



DONALD JOHNSTON

Founding Partner, Heenan Blaikie; former Secretary-General of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)

Jim's comments reminded me of the great historian, Lewis Mumford, who once said, 'I am optimistic about the possibilities, but I am pessimistic about the probabilities.' I must say, that comes through in certain parts of the discussions that we have had here.

I have enjoyed this conference very much. It has had quite an impact on my thinking in a number of areas. It has confirmed some of my concerns and I say concerns, as opposed to worries. I am coming away from this conference with a number of concerns and, also, a number of worries.

When we talk about the three nations and the new leadership, Russia, the United States, and China, I think this is very significant, because one of the issues I would like to see discussed is whether we have the right players, as we used to have when we had the big three, the big four, or the big five.

We have heard some negatives about the G20, which I think were predictable. You know, you have rotating individual members, especially in the democracies. China has a bit more stability, with a 10-year mandate, but the reality is that the spirit of the G7, in its origins, was that people would, in an informal way, put their feet up and try to understand each other's problems, try to get into the head of the other person, as it were. That was lost, as we know. It became the G8, a much greater event than it was ever intended to be, with 5000, 6000, and 7000 journalists in attendance.

Originally there was an informal atmosphere conducive to frank exchanges because there were fewer actors, which I think we should think very seriously about getting back to. I would include the three countries just mentioned, plus the EU. I think that is going to be absolutely critical.

Now, let me just say what worries me. One of the things that worries me most are the results that came out of Doha. The reality is that we have not made progress on climate change. Many of us have followed this dossier for some years, right back to Stockholm in the 1970s. If you go back and read what was said then, read what was said at Rio, and read what was said at Kyoto, Bali, and so on, we really have not come to grips with this at all. The fact is that GHG emissions are increasing every year, despite all the good intentions. There is now a focus on gas, especially shale gas in the United States with the hope of energy self sufficiency. While gas is better, it still produces CO₂. It produces up to half as much as coal and oil fossil fuels, but the reality is that using gas will merely slow global warming and climate change. This has to be a major worry for the entire planet, especially given the number of frightening weather events we see happening around us.

Again, that is not going to be solved by having over 100 countries around the table, although some of those countries have said privately that they think the two major emitters, the United States and China, must take the lead. I would add Russia and the EU if we are going to move in the direction of having smaller groups that are going to drive the global agenda. I do not see how it can happen otherwise.

In fact, as Exxon apparently said what I think many of us have believed for a long time. We must start talking about adaptation in a very serious way, especially in parts of the world where rising sea levels are going to have a major impact on large urban communities. That is one worry of mine.

A concern of mine is Europe, but I am not really worried about Europe. I am a strong believer in the future of Europe, because when I follow Keynes' advice, namely "Look at the present in light of the past for the purposes of the future," how can you not be optimistic about Europe? I am old enough to remember Europe when I came as a teenager, in 1949, not on the continent, but to the UK. There was devastation in the wake of the war and even famine before the Marshall plan was adopted. Someone here mentioned Jean Monnet, who had the genius to create the European Coal and Steel Commission and bring former enemies together in their reconstruction efforts.



Now, today, we have a continent where we are talking about policy and we are exchanging insults, but not bombs and bullets. Post war Europe is a collective achievement of an unprecedented nature. It remains work in progress but I cannot believe that it is going to go off the rails because of a so-called financial crisis.

We know that the assets are there to solve the crisis, so it raises an issue of political will; I think we are going to find that.

I am also concerned about the United States, but not worried in the way I am about other issues. The first issue I am worried about, which I mentioned long ago, is climate change. Another other worry is the one that has been raised by the Korean former foreign minister, namely, the relationship between China and the United States.

It amazes me that, today, we have so much intelligence, we are told, in terms of looking at military threats. We were told yesterday that we know how far Iran will be at any given stage in producing a nuclear weapon. I am a bit suspicious of that, given the history of Iraq and the myth of the weapons of mass destruction. Nonetheless, the fact is that spymasters probably have a lot of good data on these hard issues, but we cannot seem to get into each other's heads and understand what another government's motives are. For example, we are told that the motives behind territorial disputes in Asia are not related to resources. It is about nationalism. I have not looked at all of the elements, but I have looked at a few of them and I say to myself, how can we conceive of military conflicts as a road to resolution of these very minor territorial issues?

Again, that brings us to the question of how we are going to resolve these potential conflicts in a sensible way? I say, well, the ones we have just mentioned, the Russians, the United States, and China should be able to resolve those issues. It should be resolved at the leadership level and it should be resolved quickly, because this risk is creating, in my view, a further escalation of the arms race in the Far East. China produces an aircraft carrier and it is all over the front pages. The United States say, 'right, we must do something about this.' We will be right back into the Cold War period, I think, unless we take steps to understand, really, what the motives are and to bring all parties to the table as soon as possible.

Another challenging area which could be an area of conflict, but should be an area of cooperation is the Arctic. I have just participated in the Carnegie Foundation European Atlantic Security Initiative. It was co chaired by Igor Ivanov, Sam Nunn and Wolfgang Ischinger.

The Arctic was an area looked at very seriously, but in a very positive light. Here is an opportunity to really do something collectively. The Chinese have also demonstrated an interest in the Arctic, even though they are not members of the Arctic Council, because there are international waters in much of the Arctic.

Yes, I have a number of issues of concern which I believe will be satisfactorily resolved.

What I am most worried about is climate change. It requires global action now. Of course this has been repeatedly said for many years. It has not happened.

On the whole, let me just conclude by saying that despite some concerns and worries I am still optimistic about both the possibilities and the probabilities, but the probabilities must be turned into realities.