

# AHMET DAVUTOGLU

Former Prime Minister of Turkey

## Ahmet DAVUTOGLU

Dear participants, Excellencies, colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to thank the Qatari government and His Highness, the Emir, for hosting this conference. I also thank my French and Qatari colleagues and IFRI and my dear friend Thierry for this very timely meeting. There are many familiar faces of former colleagues. We are discussing a basic issue, global governance. In fact, in these days, everywhere in the world, not only in Doha or Paris, and in all capitals, there are meetings. These are to understand where things are going and where we are leading to.

This question today, especially the title of global governance, is important. The question is clear. Are we going towards global governance or towards world disorder? If you visit these capitals, you will see that there is a source of concern everywhere. What will be the future of international systems? What will be the future of the EU? What will be the policy of the new American president, Donald Trump? What will be the future of the Middle East?

If you were to ask me about the key concept behind this source of concern, I would like to say that it is unpredictability. Today, unpredictability is everywhere. Nobody can see what will happen. Forget the next 10 years, even for the next year, 2017, which will be a year of elections in Europe. There will be many issues, including Syria. I would like to say something very briefly, just to stimulate certain questions in our minds to discuss in future sessions.

The question is: are we leading towards global governance? The 19<sup>th</sup> century was a century of balance of power. The 20<sup>th</sup> century was a century of international order, when the League of Nations and the United Nations were established. Hope in the 1990s was that the future of international systems would be global governance. The difference between global governance and international order is that 'international' means based on nation states as the unit and 'order' means dialogue and relations between nations. Global governance is more interactive, more dialogue-based, and more transnational. In that sense, it is not only dialogue among nations, but also dialogue as human beings, with an interactive, interconnected system creating an international order.

After the Cold War, there was hope, expressed as end of history and many other new terminologies like new world order and global governance. Now it is as if we are going back to the balance of power rather than from international order to global governance. In the capitals of every state, nations are talking about their own national interests and how to defend themselves against this unpredictability and insecurity in international system, rather than talking about values.

Now what we have to respond this challenge do we have a set of rules, a set of values, which, regardless of ethnic or religious background, are respected by all? Unfortunately, it is difficult today to say this. We know that in history, after the Thirty Years War, we had the Westphalian Conference. After the Napoleonic Wars, we had the Congress of Vienna. After the First World War, we had the League of Nations and after the Second World War, we had the United Nations. However, what happened after the Cold War, which was a global war?

Let me give you a striking example of this unpredictability and absence of values. Today, His Excellency, our dear colleague, the Minister for Foreign Affairs in France, just mentioned the situation in Aleppo. Yes, we may have different views on Aleppo in the US, Russia, Turkey, Iran, Saudi Arabia, the European Union, and France. However, we should at least agree on two principles because these principles are valid for everyone and the basis of international law. One is to act together against war crimes and, secondly, there should be humanitarian access for everybody.



Why do we not respect these two basic principles even if we have differences of opinion on the future of Syria? Unfortunately, today there is no humanitarian access to Aleppo and there is no respect for international law regarding war crimes. There is collective punishment and nobody raises this in international fora because everybody has a different interest in this. We have three legs regarding this unpredictability and absence of global governance.

One is a psychological and politico-cultural leg, let me say, which is the spread of extremism and exclusivist policies. Regarding terrorism, we all agree that we have to fight against DAESH or ISIS, Boko Haram, Al-Shabaab and all types of terrorism. However, at the same time, we have to act together against policies involving an exclusivist approach. Everywhere now, there is a rise in islamophobia and there is a rise in xenophobia. There is a rise in populist autocracy which excludes others.

We have to have a common stance against terrorism everywhere because it is a threat against us, as it has been the case in Paris. I was there shoulder to shoulder with the leaders of Europe and the world against terrorism in Paris. In Istanbul, in Brussels, in New York and everywhere, we have to be together. However, at the same time, we have to defend inclusive policies everywhere against an exclusivist approach.

Regarding the political rhetoric during the electoral campaign for the American presidential election, we were very worried about this psychology of exclusion. Also in Europe, there is the rise of the far right wing. This unpredictability is a big threat, which is leading to exclusivist policies. There is Ibn Khaldun's approach to *asabiyya*: everybody is acting with their own clan or tribe, with an isolationist approach.

The second leg is the economic crisis. We have to know that from 2008 up to now, there was a huge economic crisis, which was not seen before in the history of mankind. I attended several G20 meetings and despite all common efforts and declarations, today, we still have a problem of recession. We have a problem with the decline of productivity. We have a problem with the rise of unemployment, which is leading to several crises including the Arab Spring. We should not forget that a Tunisian boy, Bouazizi, set himself on fire because of unemployment, and that started the Arab Spring. It may start new waves of reactions.

The third leg is the absence of dialogue among global players. Today, the EU is not talking about global issues but more about what the future of the EU will be after Brexit. American public opinion is not concentrating on global affairs but more on what the policy of the new president will be. Russia is following a very assertive foreign policy but there is a lack of economic progress. There is an economic crisis there. China is observing the limits of economic growth. Regional powers in our region and in the Western world are talking more about national survival than regional common destiny.

In short, we are facing a big problem of unpredictability and sources of concern, based on absence of global governance, absence of common understanding, and the rise of extremism. There is the economic crisis and the absence of or inability to start dialogue of global players. What is the solution? In my conclusion, my suggestion is a solution where the key concept is inclusivity, more dialogue, and more of a sense of common destiny.

We should not forget that in the 1930s, there was an economic crisis, there were extremist policies and there was an isolationist approach. There was a rise in populist autocracies everywhere in Europe and the end of that was the Second World War. We hope that the end of all this turmoil will not go towards a third world war but it depends on our efforts. These are the efforts of statesmen, the efforts of research institutes like IFRI or the efforts of academicians, scholars, and public opinion-makers everywhere.

Inclusivity is needed today. We need a new reform of the UN based on inclusivity and a new economic system in the world of inter-dependency and inclusivity. We need a common understanding, like civilisational dialogue everywhere,



to fight against extremist, isolationist, and exclusivist policies. We need a real, sincere dialogue among global players. I hope this forum today, the World Policy Conference, will be an asset for such a dialogue among us. I hope the future will be a future of global governance rather than a future of balance of power based on selfish national interest instead of the common destiny of humanity.