

AHMET DAVUTOGLU

Former Prime Minister of the Republic of Turkey

Dear participants, colleagues, Excellencies, my dear friend Thierry, first of all, I want to congratulate Thierry and IFRI once more for organising such an important event and a very timely organisation, and I want to express my thanks to IFRI, to the French government, as well as to the Moroccan government and His Majesty.

Global governance is a big issue and a big title, but before going into some details, I want to make a comparison between last year's meeting in Doha and this year's meeting in Marrakesh. Last year in my speech, in a very short statement, I made reference to unpredictability in international relations. Unfortunately in the past year, this unpredictability has increased. Last year, the meeting was immediately after the election of President Trump. Everybody was worried about what would happen in the United States. I am sure that worry still continues and is even growing because yesterday, President Trump mentioned that Secretary Tillerson may not continue. Nobody knows what will happen, but one thing is clear, and I will make a special reference to national issues, and that is the relations between establishments and leaders.

When we look at the EU, last year, we were talking about Brexit, but this year in addition to Brexit, we had the issue of Catalonia and we do not know what will be next. We had four elections in the Netherlands, Austria, Germany and France. The rise of exclusivist, right-wing parties is not only a worry for these nation states, but also for the basic values of the European continent, of our continent.

When we look at the Middle East, we had the crisis in the Gulf. An organisation that has been very influential in the past and becoming a deepening organisation in the last 20 years is the GCC and became for the first time a problematic institution in itself. One country of the GCC was isolated by three other countries and this is a problem of inefficiency in regional organisations. Last year, we were talking about the humanitarian crisis in Aleppo. Aleppo has now fallen, but we still had chemical use in Syria against civilians, the cases in the UN and the UN has testified to this fact, but also we had the problem of the Kurdish regional referendum in Iraq about the fissure of Iraq. By coincidence, Catalonia and the Kurdish region held referenda at the same time, which brings new issues to nation states.

Today, Prime Minister Hariri has resigned in Lebanon, so every day, we are getting news from the Middle East that makes the situation increasingly more worrying. This year, we also have the crisis in North Korea. When we look at the one-year agenda, there is almost no good news in terms of global governance even keeping the *status quo* as it is, but there is a rising psychological pessimism among not only Europeans, Asians, Turks, French, Moroccans, but among all representatives of humanity, statesmen, intellectuals. We have to think more and more about what will happen next year or the years after. Nobody can make a rational analysis because we do not have a rational analysis of the question, 'What went wrong?'

I want to briefly summarise the last 27 years after the Cold War. What has happened? I will use the analogy of an earthquake. We Turks know all about earthquakes and it is a good analogy to understand the systemic earthquake of international relations, which I call systemic earthquake because there are certain signals. If you are careful, you may overcome them. There are certain tragedies during the process and aftershocks. When we look at these, in the past 400 years, there were conferences or new orders after big global wars, like the Thirty Years War and Westphalian orders, the Napoleonic Wars and the Congress of Vienna, World War I and the League of Nations, World War II and the United Nations.

What happened after the Cold War? This was a global war, but no such arrangement has been made in the international field. There was no new convention or no new re-institutionalisation of any international organisation, no collective response to a set of principles to deal with certain questions like terrorism, nuclear weapons threat and so on. What happened in the 27 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall?



The first earthquake was what I call the geopolitical earthquake of 1991 with the collapse of the Soviet Union. This geopolitical earthquake created many questions from Bosnia, Kosovo, Transnistria, Abkhazia and Nagorno-Karabakh. All these geopolitical zones were shifted and there was huge hope for a new order. When we look today, the aftershocks of the geopolitical earthquake still continue. None of these questions have been resolved yet, plus, for example, the Crimean issue is on the agenda in the same geopolitical zone, where there is a gap between territorial integrity, control and internationally-recognised territories. That creates a problem of nation state territory integrity.

The second earthquake was a security earthquake after 9/11 in 2001. Now, 16 years after 9/11, there was an intervention in Afghanistan. The situation in Afghanistan is getting riskier every day. The second one was an intervention in Iraq. Recently, we have observed what is going on in Iraq regarding central governance and the Kurdish region. There used to be just Al-Qaeda, but now we have Daesh, Boko Haram, Shabab, all types of terrorist organisations. This means the aftershocks of that earthquake still continue.

The third earthquake was a big global economic earthquake in 2008. We had unemployment and political instability because of this crisis. There was hope that a new financial architecture would emerge, but nothing has been done in the international economic organisation except for a few reforms in the World Bank and IMF regarding the representation of countries. The gap between G20, which I have attended almost all meeting over the last 10 years, and the expectations of the decisions of the G20 have not been fulfilled. In addition, the gap between G20 and LDC countries is increasing and this means the refugee flow also increases. Such economic injustice cannot bring social nor political stability. When there is such a gap, of course the population of poor countries will try to reach rich countries in order to get jobs and survive.

The fourth earthquake was a structural earthquake after the Arab Spring in the Middle East. The nation states have collapsed. Fragile states have emerged and the consequences are still on the agenda. Since we have not been able to resolve these four earthquakes, now all the aftershocks of these four earthquakes came together and created the systemic earthquake that we face now. There is a systemic problem, which we have to approach not by conjecture or by just one country or one region. We are facing the most dangerous, riskiest situation in modern times because the means of destruction are much more threatening, not like the wars in the middle centuries. One crazy person in North Korea can threaten everybody.

I want to mention three levels of global governance and some principles of what we can do. The first is the national level. Today we have a problem of identity and legitimacy and also functioning of institutions at national level. Thierry referred to my policy of zero problems with neighbours. Turkey has been right at the centre of all these earthquakes. The Bosnian crisis, the Kosovan crisis and the Georgian crisis from the first earthquake were all next door to Turkey. Turkey was part of the Afghanistan war and sent military, and was affected by the intervention in Iraq. During the economic crisis, the European market was the first target of the Turkish economy. Again, Turkey has been affected. Of course, Middle Eastern issues and the structural earthquake have affected Turkey, so we are right at the centre of all these earthquakes and we are trying to survive on one hand and trying to control crises on the other hand.

In the first years of our governance, we were not only able to stabilise the country, but also we were very effective in regional issues. As I described to Thierry, because of the Lebanese crisis in 2008, on 17th May, I was Chief Advisor, not yet minister, and we declared two diplomatic achievements at the same time on the same day. One was the Israeli/Syrian direct talks. I was the mediator between the two sides as the Chief Advisor. The second was resolving the presidential crisis in Lebanon together with Qatar. Michel Suleiman became president.

Why do we now have problems? It is not because Turkey has changed its policy, but because we do not have counterparts today to make peace or mediate in Syria. Around Turkey, seven countries do not have full control over their territories. In Syria and Iraq, the central government does not have full control. Libya, Yemen, Lebanon... Georgia is a stable country, but there is an international dispute. It is not able to control the internationally recognised territories. The tension continues in Ukraine.

With countries that have stability, we still have good relations trying to keep it that way, but the problem is there is no real counterpart on the others. If you do not have counterparts, you cannot have proper diplomacy. You can have micro-diplomacy with every group in Syria or in Iraq. This is a basic challenge, so at a national level, there are fragile



states like Syria, Libya and Yemen. There are states that do not have full control over territories. There are states that have serious identity problems like in Iraq and even now in Spain with the continuing situation about being Catalan, being Spanish or being European. There are different levels of identities. There are rising exclusivist Islamophobic, xenophobic tendencies in Europe and also there is a problem between leaders and establishments like what we sometimes observe at that stage, which is a global power that affects everything in the world. The stability and direction of American foreign policy is very important for international stability, but President Obama and President Trump have two different approaches to international issues, which will bring national interests as a problem of global choices. I will come to certain principles about what we have to do for national level.

Regarding the regional dimension, today, seemingly we do not have a global system of international arrangement. International means inter-national states, but since there are problems in nation states, the international system is not functioning properly. For global governance, the main barrier is that we have much more systems with balance of power, but not one system like in the 19th century. We have several balances of powers at the same time, regional balances of power and global balances of power. When they meet, you can find a solution. In the Middle East today, there is a regional balance of power between Turkey, Iran, and Saudi Arabia. Inside the GCC, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Qatar and so on, but also there is a general balance of power between Russia, the EU, the US and there is no international arrangement for people to come together. Success stories like the EU and the GCC are facing a serious crisis, so regional leaders face instability and regional/international organisations like the Arab League, like OIC, like GCC, like the EU, are not as effective as before.

Lastly, at the global level, as I said, we need a new global set of conventions that everybody agrees on. There will be no exclusivity of these. I want to give one striking example, which really hurts very much. I feel the pain in my heart. During the hard times of the Syrian crisis, when chemical weapons were used against civilians in 2013, at one meeting, I addressed my colleagues and I said, 'We may disagree on the future of Syria or on certain issues, but at least on two issues, we have to agree. One is humanitarian access and the other one is acting together against war crimes'. These are not national interest issues. These are international convention issues. Whoever prevents humanitarian access must be punished, regime opposition or whatever it is. Whoever commits a war crime using chemical weapons must be punished. These are UN principles, but unfortunately what happened is that war crimes are not being punished and humanitarian access is not being achieved, so millions of refugees escaped Syria, and Turkey has suffered as a neighbouring country. Those who criticise Turkey today must know that we host almost 4 million Syrian refugees. You can imagine the cost on our economy. There are certain Turkish cities now like Kilis that have more Syrians than Turks, but you do not have any racism.

This is a big issue. Nobody expects any solution from the UN, not because of the inefficiency of the UN Secretary-General -I know António Guterres, he is the right person to be Secretary-General. When he was UNHCR chairman, he did extraordinary work. I know him personally. He has the ability to do everything. He is the right person in the right place, but the UN Security Council today reflects a balance of power rather than internationally agreed conventions. Therefore, the only mechanism regarding the Syrian question is the Astana mechanism, where Turkey, Russia and Iran run diplomacy to have no-conflict zones in Syria and there is no hope of any UN mediation. This means ad hoc systems and ad hoc solutions are on the way. This is basically the problem of global institutions. We need more effective institutional mechanisms in the UN and also in international economic organisations.

I want to give five principles for future global governance. I call them the five 'I' in one of my articles. One is inclusivity. We need to have an inclusive national, regional and global order, not populist nor exclusivist. Second is integrity. We should not have double standards. All principles should be followed by integrity. These are ideals. The other principle is interest optimisation. Rational negotiation is absent today. There is no longer any rational negotiation. There are more emotional reflections in the international arena. Fourth is implementation of decisions, not just taking decisions, but implementing them. The last is a new institutionalisation of international systems. We need integrity, inclusivity, institutionalisation, interest optimisation and implementation of decisions. Otherwise we will have many more meetings on this as an intellectual exercise, but no result-oriented meetings. I hope all these discussions will open up a way for global governance. Thank you very much.