Fundamental questions which were never seriously addressed, have chronically beset Russia-West relations and hindered the building of a more inclusive and cooperative wider European peace and security order. Schulze recalled that the 1990 Charter of Paris, which was never implemented, was designed to bring peace to the whole of Europe, not parts of it. He pointed out that one of the aims of the Charter was to address these security dilemmas. The fact that every country should have the freedom to choose the alliance to which it wants to belong – often highlighted in discussions – is only one part of the Charter.

According to Sergey Markedonov, associate professor at the Russian State University of Humanities, a key challenge to building a new European security order is the fact that societies in the post-Soviet space remain split in terms of social and (geo-)political identity and vision on the future of their country. This is exemplified by the existence of protracted ethnic conflicts in this area. As Markedonov pointed out, the formation of identities as part of the process of the collapse of the USSR is not completed yet. The best examples of this are Georgia and Ukraine, where to this day there is no consensus within society on the foreign policy orientation of those countries. While some parts of the population are in favour of joining Western institutions, others want to keep close ties to Russia and even consider it the country’s main security guarantor. In order to guarantee stability and security in these countries, a balance between (geopolitical) identities must be ensured.

Markedonov recalled that the current standoff between Russia and the West goes back to the end of the Cold War and is based on diverging geopolitical interests and security perceptions. Just as the West claims the right to secure interests considered vital to its security, Russia perceives its neighbourhood as a particular area of interest. Markedonov drew attention to the broadened and continuous consensus within Russian elites on basic national strategic goals and security challenges. Therefore, Russian foreign policy is not simply ‘Putin’s policy’. As Markedonov pointed out, every potential successor will follow a similar course to President Putin.

Alexey Gromyko, the director of the Institute of Europe at the
Russian Academy of Sciences, shared a concern which recurred throughout the panel discussion about the EU’s limited ability to act as a strategic actor that shapes international affairs. As Gromyko argued, in fact, the biggest threat Europe is facing today is Europe’s increasing marginalisation from the global arena. A forecast of how the economies of Europe will develop over the next two to three decades shows that the share of Germany – not to mention Russia, Italy, France, or the UK – in the world economy will decrease significantly. At the same time, the share of China, India, Indonesia, and Brazil will increase. Gromyko sees this progressively decreasing power of Europe and the absence of strategic autonomy for the EU, as well as the political warfare currently taking place in the United States – at the centre of which is Russia – as the two main obstacles to building a more inclusive Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security system.

As for mechanisms that might help overcome the current deadlock in Russia-West relations, Gromyko suggested setting up a European Security Council that would include EU member states as well as Russia and Turkey. Furthermore, the idea of a Committee on Foreign Policy and Security between Russia and the EU, which was suggested by Angela Merkel and Dmitry Medvedev in Meseberg in 2010, should be revived and implemented. However, as Gromyko emphasised, in order to make sure that the idea can be efficiently applied this time, it would be key to set up a concrete structure and mechanisms to implement joint decisions taken within this framework.

With regard to prospects for resolving the Ukraine crisis, Gromyko left no doubt that a new way must be found to break the deadlock in the implementation of the Minsk II agreement. As Gromyko argued, installing a UN peacekeeping mission might be the only solution at the current moment in order make progress. However, the peacekeeping mission would have to follow a concrete road map which would go in sequence with the points of the Minsk II agreement. For both sides to agree on such a mission, its structure and scope would have to constitute a compromise between the respective proposals brought forward by Kiev and Moscow. In this sense, the peacekeeping mission could be deployed first along the line of contact in Eastern Ukraine, and then gradually expanded, so that in two-three years, the mission would cover the whole territory of the Donbass, Gromyko suggested.

In order to overcome the crisis of the European security order in the long term, fundamental questions which have plagued Russia-West relations for decades and hindered the building of a common security order will have to be resolved. One question of crucial importance is the future of so-called ‘countries in-between’, i.e., countries that are neither part of Russian nor Western institutions, and therefore form a kind of political vacuum which encourages geopolitical competition between external actors. According to Winfried Veit, author and senior lecturer on International Relations at the University of Freiburg, the Western Balkans – Slovenia and Croatia excluded – have significant potential for conflict due to unresolved ethno-political questions (the ‘Serbian question’ and the ‘Albanian question’) and the competing interests of external actors in the region. Ensuring that the dynamics in the region are not exacerbated by foreign interference, and that the region does not become a political grey zone, will require the building of a new security architecture that takes the specific needs of the region into account and ensures close relations with the European Union, the United States, Russia, and Turkey. In fact, as Veit pointed out, despite its massive presence in the region, the European Union alone does not even have enough power to provide security in the region, not least due to the weakness of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP).

Richard Sakwa, professor of Russian and European Politics at the University of Kent, made clear that the post-Cold War European security system and international relations in general are at a deep structural impasse. Today, we are witnessing a clash of two world orders – the US-led international liberal order and an emerging alternative order, which consists of an ‘anti-hegemonic alignment’ between Russia, China, India, and an increasing number of social movements in the West – Sakwa explained. This second order refuses to accept that the existing international institutions belong to the liberal Atlantic order.

As Sakwa argued, in 2014 with the outbreak of the Ukrainian crisis, we entered the ‘Second Cold War’. This is symptomatic of the failure to build an inclusive dialogical order. In this Second Cold War, there is a mobilisation of ideological warfare and disinformation. Sakwa emphasised that this Second Cold War is far more dangerous than the first one, not least because nuclear weapons are no longer managed, as they were during the Cold War. In addition to this, we are witnessing de-diplomatising, i.e., the death of diplomacy.

Sakwa pointed out that the dead-end in relations between Russia and the West must be managed through a negotiation of some sort of grand bargain. Otherwise, muddling through will continue along with the ever-present danger of either deliberate or accidental escalation.

Adrian Pabst, reader in Politics at the University of Kent, discussed the deep crisis Europe is facing against the backdrop of the progressively fragmenting international system. Set up as a system based on rules and cooperation between sovereign states, since 1989 it has become increasingly exclusive and disregarding of diversity in values and traditions. As most the recent examples – Brexit and the popularity of Trump – show, today we are seeing a rejection of Western liberal value moralism, which claims superiority of a certain type of values. As Pabst explained, the international liberal order is changing in the sense that capitalism is remaining in place,
but as it turns out, it is compatible with forms of political organisation that cannot be described as democratic. Therefore, the popular argument that economic liberalism leads to political liberalism has not proven true, Pabst pointed out.

Pabst insisted that despite all divergences, common interests and challenges exist, the management of which requires the joint action of Russia and the West. For him, this requires stronger political leadership, greater willingness to debate, as well as new rules. Pabst lamented the lack of strategic culture which has prevented a bridging of the divide between the liberal West and ‘the rest’. Instead, complete distrust and mutual demonisation are the rules of the game. Responses of both sides to each other’s decisions and actions are paranoid and hysterical. He argued that it is crucial to recognise the centrality of culture and civilisation. Acknowledging that disagreement between Russia and the West stems from diverging interests, and not different values, is fundamental for building a solid relationship.

Building stability and security in the Western Balkans requires a new security architecture that takes into account the specific needs of the region. An arrangement is needed that would allow for cooperation between all actors that have interests in the region – most notably the EU, the US, Russia, and Turkey. This is key to building sustainable stability and security in the region over the long term.

A European Security Council should be set up, which would include EU member states, as well as Russia and Turkey.

Installation of a UN peacekeeping mission is the only way at the current moment to break the deadlock in the Ukrainian crisis. This peacekeeping mission would have to follow a concrete road map which would go in sequence with the points of the Minsk II agreement and would constitute a compromise between the ideas for a peacekeeping mission brought forward by Kiev and Moscow. The first step of the road map would be the deployment of the peacekeeping mission along the line of contact in Eastern Ukraine; then it would be gradually expanded, so that in two-three years, the mission would cover the whole territory of the Donbass.

A Committee on Foreign Policy and Security between Russia and the EU should be revived and implemented, as suggested by Angela Merkel and Dmitry Medvedev in Meseberg in 2010. This time however, it needs a concrete structure and mechanisms to implement joint decisions.

An agreement to avoid military escalation between Russia and NATO in the Baltic should be implemented, based on the example of Syria where both have managed not to collide.
Economic inequality and democracy: Are they compatible?

Key-points

Inequality may undermine democracy.

In countries with less freedom, the billionaire intensity of GDP is high.

Life expectancy in countries with a communist past is higher than in other countries with the same GDP per capita.

High inequality can lead to social tensions and populism.

In African countries, political forces are not able to implement policies that can eradicate poverty.

Summary

Vladimir Popov argued based on the World Income Database that inequality was increasing before World War One, then declined, and again began to grow from the beginning of the 1980s. Currently, it is at a historical high and when income inequality is high, democracy doesn’t work. In addition, empirical analysis shows that authoritarian countries have lower levels of income inequality (e.g., Cuba). The empirical results show that democracy negatively affects income inequality and that the ‘billionaire intensity’ of GDP is higher in countries with lower levels of freedom.

If income inequality increases, it leads to more poor people and these people like to vote for redistribution of wealth in favour of themselves via government spending for them, which then hinders economic growth. Income inequality creates polarised societies that have improper property rights and where contracts are not guaranteed. Popov argued that one of the reasons of why people voted for Brexit was that the outcomes of globalisation did not benefit everyone but favoured those in high-income brackets, meaning that income distribution was uneven. Life expectancy in countries with a communist past is five years higher than in other countries with the same GDP per capita: for example, Chinese life expectancy was 10-13 years higher than in India in the 1960s and 1970s.

Justin Lin distinguished inequality in developing and developed countries. In developing countries, the way to address the issue of inequality is to create jobs for poor people. But how to create jobs in these economies depends on how these countries develop their economies; if development is based on capital intensive strategies then countries are unable to create sufficient jobs for people. In addition, investing in capital intensive industries in developing countries is not viable because investment needs to be protected and this protection creates distortion in the economy and creates a wealth transfer, both of which cause inequality to rise. To eliminate inequality, development strategies should be labour intensive like in East Asian countries in the 1960s and 1970s. Therefore, reducing inequality depends on what strategy is adopted, irrespective of political systems.

In developed countries, inequality is high because of financial liberalisation and innovation, as well as the existence of the high-tech sector. In this environment, few people become rich and not many people are able to work in these industries.

Samia Nkrumah emphasised that democracy is not just about having the right to vote but about seeing the outcome of voting in eradicating poverty, or having a better water supply, sanitisation system, etc. It seems that in some African contexts, a problem of buying votes exists, meaning the wealthiest are elected even though they are not necessarily good governors;
they are also not then under pressure to deliver results.

In some African contexts, distinctions between parties are not clear: “The driver of the bus changes, but bus goes in a same direction irrespective of who the driver is”. Furthermore, no political force can afford to implement policies to eradicate poverty.

Andranik Migranyan said that the most serious threat to society is the deterioration of the middle class; the income of this class is shrinking. In the European context, the old parties have lost a lot, new parties are rising, and the rise of left populism and right populism is becoming a threat to democratic values. He quoted from Stiglitz that democracy in the US is increasingly seen as ‘one dollar one vote’ rather than ‘one person one vote’, as the political process has become so expensive that not all people can participate. He stated that in countries with high levels of inequality, people lose their social identity and this has led to the rise of populism, bringing radicals like Trump into power. Furthermore, money seems to be behind many political decisions in democratic countries.

Jack A. Goldstone argued that inequality is bad for democracy but that democracy is trying to fight back. He differentiated between vertical inequalities (economic inequality between individuals) and horizontal inequalities (inequality between identity groups). When the rich separate themselves from the middle class because of the presence of high inequality and slow social mobility, the middle class unite with the poor and target the rich, and rich respond with autocracy. In this scenario, the rich try to emphasise horizontal inequality, i.e., leaders stress the threat of foreigners and this leads to the formation of nationalist governments.

Goldstone added that a rise in inequality can promote democracy in authoritarian countries. In democratic countries, inequality undermines democratic governments. Goldstone predicted that there will be a crisis in the next decade which will require more taxes in order to keep government promises to people on healthcare and other social commitments.

James K. Galbraith made the point that inequality cannot be resolved by being addressed in only a few select countries; it needs global attention. In the post-colonial era, the democratic form of governance has taken hold in relatively low-inequality industrialised countries and the absence of democracy is generally found in countries where inequalities are either very high or very low. He added that inequality is a result of financial liberalisation and financial crisis throughout the world, but inequality has also risen all over the world as a result of particular forms of government. In the United States, the rise in inequality has led to more democracy. Answering a question about the consequences of inequality in United States, Galbraith said that for the period of 1990-2014, electoral outcomes show that republicans represent the centre of income distribution and democrats represent both the low and high ends, including the wealthiest professionals on one hand and migrants, minorities, and low-income working class people on the other hand. As inequality rises in specific states in the US, those states tend to vote democrat and states where inequality isn’t rising tend to be republican.

On the relationship between growth and inequality, Galbraith believes that economic growth reduces inequality through industrialisation and the engagement of a middle class. Therefore, causality runs from economic growth to inequality and not the other way round.

Policy recommendations

In order to reduce inequality, the following policy recommendations were made:

Democracy should be based on the ‘one man, one vote’ concept, not ‘one dollar, one vote’. Elaborate with policy recommendations on how to reform campaign finance and the influence of special interest groups on elections; for the US, re-evaluate the efficacy of the electoral college.

Governments should provide some social support for the poor to encourage social mobility, especially by making education free and easily accessible. Investment in education and health care, basic social security.

Governments should re-implement the policy of progression in the progressive taxation policy (increasing the rate of marginal tax).
The role of the private sector and foundations in promoting intercultural dialogue and multipolarity

Key-points

Cultural diversity provides a richness to culture, but in order to achieve peaceful co-existence people must be able to listen and remain non-judgemental of others, including those with whom they disagree.

The private sector, civil society, and religious organisations must all play a role in promoting intercultural dialogue, and they must work together to coordinate their efforts and build scale.

The private sector can deliver sustainable investment and huge scale to humanitarian and diplomatic projects, but this is dependent on there being commercial incentive.

Inter-religious dialogue and technology also have a role to play in promoting intercultural dialogue and building a peaceful society.

Summary

Opening speeches from Sebastien Crozier, Kader Kaneye, and Veronika Zonabend described a number of barriers and opportunities to delivering multilateral projects. Crozier outlined the impact of technologies such as mobile money and the internet on multilateralism and cross border project delivery. Kaneye discussed his work with HLB, the global advisory and accounting network, and the foundation of the African Development University. Throughout other participants’ updates the following themes emerged:

The private sector is an undervalued agent of positive change and international diplomacy, but it can’t do everything. Jean-Yves Ollivier, Andreas Knaul, Richard Saldanha, and Maxim Mikhalev all outlined experiences of positive cultural and humanitarian achievements that came about through commercial activities, and also that the commercial nature of activities allows you to build scale. Furthermore, it is commercially vital for companies to invest in their communities and promote peace.
The private sector, civil society, and religious organisations all must play a role in promoting intercultural dialogue, and they must work together to coordinate their efforts and scale. Policies should be developed with all parties involved, perhaps for the private sector as part of their CSR programmes.

The private sector can deliver sustainable investment and huge scale to humanitarian and diplomatic projects, but this is dependent on there being commercial incentive. The Philanthropic sector can pick-up where there is no commercial incentive, but the key here is to develop policies or advice that will increase commercial incentive.

Large philanthropic and commercial organisations should take a ‘venture capitalist’ role in scaling up smaller successful initiatives that effectively promote intercultural dialogue and peace, or humanitarian ends.

Policy recommendations

The private sector, civil society, and religious organisations all must play a role in promoting intercultural dialogue, and they must work together to coordinate their efforts and scale. Policies should be developed with all parties involved, perhaps for the private sector as part of their CSR programmes.

The private sector can deliver sustainable investment and huge scale to humanitarian and diplomatic projects, but this is dependent on there being commercial incentive. The Philanthropic sector can pick-up where there is no commercial incentive, but the key here is to develop policies or advice that will increase commercial incentive.

Large philanthropic and commercial organisations should take a ‘venture capitalist’ role in scaling up smaller successful initiatives that effectively promote intercultural dialogue and peace, or humanitarian ends.

Summary

“Ten years after the collapse of Lehman Brothers, the policy lessons have not been learned”, began Richard Werner in his conversation with Stefan Grobe, correspondent for Euronews in Brussels.

Werner explained how banks operate, discussing both central banks and commercial banks, and clarifying three historically preeminent theories on the nature and role of banks with their attendant implications for regulatory policy.

The theory currently most prominent is the ‘financial intermediation theory of banking’, which says that banks simply collect deposits and then make loans. This understanding leads to regulation based on capital requirements. Similarly, the theory that was previously popular during the mid-20th century – the ‘fractional reserve theory of banking’ – also sees individual banks as simply intermediaries, but sees the banking sector collectively as creating money through a ‘money multiplier’ effect. This
leads to regulation based on reserve requirements.

Neither of these theories are well supported by evidence, in contrast to the ‘credit creation theory of banking’, which was dominant until the 1920s. Regulatory implications of this theory have been practiced by East Asian economies like Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and South Korea. Banking crises have been prevented through ‘credit guidance’: regulating banks’ allocation of credit. This means providing bank credit for productive uses rather than for non-GDP-related transactions.

Werner reviewed contrasting responses to the financial crisis in the US and Europe with comparative examples from post-World War Two reconstruction in Japan, also sharing the results of his own research projects and using various practical examples to problematise central features of the Basle regulatory framework for international banking.

Werner also compared the UK and German banking systems, highlighting the fact that countless world-leading German SME exporters are financed by the country’s 1,700 cooperative banks. He concluded with his own double-edged policy recommendations: (i) force banks to lend for productive purposes (e.g., the ‘credit guidance’ practiced by China); and (ii) restore the link between communities and banking through ‘bottom-up’ cooperative finance (see Werner’s own ‘Local First Community Interest Company’, or the many examples of German not-for-profit banks).

Audience questions allowed Werner to touch on the dangers of self-regulation for the banking sector and government crisis intervention; self-regulation was the UK’s approach leading up to the financial crisis, where one problem both then and now, as elsewhere, was that small banks receive too much regulation and large banks receive too little. There should be different rules for big and small banks, and regulation should recognise banks’ role as money creators.

Werner was also asked about the differences between a few ‘good’ and ‘bad’ central banks – for example the European Central Bank, which, in contrast to historical examples like the Bank of Japan, has both worked in opposition to small community banks and has created asset bubbles across the continent.

---

**Policy recommendations**

**In order to prevent banking crises and support productive growth in the real economy:**

Credit guidance – directing banks to lend for productive purposes rather than for transactions that do not contribute to nominal GDP – should be used to avoid the asset boom-bust cycles caused by credit being allocated to financial transactions.

Decentralised community banks, modelled on successful not-for-profit German banks, would be a safer way of ensuring money creation is democratic, accountable, and productive, than continuously increasing the centralised power of central banks and large banks.
The digital future of humanity. Impact of technological progress on economy, cyber security and social values

Key-points

While productivity has increased, the income of labour is pressured and the wealthy are privileged.

User data as the new currency should be owned by citizens or at least enjoy a high degree of anonymity.

Blockchain technology has a lot of potential to increase transparency as well as to decrease transaction costs (smart contracts, data storage, banking, etc.).

Jobs are not only lost due to economic crises, but also due to automation, globalisation, and the environmental crisis; competition today is mostly in technology, and not so much in prices.

Governments are ill-prepared and therefore swift policy adjustments have to be made to meet the challenges of technological progress.

Summary

Jens Wendland, visiting professor at the Faculty of Journalism, Lomonosov Moscow State University and professor at the University of Arts, and Sophie Hackford, futurist and researcher, were the moderators leading this panel and posed challenging questions to the panellists.

Tim Dunlop, writer, academic, and author, from the Centre for Advancing Journalism, University of Melbourne, emphasised that the political questions over digitalisation are most important.

When it comes to automation and the loss of jobs, the media was one of the first sectors where digitalisation caused traditional business models (of newspapers) to collapse. As a rule of thumb, Dunlop explained, if you can write down the rules for a job – including cognitive white-collar jobs – then that job can be replaced by algorithms. The important questions is then whether there will there be similar jobs for millions of people to replace the jobs lost?

In recent decades, policies have put pressure on labour income and privileged wealth, while productivity has increased. The net effect of these neoliberal changes is that a job is no longer a guarantee that you can stay out of poverty. The reduction of working hours at the same pay or the introduction of a universal basic income could be appropriate solutions to address these challenges. In the political realm, a shift from representative to direct democracy has to take place. Give people more decision-making power, create a people’s house, give the power of review to every adult instead of only professional politicians.

Rob van Kranenburg, co-founder of Bricolabs and the founder of Council, the largest independent Internet of Things think tank, said that we are witnessing an ontological shift, where humans are no longer fully autonomous but partly controlled by algorithms. The new General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) for the EU is, in his opinion, merely a drop in the ocean and not enough to protect citizen data. Van Kranenburg called for data to be in public hands instead of being owned by unaccountable global tech companies. He presented a ground-breaking innovation from Utrecht, where credit scores of inhabitants are saved anonymously with the help of blockchain technology and 5G. While companies can access this data to evaluate the credibility of a customer, the companies don’t own the data and don’t know the names of the people.

Ji Deqiang, associate professor at the National Centre for Governments are ill-prepared and therefore swift policy adjustments have to be made to meet the challenges of technological progress.
Communication Innovation Studies, Communication University of China, opened his presentation by asking how the new platform companies should be regulated. He mentioned two cases in China where drivers from the local ride-hailing platform Didi were probably involved in the murder of two female passengers. This sparked a huge debate on security and platforms. Ji stressed that platforms are steered by the desire for profits, and that the win-win promise of the sharing economy was just a myth. The Chinese debate on this issue is characterized by a polarization between a consumerist optimism, which highly values digitalized, customized, efficient products and services and moral scepticism, which fears robot control, human alienation, and the cooperation of government with tech players at the expense of citizens. In China, the big three, Baidu, Alibaba, and Tencent, are trying to integrate every kind of digitalized service into their platforms, while the big five in the US are more specialized. Ji sees a concentration of ownership in tech companies and stressed that the making of algorithms is dominated by venture capital, increasingly out of reach from public scrutiny. Ji explained that Chinese platforms today are focusing on low-end products and services on the basis of cheap labour, which is meeting increasing resistance from the digital labour force. He concluded by saying that datafication can’t solve everything, especially not the challenges of sustainable development.

Kyriakos Pierrakakis, director of research at diaNEOsis, began with the comment that people in Greece often think that jobs were lost due to the economic crisis, while many jobs were actually lost due automation, globalisation, and the environmental crisis. He added that unlike what is taught by economic theory today, competition is no longer in prices, but in technology. Pierrakakis was sure that many jobs are still to be automated away. For example, jobs in driving are going to be quickly affected. Retraining and life-long learning is therefore a very important tool in countering future job losses. He went on to state that 3-D-printing has a lot of potential, but with regard to national security there are substantial challenges as well. He mentioned a case where a non-traceable plastic gun was printed with a 3-D printer. Other future security issues he saw were related to the rise of Artificial Intelligence and its implications for human safety. His main point was that societies have to shape the future or take the consequences. To achieve this, sound regulations have to be in place to shape digitalisation in the desired manner.

Dimitris Psarrakis, economic and monetary policy advisor at the European Parliament, shared a joke: The future of production in the economy will contain only three elements, namely a machine, a human, and a dog. The job of the machine is to execute the production, the task of the human is to feed the dog and the dog’s job is to bite the human if he tries to interfere with the work of the machine! Psarrakis stated that Total Factor Productivity has increased in blockchain and the Internet of Things (IOT). All the while, the world has been encountering a third wave of neoliberalism. In Fukuyama’s End of History, one of the reasons for the end of history is the end of trust. In Psarrakis’ view this idea has been challenged by the introduction of blockchain, which can store data safely and is de-centralised; data is undeletable and is accessible via the internet. Therefore, the main advantage of this technology is that it can create trust through the safe storage of data, which removes the need for trusted intermediaries and thus decreases transaction costs dramatically. As examples of areas where this technology is especially useful, he named smart contracts, identification, and energy production. In terms of policies, Dimitris stressed that regulations should refrain from trying to overregulate disruptive business models, since it is not the responsibility of a regulator to champion one business model over another.

Acting as a discussant, Marie Desrousseaux, the human rights and solidarity coordinator for the European Students’ Union referred to the digital divide, where old people and people of disadvantaged backgrounds face a high likelihood of being left behind and excluded from the advantages of technical progress. She also mentioned the Aadhar card project in India, where some ethnic minorities in rural areas were not part of the project and hence faced difficulties in their daily lives.

The panel’s second discussant, Pankaj Pachauri, a prominent Indian journalist, observed that due to the widespread use of smartphones, people have stopped talking to each other. These devices keep young people busy and restrain them from pursuing more productive activities. Pachauri also referred to Jack Ma (CEO of Alibaba) as a way of highlighting the digital
Policy recommendations

In order to address the opportunities and challenges digitalisation poses for society, the following policy recommendations were made:

Data as the new ‘gold’ should be owned by the people that create the data and not by global corporations.

There should be accountability and public scrutiny of algorithms and artificial intelligence to make sure that people retain some degree of control.

Reduce the numbers of working hours at the same pay, and/or introduce a universal basic income and introduce policies that support employees in becoming shareholders of the companies they are working in.

Move from representative to direct democracy by giving people more decision-making power, creating a people’s house, and giving the power of review to every adult.

Life-long education programmes for all should be designed.

Key-points

There are several challenges of contemporary global concern: migration, security, terrorism, democracy, and multilateral cooperation.

The EU and Africa need each other.

NATO-EU cooperation is a cornerstone of security and defence strategy.

Terrorism is changing and innovating itself.

Summary

The world is facing many challenges of global concern. The essence of Europe as we know it today is grounded on the principles of multilateralism, working equally together towards a shared goal not just within the union, but also outside it.

In the field of migration and security, the EU has recently strengthened the European Border and Coast Guard Agency to enable it to...
offer management support in other countries.
The EU has also stepped up cooperation with countries of origin and transit on return and readmission, concluding admission agreements with 17 countries.

Europe and Africa are two continents bound together. Europe needs Africa and Africa needs Europe. There is a need to forge equal an and strong partnership for the future.

Cooperation between NATO and the EU today is a cornerstone of an overall security and defence strategy.

Terrorism is changing and innovating; radicalisation, both online and offline, remains a threat.

There is a threat against democracies and a risk of foreign interference in election processes.

Policy recommendations

Establish a new Africa-Europe Alliance for sustainable investment to create up to 10 million jobs in the next five years.

Reduce irregular migration flows while enhancing legal pathways in a comprehensive and effective manner for the migrants that the EU economy demands.

Establish trustful partnerships for better information exchange within the EU and with partners to find terrorists multilaterally and collectively.

Propose wide-ranging rules to ensure that terrorist content is taken down.

Enhance cooperation with key partners across the world to protect citizens’ rights and strengthen the resilience of the EU democratic system.

Hegemonies and Counter-hegemonies.
The new global distribution of power and influence

Key-points

The times of hegemony have passed for ever. There may be a demise of the liberal world order as once defined by the US. Yet, neither the Chinese, nor the Russians, nor the BRICS countries or anyone else will re-establish something similar in the future.

It is questionable whether the international liberal order has been an order at all, and whether it is not actually a form of disorder.

The US is no longer a hegemonic power but it nevertheless continues to be dominant on a world scale.
An increasing number of emerging countries are now assuming more and more power (in politics, markets, and in the ideological sphere). It is as yet unclear which of them will be the first to establish a power mix that really amounts to establishing a new hegemony.

Summary

Given the structural crisis in global governance, an increasing number of countries has started to develop new strategies to take on more significant roles in the new world order. Notwithstanding the enduring, albeit slowly declining hegemony of the US, the torch is being passed to a new generation of players, a fact that has in turn led to reactions on the part of the West and its allies to invent socio-political and economic counter measures to hold onto and/or advance their domination.

The panel chair, Professor Piotr Dutkiewicz from Carlton University, Canada, opened the session by pointing to a disturbing message delivered by Donald Trump at the UN’s meeting on 25 September. President Trump argued that the present politics of the US would not be about power and hegemony but patriotism and sovereignty. The Chinese foreign minister would argue in a quite similar vein just a few days later (29 September), saying it would be a serious misjudgement for China to compete with the US. The US will be a preeminent world power for quite some time in the future. Jointly considering these two remarks,

Dutkiewicz rightfully asked whether this would make the entire panel obsolete. Not all speakers of the panel agreed with that question. The panel addressed the issue of power and hegemony and tried to figure out the extent to which these two notions are distinct or compatible with each other. Among the most crucial contributions in that respect were the ones by Adrian Pabst, director of the Centre for Federal Studies at the School of Politics and International Relations of the University of Kent, Fabio Petito, senior lecturer in International Relations at the University of Sussex, and Tom Casier, reader in International Relations & Jean Monnet Chair, Brussels School of International Studies.

In his introductory statement, Pabst argued that hegemony is more than power. Referring to Antonio Gramsci, he defined hegemony as “political domination beyond the role of the state and the market”. Hegemony stretches deeply into the realm of civil society, thereby also including ideology, worldviews, and belief systems. State power, market power, and ideological power are all continuously changing, but a shift in hegemony requires all these power sources to change at the same time and to change extensively.

This is not what is happening at the moment. Again, paraphrasing Gramsci, Pabst argued that while the old liberal world order is dying, the new cannot be born. “In this interregnum a great variety of morbid symptoms appear”. The liberal world order has never been and is not really a liberal order, Pabst argued. Indeed, it is questionable whether it has been an order at all and whether it is not actually a form of disorder. Yet, it has somehow managed to remain the leading concept ever since World War Two. Overall, the US is no longer a hegemonic power but it nevertheless continues to be dominant on a global scale. An increasing number of emerging countries are now assuming more and more power (in politics, markets, and in the ideological sphere). It remains to be seen which of them will manage to be the first to come up with a power mix which would amount to something that could reasonably be given the label of a new hegemony.

The scenario presented by Pabst was criticised by Petito, who argued that the times of hegemony would be over for ever. There clearly is a demise of the so-called liberal world order as once defined by the US. Until recently, this phase of the hegemonic cycle was the successor of the British Empire. Yet, it is unlikely to be replicated in the 21st century. Neither the Chinese, nor the Russians, nor the BRICS countries, nor anyone else is likely able to re-establish something similar in the future. The very concept of hegemony is no longer useful today. The main message is the one of multilateralism. Increasing multipolarity is shifting power away from the West towards an increasing number of emerging countries. There is a noteworthy trend towards multiple (civilisational) identities in a new ideological environment. These identities constitute an important new framework for politics and policy-making. Moreover, there is an emergence of multiple modernities, anchored in peculiar historical legacies, not all of which are easily compatible with each other. The new scenario is referred to by Petito as “civilisational politics”. What has once been ‘the West’ is today as much disintegrated as ‘the East’. For example, not long ago, countries such as Turkey and Japan were indiscriminately thought of as belonging to the West. This is not the case anymore. The West has disintegrated into several distinct civilisations, and it is these civilisations which are today engaged in forms of inter-civilisational dialogue. Taken together, it should be clear that things like unilateral monologues are no longer sustainable. The only way forward is by dialogue. This will either lead to some sort of formal order or will shift to clashes of a very different character.

Connecting with the two former speakers, Casier argued that power is something very fluid, changing on a daily basis and hard to grasp. While power relations are changing all the time, hegemony is something being much more stable. It is a stable configuration of forces. Understood that way, we need to distinguish between the different capabilities and sources on which hegemony is resting. These are (i) material [raw material, money,
industry, military, finance, etc.; (ii) ideational, ideological, or discourse-based [narratives of community, democracy, justice, transparency, development, etc.; (iii) institutional [formal and informal systems of rules of national and international bodies and organisations such as civil society groups, foundations, think tanks, etc.;] and (iv) performative [behaviours and rituals, national holidays, military parades, conference routines, academic prizes, street marches, etc.]. These forces are not only intertwined but also reinforce each other. Casier then turned to three countries located at different points along a continuum of hegemony and counter-hegemony: the US, China, and Russia. Although these countries’ capabilities are continuously shifting up and down along all of the four dimensions, and although China’s role is actually increasing while the Russian one is largely in decline, these changes in power and capabilities do not necessarily translate into challenges of the established hegemonic order. Only where the interlocking network of all four capabilities is changing simultaneously and to a significant extent, can we expect a new hegemony to arise. Although US hegemony is declining both in width and scope, no other country or group of countries is likely able of substituting the US in terms of proper hegemonic leadership which, not least, has been the result of a very peculiar historical period. Today, it would be more appropriate to speak of a system of “complex hegemonies”, according to which legitimated rule by a dominant power rests on a mixture of several forces – a mixture being in permanent flux and becoming manifest in constantly changing combinations. Considering this distinction between hegemony on the one hand and power sources and capabilities on the other would substantially help making the debate more focused and more systematic.

As argued by Elena Chebankova, reader in politics at the School of Social and Political Sciences, Lincoln, UK, the influence of ideology on hegemony is noteworthy. Both military and economic politics heavily rest on the ideological dimension. Ideologies tend to create regimes of truth that guarantee power and leadership. This has been the case, for instance, for the global diffusion of the so called “American way of life”. The West began to secure its hegemony at the end of the middle ages and this has lasted until recently when the liberal world order became to be replaced by the triumphant doctrine of the neoliberal mantra having swamped Western European society and, subsequently, having conquered the global hegemonic discourse. The ideational victory of liberalism at the end of the twentieth century marked the beginning of its internal crisis. This crisis unfolded with the emergence of new forms of ideological tyranny, political manipulation, hypocrisy, and control. The West has experienced this process across four different spheres: political, economic, ideological, and social. The idea of the state was recast, economic inequality sharpened, ideological and cultural control strengthened. This atmosphere fostered the emergence of alternative hegemonic doctrines promoted by other global actors. Russia, for example, began generating one such discourse both in the official and oppositional domains. While Russia’s ideological scene remains varied and diverse, a kind of “left conservative” leaning comes across as one important direction that could capture alternative hegemonic ground. This encompasses traditional modern ethics, coupled with ideas of social justice and cultural diversity in the international arena. Compared to left liberalism and right conservatism, left conservatism has not as yet not been tried out in most of the world apart from Russia. It might become an important ideological option for other countries as well.

In a similar vein to the arguments presented by Casier, Jan Aart Scholte, professor in Peace and Development at the School of Global Studies, University of Gothenborg, raised doubts about the allegedly dwindling strength of the liberal world order. Decomposing the notions of power, dominant power, governance, global governance, and legitimated global governance, Scholte argued that the latter in particular does not need to rest with any specific state or with any state at all. In reality, an order of legitimated liberal global governance is a question of more than just one state. It is represented, rather, by a combination of different countries and different types of actor. In contrast to the past, when multilateralism slowly replaced unilateralism and US hegemony, in the current period, the multilateral liberal world order is itself turning into what Scholte suggests calling multi-stakeholderism. Multi-stakeholderism does not replace multilateralism but functions on top of it. Its most important characteristics are elite networks of business, civil society, academia, multinational corporations, and non-governmental organisations. In an environment like this, it would be very
unlikely for any single country or group of countries to assume the role of a hegemonic power. In particular, if we consider the four main components of hegemony outlined by Casier in his contribution, no single country or group of countries can claim to be dominant in either of these four dimensions. Overall, ours continues to be a time of liberal world order, although that order has today assumed the character of multilateralism and multi-stakeholderism.

Claude Begle, an MP in the Swiss parliament and the CEO of SymbioSwiss, began his contribution with a tour de force through the history of the past century and a half. Focusing on the main sources of power being controlled by dominant countries, he mentioned colonialism, the era of superpowers during the Cold War, the phase of US hegemony (the so-called liberal world order), the first (US, Europe, Japan, Russia) and the second wave of multipolarity (plus BRICS countries). Similar to Scholte, Begle argued that characteristic of the present situation would not only be the decreasing significance of any one single country but, moreover, the declining role of governments and public actors in these constellations. Among the main actors nowadays are also multinational corporations (in both the West and East) and other non-governmental organisations. Overall, the main argument brought forward was that all countries currently suffer diverse types of domestic and internal contradictions in terms of social balance, institutional stability, political sanctions, and fluctuations in alliance partners. The winner in the future is likely to be a country, or group of countries, with the lowest number of such internal contradictions.

Concluding the panel was Daisuke Kotegawa, research fellow at the Canon Institute in Japan and a former representative of Japan at the IMF, came up with a number of intriguing tales concerning the role of US presidents since Bill Clinton (George W. Bush and Barack Obama) in the manifold efforts to establish relationships with North Korea. Kotegawa thereby highlighted the role of personality and individual leadership. Particularly enlightening were his remarks about Donald Trump. It turns out that the relationship between the US and the North Korean leaders cannot be seen as a one-shot event, but that is has actually been carefully prepared over a period of more than ten years. A special group of CIA agents born in North Korea and silently working in the shadow of official diplomacy has figured out the opportunities and constraints of more intense relationships. Contrary to the erroneous image depicted by Trump’s most recent initiatives, Kotegawa underlined the fact that the Singapore meeting had been carefully prepared for by the president: Trump had been briefed on the intricacies of Korean politics for eight hours per day over a period of about three consecutive months.
Summary

The challenges of security and development that Africa deals with, received particular attention during the Forum’s summit on Africa. The Summit included African politicians as well as representatives from the EU, Russia, and China, who discussed African countries’ potential and the issues hindering the realisation of this potential. Zyad Limam, Editor-in-Chief of Afrique Magazine, moderated the discussion, which included Prime Minister of Guinea, Ibrahima Kassory Fofana; Samia Nkrumah, President of the Kwame Nkrume Pan-African Centre; Mikhail Bogdanov, Deputy Foreign Ministry of Russia; Dioncounda Traoré, President of Mali (2012-13); Jean-Yves Ollivier, Founder and Chair of the Brazzaville Foundation; Hang Yuanxiang, Executive Vice President of the China Soong Ching Ling Foundation; and Sebastien Crozier, Senior Vice President of Orange.

The main message of the Summit was that while Africa is diverse, with more than 50 countries, a pan-African approach to development is a viable alternative to the individualised approach implemented after decolonisation. Through economic integration, argued Samia Nkrumah, the continent can become stronger and overcome the disadvantages brought on by the arbitrary national boundaries drawn by European powers. She used the example of the ‘Ghana-Guinea-Mali Union’ of the 1960s. When Guinea voted for full autonomy and independence from France in 1958, they were in many ways punished as the French left the country with everything. Ghana came to Guinea’s rescue, Samia Nkrumah said. When African states had an agenda for pan-African unity things were hopeful. This is the key for the future of Africa, she concluded.

Dioncounda Traoré said that Africa needs to be united and integrated economically, so that sustainable development can be realised. The African market is much stronger than each individual country’s market. But this is not to say that the individual interests of countries should be ignored.

It was pointed out that small and medium-sized companies are key for developing a sustainable economy in Africa, rather than large international corporations. According to Prime Minister of Guinea, Ibrahima Kassory Fofana, the agricultural sector is the future: African countries have the potential to produce far more food for the continent and would therefore have to import less food than at present. Africa is at a crossroads, he continued, on the one hand the continent is improving in terms of conflict (compared to the 1980s and 1990s), as well as combating diseases such as malaria and HIV. There are also booming economies, the younger generations are more well educated and less poor than previous generations. Parts of the continent are increasingly attractive to investment, particularly from China. In turn, Hang Yuanxiang spoke about the importance of cooperation for peaceful development. Mutual learning between civilizations is also key to building a community of a shared future that is fair and just.

The phrase ‘African solutions to African problems’ was Mikhail Bogdanov’s position, but with concerted and multilateral assistance from the international community. Internal stability in Africa is then of course critical, also due to an increase in terrorism in certain parts of the continent. However,
foreign countries should be involved, but not only militarily. Rather, external powers should invest in education, infrastructure, humanitarian aid, and job creation – as well as to help strengthen state institutions. This is also key in addressing migration from the African continent to Europe. Bogdanov emphasised Russia’s contributions to the UN, WHO, and other supranational organisations. He also said that Russia’s relationship with South Africa, and it could perhaps be a gateway of sorts to strengthen Russia’s relationships with the rest of the continent.

Jean-Yves Ollivier agreed with moderator, Ziad Limmam’s view that there is not only one Africa and that the continent is incredibly diverse. He went on to emphasise that the human aspect in dealing with African countries cannot be forgotten, as many countries are currently only viewing the continent as an investment opportunity. The world wants to teach Africa how to govern, etc. but the approach should instead be to help Africans find their own path – in an African context – that isn’t based on European models.

Sebastien Crozier discussed how telecom company Orange approaches their African markets, taking into account the various contexts and needs of consumers. He pointed to how ‘mobile money’ an example of how Africa has much to offer in terms of innovation and ingenuity. While Orange provides the same services across their markets in Africa, they try to adjust to the specificities of each country. Crozier continued by proposing that the key to peaceful development was people-to-people interaction and dialogue among African countries, something which technology can facilitate. He continued by clarifying the three types of customers in Africa:

two out of three people with mobile phones have a smart phone, the second group only have basic mobile phones but can still use services such as mobile money, and the third group are not connected to the internet at all. But the continent is ‘catching up’ to other regions in terms of use of social media networks.

But what is needed now in Africa for ‘harmonious development’? In order to make economic growth in Guinea more inclusive by trying to retain at least some revenue from, for example, the mining sector. The profits typically go to foreign companies, which President Fofana said should instead subcontract the work to African companies. He also emphasised that the agricultural sector will be the future of African economies.

The question of what role industrialisation has played in hindering Africa’s development and why that is. Nkrumah pointed to neoliberal policies that forced Ghana to open up its markets before it had a chance to follow through with the government’s post-independence industrialisation plans. She emphasised that industrialisation is a must for any economy to develop. There is also a lack of state control over the private sector; if there was a government leading the development of Africa, it could help strategically guide businesses towards the sectors that would foster sustainable growth. A single currency at least for the ECOWAS region would benefit Africa in terms of trade. “The Euro always has the last word”, Traoré said, and profits are usually in favour of the Eurozone. Nkrumah said that any decision about a single currency will have to be a serious political conversation. Plans for African unity more broadly have been made, but implementing them is what is holding the continent back.

Policy recommendations

A pan-African approach to development is needed. Thus far African countries have been treated individually, based on borders drawn by colonial powers. This does not mean that socioeconomic and political differences across Africa should not be considered; the distinction should be made based on culture, history, levels of infrastructure, resources (natural and human), production capacity, geography, etc. and not on national borders. Infrastructure projects should focus not only on connecting people within countries, but also across borders, integrating economies. Something similar to the Eurozone should be considered.

The agricultural sector should be the focus of investment. Many countries in Sub-Saharan Africa have the capacity to produce enough food for their people, yet food imports exceed production.
Human in the Third Industrial Revolution: to thrive or to survive?

Summary

Moderated by Rob van Kranenburg, Co-Founder of Bricolabs, the closing plenary session focused on the challenges that humanity is facing, and will continue to face, as technology is an increasing part of our lives. Speakers included Vladimir Yakunin, DOC Co-Founder and Chairman; Sophie Hackford, CEO of 1715 Labs; Scherto Gill, Senior Research Fellow at the Guerrand-Hermes Foundation for Peace; Kira Preobrazhenskaya, Professor at Herzen State Pedagogical University in St. Petersburg; Samia Nkrumah, President of the Kwame Nkrumah Pan-African Centre; and Fabio Petito, Professor at the University of Sussex;

The panel agreed that the human aspects of the world cannot be subsumed by AI and automation. Sophie Hackford advised that we should also reconsider the way we think about robots and AI, that they don’t have to be something completely separate from us, and that this sort of technology can be incorporated gradually rather than all at once as a single, massive disruption to the status quo.

Scherto Gill brought up the fact that AI does not have intentionality as humans do, and the lack of self-awareness is something that profoundly differentiates us from AI. Education was another area that Gill brought up, that our education systems have not responded adequately to technological advancements. The current model for education – a classroom with children of the same age being evaluated based on test scores and waiting for knowledge to be imparted to them – is outdated and should be revamped to become more holistic, as well as tailored to a child’s needs and capabilities.

Key-points

- Today’s world is facing a crisis of humanity.
- The world’s education systems have not responded adequately to technological advancement.
- Human aspects of the world cannot be subsumed by AI and automation.
- A balance is needed between fear and blind acceptance of technology such as AI.
Speaking about education more broadly, it is indeed the key to humanity adapting to and co-existing with technology such as AI.

Vladimir Yakunin argued that the world is facing not political or economic crises, but rather a crisis of humanity. If we are living in the type of crisis, we need to understand that AI and transhumanism are not without major drawbacks. As humans try to make life easier for themselves, we are foregoing what it means to be human.

Samia Nkrumah drew from personal experience, speaking about how she is the product of a pan-African marriage. This was forward thinking; as transboundary relationships were uncommon. Her father was Ghanaian, her mother was Egyptian; at first the couple had to communicate through translators. Nkrumah said that this, as well as her father’s book, *Conscientiousism: Philosophy and ideology for decolonisation*, are both examples of how some Africans were forward thinking. With technology, humanity now has the capacity to further this approach, bringing together Africans from across the continent.

Kira Preobrazhenskaya’s discussed the problematic nature of technology, in that technological processes do not care about humans. Technology’s presence in our lives is increasing without limits and without borders. There is no predictable trajectory, she continued, and thus the ‘zone of risks’ is multiplied with the advance of technology. While her overall argument was to avoid the rapid integration of technologies – particularly those that ‘dehumanise’ us, such as transhumanism – we must remember, it is humans who are behind AI, behind economic crises, and behind wars.

Fabio Petito looked back to when the in President Khatemi visited Italy and called for a ‘Dialogue of Civilizations’. He then proposed that unlike what is often argued, technological progress is not at odds with tradition. Cultural, social, civilisational traditions, values, and norms are the core of humanity; outside of these spheres is detrimental. As progress accelerates, these traditions need to be revitalised to help humanity embrace, yet remain wary of, technological advancements.

In closing, Rob van Kranenburg noted that we must not forget that we still have agency in how technology advances. Finding a balance between fear and blind acceptance of technology such as AI is where humanity in the third revolution will live.

### Policy recommendations

Policymaking should consider the unevenness of economic and social development and political contexts (more ‘democratic’ or more authoritarian) in the world, based on the assumption that different county needs different policies for developing their civilisation digitally. It was proposed here to develop a research project, but it should be more specific, like a base-line evaluation, before developing policies.

Regulations that prohibit, or at least inhibit, service provider monopolies. (See FCC broadband regulations and policies)

To create a level playing field for competition, global tech companies need to be taxed efficiently.

Data portability and data sharing must be ensured, while also taking into account privacy regulations.

To counter possible automation-induced persisting unemployment in emerging countries a Universal Basic Income should be granted, whereas in countries with strong social systems a reduction in working hours at same pay should be achieved to eradicate poverty or to free up time for important non-work-related activities (care-work, re-training, leisure).
DOC’s cooperation with the G20 Summit in Argentina

Summary

This year’s G20 priorities are deeply in-line with the work and mission of DOC. The Leaders Club Meeting at the 2018 Rhodes Forum provided a constructive and open platform for discussion and contribution to the development of policy recommendations for the G20, and other international institutions.

The Argentinian presidency of the G20 is focused on addressing the substantial discrepancies between countries in terms of economic growth and development. Sustainable development depends on geographical, historical, economic, cultural, and social characteristics of a country or region. It was stressed that a holistic and unbiased approach to solving these issues is greatly needed, particularly in a multipolar world.

Jean-Christophe Bas, CEO and Executive Board Chairman of DOC continued by guiding the discussion within the framework of the Argentinian presidency’s priorities and introduced a series of short presentations relating to the ‘Future of work’ topic and a discussion involving Pablo Ava, Head of Policy and Research at the Argentina Council of Foreign Relations, Co-chair Policy & Research of T20 Argentina, and Professor at the Universidad de Buenos Aires; Mario López-Roldán, Head of the Cabinet’s Intelligence Outreach & Speech Writing Unit at the OECD, Secretary of the OECD-Greece Joint Steering Committee at the Office of the Secretary General; Wang Wei, Executive Dean at Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies at Renmin University of China; Klemens Witte, Research Associate at DOC Research Institute; and José Siaba Serrate, Chair of CARI at the Task Force of Finance, T20 Argentina.

During this segment, participants discussed possible future scenarios relating to employment trends, the nature of labour demands, the changing nature of work/life balance, human capital, and the role of government. The overarching theme, which played into each of these topics, was the impact of technology on the future of work. More specifically, participants exchanged views on the following:

How is the nature of employment changing, and what does this mean for job opportunities? Of course, rapid technological advancements are playing a significant role, but in addition to the challenges presented by AI, automation, robotics, etc. are there opportunities to harness technology to generate jobs?

Technology is also deeply affecting the way firms operate. According to the upcoming 2019 World Development Report, “digital technologies allow firms to scale up or down quickly, blurring the boundaries of firms and challenging traditional production patterns. New business models – digital
platform firms – are evolving from local start-ups to global behemoths, often with few employees or tangible assets”. Broadband internet is allowing for the advent of platform marketplaces, which are able to provide people in less developed regions with goods and services not previously accessible. However, this is also changing labour demands in both emerging and developed economies, with automation making more advanced cognitive skills, problem-solving, social skills such as teamwork, and adaptability attractive to employers.

Another issue is how governments can become involved in ensuring that human capital is suitable for the changing nature of work. Many governments, particularly those of emerging or less-developed economies, are falling short in investing in the foundation of their work forces, which begins in early childhood. Given the change in the type of labour sought by employers (mentioned above), early childhood education (and healthcare – perhaps the most basic need) is likely the most critical aspect in establishing the skills that will make for a competitive and in-demand labour force. How exactly can governments, as well as international organizations invest not only in early childhood education, but also life-long learning programmes that can ‘re-skill’ the under and unemployed? Given that government budgets are finite, what areas of existing government spending can be shifted to programmes that will establish a workforce with the cognitive, problem-solving, social, and informational skills necessary for current and future labour demands?

The second segment was the same format as the first, with an introduction from Vladimir Yakunin and moderated by Jean-Christophe Bas. Those who engaged in the discussion were Gustavo Martinez, Managing Director, Argentine Council for International Relations (CARI); Sébastien Crozier, President of CFE-CGC Orange Mobile, Senior Vice President of Orange; Daisuke Kotebawa, Research Fellow at the Canon Institute, Japan and Former representative of Japan to the IMF; Holger Heims, Managing Director of Falcon Group; Peter W. Schulze, Professor of Political Science at University of Göttingen and Co-founder of the Dialogue of Civilisations Research Institute; Angelos Pangratis, Member of the High-Level Board of Experts on the Future of Global Trade Governance, Bertelsmann Stiftung, Advisor Hors Classe for the European Economic Diplomacy at the European External Action Service; and Mario López-Roldán from the OECD.

The discussion addressed how both national and cross-border infrastructure initiatives can help bolster sustainable development in emerging and lesser-developed economies, and what the potential implications are. The main questions that were raised during the discussion were:

Aside from being a critical topic in and of itself, investment in infrastructure projects are also tied to the future of work and job creation. Again, technology is central to the discussion on how infrastructure can enable sustainable development solutions. Affordable internet access for people in developing countries who remain unconnected is a much-needed area of investment. Through internet access, citizens can take advantage of educational resources to bolster their skills at much lower costs. This is critical in regions such as sub-Saharan Africa where higher education, as well as primary schooling, is often suboptimal for preparing them to participate in a globalised workforce. Not to mention the geographic distance between cities and villages, making physical access to education and learning programmes near-impossible for many. The key point then is how to make investment in broadband infrastructure projects attractive to multinational corporations and how to attract foreign direct investment (FDI).

Geographic limitations are a huge hinderance to economic development. China’s FDI in Africa is a key example of how a foreign power can quickly help resolve this issue. Connecting inland regions to port cities can help developing countries eventually become competitive trading partners, but it also brings some potential challenges depending on the model of investment, production, and consumption. How can businesses, governments, international institutions, and civil society help guide such projects in a mutually beneficial direction?

Are cross-border infrastructure projects only about business and economic development? Or is there the possibility that projects such as China’s Belt and Road Initiative can also create dialogue between countries
within the political, social, and cultural spheres? The ‘New Silk Road’ project has been touted as such by the Chinese government, promising a co-creation of humanity’s future. Perhaps if this aspect of BRI is to succeed there are other kinds of investment needed, in the form of cross-border education initiatives that can facilitate the development of businesses across borders and cultures.

---

Policy recommendations

Based on the discussions between Leaders Club Meeting participants the following policy recommendations were proposed, to be elaborated on and developed into full recommendations to be submitted to the G20 leadership, as well as to institutions such as the UNDP, World Bank, European Commission, African Union, etc.

Creation of a G20 or other platform for long-term development strategies. There are significant limitations associated with the fact that every year the agenda shifts from one set of priorities to another. Decisions made earlier do not always find support in subsequent years. In order to overcome this problem, it is necessary to create and support an international platform capable of working on long-term development goals in the framework of G20. This is not to say that each presidency of the G20 should not have its own short-term priorities, but these should be achievable within the duration of each presidency and support the long-term goals.

A universal basic income for economies that see a decrease in working hours (and thus lower incomes) due to AI, roboticisation, automation, etc.

Technological progress creates challenges for the employment structure, but we are observing that in some cases innovation outpaces society’s adaptation to technological advancement. With AI, roboticisation, and automation workers may see an increase in leisure time, and a decrease in working hours. This may very well result in a decrease in income, particularly for ‘blue collar’ workers. A universal basic income would be needed, based on the labour market and each country’s per capita income.

Investment in digital infrastructure projects. Broadband is allowing for the advent of platform marketplaces, which are able to provide people in less developed regions with goods and services not previously accessible. Policies that facilitate PPPs and make investment in digital infrastructure attractive are needed.

---

Early childhood education that fosters skills needed in the future labour force. Changing labour demands in both emerging and developed economies, with automation making more advanced cognitive skills, problem-solving, social skills such as teamwork, and adaptability attractive to employers. These skills should be focused on beginning with early childhood education, all the way through adult retraining programmes.

Continuing adult education and retraining programmes. Similar to the need for children learning the skills of a changing economic and labour structure, adults will need to adapt as well.

Adaptation of tax systems. Changes in the structure of employment will significantly affect related tax systems, which will need to be adapted to changes in the levels of labour input versus outputs.

An international platform for policy-making that engages both developed and developing countries in decision making processes. The current international system is focused on the leadership role of developed countries; today’s interconnected global world involves all countries in the global processes, however, their interests, economic opportunities, security architecture, and levels of development are not comparable. Special international platforms for cooperation should be created and supported, which will facilitate the countries from emerging regions to discuss their own needs and local development agenda.

The implementation of international cross-border projects with wider participation and inter-institutional cooperation of civil society, the private sector, and governments. This will help address legal and normative uncertainties; lack of policy coordination; lack of know-how and financial resources; different working practices and cultural barriers. For effective resolution of the mentioned obstacles special development platforms (centres/hubs) should be created and supported.

Special infrastructure development programmes should be created for regions in crisis. Many regions are in deep crisis due to military conflicts or natural disasters. Basic needs and requirements, such as access to water, electricity, and food supply, which are vital for these regions are not met. It is essential for the developed and developing countries to support the peacebuilding activities in the war-torn regions, the key is how policies can help make post-crisis investment in these areas attractive. This could possibly be something for CSR programmes.
Which sources can be trusted?
Media in the age of post-truth politics

Summary

The panel was dedicated to the role of media in the age of ‘post-truth politics’ and ‘fake news’ and possibilities of rebuilding trust in media.

Leading international journalists participating in the event included Eylon Levy from I24; Simon Shuster from Time Magazine; Mary Dejevsky, well known for her work in The Independent and The Guardian; Crystal Orderson from The Africa Report, and Ben Aris from IntelliNews. The discussion, which focused on, was moderated by Stefan Grobe from Euronews.

Eylon Levy kicked off the discussion by saying that he had not heard of the term ‘fake news’ before US President Donald Trump used it. Levy outlined the two main ways the term is used today: “One is in the sense of dismissing news reports that are uncomfortable even if they are entirely true, which seems to be the main form in which Donald Trump uses the term fake news.

The other is of course the very systematic attempts to disseminate deliberately fake news – in particular the example of Russian ‘troll farms’ which create and promote misinformation, or knowingly inaccurate information aimed at getting hits or driving ratings”.

Ben Aris described the phenomenon of fake news as “distressing”. He talked about how significantly journalism as a profession has changed over the years. Aris said that “the standards have changed, the requirement to try and be objective, the requirement to have two quotes, the requirement to back everything up with evidence and to take yourself out of the story has slowly slipped away.”

“Phrases like ‘it’s clear that’, ‘there’s no other explanation for’, and ‘it’s obvious that’, are phrases that should not be getting into anything other than opinion pieces, and yet they are part of reporting now,” Aris said.

Aris highlighted that the pressure, in part due to social media and new technologies, on journalists in the field to deliver quickly as a key part of the problem. As a result, the story is less about the facts of the case and more about the mood of people at a particular time. This is a fundamental part of the narrative in the media for stories about Russia, Aris said.

Simon Shuster looked at how the ‘fake news’ phenomenon differs country to country by looking at Germany and recent polls about ‘fake news’ and ‘misinformation’ in which a majority say they are aware of it and know to filter it out. He identified the reason for this as clear efforts by Chancellor Merkel to counter the phenomenon, as well as the specific media
environment which exists in Germany, in which public broadcasters and newspapers dominate the media scene. This traditional media environment is not, Shuster argued, particularly conducive to the expansion of ‘fake news’.

Crystal Orderson voiced concerns within Africa over the derogatory comments Trump has made about the continent. She traced the impact that Trump tweeting ‘fake news’ stories about ‘land grabs’ in South Africa has had on the country’s politics and economy: His ‘late night tweet’ sparked a market downturn and required a political response.

Mary Dejevsky noted that regarding the Brexit referendum, “my view, and it may be a minority view in the UK, is that social media and the Trump phenomenon and ‘fake news’ have had maybe less effect on the UK media and the UK political scene than they have almost anywhere else in the world.” “The British press has always been opinionated and politicised, so it is nothing new that the press at least is engaged in a political battle”, Dejevsky said.

“It does not seem to me that what we’re now calling ‘fake news’ is a new phenomenon in Great Britain; in some ways, Tony Blair and his spin machine was a much more sophisticated version of ‘fake news’ in the sense that it was designed to use facts but spin them in a particular way”, Dejevsky said, tracing ‘fake news’ back through the last 20-30 years of political discourse in the UK.

This is the first time that the Rhodes Forum has brought leading international journalists together to participate in a roundtable discussion focused specifically on issues relating to the challenges of working in the media today. The Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute hopes that this discussion will spark further and more profound examination of the changes underway in media ecosystems across the world.
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