



# Project Mosaic

---

**Morality, civility and democratic dialogue  
The experience of Turkey  
in a broader international context**

## Activity Report

**Spyros A. Sofos and Aysel Madra**



Lund 31 October 2019  
Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights  
and Humanitarian Law  
and Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Lund University



# Activity Report

## 2017-19

### Project Mosaic

**Morality, civility, solidarity and  
democratic dialogue  
The experience of Turkey in a  
broader international context**

#### ABSTRACT

Project MOSAIC, extending over three years (2018-20), is sponsored by the Turkey Programme of the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law (RWI), and involves researchers based in Istanbul University (Department of Public Administration Faculty), Lund University (RWI and Center for Middle Eastern Studies), Koç University and the American University of Beirut. Its aim is to build a transdisciplinary, and, ultimately, a genuinely interdisciplinary, intercultural platform for fruitful exchange on the prerequisites for democratic dialogue in contemporary societies. Project MOSAIC intends to address the relationship between morality, civility, solidarity and democratic dialogue as intertwined processes through a series of workshops, roundtables, academic and policy-oriented publications and to provide insights and inspiration for concrete social actions that could produce conditions for democratic dialogue.



# Contents Table

- Introduction* ..... 2
- Methodology* ..... 4
  - Interdisciplinarity* ..... 4
  - Action-oriented work* ..... 4
  - Research Dissemination* ..... 4
  
- Actions for 2017-18 and 2018-19* ..... 6
  - Planning Workshops and Meetings* ..... 6
  - Istanbul Roundtables: Trust in Democratic Societies Roundtable* ..... 7
  - Istanbul Roundtables: Envisaged Outcomes* ..... 14
  - Raoul Wallenberg Institute Turkey Programme*..... 15
  
- Further Information* ..... 17



# **Project Mosaic**

## **Morality, civility, solidarity and democratic dialogue: The experience of Turkey in a broader international context**

### **Activity Report 2017-19**

#### **Introduction**

Project Mosaic was conceived back in late 2018 after a meeting of its steering committee members in Lund organized by the Turkey Programme of The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law and hosted by the Center for Middle Eastern Studies of Lund University. The project was intended to comprise a set of actions aimed to foster academic debate and cooperation, as well as practical interventions in order to meet the multitude of challenges polarized, divided or fragmented societies such as the Turkish one are facing, and to work towards establishing a ground upon which an open, tolerant and inclusive society--the basis for a democratic, peaceful, and prosperous future can be built. Although Turkey was explicitly identified as a focal point of the project, there was always an implicit interest among the steering group membership in a comparative approach: Indeed the project was to identify social structural and cultural similarities and differences between Turkey, Sweden, and, more broadly, western societies as well as societies in the Middle East.

The questions we sought to tackle were many and complex but could not be answered by only referring to Turkey in isolation. From the very fundamental interrogation of the potentially different meanings and experiences of the notions of trust, morality, solidarity and democracy in Turkey, and in other European and Middle Eastern societies, to the identification of different practices and lived experiences of democracy, dialogue, respect, it became evident that the success of our endeavor necessitated a wider and more diversified scope and a genuine comparative and interdisciplinary approach.

The current form of the project has been informed by this realization and comprises a cooperation between a Swedish, two Turkish and a Lebanese University, and a team of researchers and interlocutors not necessarily associated to these institutions but who are academically active or engaged in civil society and cultural work.

The project is premised on the realization that in today's risk societies which are situated within a rapidly changing global context, once fairly established notions of morality, solidarity and civility in European societies and beyond are under serious pressure. Political instability, perceptions of lack of local anchors to political and cultural developments, increased immigration, environmental crises and threats to domestic and inter-societal security in Europe, and the globe at large, further complicate the issue by bringing about fissures and divides at the political and social domain that challenge the possibility of democratic dialogue and the development of shared horizons among citizens in many polities.

The working hypothesis of Project MOSAIC is premised on the assumption that overcoming the "crisis" of contemporary democracies requires

- the exploration and cultivation of values conducive to understanding the standpoint of collective others, respecting difference and challenging exclusivist and adversarial understandings of the political.
- the promotion of respect of human rights and human security for all.

Our primary aim is to create a network of scholars and practitioners from Turkey, Lebanon (and the broader Middle East), and Sweden as well as from other Nordic and European countries to build a transdisciplinary, and, ultimately, a genuinely inter-disciplinary and intercultural platform for fruitful exchange with regards to the prerequisites for democratic dialogue such as morality, solidarity and civility in our contemporary societies.

**Project MOSAIC extends over three years (2018-20) and constitutes a collaborative endeavor involving researchers from its three original coordinating institutions - Istanbul University (Department of Public Administration), Lund University (Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law and Center for Middle Eastern Studies) and Koç University, as well as from the American University of Beirut.**

Acknowledging that civility as a key value in a democratic society is under pressure with regards to building up trust among morally acting citizens who respect each other's basic rights and fundamental liberties, Project MOSAIC places the notion of trust at the intersection of these three interlinked concepts which are prerequisites for democratic dialogue. Therefore, it starts off by analyzing the variegated forms of the notion of trust takes in modern democratic states, addresses the phenomenon of "erosion of trust" and its implications for democratic societies, and examines the ways in which trust can be rekindled in modern societies.



## Methodology

**Interdisciplinarity** From its inception, project MOSAIC has set out to explore questions, and develop actions that required the application of insights and perspectives from more than one conventional discipline. To this end, the project team has taken seriously into account the methodological, theoretical, as well as, institutional implications of implementing interdisciplinary approaches to research and engagement with stakeholders. Thus, the project is premised on

(i) *cross-disciplinary approaches* involving interaction across conventional disciplines, though developing spaces and conditions that support communication among researchers and practitioners from different disciplines and practice domains and catalyse collaboration; and

(ii) *transdisciplinary approaches* which are more 'intense' and 'focused', and whose aim is the articulation of conceptual frameworks that seek to transcend the more limited worldviews of the specialized conventional disciplines, the crossfertilization of research methodologies that originate in different disciplines and the development of actions that are informed by the new conceptual and methodological frameworks we are developing.

**Action-oriented work** Project MOSAIC additionally aims to encourage and stimulate **research** to facilitate a better understanding of challenges to democratic dialogic processes and to provide insights and inspiration for **concrete social actions** that could produce conditions for democratic dialogue. To this end the project actively seeks to locate and create synergies with other actions within the Turkey Programme of the Raoul Wallenberg Institute such as [the Human Rights Cities project](#), particularly its aspects that seek to mitigate the polarised relations between political, ethnic and cultural groups within Turkish society.

**Research dissemination** Project MOSAIC fosters this crossfertilization through a series of **workshops**, and more frequent and regular smaller-scale **roundtables**. These bring together researchers and their individual work addressing the themes examined in the project and provide conduits for focused discussion and

exchange and also serve as part of our research dissemination process within the academic and practice communities. Additional dissemination avenues include a dedicated website, regular reports, and academic and policy-oriented **publications** .

## Actions for 2017-18 and 2018-19

### *Planning workshops and meetings*

#### **Lund**

A kick-off, brainstorming workshop took place on Thursday 26 October 2017 at the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Lund University. Attendees included Ilhami Alkan Olsson, (Chief Consultant of Turkey Programme-RWI), Pinar Dinç (CMES, Lund University), Zeynep Direk (Koç University), Jan Östen Hjärpe (Professor, Centre for Theology and Religious Studies, Lund University), Hikmet Kırık (Istanbul University), Spyros Sofos (CMES, Lund University), Özge Özdüzen (Loughborough University in London) and Umut Özkırmı (CMES, Lund University). The workshop discussed the key terms of reference of the project, refined its remit and objectives as well as its methodology and identified advisory board members and participants.

#### **Istanbul**


A subsequent planning meeting took place in Istanbul on 1 March 2018. Attendees included Ilhami Alkan Olsson (Chief Consultant - Turkey Programme, RWI), Seda Alp (Senior Programme Advisor - Turkey Programme, RWI), Zeynep Direk (Koç University), Hikmet Kırık (Istanbul University), Gamze Rezan Sarisen (Programme Advisor - Turkey Programme, RWI) and Spyros Sofos (CMES, Lund University). The meeting elaborated on the activities envisaged and led to the drafting of calls for participation and budgets for subsequent actions.

#### **Beirut**

On 19 October 2019, Ilhami Alkan Olsson (Chief Consultant - Turkey Programme, RWI), Zeynep Direk (Koç University), Hikmet Kırık (Istanbul University), Aysel Madra (Researcher/Programme Advisor - Turkey Programme, RWI) and Spyros Sofos (CMES, Lund University) visited the American University of Beirut to discuss the expansion of Project Mosaic's scope and explore the possibility of establishing a cooperation with AUB. Members of the team had introductory meetings with the Asfari Institute for Civil Society and Citizenship and the Center for Arab and Middle Eastern Studies at AUB and identified the Issam Fares Institute for Public Policy and International Affairs and the Center for Arts and Humanities (CAH) as potential partners that would strengthen the multidisciplinary approach and interdisciplinary aspiration of the project.

## Istanbul Roundtables:

### Trust in Democratic Societies Roundtable



democratic dialogue  
and the development  
of shared horizons  
among citizens

project *mosaic*  
istanbul roundtables

mosaic

SWEDISH-TURKISH COLLABORATION ON OPEN AND INCLUSIVE SOCIETIES  
HARALD WALLBERG INSTITUTE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS  
LUND UNIVERSITY - ISTANBUL UNIVERSITY - KOÇ UNIVERSITY

**Project *Mosaic* launches this May**  
with its first event, a roundtable on the theme |  
“Trust in Democratic Societies”  
on Thursday, May 23 between 15:00-18:00 to be held at the  
Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul.

- Prof. Dr. Nader El-Bizri (Department of Philosophy, American University in Beirut) and Assoc. Prof. Edward Alam (Department of Philosophy and Theology, Notre Dame University, Lebanon) will talk on the variegated forms trust takes in democratic societies and the relationship between trust and democratic dialogue
- A discussion with the attendees will follow

Admission only by registration to [spyros.sofos@cme.lu.se](mailto:spyros.sofos@cme.lu.se)

project coordinators: Hikmet Kırık (Istanbul University), Zeynep Direk (Koç University) and Spyros A. Sofos (Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Lund University).

This, first, roundtable of project Mosaic took place at the premises of the Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul on 23 May 2019 and brought together scholars and cultural practitioners from diverse disciplines and backgrounds to

- discuss the variegated forms trust takes in daily contexts such as intimate and personal life, politics, science, legal practice, commerce, to name but a few, and
- explore the relationship between trust and democratic dialogue.
- seeking ways to operation-alize the concepts in order to refine the discussion and to develop concrete future practical actions within the Human Rights Cities project as well as in other contexts.

The ambition of the project team to foster a genuinely interdisciplinary discussion was supported by a roundtable organization methodology that entailed the careful selection of the participants so as to ensure representation of a broad

spectrum of different disciplinary and practice traditions and a discussion format that would encourage frank and free exchange and debate.



The invited participants were Zeynep Alemdar, Political Scientist, Okan University; Bann Seng Tan, International Relations Scholar, Boğaziçi University; Mehmet Bahadır Er, film director; Zeynep Gambetti, Boğaziçi University; Zeynep Kadirbeyoglu, Political Scientist with expertise on Political Economy and Development, Boğaziçi University; Emre Erdoğan, Political Scientist with Political Psychology expertise, İstanbul Bilgi University; Gülrü Göker, Gender Studies Scholar, Sabancı University; Murat R. Özsunay, Legal Scholar, Özyeğin University; İlker Çayla, Social Anthropologist, Okan University; İrem Aydemir, Middle Eastern Studies Postgraduate Scholar, Lund University; Can Pürüzsüz, editor, 140journos and Urban Conservation and Renovation Postgraduate Scholar, Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University; Pelin Karakoca, Zeynep Direk, Philosophy Department, Koç University; Hikmet Kırık, Political Scientist, İstanbul University; Aysel Madra, Sociologist-Researcher/Programme Advisor - Turkey Programme, RWI; and Spyros Sofos, Political Sociologist, CMES, Lund University. The expertise and training of the majority of discussants can be situated within social science and humanities disciplines and traditions, however, members of the team had competences that enabled them to situate their interventions in the context of technological advances in communications, surveillance and artificial intelligence, while others drew on their experiences as journalists, film makers and cultural activists.

Trust refers to a person's confident belief that another's motivations are benevolent toward them and that the other actor will therefore be responsive to their needs. Trust is typically viewed as a belief about a specific social actor, though it has also been viewed as a personality trait characterizing people's tendency to trust or distrust others in general.

Trust is critical in modern societies, especially in one's significant relationships with family, friends, and romantic partners (Holmes & Rempel 1989) as well as institutions (Fukuyama 1995, Inglehart 1999). Close attachments such as these oblige people to depend and rely on others' good intentions, that is, to become more heavily interdependent with others to satisfy their own central needs. As the extent of risk and possible costs of rejection and betrayal increase in such relationships, the stakes become much higher and trust becomes all the more critical. It is therefore unsurprising that research on trust has been most prevalent within the contexts of these close relationships.

The development of trust in a relationship is usually a gradual process that requires social interactions and experiences with a person that suggest he or she is predictable and dependable, especially in situations in which costly sacrifices by another may be necessary to be responsive to one's own needs. Such situations are seen as diagnostic because clearer conclusions about others' motives can be drawn when helping is costly to another and not in their short-term interests. However, to achieve a true sense of confidence in another person, one must eventually go beyond the available evidence and make a leap of faith. Past evidence can never fully predict future behavior, so to genuinely trust and achieve some peace of mind about a significant other, people must set aside their uncertainties and simply act in a trusting way.

From a philosophical standpoint, trust entails, 1) a degree of vulnerability to others; 2) a measure of trustworthiness of others, at least in certain domains; and 3) a sense of optimism – an expectation that they are, or at least will be, competent in certain respects. Each of these conditions for trust is relatively uncontroversial. A further, controversial, condition however is that the trustor is optimistic that the trustee will have a certain kind of motive for acting. It is unclear what, if any, sort of motive we expect from people we trust, as well as, what, if any, sort of motive a *trustworthy* person must have. Clear conditions for trustworthiness are that the trustworthy person is competent and committed to do what s/he is trusted to do. But this person may also have to be committed in a certain way or for a certain reason (e.g. they care about the trustor).

One important criterion for trust is that the trustor can accept some level of risk or vulnerability (Becker 1996). Minimally, a risk, or vulnerability is inherent in the potential failure by the trustee to do what they depend on that person to do. The trustor might try to reduce such a risk by monitoring or imposing certain constraints on the behavior of the trustee; yet after a certain threshold perhaps, the more monitoring and constraining they do, the less they *trust* that person. Trust is relevant "before one can monitor the actions of ... others" (Dasgupta 1988) or when out of respect for others one refuses to monitor them. One must be content with them having some discretionary power or freedom (Baier 1986; Dasgupta 1988). Hence, one cannot reject being vulnerable.

A related condition for trust is the potential for betrayal (and, the corresponding condition for trustworthiness is the power to betray). Baier writes that “trusting can be betrayed, or at least let down, and not just disappointed” (1986, 235). In her view, disappointment is the appropriate response when one merely relied on someone to do something, but did not trust him or her to do it. Although people who monitor and constrain other people's behavior and do not allow them to prove their own trustworthiness may rely on others, they do not trust them. For, while their reliance could be disappointed, it could not be betrayed. Consider that one can rely on inanimate objects, such as alarm clocks; but when they break, one is not betrayed, although one may be disappointed. Reliance without the possibility of betrayal is not trust. Thus, people who rely on one another in a way that makes betrayal impossible do not trust one another. (For some resistance to this view, see O'Neil 2012, 307.)

People also do not, or cannot, trust one another if they are easily suspicious of one another). If one assumes the worst about someone, then one distrusts the person. Trust involves being optimistic, rather than pessimistic, that the trustee will do something for us (or for others perhaps), which is in part what makes us vulnerable by trusting (Govier 1997). As Jones points out, such optimism “restricts the inferences we will make about the likely actions of another. Trusting thus opens one up to harm, for it gives rise to selective interpretation, which means that one can be fooled, that the truth might lie, as it were, outside one's gaze” (Jones 1996, 12).

Some philosophers believe that trustworthiness can be “compelled by the force of norms” or, more generally, by the force of social constraints (Hardin 2002, 53; O'Neill 2002, Dasgupta 1988). In an effort to be trustworthy, people can subject themselves to social constraints, as someone does when they publicly undertake a commitment, putting themselves at risk of public censure if they do not go through with it. Alternatively, the *trustor* in a relationship can introduce the constraints by requiring that the trustee sign a contract, for example. The constraint imposed could be the primary motivation for being trustworthy. It would compel on ongoing commitment grounded in self-interest. This view of trustworthiness is also known as “the social contract view.” But one can argue that, while social constraints can shore up trustworthiness, they cannot account for trustworthiness altogether. Many would argue that while a person's behavior may be predictable or reliable, it may not be *trustworthy* in any genuine sense. These theorists may distinguish mere reliability from trustworthiness on the grounds that people known or considered to be trustworthy have the power to betray us, whereas people known or considered to be merely reliable can only disappoint us (Holton 1994).

This cursory introduction suggests that the notion of trust is by no means uncontroversial and it depends on a number of social, and psychological factors as well as on compulsion related to social norms, constraints and the contractual relationships underpinning them. Also, trust is part of a cluster of concepts such as reliability, faith, trustworthiness, vulnerability, betrayal and disappointment, to name but a few. It is such issues that the Trust in Democratic Societies roundtable sought to unpack and operationalize.

After an introduction to the aims and procedures of the roundtable by Aysel Madra and Spyros Sofos, the invited speakers, Prof Nader El-Bizri (Department of

Philosophy, AUB) and Prof. Edward Alam (Department of Philosophy and Theology, Notre Dame University, Lebanon) introduced the notion of trust from a philosophical and epistemological standpoint. The speakers attempted to locate trust in different contexts and unpack its socially and historically situated constants. They also examined the diversities in its meanings and the practices these meanings sustained in critical and theological terms as well as the transition of trust towards scientific rationality that became predominant in the age of techno-science. It was suggested that trust in science is not merely limited to confidence in theories, hypotheses, mathematical calculations and experiments but also extends to trusting the institutions of social, political and economic conditioning of the production of scientific knowledge, its technological applications, and, ultimately, the intentions of scientists themselves. The speakers thus introduced the intersubjective and institutional dimensions of trust as a concept and the practices emanating from it, including the production of knowledge. This discussion thread was picked up again later on as the participants talked about trust in science and the types of scientific knowledge that emerged in modernity as essential for another trend – trust in experts.

The discussion on the “intersubjective” prompted a cursory exploration of the affective aspects of trust and reflections on the potential impact of artificial intelligence, or surveillance on trust, the relationship between trust and faith and other contiguous concepts such as fidelity, confidence, betrayal and their relational character and the suggestions that trust is ultimately a moral concept or a human need. Participants attempted to unpack these concepts by resorting to philosophical reasoning and conceptual history methodologies, and by unpacking the usage of terms in quotidian contexts.

The discussion moved to attempts to locate links between trust as experienced in intimate, more public interpersonal and institutional contexts; a consensus seemed to emerge on the underlying intersubjective character of all these different modalities of establishing trust until a participant suggested that the notion of self-trust might point to psychological dynamics that differentiate it from that of trust. There was some controversy on whether trust and faith might be considered as identical and the implications of a possible differentiation between the two where religious traditions have a certain hold over segments of society but also more generally. It was suggested that trust is constantly premised on processes of trust-building, testing and falsification whereas faith is more resistant to such considerations, yet not entirely immune to them.

Another line of reasoning drew on the distinction among three kinds of friendship and, concomitantly, trust in Aristotle and the premise on three “goods” – the more imperfect friendships of *practical utility*, and of *pleasure* and the higher and more durable friendships of *virtue and good* which prompted a discussion as to the ways in which trust can be generated in a given social context, as well as to its durability. Further discussion revolved around the issues of truth, knowledge and trust and prompted an exploration of the notion of trust in post-truth societies.

The roundtable participants discussed the role of the media in facilitating and undermining trust, the impact of technological change in the way that knowledge is generated, critically assessed (or not) and in the formation of ingroups and outgroups based on trust and shared beliefs and values. Examples revolved



around the changing media system in Turkey, the emergence of social media and their impact of trust and intergroup relationships, but also touched upon recent aspects of polarization of public opinion in the United States, the United Kingdom and elsewhere, also prompting the question whether trust (or mistrust) in the era of social media might be related to whether others/significant others trust or mistrust. In addition, with respect to the virtual experiences that contemporary social media seem to enable and sustain, it was noted by participants create different conditions for the generation of trust. The issues of developing critical media literacies (and the methodologies of doing so) as well as of learning from past experiences of the introduction of new media technologies were also considered. The discussion on the validity of knowledge also created fertile ground to consider the role of power relations in media and, more generally, knowledge production and, subsequently the consideration of establishing and securing trust as the product of such relationships as well.

Concern about the impact of social media proved persistent in the discussion and the ways in which social media affect the potential for processes of deliberation was the focus of exchange of views, including the possibility of personal perspectives to be shared and publicized. Examples included the #metoo movement, the transformation of the personal into political, the possibility of anonymity in the public sphere and the potential of all these factors generating discussion and exchange of views. But technological progress is not restricted in the capacity of social media to foster interaction alone, but it extends to the increasingly routine surveillance and collection of personal information and *Big Data* and its impact on trust. The uses of such technologies by authoritarian regimes soon gave way to a more generalized exploration of the relationship between authoritarian regimes and trust that was revisited in the subsequent discussion.

A final categorization which generated some debate was derived from social psychological classifications. It was argued that *strategic trust* - 'starting to trust' or 'particular trust' is based on our previous interactions or transactions with some people and is premised on rational considerations, A second, more *generalized* type of trust is trust premised on extrapolations about persons and institutions one does not know. Generalized trust, it was argued, is something complicated and is intermingled with discriminatory classifications and assumptions. A third type of trust is *political trust* or *trust in institutions*. It is related to the performance of the government or of political institutions. Polarization as experienced in societies like the Turkish one largely depends on evaluations of political institutions and of their partiality - whose government is it? and leads to *us versus them* classifications. Examples were used to operationalize these classification and evaluate them.

Overall, the roundtable enabled an academic and, at the same time, more practical examination of trust as a moral, social and psychological concept and the ways it is generated, sustained or dismantled. It provided opportunities for the participants to examine it both within more intimate domains, and broader social contexts, and to explore the mechanisms of trust building as well as undermining trust. It made possible useful classifications, for analyzing trust and for designing actions to foster trust and dialogue, pertaining to our highly mediatized societies, societies of surveillance and data collection, to polarised situations and to authoritarian moments. The roundtable will inform further theoretical and more

empirical and practical work in future roundtables, workshops and actions in the community.

## References

Baier, A. C., 1986. "Trust and Antitrust," *Ethics*, 96: 231–260.

Becker, L. C., 1996. "Trust as Noncognitive Security about Motives," *Ethics*, 107(1): 43–61.

Dasgupta, P., 1988. "Trust as a Commodity," in D. Gambetta (ed.). *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*, New York: Basil Blackwell.

Fukuyama, F., 1995. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*, New York, NY: The Free Press

Govier, T., 1997. *Social Trust and Human Communities*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Hardin, R., 2002. *Trust and Trustworthiness*, New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Holmes, J. G., & Rempel, J. K., 1989. "Trust in close relationships." in C. Hendrick (ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology: Close relationships* (Vol. 10, pp. 187-219). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Holton, R., 1994. "Deciding to Trust, Coming to Believe," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 72(1): 63–76.

Inglehart, R., 1999. "Trust, Well-being and Democracy." In M. Warren, (ed.). *Democracy and Trust*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jones, K., 1996. "Trust as an Affective Attitude," *Ethics*, 107: 4–25.

O'Neil, C., 2012. "Lying, Trust, and Gratitude," *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 40(4): 301–333.

O'Neill, O., 2002. *Autonomy and Trust in Bioethics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## Istanbul Roundtables: Envisaged Outcomes

The discussion that took place in the *Trust in Democratic Societies Roundtable* generated a host of insights on the complexity of the notion of trust, the fruitfulness of interdisciplinary approaches in better understanding it and ways of working towards building different aspects of trust, civility and solidarity. It is envisaged that a number of concrete outcomes will build on the roundtable. These include

- a special section in an academic journal in 2020: this will be a contextualized, structured and edited version of the roundtable discussion, enriched with reflective texts written by the participants. Discussions are currently underway with both participants and journals that might have an interest in hosting the dialogue.
- further roundtables and a workshop within 2020 to further explore the issues raised, but also to provide the focus for a more focused discussion on the testing, and, subsequently, operationalization and integration of the findings in projects such as the [the Human Rights Cities project](#).

## Raoul Wallenberg Institute Turkey Programme

**The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law is named after Raoul Wallenberg, a Swedish diplomat who saved tens of thousands of Jews and other people at risk in Hungary at the end of World War II.**

It combines evidence-based human rights research with direct engagement in close collaboration with partners to bring about human rights change for all.

RWI is a research and academic institution with offices, programmes, and convening power covering 40 countries.

Since the late 1990s, RWI has implemented human rights education and research capacity development programmes in Turkey in close cooperation with universities, justice sector institutions and individual academicians.

RWI's Turkey programmes have been funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), which is a government agency working on behalf of the Swedish parliament and government.

Between 2011 and end of 2014, RWI implemented a Sida-funded Programme that aimed to support the development of human rights teaching and research capacity (including in the rights of women) at legal education institutions in Turkey and the sharing of this expertise with students and justice sector stakeholders, in order to achieve a more human rights responsive system in Turkey.



**The overall objective of the programme period between 2015-2020 has been 'a more human rights responsive justice system in Turkey' with the following components:**

1. Human rights education of high quality increasingly institutionalised at targeted institutions

## 16 #project mosaic

2. Increased availability and accessibility of high quality gender-integrated human rights research and related policy recommendations of key relevance to the Turkish context
3. Increased collaborative initiatives between academic institutions, state actors, municipalities, private sector actors and civil society organisations aiming to improve human rights and access to justice from an inclusion and gender perspective.

RWI signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Union of Turkish World Municipalities and 7 pilot municipalities from nearly all political parties to work human rights in daily practices of the local governance (İstanbul Maltepe and Zeytinburnu municipalities, Ankara Altındağ and Çankaya municipalities, Mersin Metropolitan Municipality, Gaziantep Şahinbey Municipality). During the same period, RWI also signed MoU with the following universities: Boğaziçi University, Sabancı University, Koç University, Özyeğin University, Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, Atılım University.

RWI also cooperates with various national and international institutions and organisations, among others, the Turkish Constitutional Court, Bar Associations, the European Court of Human Rights, the Council of Europe, the Union of Municipalities of Turkey (TBB), and the Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions (SKL).

## Further Information

The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of  
Human Rights and Humanitarian  
Law (RWI)

[www.rwi.lu.se](http://www.rwi.lu.se)

Project Mosaic

[www.project-mosaic.org](http://www.project-mosaic.org)

The Swedish Human Rights  
City Project

[www.rwi.lu.se/the-swedish-human-rights-city-project](http://www.rwi.lu.se/the-swedish-human-rights-city-project)

**Project Mosaic Coordination:**

**Nader El-Bizri**, *Faculty of Arts and  
Sciences, American University of Beirut*

**Zeynep Direk**, *Department of  
Philosophy, Koç University*

**Hikmet Kırık**, *Department of Public  
Administration, İstanbul University*

**Aysel Madra**, *RWI, Turkey Programme*

**Spyros Sofos**, *Center for Middle  
Eastern Studies, Lund University*

