

# IPI Salzburg Forum 2016: Open Societies under Attack

DECEMBER 2016

From September 4 to 6, 2016, IPI organized the Salzburg Forum at Schloss Leopoldskron in Salzburg, Austria—a major annual event to address global risks and challenges and contribute to more effective multilateral governance. This was the second Salzburg Forum, building on a major conference in 2015 on “The Rule of Law and the Laws of War.”

Participants from a range of backgrounds discussed a variety of interconnected issues including the governance of security, privacy and civic freedoms, manifestations of right-wing and Islamic radicalization, prevention of violent extremism and the incentives of terrorism, the spread of populism and authoritarianism, and the growing lack of trust in the political sphere.

This meeting note was drafted by Maximilian M. Meduna. The note reflects the rapporteur’s interpretation of the meetings and does not necessarily represent the views of all other participants.

The 2016 Salzburg Forum was made possible thanks to generous support from the Open Society Foundations and the King Abdullah Bin Abdulaziz International Centre for Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue (KAICIID).

## Introduction

How can open societies cope with threats that do not respect borders, from terrorist attacks, to cyber threats, to pandemics, to refugees and migrants? Will attempts to deal with these threats cause societies to become more closed, undermining the very elements of their success? Are open societies by their nature resilient, or does their openness make them vulnerable? Is the fear caused by “openness” fueling a rise in ideology and intolerance? And could the reaction it spawns lead to the type of tribalism and extremism that Karl Popper, and others since, warned about in his book *The Open Society and Its Enemies*? It is worth recalling what Popper wrote in 1945:

The more we try to return to the heroic age of tribalism, the more surely do we arrive at the Inquisition, at the Secret Police, and at a romanticized gangsterism. Beginning with the suppression of reason and truth, we must end with the most brutal and violent destruction of all that is human. There is no return to a harmonious state of nature. If we turn back, then we must go the whole way—we must return to the beasts.... We can return to the beasts. But if we wish to remain human, then there is only one way, the way into the open society.<sup>1</sup>

The UN system, also established in 1945, was designed “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war” and to establish and maintain conditions for dignity, justice, and progress for all.<sup>2</sup> Open societies are best suited to create such conditions. But with open societies under attack, what are the consequences for the international system? Will states seek to work more effectively to cope with transnational risks and challenges, or retreat behind ever-higher national walls?

The International Peace Institute’s (IPI) 2016 Salzburg Forum looked at these questions, seeking actionable solutions for maintaining open yet secure societies and for more effectively coping with the return of ideology. This was the third in a series of major conferences, following the 2015 forum on “The Rule of Law and the Laws of War” and the 2014 forum on “Lessons from the Past, Visions for the Future.” It brought together a high-level group of participants from diverse backgrounds, including the diplomatic, academic, and art communities, as well as current and former politicians, journalists, and representatives of civil society.

Under the Chatham House rule of non-attribution, six panels discussed a variety of interconnected issues, including the governance of security, privacy and civic freedoms, manifestations of right-wing and Islamic radicalization,

<sup>1</sup> Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies* (London: Routledge, 1945).

<sup>2</sup> United Nations, *Charter*, preamble.

prevention of violent extremism and the incentives of terrorism, the spread of populism and authoritarianism, and the growing lack of trust in the political sphere. One panel, on “Open Borders and Open Societies: Stability, Integration and Dialogue,” was co-organized with the King Abdullah International Centre for Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue (KAICIID).

There was also debate on what to do about large flows of refugees and migrants and their impact on open societies. Related to that theme, the Thyssen-Bornemisza Art Contemporary (TBA21) presented an art installation called “Green Light” by Danish-Icelandic artist Olafur Eliasson (see Annex 1).

Ivan Novak, from the avant-garde Slovenian rock band Laibach, made a presentation called “Laibach and the Sound of Ideology” on how music is often used to promote ideology. He used art, including posters made by Laibach, to show how symbols and images can be manipulated to depict martial themes (see Annex 1).

## The Impact of Openness: More Liberal or More Unsafe?

The first panel discussed a fundamental question facing open societies: Do the characteristics that make open societies strong also make them vulnerable? Since the collapse of communism, it was noted, the world has witnessed a window of opportunity in the increasing flow of everything across borders—people, goods, services, capital, and information. Twenty-five years later, many agreed it would not be in our interest to close this window. But at the same time, it is becoming increasingly challenging to maintain stability and security in open societies. Participants considered how leaders and societies can adapt to change and confront these challenges so as to avoid upheaval or collapse.

One of the most important transformations facing open societies, one participant noted, is that many are beginning to challenge long-held assumptions about national borders. One participant challenged the idea (put forth by Ian Bremmer, among others) that open borders make authoritarian regimes more unstable. On the contrary, it was argued, they allow a critical mass of the opposition to leave the country, as many prefer

emigration to confrontation. Participants also considered how to convince the public that closing borders will not increase security. It is now easier, one discussant noted, to cross borders between states than between social classes—a change from the closed borders of the Soviet bloc, where internal social mobility was easier than external migration. As one speaker observed, we need “smart borders”; fences and walls will not protect sovereignty, but a world without borders would be chaotic.

Migration, however, is not only geographic. It was observed that the “open” Internet society causes a migration of worldviews from the center to the extremes. Despite much quicker and easier access to a wide spectrum of information, many people gravitate toward limited sources of information that reinforce their existing views. It was pointed out that web-content algorithms are matching user expectations, while social media communities are interacting within like-minded bubbles, which gradually radicalizes their positions. More open sources of information are not necessarily leading to more open minds.

Another observation was that the countries that profited most from globalization in earlier times now “feel like losers.” Many used to perceive globalization as “Americanization” and as largely in the interest of the United States. However, globalization does not always benefit the United States. One speaker noted, for example, that the spread of English has often limited US officials to gathering information from and interacting with a select group of English-speaking elites, which can provide a distorted picture of other societies. Furthermore, sensitive leaks from US government agencies are globally more accessible than, for instance, those from the Chinese government, simply due to the language barrier.

Participants also expressed concern about liberal democracies restricting freedoms in the name of security. Open societies are increasingly concerned about the threat of terrorist attacks, but it was argued that increased “securitization” and restrictions on basic freedoms in response to such attacks also threaten open societies. Participants suggested that an independent press and media pluralism are core elements of safe and open societies but that hate speech and instigation to violence should be considered unacceptable. A participant also

described as worrisome any attempts by governments to “control the minds of their people.”

Human rights are at the center of open societies. In debating the refugee crisis and human rights violations around the world, one speaker asked whether human rights should be framed on the basis of what the majority in a given society thinks, or whether they are universal. The speaker noted three main tensions open societies are facing in relation to human rights:

- Tension between countering violent extremism, counterterrorism, and security, on the one hand, and human rights, on the other, including questions related to gathering of personal data by government agencies fighting a “war on terror,” suspension of the rule of law, lack of access to fair trials, and militarization of the police;
- Questions of national identity and sovereignty, reflected, for example, in the tension between the European Court of Human Rights and France concerning the burqa, as well as between the International Criminal Court (ICC) and certain African states; and
- The relationship between resources and human rights, as in states that deny parts of their population access to both resources and human rights

protections and in those that provide weapons and training to other states that systematically violate human rights.

In discussing human rights, participants asked how an international system based on peer pressure can be effective if some key players are no longer playing by the rules. It was stressed that liberties should not be taken for granted and that turning a blind eye or supporting bad behavior abroad can have dangerous unintended consequences at home and for the greater world order. Both institutions and the general public need to remind leaders to honor laws and political commitments, even (or especially) in the absence of political will to do so.

A conversation also developed around what has been called “demographic fear”—the reaction of demographic majorities to becoming minorities—driven by feelings of losing out and needing to “protect their way of life.” The rise in demographic groups that feel threatened—like the white working class in the United States—is fueling support for parties defending the status quo against change and “otherness.” It was argued that this trend needs to be taken seriously as part of an attempt to redefine open societies to make them better able to address the dynamics of change.



Participants in the 2016 IPI Salzburg Forum



## Controlling Threats to Open Societies: Increasing Security or Tyranny?

Focusing on the question of how to strengthen the resilience of open societies in light of threats like terrorism, the panelists looked in particular at the case of Tunisia. The country was targeted by terrorists who viewed it as diametrically opposed to their agenda, demonstrating how terrorists attack democracy all over the world, not only in the West. Terrorists targeted public places (to spread fear), as well as mosques and churches (to fan religious conflict).

Participants identified several factors that helped Tunisia withstand a “security shock” following these attacks. While many contextual factors might not be translatable to other societies—there is no “Tunisian spring” that can be exported, cautioned one speaker—participants highlighted the role of compromise and dialogue as the basis for consensus, even in a deeply divided society. It was recalled how Tunisia managed to implement a democratic constitution that affirmed the rule of law and human rights through a process that involved civil society and settled disagreements through dialogue. It was also noted how Tunisia managed to maintain stability in a volatile region while taking in more than 1 million refugees from Libya. Another speaker emphasized that since its independence, Tunisia has been a Muslim country, not an Islamic state, and that the government regulates the work of imams and preachers to guide them toward a more moderate understanding of Islam.

Concerning the broader issue of how to confront terrorism, one participant pointed out that “the point of terror is to terrorize” by spreading fear and anxiety that goes far beyond the actual attack. This, in turn, creates a desire for security. But, the speaker asked, how much security is needed? How much is too much? Where are the boundaries between security and other values such as privacy and civic freedoms? It was observed that great powers did not always respect human rights in their fight against terrorism, especially in regard to detainees, which increases tensions and sends a dangerous signal. One speaker suggested redirecting funding from counterterrorism

programs toward educating youth in universal values. The speaker also noted the need for the UN system to develop a comprehensive global strategy to combat terrorism and violent extremism, including through a focus on education, security, social economy, culture, and law.

The rise of authoritarian ideologies has challenged not only universal norms but also secularism. How does a secular democracy confront and interact with more deeply religious societies? What happens to Western societies attempting to integrate large numbers of people with different ideas about the role of religion in society? Coining the notion of “post-secularism,” one participant worried about militarized overreactions by states when their mythical-historical sense of identity feels threatened by dynamics such as globalization and migration. Such overreactions are precisely the goal of terrorism—manipulating, dividing, and breaking social bonds, particularly between states and their Muslim residents. To counter this societal breakdown and stop people from falling into extremes, several participants agreed that the media and political leaders have a responsibility to explain the nuances underlying complex issues.

Finally, seminar participants attempted to explain the phenomenon of Trump voters. They described people whose “American dream” has faded and whose incomes have dropped—who see America being less important and less decisive in the world, are angry at elites and consider both parties to be merely wings of the same political class, are voting for change (regardless of what type of change it may be), and want to be protected from uncontrolled immigration. In some ways, one participant noted, these voters are non-ideological and profoundly unhappy with the direction the country is going.

## A Different Narrative: Political Islam and the Spell of Ideology

Approaching the contentious subject of political Islam through an analytical lens, one participant identified Islamism as a global ideology manifested under different labels, all of which emerged after the 1979 Iranian revolution (with the exception of

the Muslim Brotherhood). The speaker postulated that under all of these labels, Islamism is a totalitarian ideology that aims to overturn the existing world order. Others agreed that Islamism should be considered an ideology, noting that the foundation of the Muslim Brotherhood in 1928 has to be understood as a response to the abolition of the Ottoman Caliphate; since then, all prominent Islamist thinkers have ultimately aimed to reestablish the caliphate.

It was argued, however, that Islamism as an ideology has been less influential on a global scale than the twentieth-century totalitarian ideologies. Islamism has primarily exerted “soft power” that occasionally influences the international agenda of regional powers. According to the speaker, Islamism has been less influential due to divisions between Shia and Sunni Muslims and the stagnation of the Muslim world. The speaker concluded that this stagnation can no longer be attributed to Western colonialism—“From Mali to Bali,” the key to resolving Muslims’ problems is in the hands of Muslims themselves. The speaker proposed an Islamic equivalent of the European Treaty of Westphalia to end sectarian divisions and conflicts, while suggesting that the West stand firmly by its democratic values at the same time as improving its knowledge of Islamic history.

Another participant disagreed with this assessment, suggesting that the term “Islamism” does not reflect a coherent ideology and should therefore be avoided. The speaker argued that, while the first thinkers of political Islam emerged in the 1920s in parallel to Nazi and Communist totalitarian ideologies, the contemporary debate is less about ideology than values. This is reflected, according to the speaker, in the vision of Islamic societies as opposed to Western values, as well as in tensions between secular majorities and Muslim minorities in Europe. It is hypocritical, the speaker argued, to interpret manifestations of Islam as ideology-based and those of Christianity as values-based.

Moving on to the influence of political Islam in Europe, one participant noted that radicalization of Europeans is wrongly seen as a spillover from Middle Eastern conflicts. It was suggested that Europeans are radicalizing themselves and going to

the Middle East. This speaker pointed out that most Western Islamist radicals have no religious background, and that links between mosques and radicalization do exist, but only in some countries (although another participant noted that there is little correlation between religious education and radicalization). Suggesting a new “anthropology of radicalization,” the speaker also noted that many of these radicals have a background in petty crime and could be predisposed to antisocial behavior—what could be called the “Islamization of radicals, not a radicalization of Islam.”

Arguing for “more drastic measures,” another participant suggested that radicalization in Europe is increasing exponentially, while policymakers are only addressing it with incremental changes. According to the speaker, the past five years have seen a significant surge in jihadi activity, including an increase in the number of attacks and plots each year. The speaker identified four fundamental factors driving jihadism: (1) an increase in the number of returned jihadi fighters; (2) increasing socioeconomic disparities between Muslims and non-Muslims in Europe; (3) conflict zones in the Middle East that reinforce the sense that Muslims are suffering on a global scale, attract fighters from Europe, and serve as jihadi training grounds; and (4) the spread of the Internet as a tool jihadi militants are using to recruit and communicate. To deal more effectively with these challenges, there was a call for both hard measures (e.g., monitoring the Internet, lengthening prison sentences) and soft measures (e.g., launching massive education programs in marginalized neighborhoods).

## The Limits of Tolerance: Tackling Radicalism and Violent Extremism

In defending the open society, Karl Popper argued that “we should...claim, in the name of tolerance, the right not to tolerate the intolerant.”<sup>3</sup> In discussing the notion of tolerance, one speaker noted that tolerance should not be an abstraction but a more inclusive experience of living together. Another suggested that we should seek not only to tolerate each other but to accept each other. In

3 Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*.

exploring the limits of tolerance, participants debated why radicalism and violent extremism have resurged and how best to address them—including through dialogue, education, mass media, and an alliance of moderate voices in the Muslim world.

One speaker noted that today's radicalism and violent extremism do not reflect a conflict between religion and secularism but between universal values and particular values. They can be seen as the struggle to achieve for Islamic societies what the Renaissance and Enlightenment achieved for the West—namely, to apply universal values not only to God but to humans, giving birth to what became known as “human rights.”

Another speaker suggested that tackling radicalism and violent extremism requires communicating with and understanding violent extremists. The example was given of Saudi Arabia, which, according to the speaker, is undergoing a period of introspection to understand why and how violent extremism is changing its social fabric. Its response has included the al-Munasah (“advice”) initiative aimed at rehabilitating and reintegrating extremists into the community through three steps: (1) psychologically evaluating the person considered to have extremist or violent views; (2) challenging the person's beliefs with their own language without trying to impose a counter-view; and (3) reconnecting the person with their previous social fabric, for which their friends and families share responsibility. Beyond that program, Saudi Arabia was said to be undertaking a more expansive effort to engage in dialogue with non-Muslims (e.g., through KAICIID), although some thought the focus should remain on Muslims “putting their own house in order.”

While the speaker noted that this Saudi initiative has a “high success rate” (about 10–15 percent), one participant observed that it has a severe sample bias, since it excludes hardcore militants. Another expert also observed that de-radicalization in the sense of changing the individual's views is extremely rare. The vast majority of those who are de-radicalized merely demobilize for a short period of time. They remain nonviolent only when subjected to daily reporting to police and similar punitive threats by the state. Hardcore militants who instigate violence are deeply alienated from society, exhibiting a commitment based on

ideology that is deeply entrenched.

Addressing the issue at hand, one panelist identified three interconnected questions: (1) how should we deal with violent extremism; (2) how should we deal with nonviolent extremists; and (3) how can we prevent nonviolent extremists from becoming violent? In answering these questions, the speaker gave a broad overview of various strands of right-wing extremism and radicalism (ranging from hardcore neo-Nazis, neo-fascists, and ultra-national identity movements to counter-jihadists driven by strong anti-Muslim, anti-immigration, and anti-globalization tendencies).

To assess the extent of the threat posed by such movements and identify what kind of right-wing movements attract broad support and what kinds have a potential to incite violence, the presenter gave as an example the case of the Norwegian far-right terrorist Anders Behring Breivik, whose writings reveal four levels of radicalization:

- Opposition to Islam, immigration, cultural Marxism, feminism, globalization, ruling elites, mass media, and academia, including the view that leaders are naive idealists who are destroying society because they do not know what they are doing;
- Conspiracy theories concerning the Norwegian and Western democratic elites (e.g., the “Arabia conspiracy” to Islamize Europe and destroy European values as we know them, globalization and new world order conspiracy theories), including the view that ruling elites are not naive but evil and are purposely trying to destroy society;
- The idea that revolution is necessary to create a new society, the system is rigged and impossible to reform, and leaders are fundamentally evil; and
- The realization that armed struggle is necessary here and now.

Breivik, said the speaker, hoped to escalate conflict between the ruling elite and broad masses, leading to anti-jihadist allies “seeing the light and taking up armed struggle.” In short, he hoped for civil war in Norway and Western Europe. In reality, no such escalation occurred. No copycats emerged, no civil war started, and presumed allies rejected him, his violent strategy, and terrorist action. Even neo-Nazis did not sympathize with him because he

was pro-Israel and a proud Freemason and Christian. Curiously, though, during his ideological development in prison since 2011, Breivik renounced all anti-jihadist and pro-Christian positions. Concluding, the speaker gave the following answers to his set of three introductory questions:

1. There can be no tolerance in dealing with violent extremists like Breivik. The full force of the law must be applied.
2. Nonviolent extremists, on the other hand, should be treated with the utmost tolerance. We should talk to them and confront their views.
3. Nonviolent extremists should not be given any excuse to become terrorists, and the priority should be on preventing escalation.

## Open Borders and Open Societies: Stability, Integration and Dialogue<sup>4</sup>

There are currently 60 million displaced people in the world, and over 250 million migrants worldwide—more than at any point since the Second World War. This movement has transformed countries of origin, transit, and destination while also highlighting how interconnected the world has become. Participants discussed the root causes of the increasing flow of refugees and migrants and how they relate to the concepts of open societies, ideology, security, grievances, identity, and dialogue.

Expressing concern about the state of the world today, one speaker called for changing the language we use in talking about the refugee situation, giving as examples the negative connotations of terms like a “flood of people” or “crisis.” The speaker emphasized the value of refugees and how they can contribute to host societies, urging decision makers and the public to think beyond walls and weapons.

Analyzing the current narratives surrounding the debate on integrating refugees, one panelist warned of the negative consequences caused by reducing problems in society to religion. Instead, there should be a shared awareness that “we are all responsible”—including representatives of religious communities,

politicians, and decision makers. In discussing the rise of Islamophobia in Europe, the speaker emphasized that some religions in Europe are treated as “more equal” than others. Participants asked whether a common narrative of Islam in Europe is creating a homogenous “villain” to attack, noting that Islam as a religion is not homogenous. It was noted that, while Islam has a largely negative image in many parts of the world, that has not always been the case. Several participants agreed that open dialogue, including interreligious dialogue, is one of the most important ways to contribute to stability and peace.

Focusing on Syria, one panelist critiqued a number of widely held beliefs related to the role of religion in the conflict. According to the speaker, the conflict in Syria is not driven by extremism or sectarianism but is a reaction to politics of violent oppression. Moreover, the role of religion is widely overestimated—ISIS has killed more Sunni Muslims than any other group. In order to tackle the refugee situation, the speaker continued, decision makers need to fully understand why people flee. They should focus on promoting education, critical thinking, and the need for justice and accountability in Syria.

Another speaker focused on Iraq, noting that the country has shifted from relative ethnic and religious harmony to “conflict, crime, isolation and displacement.” The speaker identified the key reasons for radicalization as: poverty, corruption, and marginalization; lack of education, freedoms, and respect for religion; and the inhumane situation in US-run Iraqi prisons such as Abu Ghraib, where many ISIS fighters were radicalized. The speaker also observed that, while Western societies accuse Middle Eastern countries of being closed societies, many ISIS fighters are coming from Europe.

## Globalization and Its Enemies: Toward a Global Open Society?

The seminar concluded with a discussion of whether the international community, particularly in the context of the United Nations, is a global

<sup>4</sup> Panel co-organized with the King Abdullah International Centre for Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue (KAICIID).



open society and how it can confront the backlash against globalization by those who perceive it as a threat. One speaker suggested that current rhetoric could be a precursor to totalitarianism similar to that which emerged in twentieth-century Europe, noting that right-wing extremism could be “only the beginning.”

The speaker said that communism, fascism, and Nazism also influenced the ideologies of the Muslim Brotherhood, Hamas, and the Iranian leadership. “Occidental” and “oriental” totalitarisms thus share several features: (1) the concept of a utopia (the Third Reich, the communist paradise, the caliphate); (2) their dictatorial nature; and (3) their claim that terrorism is not only legitimate but a necessary means to achieve the utopian society. While agreeing that there are commonalities between these different ideologies, another participant cautioned against lumping them together. The speaker outlined his idea of a “triangular relationship” between threats, challenges, and the policy responses required.

In terms of understanding the growing trends of radicalization, one participant pointed out that while individuals might propagate extremist ideologies, it is the resonance of these ideologies with people facing socioeconomic difficulty that leads to mobilization. Some participants noted that jihadi movements seem to be perfectly adapted to the dynamics of globalization, particularly groups like ISIS that do not recognize national borders or need a territorial basis—the conceived caliphate is essentially a society without a state.

One discussant identified three broad dynamics

that create a “backdrop of confusion” to ongoing debates on integration, borders, and stability: (1) the crisis of Western democracies; (2) the crisis of the international financial system; and (3) the crisis of the global governance system. With many changes happening in parallel on a global scale, it was reasoned that joining radical movements could help people bring order to their otherwise confused lives, providing structure, employment, meaning, and purpose.

An additional dynamic behind these debates was identified as the “tech revolution,” with mobile phones referred to as “weapons of mass confusion” in a context where jihadi groups use communication technology in sophisticated ways. Referring to platforms like Google and Facebook that push personalized and unverified content, one speaker highlighted that users are more likely to receive information that already fits with their established beliefs. The speaker thus dismissed the belief that the Internet spreads democracy and information. Another speaker added that the unprecedented speed of the information revolution, along with fundamental demographic changes, are the main vulnerabilities facing short-sighted modern democracies.

Taking a final outlook on the future, it was observed that Europe has a post-colonial problem: the continent is transitioning from mono-ethnic states to permanently diverse societies. The real issue for Europeans in protecting their democracies is to come to grips with their diversity and the past they share with Muslims and other social groups in Europe.



## Annex 1: Artistic Presentations

### “Green Light,” by Olafur Eliasson and TBA21

“Green Light: An Artistic Workshop” is a project initiated by Danish-Icelandic artist Olafur Eliasson and co-produced by the Thyssen-Bornemisza Art Contemporary, Vienna. It was originally held at TBA21-Augarten from March to July 2016 as an artistic workshop and ongoing multifaceted program of shared learning for thirty-five migrants who had arrived in Austria since the summer of 2015. The green lights jointly manufactured in the workshop are conceived by Eliasson as metaphors for refugees and migrants in Austria and beyond. As such, the project represents an attempt to dissolve interpersonal, cultural, linguistic, and social borders through shared experiences and learning and to raise funds for organizations involved in supporting integration.

A small workshop was held for all forum participants to engage in acts of connective fabrication with “Green Light” experts. The aim was to contribute to the discourse around civic involvement, open societies, and cultures of welcoming, testifying to the agency of contemporary art and its potential to initiate processes of civic transformation.

### “Laibach and the Sound of Ideology” by Ivan Novak

The presentation by Ivan Novak of the avant-garde Slovenian rock band Laibach, titled “Laibach and the Sound of Ideology,” focused on the intertwining of art and politics in history and today, especially in popular culture and its influence on popular politics. The presentation also offered a “solution” to this intertwining, explaining the tactics the mixed-media art group Laibach uses to stay “independent” but relevant within the worlds of both art and politics.



Huseyin Haj Hassan, a member of the “Green Light” delegation

## Annex 2: Agenda

Sunday, September 4, 2016

8:15pm      **Welcome and Introduction**  
Andrea Pfanzelter, *Senior Director, IPI (Vienna)*

Monday, September 5, 2016

9:30–11:00      **Session 1: The Impact of Openness: More Liberal, or More Unsafe?**  
*What is an “open society” in the original understanding of Karl Popper, and what are its indispensable principles? How is the modern liberal democracy—as the manifest form of the open society—to be understood in the flow of history, and how does it relate to its counterparts, fundamentally distinguishable by the dominance of ideology (totalitarian and radical in its most authoritarian form) rather than rational, discursive, informed, and participatory “truth”-finding processes? How are basic elements of open societies (such as literacy, anonymity, social mobility, inclusivity, education, pluralism, and the capacity to enable and integrate critical arguments) reflected in our current systems of democratic governance, and how stretched is the space between ideal-type and reality? Are open societies their own worst enemy (e.g., due to loose regulation of borders, cyberspace, and financial flows)? How can open societies prevent their freedom and openness from being abused? How can leaders and societies be encouraged to adapt to change so that change does not lead to upheaval or collapse?*

**Chair**

Walter Kemp, *Senior Vice President, IPI*

**Panelists**

Ivan Krastev, *Chairman, Centre for Liberal Strategies*

Dunja Mijatović, *Representative on Freedom of the Media, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe*

Tawanda Mutasah, *Senior Director for International Law and Policy, Amnesty International*

11:00–11:30      Break

11:30–1:00      **Session 2: Controlling Threats to Open Societies: Increasing Security or Tyranny?**  
*Open societies today are faced by a range of threats and challenges, particularly terrorism. How can liberal democracies retain their openness while maintaining security? How can they be resilient in the face of threats? How can they reconcile tensions between security and justice, safety and privacy, and transparency and control? What arguments shape the debate in relation to issues of access, data, knowledge, markets, and government? Does too much freedom undermine civilization, or does too much control risk tyranny and totalitarianism in order to save the state from its enemies? In the face of such threats, how can liberal democracies promote good governance, not just strong governance? If free markets are contributing to unchecked capitalism, growing inequality, and corruption, what is the alternative? Where in our societies is the authority and legitimacy to tackle these questions located, and how can institutional and personal accountability be ensured in a sustainable way?*

**Chair**

Natalie Nougayrède, *Foreign Affairs Commentator and Editorial Board Member, The Guardian*

**Panelists**

Abdessattar Ben Moussa, *President, Tunisian Human Rights League*  
 Steven Erlanger, *London Bureau Chief, New York Times*

1:00–3:00

Lunch

3:00–5:30

**Session 3: Responsibility and Protection: Preventing Mass Atrocities**

*While “open societies” are regarded as constructing their narrative through rationality and discourse, ideology has endured as the dominant narrative in other societies that have followed different trajectories of development. How did political Islam as a dogmatic narrative gain prominence in the past decades, and how does it relate to open societies? In the quest for individual and social meaning, what alternatives does ideology provide in today’s world? What is the role of authority and social power or capital in either social configuration? How do secularism, consumerism, the role of media, and corporate power shape social behavior, and what narrative vacuums do they create? How does economic imperialism and the disenfranchisement of social groups relate to authoritarianism, both institutional and ideological? Is contemporary Islamic extremism conceptually comparable to European totalitarianism of the past?*

**Chair**

Moeed Pirzada, *TV anchor and political commentator*

**Panelists**

Thomas Hegghammer, *Senior Research Fellow, Norwegian Defence Research Establishment (FFI), and Adjunct Professor of Political Science, University of Oslo*  
 Mehdi Mozaffari, *Professor Emeritus, Department of Political Science, Aarhus University*  
 Olivier Roy, *Joint Chair, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, and Chair in Mediterranean Studies, European University Institute*

6:30–7:15

**Laibach and the Sound of Ideology**

Art presentation by artist Ivan Novak

Tuesday, September 6, 2016

9:30–11:00

**Session 4: The Limits of Tolerance: Tackling Radicalism and Violent Extremism**

*“We should...claim in the name of tolerance the right not to tolerate the intolerant,” Popper reasoned in defense of the open society. Why are right-wing radicalism and far-left politics returning within our modern liberal democracies, particularly after the lessons of the 20th century? Is totalitarianism a response to modernity or its logical consequence? How does contemporary right-wing radicalism compare with fascist ideologies of the past and the violent extremism of today? Is it what Popper would have described as a return to “tribalism”? How should we combat anti-Semitism? How do we deal with responses to violent extremisms that adopt the same radical narrative? What components of governance have failed, leading to radicalism within liberal democracies? Is Islamic violent extremism a reaction to liberal democracy or an independent development?*

**Chair**

Nasra Hassan, *Senior Adviser, IPI*

### Panelists

Emmanuel Adamakis, *Exarch of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, and Board Member, King Abdullah Bin Abdulaziz International Centre for Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue (KAICIID)*

Turki Al Faisal, *Chairman, King Faisal Center for Research and Islamic Studies*  
Øystein Sørensen, *Professor, University of Oslo*

11:00–11:30

Break

11:30–1:00

### Session 5: Open Borders and Open Societies: Stability, Integration, and Dialogue

*There are currently more than 60 million displaced people and 250 million migrants worldwide. This is an unprecedented volume of people on the move, causing fundamental social transformation in countries of origin, transit, and destination. In particular, while the wars in Syria and parts of Iraq have triggered unprecedented refugee flows, they have also highlighted how interconnected the world has become. On a smaller scale, this is also true for other conflicts, such as in Myanmar, Central Africa, and Nigeria. What are the root causes of the increasing flows of refugees and migrants, and how do they relate to the concepts of open societies, ideology, security, grievances, identity, and dialogue? Can fences and walls defend the values of open societies, or do they create closed societies? And if closed societies are not a viable solution, what vision, narratives, and policies can cope with this challenge? How can we protect people on the move while protecting societies? What strategies—including forms of interreligious dialogue—can be developed to promote integration within increasingly diverse societies?*

### Welcome and Introduction

Faisal Bin Muaammar, *Secretary General, King Abdullah Bin Abdulaziz International Centre for Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue (KAICIID)*

### Chair

Patrice Brodeur, *Senior Adviser, King Abdullah Bin Abdulaziz International Centre for Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue (KAICIID)*

### Panelists

Vian Dakheel Saeed, *Member of the Council of Representatives of Iraq*

Nedžad Grabus, *Grand Mufti of Slovenia, and Professor, Faculty of Islamic Studies, University of Sarajevo*

Hind Kabawat, *Director of Interfaith Peacebuilding, Center for World Religions, Diplomacy, and Conflict Resolution*

1:00–2:00

Lunch

2:00–4:00

### Green Light: An Artistic Workshop

4:00–5:30

### Globalization and Its Enemies: Toward a Global Open Society?

*Is the international community, particularly in the context of the United Nations, a global open society? How can states that aspire to such a vision protect the international system from threats of disorder, violations of basic principles, and violent non-state actors? Will a quest for order come at the expense of freedoms? Is globalization itself perceived as a threat to some, causing a backlash in favor of nationalism, protectionism, anti-universalism, and the politics of identity, which can be exploited by populists and demagogues? What more can be done to*



*promote peace in unstable regions as an end in itself and as a way of reducing the risk of knock-on effects in other parts of the world (for example in the form of organized crime, terrorism, or extremism)? What can be done to strengthen a sense of global consciousness and solidarity to encourage more humanitarian assistance, promote democracy, enhance cooperation to deal with global challenges, and uphold universal human rights and freedoms?*

**Chair**

Terje Rød-Larsen, *President, IPI*

**Panelists**

Turki Al Faisal, *Chairman, King Faisal Center for Research and Islamic Studies*

Natalie Nougayrède, *Foreign Affairs Commentator and Editorial Board Member, The Guardian*

Thomas Seifert, *Editor in Chief, Wiener Zeitung*

Øystein Sørensen, *Professor, University of Oslo*

## Annex 3: Participants

**Fahad Abualnasr**

Director General, KAICIID

**Mohammed Abu-Nimer**

Senior Advisor, KAICIID

**Andreas Accardo**

Head of Director's Office, European Union  
Agency for Fundamental Rights

**Emmanuel Adamakis**

Exarch of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of  
Constantinople, and Board Member, KAICIID

**Fabrice Aidan**

International Adviser, Edmond de Rothschild  
Group

**Alvaro Albacete**

Deputy Secretary-General for External Relations,  
KAICIID

**Adel bin Khalifa Hamad Al Fadhil**

Deputy Interior Minister, Kingdom of Bahrain

**Turki Al Faisal**

Chairman, King Faisal Center for Research and  
Islamic Studies

**Khalid bin Saud Al Faisal**

Advisor to the Chairman, King Faisal Center for  
Research and Islamic Studies

**Khalil Taher Algharairi**

Office Manager, Office of the Deputy Interior  
Minister, Kingdom of Bahrain

**Hamad Al Majed**

Board Member, KAICIID

**Khaled Al Rashed**

Assistant of the Secretary General, KAICIID

**Ammar Mustafa Al Sayed**

Director, Officers Training College

**Milad Amiry**

Green Light delegation, Thyssen-Bornemisza Art  
Contemporary

**Zaina Asaad**

Events Intern, IPI (Vienna)

**Susanna Barla**

Thyssen-Bornemisza Art Contemporary

**Bethany Bell**

Journalist, BBC

**Andrej Benedejčič**

Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of  
the Republic of Slovenia to the Organization for  
Security and Co-operation in Europe and other  
International Organizations in Vienna

**Abdessattar Ben Moussa**

President, Tunisian Human Rights League

**Nasser Berhan**

Assistant of Prince Turki Al Faisal

**Faisal Bin Muaammar**

Secretary General, KAICIID

**Abdullah Binshuwaish**

Accompanying Prince Turki Al Faisal

**Johanna Borstner**

Office and Events Manager, IPI (Vienna)

**Nart Bouran**

Head, Sky News Arabia

**Patrice Brodeur**

Senior Advisor, KAICIID

**Maria Zeneida Angara Collinson**

Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of  
the Philippines to the United Nations and other  
International Organizations in Vienna

**Vian Dakheel Saeed**

Member of the Council of Representatives of Iraq

**Georg Eder**

Project Manager, Thyssen-Bornemisza Art Contemporary

**Raphaela Engel**

Security Policy Adviser, Austrian Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports

**Steven Erlanger**

London Bureau Chief, *New York Times*

**Nejib Friji**

Director, IPI (Manama)

**Nedžad Grabus**

Grand Mufti of Slovenia, and Professor, Faculty of Islamic Studies, University of Sarajevo

**Hyseyin Haj Hassan**

Green Light delegation, Thyssen-Bornemisza Art Contemporary

**Nasra Hassan**

Senior Adviser, IPI

**Huseyin Haj Hassan**

Green Light delegation, Thyssen-Bornemisza Art Contemporary

**Thomas Hegghammer**

Senior Research Fellow and Adjunct Professor of Political Science, Norwegian Defence Research Establishment (FFI), University of Oslo

**Hind Kabawat**

Director of Interfaith Peacebuilding, Center for World Religions, Diplomacy, and Conflict Resolution

**Peter Kaiser**

Director of Communications, KAICIID

**Kathrin Kaisinger**

Office & Events Assistant, IPI (Vienna)

**Walter Kemp**

Senior Vice President, IPI

**Sherin Khalil**

Events and Protocol Delegate, KAICIID

**Mohammad Farhan Khan**

Assistant of Prince Turki Al Faisal

**Ivan Krastev**

Chairman, Centre for Liberal Strategies, Sofia

**Adam Lupel**

Vice President, IPI

**Maximilian Meduna**

Policy Analyst and Head of Global Trends Unit, IPI (Vienna)

**Luc Metivier**

Chief Executive Officer, TAKAUD Saving & Pensions

**Dunja Mijatović**

Representative on Freedom of the Media, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

**Masroor Aswad Mohialdeen**

Commissioner, Iraqi High Commission for Human Rights

**Mehdi Mozaffari**

Professor Emeritus, Department of Political Science, Aarhus University, Denmark

**Tawanda Mutasah**

Senior Director for International Law and Peace, Amnesty International

**Natalie Nougayrède**

Foreign Affairs Commentator and Editorial Board Member, *The Guardian*

**Ivan Novak**

Artist, Laibach

**Andrea Pfanzelter**

Senior Director, IPI (Vienna)

**Najma Pirzada**

Director, Governance & Policy Advisors

**Moeed Pirzada**

TV anchor and political commentator

**Nevzet Poric**

Assistant of the Grand Mufti of Slovenia

**Lundeg Purevsuren**

Foreign Policy Advisor to the President, Office of the President of Mongolia

**Sean Redmond**

Assistant of the Secretary General, KAICIID

**Camilla Reksten-Monsen**

Chief of Staff, IPI

**Lynne C. Rienner**

President and CEO, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.

**Terje Rød-Larsen**

President, IPI

**Olivier Roy**

Joint Chair, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, and Chair in Mediterranean Studies, European University Institute

**Mohammad Sammak**

Board Member, KAICIID

**Thomas Seifert**

Editor in Chief, *Wiener Zeitung*

**Dory Shayaa**

Assistant of the Secretary General, KAICIID

**Øystein Sørensen**

Professor, University of Oslo

**Christian Strohal**

Ambassador and Special Representative for the Austrian Chairmanship of the OSCE 2017, Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs

**Anahita Tabrizi**

Green Light delegation, Thyssen-Bornemisza Art Contemporary

**Franziska Sophie Wildfoerster**

Co-Curator, Thyssen-Bornemisza Art Contemporary

**Karine Yaralyan**

Event Intern, IPI (Vienna)









The **INTERNATIONAL PEACE INSTITUTE** (IPI) is an independent, international not-for-profit think tank dedicated to managing risk and building resilience to promote peace, security, and sustainable development. To achieve its purpose, IPI employs a mix of policy research, strategic analysis, publishing, and convening. With staff from around the world and a broad range of academic fields, IPI has offices facing United Nations headquarters in New York and offices in Vienna and Manama.



**777 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017-3521, USA**

TEL +1-212-687-4300 FAX +1-212-983-8246

**Freyung 3, 1010 Vienna, Austria**

TEL +43-1-533-8881 FAX +43-1-533-8881-11

**51-52 Harbour House, Bahrain Financial Harbour**

**P.O. Box 1467, Manama, Bahrain**

[www.ipinst.org](http://www.ipinst.org)