Now, let us wrap up and get back to the questions.

Fyodor Lukyanov

Thank you. I think it is a really a wonderful idea from the organisers to include the whole event with this panel. This is because we have touched upon all the major questions about what the sources for dynamism are in the contemporary world and why this was changing in this way. It is quite difficult to summarise, because each statement was excellent. There was a great deal to learn from each speaker. I came to conclusions that were probably unexpected, when listening to all the interventions.

The only thing we need to deal with is actually psychology. It is not the economy, it is not politics; it is psychology. What I feel, from the discussions yesterday and today and from this panel, is that there is a feeling of insecurity, which is there on both sides to some extent. This is in the emerging world and the developed world. Vice-Minister started by saying that there is not a real power shift. There is much more of a diffusion. Mr Eizenstat concluded by saying that there is a profound power shift in the world. I think that is a very good composition.

We see that both participants in this process experience some problems. Developing and emerging countries feel that maybe they will not be accepted as fully-fledged participants in these processes. If not, then probably the developed world will probably try to stop them. The developed world is actually afraid to lose traditional official positions. In this regard, many processes are going on all over the world, including in Europe.

There is manifestation of insecurity, for example, this rise of bad feeling against the migrants, which Mr Dervis mentioned. There is a clear reaction on globalisation; people in Europe are not prepared to take the new situation. They are scared that the whole traditional identity can be challenged. So far, nobody knows how to deal with that. Many people heard yesterday’s statement by Chancellor Merkel that multiculturalism in Germany has failed completely. Now, Europe should find something new. There are very new developments; we could not have imagined hearing something like that a year ago.

Mr Dervis’ idea about taking advantages of the different dimensions is a wonderful idea. I come from a country which is very similar to Turkey, which is also split between different identities. It cannot decide whether it is Europe, Eurasia, Asia or something else. Therefore, I would say that it is a very difficult task. It is not only countries like Russia and Turkey that are facing this problem; it is the whole world. Everybody needs to abandon the very comfortable division through the simple science of barricades. We are extremely eager to see the world in a simpler form than it is: East versus West, poor versus rich. Is Turkey part of the West or Islamic? These simple oppositions do not fit into the current world and will never do so any more.

I think that what Mr Sibal was saying about the need for democratisation of the world situation is a very important statement. That means not only increased representativity of international institutions, but also changing the way we look at world affairs. We need to understand that the world we lived in before will never come back. We will need to change our psychology to adapt to the new situation.
Regarding what Mr Eizenstat said about G20, I think my assessment is very primitive. However, my feeling was that the main advantage for G20 was that during the worst stage of the economic crisis, 20 of the most powerful and important countries came together and that had a very important psychological effect. People who were hysterical about what is going on started to believe that if they came together, they would decide on something.