



Envisioning
**Peace and
Security**
in a **Fragmented World**

3rd - 4th October 2018 | Istanbul

TRT
**world
forum**

Envisioning **Peace** and **Security** in a Fragmented World

3rd - 4th October 2018 | Istanbul

TRT
world
forum
2018

© TRT WORLD RESEARCH CENTRE

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PUBLISHER

TRT WORLD RESEARCH CENTRE

APRIL 2019

EDITED BY

SEMANUR PEKKENDİR

CONTRIBUTORS

DR. TAREK CHERKAoui

ABDULLAH KEŞVELİOĞLU

ARUKE URAN KYZY

HAJIRA MARYAM

HAYA ATASSI ÖNÜGÖREN

HUMZA AZAM GONDAL

MERVE AKIN

MERVE KÖKER

MICHAEL ARNOLD

MUHAMMED LUTFİ TÜRKCAN

RAVALE MOHYDIN

SELÇUK AYDIN

YASMINA ALLOUCHE

DESIGNER

EKREM US

TRT WORLD İSTANBUL

AHMET ADNAN SAYGUN STREET NO:83 34347

ULUS, BEŞİKTAŞ

İSTANBUL / TURKEY

TRT WORLD LONDON

200 GRAYS INN ROAD, WC1X 8XZ

LONDON / UNITED KINGDOM

TRT WORLD WASHINGTON D.C.

1819 L STREET NW SUITE, 700 20036

WASHINGTON D.C. UNITED STATES

www.trtworld.com

researchcentre.trtworld.com

PRINTED BY

CREATIVE BASIM LİMİTED ŞİRKETİ

MALTEPE MAH/ SEMT LİTROS YOLU SOKAK

MATBAACILAR SİTESİ 2-4 ZD ZEYTİNBURNU / İSTANBUL

CERTIFICATE NUMBER: 33962

ISBN: 978-605-9984-27-0

Envisioning Peace and Security in a Fragmented World

3rd - 4th October 2018 | Istanbul

This book includes summaries and highlights of keynote speeches, 8 public and eleven closed sessions of the TRT World Forum 2018. The views, themes and discussion points expressed in the TRT World Forum 2018 book are strictly those of the speakers and participants present at the Forum, and do not reflect the official view of TRT World Research Centre.

Contents

Preface	10
Executive Summary	12

Guests of Honour 16

President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan <i>President of the Republic of Turkey</i>	16
Her Majesty Queen Rania Al Abdullah of Jordan	22

Opening Ceremony 26

Welcoming Speech by İbrahim Eren <i>Director General and Chairman, TRT</i>	28
Opening Speech by Binali Yıldırım <i>President of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey</i>	30

Joint Keynote: Exploring a Just Peace in a Fragmented World 34

Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu <i>Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey</i>	36
Stef Blok <i>Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands</i>	38

Public Sessions

40

First Session

A World in or Out of Order?: A Hundred Years since WWI

42

Robert Dickson Crane

44

Former Advisor to President Richard Nixon

Şükrü Hanioğlu

45

Professor of History at Princeton University

William Hale

46

Emeritus Professor of Politics at SOAS

Thomas P.M. Barnett

48

American Military-Geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat

Second Session

The EU and Its Discontents: Is it the End of the European Project?

50

Ivo Josipović

52

Former President of Croatia

Volkan Bozkır

53

Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey

Franco Frattini

54

Former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Italy

Štefan Füle

55

Former European Commissioner for Enlargement and European Neighborhood Policy

Third Session

Disrupting the Established Order: Rise of the Global South

56

Keynote Speech: Hamid Karzai

57

Former President of Afghanistan

David McWilliams

61

Economist, Author and Journalist

Sergey Karaganov

62

Former Foreign Policy Advisor to President Vladimir Putin

Mamphela Ramphele

63

Former Managing Director of the World Bank

Haiyan Wang

64

Managing Partner of the China-India Institute

Baghdad Amreyev

65

Secretary General of the Cooperation Council of Turkic Speaking States

Fourth Session

The Leadership of Women in a World of Conflict

66

Monique Villa

68

CEO of the Thomson Reuters Foundation

Diana Buttu

69

Human Rights Lawyer

Anita Alban

70

Former Minister of Environment of Ecuador

Sakena Yacoobi

71

CEO of the Afghan Institute of Learning

Fifth Session

Regional Players and Shifting Security Equation in the Middle East

72

Keynote Speech: Fouad Siniora

74

Former Prime Minister of Lebanon

İbrahim Kalın

78

Presidential Spokesperson of the Republic of Turkey

Staffan de Mistura

79

UN Secretary-General's Special Envoy to Syria

Maha Yahya

80

Director of the Middle East Centre, Carnegie

Mokhtar Lamani

81

Former Ambassador of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference to the UN

Sixth Session

A Crisis of Connectivity: New Media and Trust Formation

82

Haroon Siddiqui

84

Editorial Page Editor Emeritus of the Toronto Star

Riyaad Minty

86

Acting Director of Digital for TRT World & TRT Arabi

Rageh Omaar

87

ITV News International Affairs Editor

David Patrikarakos

88

Writer and Journalist

Seventh Session

Closing Ranks: International Cooperation Against Terrorism

90

Robert Fox

92

Defence Editor at the Evening Standard

Ufuk Ulutaş

93

Chairman of the Center for Strategic Research

Burhanettin Duran

94

Professor at Ibn Haldun University and General Coordinator of SETA Foundation

Peter van Praagh

95

President of the Halifax International Security Forum

Ali Asghar Soltanieh

96

Iran's Former Permanent Representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency

Eighth Session**Fostering Global Consciousness in Times of Crisis****98**

İbrahim Eren

100

Director General and Chairman of TRT

Francesco Rocca

101

President of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Borge Brende

102

President of the World Economic Forum

Pierre Krahenbühl

103

*Commissioner-General of UNRWA***Closed Session****104**Belt and Road Initiative and
its Implications for MENA**106**Western Mainstream Media and
Coverage of the Muslim World**107**

Perpetuating or Breaking the Syrian Stalemate?

108Muslim Minorities in South Asia:
India, Myanmar and Sri Lanka**109**Is there a Trump Doctrine in
American Foreign Policy?**110**Activities of Terrorist Groups Abroad:
FETO and PKK**111**The Political Atmosphere in Egypt:
Reconciliation or Regression?**112**Turkey's Security Policy: National Defence
Industry and Cross Border Operations**113**The Fate of Palestine:
The Crisis Deepens**114**Turkey's Political Landscape under
the New Presidential System**115**

Turkey's Foreign Policy in an Age of Crises

116**Memories from
the TRT World Forum 2018****118**



Recep Tayyip Erdoğan

President of the Republic of Turkey



Preface

TRT is a value-focused organisation, with an evident legacy in its focus on objective and truthful reporting, in-depth understanding of current affairs, and emphasis on the issues that matter the most to global audiences. In this quest, we have continuously reaffirmed our commitment to building a more peaceful world founded on the values of mutual understanding and intercultural dialogue. At TRT, we are deeply engaged with the issues of our time and believe that knowledge is the first step to overcoming them.

At TRT we have pledged not to differentiate between the suffering of people regardless of their ethnicity, colour, or religion. Likewise, we do not compromise on people's rights to security and peace — security and protection not only from physical harm but also from xenophobic and racist discourses that seek to vilify and dehumanise.

We believe in the capacity of dialogue and consultation in resolving disputes and differences. These values are indeed requisites to construct a better world. We believe in inspiration and the power of ideas. We also recognise that knowledge is produced in a variety of ways in order to serve different purposes. With this belief in mind, we launched the TRT World Forum, a platform to discuss the most pertinent issues of our time with some of the world's leading experts.

Peace and security are, in our view, two fundamental human rights, which have largely been taken for granted in the aftermath of the Cold War. Many believed that the world would experience an era of unprecedented peace in which humanity would subsequently thrive. However, in recent years our increasingly fragmented world has witnessed the aggravation of divisions and conflicts, in turn jeopardising the lives of millions of people. In organising an event around the themes of Peace and Security, our purpose has been to explore the points of view not only of the powerful, but also of the disadvantaged and oppressed. Ultimately, the latter are the ones whose prosperity is most dependent on peace and security in our world, as they are the most disadvantaged by the ever-increasing wave of fragmentation. Thus, we do not see discussion as merely an exercise in mental gymnastics, but rather as a concrete tool to address real-world problems.

Through the TRT World Forum 2018, we have built upon the legacy of the inaugural Forum, producing outcomes with the potential to profoundly impact our world. Thanks to the expertise of our speakers and participants, we were able to look at vantage points, which are often overlooked in mainstream debates. Most importantly, we have managed to go beyond the superficial treatment of notions of peace and security that have continually failed to positively develop the world from beyond the realm of conflict and fragmentation.

I look forward to the TRT World Forum 2019.

İbrahim Eren
Director General and Chairman, TRT





Executive Summary

After decades of prolonged conflict, the question of how to attain sustainable peace and security remains elusive. At the 2018 TRT World Forum, we addressed this seemingly perennial question in light of the current challenges. With the participation of over 600 esteemed speakers and international guests, we engaged in thought-provoking discussions and sought to prospect new ways to resolve some of the most pressing issues of our day.

Last year, the theme of our forum was 'Inspiring Change in an Age of Uncertainty'. We addressed a wide array of global quandaries with the aim of stimulating ideas and promoting action around several key geostrategic, political, economic, and humanitarian issues. Given the array of uncertainties that characterise the current state of the international order, from increased protectionism, unilateral sanctions and ever-increasing disengagement from international cooperation, in 2018 we discussed the most persistent predicaments threatening world peace. Hence, the theme chosen for 2018 of "Envisioning Peace and Security in a Fragmented World."

This year's forum brought together a wide array of distinguished academics, journalists, politicians and members of civil society to analyse and discuss some of the most important questions that continue to define our world. Consisting of eight public sessions, 11 closed sessions, six keynote speeches and several private meetings, the 2018 Forum succeeded in providing a platform for serious engagement and debate.

This year's Forum hosted high profile keynote speakers with vast political experience. The Forum opened with a speech delivered by Binali Yıldırım, President of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey. Following, Fouad Siniora, Former Prime Minister of Lebanon and Hamid Karzai, former President of Afghanistan delivered keynote speeches on the necessity of cooperation between established and emerging powers. This year, the annual joint keynote was delivered by Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey and his counterpart, Stef Blok, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands.

Forum 2018 closed with a speech from Turkish President, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. He pointed to the ineffectiveness of the global system in resolving conflicts such as in Afghanistan, Syria and Yemen and stated that the current system is broken and needs to be fixed. President Erdoğan reiterated that the "world is bigger than five" and added that new international institutions and mechanisms are needed in order to ensure an equitable representation of all countries.



TRB
world
forum

At the TRT World Forum 2018, we dealt with questions of peace and security holistically, not only through the prism of classical realism. Over the two days, of the Forum, participants discussed issues ranging from the future of the EU, the leadership of women in conflict and the shifting security equation in the Middle East, to the power of new media, anti-terror cooperation, and humanitarian aid. 2018 marked the centenary of the First World War. In commemoration of this immensely tragic event, our first session addressed the question of the development of the global order in the century following the end of the war. Renowned scholars, Professor William Hale and Professor Şükrü Hanioglu, provided an in-depth analysis from a historical point of view, while Robert Dickson Crane, former advisor to President Richard Nixon, and Thomas P.M. Barnett, American military strategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat offered their opinions based on their experience on the field.

The second session, 'The EU and Its Discontents- Is it the End of the European Project?' addressed the issues facing the European Union and whether or not the European project is trending towards further disintegration. This session hosted political figures, such as Ivo Josipović, Former President of Croatia, Volkan Bozkır, Former Minister of EU Affairs of Turkey, Franco Frattini, Former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Italy and Štefan Füle, Former European Commissioner for Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy.

The third session covered the issue of the rise of the Global South and how the rise of new power centres contribute to shifts in the global order. Panellists such as Sergey Karaganov, Former Foreign Policy Advisor to President Vladimir Putin, Haiyan Wang, Managing Partner of the China-India Institute, David McWilliams, Economist, Author and Journalist, Mamphela Ramphele, Former Managing Director of the World Bank and Baghdad Amreyev, Secretary General of the Cooperation Council of Turkic Speaking States discussed the rise of the Global South and its effects on the world order.

The last session of the day explored the question of women in leadership. The panel discussed obstacles to the increased participation of women in the public sphere and the pathways open to engendering a more egalitarian division of labour when it comes to leadership in both public and private spheres. Humanitarian activist Sakena Yacoobi, CEO of the Afghan Institute of Learning and Diana Buttu, Human Rights Lawyer contributed to the panel with their unique experiences. Monique Villa, the CEO of Thomson Reuters Foundation and Anita Alban, Former Minister of Environment of Ecuador, stressed the importance of the participation of women.

The second day of the forum began with a broad discussion on the Middle East with a panel titled 'Regional Players and shifting security equation in the Middle East'. The panellists addressed some of the major issues facing the region, highlighting trends towards positive change as well as areas where the region continues to struggle. İbrahim Kalın, Presidential Spokesperson of the Republic of Turkey and Staffan de Mistura, UN Secretary-General's Special Envoy to Syria emphasized the importance of the peace process in Syria to the stability of the region as a whole. While Mokhtar Lamani, Former Ambassador of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference to the UN and Maha Yahya, Director of the Middle East Centre at Carnegie, analysed the feasibility of reaching a political solution in Syria through the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) acceded by Turkey and Russia regarding Idlib.

The following session, 'A Crisis of Connectivity: New Media and Trust Formation' engaged leading journalists in a stimulating discussion regarding a new era in information consumption constructed by the rise of digital and social media platforms. Rageh Omaar, ITV News International Affairs Editor, David Patrikarakos, Writer and Journalist, Haroon Siddiqui, Editorial Page Editor Emeritus of the Toronto Star and Riyaad Minty, Acting Director of Digital for TRT World and TRT Arabi, addressed issues ranging from the decline in traditional media to the challenges of living in what some call a 'post-truth' era.

The third session of the day focused on the challenging issue of international cooperation against terrorism and considered a variety of approaches to counter-terrorism ranging from military force to counter-radicalisation strategies. The panel, 'Closing Ranks: International Cooperation against Terrorism', hosted Robert Fox, Defence Editor at the Evening Standard, Ali Asghar Soltanieh, Iran's Former Permanent Representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency, Peter Van Praagh, President of the Halifax International Security Forum, Burhanettin Duran, Professor at Ibn Haldun University and General Coordinator of SETA Foundation and Ufuk Ulutaş, Chairman of the Center for Strategic Research. Perhaps most importantly, the panel identified the importance of addressing the root-causes of terrorism and the need to come to some sort of common definition of what constitutes terrorism and what does not. The final session of the day revolved around fostering a global humanitarian consciousness in an age of crisis and discussed practical strategies for dealing with humanitarian crises. The session included a keynote address given by Queen Rania of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, and identified the centrality of international institutions, humanitarian organisations, the media and even individuals in alleviating suffering and combatting systemic injustices. After the keynote speech, panellists İbrahim Eren, Director General and Chairman of TRT, Francesco Rocca, President of International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Børge Brende, President of World Economic Forum and Pierre Krähenbühl, Commissioner-General of UNRWA, discussed the importance of alleviating poverty and combating systematic and widespread injustices through various institutions like humanitarian organisations and the media.

Throughout Forum 2018, we conducted 11 closed sessions in parallel with the public sessions and were invitation-only events. Politicians, policymakers, officials, journalists, leading global politics, and security experts participated in these sessions. The latter paved the way for in-depth intellectual engagement with the most critical matters affecting Turkey, the MENA region, the European Union, United States and China, on topics as diverse as 'Western Media Coverage and the Muslim World', 'Turkey's Political Landscape under the New Presidential System' and 'Belt and Road Initiative and its implications in MENA'. The closed sessions were conducted under the Chatham House Rules, allowing speakers and participants to exchange views and information freely. These private discussions provided invaluable insight for those in attendance.

The 2018 TRT World Forum was a success in many aspects. Building on last year's achievement, we pushed the boundaries of debate on critical predicaments facing the world today. It was a pleasure to be in the company of such distinguished speakers and guests. Their invaluable insights have been very much appreciated. Finally, we are fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with a highly motivated team in undertaking such a successful event that we hope will continue to grow in the future.

Pinar Kandemir

Director of Research, TRT World

Guest of Honour: President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan



Summary of the President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's Speech

President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan began his speech by recalling the importance of learning lessons from history, and that if people were to take heed, history would not repeat itself. He criticised the United Nations for its inability to provide answers to global issues. He pointed to the ineffectiveness of the global system in resolving conflicts such as in Afghanistan, Syria and Yemen and stated that the current system has collapsed. President Erdoğan reiterated his famous slogan that the “world is bigger than five” and added that the current world system is the aftermath of WWI and WWII and that we are no longer bound by these circumstances. A UN system should be formed in which all 193 members serve as permanent members. Otherwise, it is impossible to establish peace and justice in the world if we are to only rely on these five permanent members. There should be a UN Security Council that represents all continents alike.

Commenting on the Turkish-Russian Idlib deal, President Erdoğan said that the country's aim is to create a de-escalation zone in order to prepare for the return of refugees. When free and fair elections are held in Syria, Turkey will end its military presence; otherwise, unless

stability and peace are established, Turkish troops will remain in Syria. On the issue of Turkey's purchase of the S400 missile system from Russia, the US expressed its disapproval, expressing concern over a NATO member deploying a Russian-made weapon's system. President Erdoğan responded by simply stating that NATO's Secretary General issued a statement giving Turkey freedom of preference. He also added that the US did not object to Greece buying S300's from Russia but is objecting to Turkey buying S400's. President Erdoğan rejected the US philosophy of “I am strong, therefore I am right” and stressed that Turkey's philosophy is “I am right, therefore I am strong”.

President Erdoğan finally added that Turkey is moving forward with new projects and initiatives, such as the nuclear energy plans with Russia, China and Japan. The fact that the US refused to sell Turkey drones has forced Turkish entrepreneurs to produce their own drones, which have already been used successfully in Jarablus and Afrin. This is a sign that Turkey is no longer dependent and is slowly but firmly moving towards attaining its goals.

World
forum
2018

TRT

TRT
World
forum
2018



President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's Keynote Speech

First of all as the saying goes, history repeats itself. If people had drawn lessons [from past events], history would not repeat itself. It is precisely because people do not draw lessons that history repeats itself. Efforts have been made in the past to overcome certain obstacles; we cannot ignore that. However, although the UN was set up to establish justice, we are at a point today where the UN is still unable to find solutions to the issues in our world. We see the UN's efforts spanned across different parts of the world, and the Security Council has enacted many resolutions. These

resolutions have not served in bringing about an effective outcome. The case of Afghanistan is clear. To our south, Syria's situation is clear. Have they resolved the issues in these places? No. Why not? Because the system of global justice has collapsed.

Although there are many resolutions at the UN that are unfavourable to Israel, these resolutions cannot practically be put into effect. Why? Because as long as Israel does not recognise these resolutions, no one says or can say anything. Why? There are five permanent members at the Security Council and if one of these five permanent members says no, the matter is settled. So, regarding Israel, do you think that the United States will say yes to a resolution if it is against the will of Israel? No, that is not possible. So, what happens in the end? In the end, it is again in their favour. So, what has to be done? This is what needs to be done: the time of the five permanent members of the Security Council is over. Those were the conditions of the post-Second World War era. We are no longer bound by the same circumstances. It is time for new transformations and new changes. A UN Security Council should be formed in which all 193 members serve as permanent members. Otherwise, it is impossible to establish peace and justice in the world if we only rely on these five permanent members. This is the reason why I say, "The world is bigger than five". The world is especially bigger than one; however, unfortunately this is not the current practice at the Security Council. If we look at all of the countries represented at the Security Council and divide them according to their geography, does it represent the world? No. We say that there needs to be a UN Security Council that represents all continents. We say that Asia should be represented, Africa should be represented and so should Europe. Let us go even further: there needs to be a UN Security Council that represents all seven continents. This is something we have to achieve. Who will achieve that? The political leaders of the world will achieve that. However, will this be favoured by the five permanent members of the Security Council? Well it may or may not be. Then, this should be brought to the UN General Assembly. Here, we must debate this. We have to install this

A UN Security Council should be formed in which all 193 members serve as permanent members. Otherwise it is impossible to establish peace and justice in the world if we only rely on these five permanent members. This is the reason why I say "The world is bigger than five".

TRT
world
forum
2018

TRT

world
forum
2018

TRT

world
forum
2018

TRT

TRT
world
forum
2018

TRT world forum

2018

TRT

TRT
world
forum
2018

TRT

TRT

TRT
world
forum

TRT
world
forum
2018

TRT
world
forum



in the minds of people worldwide, we have to work on global perceptions, and take steps accordingly, because today's world is no longer the world of the First World War era, nor the Second World War era.

Fatih Er (Moderator): Mr. President, our speakers and panellists said that Turkey may become even more active and even more effective globally based on its historical legacy. Over the past few weeks, there has been a diplomatic victory: the Idlib agreement. If an agreement was not reached, more and more refugees could have entered through Turkey's borders and then that would lead to further turmoil. However, your involvement and tremendous efforts with Turkey's participation in the Astana and Sochi meetings

prevented Turkey from being subjected to this. Do you think this could be the beginning of a great global turn for Turkey?

Recep Tayyip Erdoğan: In the first Sochi Summit and then in subsequent summits in Ankara and Tehran, we did great work and after this, of course, the regime started bombing Idlib. This caused us to act swiftly. We spoke to Mr. Putin and agreed to hold a final summit to discuss the Idlib situation. There we witnessed the signing of a ten-item Memorandum of Understanding by our defence ministers. This reconciliation agreement was put into play that very night. The decisiveness and determination of Mr. Putin and myself, and the work done by our delegation has facilitated the process. This is because Mr. Putin said that Russia would take the necessary measures to protect the de-escalation zone in Idlib and that in return we would have to ensure that the radical groups would not operate in the area under discussion. We said let's do this together. As you know, in addition to the 12 observation points hosted by Turkey in Idlib, Russia has ten observation points and Iran has six. However here, the 15 to 20 kilometre corridor is of utmost importance. Because securing this corridor means securing Idlib and we have started fortifying our observation posts. And as these observation points have continued to strengthen, so has the confidence of the people of Idlib. We also required the cooperation of all groups in Idlib and since these steps were taken, we have not experienced any difficulty in conducting talks with them. Our wish is to be able to sustain the situation and this status quo, which we are striving for. And of course, most importantly in our discussions with Russia is to improve the humanitarian situation in Idlib: a region in ruins. 70,000-80,000 people have started to return home and that was the aim of our intervention. Similarly, around 250,000 people have returned to El Bab, Afrin and other parts of northern Syria. The safe return of refugees is the fruit of all our efforts. Even though the total figure is approximately 3.5-4 million refugees, such returns indicate a very positive development. Of course, we have taken further precautions. We have taken certain steps. The 3.5 million refugees that arrived to Turkey are no longer in tent camps because these camps do not meet their needs. We are eliminating them slowly and turning them into container towns and cities. This is what we are doing right now to serve Syrian refugees. However, when we look at the West, when we look at the world, the situation there is

***Whilst you are
calculating gains,
Syria is suffering from
poverty. You refer to
this poverty and then
you turn to us and tell
us to leave this piece
of land? No, we are not
going to leave. Not until
the people of Syria have
free and fair elections.
Once this takes place
we will hand the
country over to the real
owners and leave.***

unfortunately very different. We said we would not behave like them and we are doing our best at this point. Mr. Putin has had a positive approach to the resolution of the Idlib issue and in the same manner so has Iran on their latest decision to not be involved in any operation targeting Idlib. And so, we have taken steps based on that.

Today in Syria, 19,000 trailers worth of weapons, ammunition and other equipment have been supplied to terrorist organisations by the US. 3,000 cargo planes brought weaponry, ammunition, equipment and other devices, and they are currently being used in the north of Syria. There are 22 bases belonging to the US and they are being consolidated with all this weaponry, ammunition, and equipment that have been brought here. Moreover, we know that there are five more bases belonging to Russia. So why are these bases located here? Why do we see these bases here? On the one hand, we see that people talk about the integrity of Syrian territory. Then on the other hand, you establish 22 bases. And again, who will be profiting from the regional oil supply? Whilst you are calculating gains, Syria is suffering from poverty. You refer to this poverty and then you turn to us and tell us to leave this piece of land? No, we are not going to leave. Not until the people of Syria have free and fair elections. Once this takes place we will hand over these territories to the real owners of the country, and we will leave. We do not see the US being invited by the state, but the US is there. What we are saying is that once peace and stability is established, then we will leave. This was the case in Afrin and in Idlib. We were invited and that is why we were there. Because wherever and whenever there are people in need, we do our best to go and help.

Fatih Er: Mr. President, your speech at the UN in recent days has attracted worldwide attention. And Turkey has received messages of support in this context. You mentioned trade wars, and that we may be witnessing these types of wars more frequently in the upcoming period. In your UN speech, you said that you believe if all countries were to act in unison, all of this chaos could be prevented. What type of cooperation could be established?

Recep Tayyip Erdoğan: Simple. Currently, an iron and steel issue has surfaced, and some steps have been taken in regards to iron and steel prices. Of course, the US is a monopoly, and because of that they have exercised their power on the rest of the world by imposing heavier tariffs.

Even China could not withstand this and has had to take counter-measures. Russia took its own precautions. We said we are going to purchase the S400 missiles from Russia. The US stated their disapproval of this deal. What was their reason? Because you are a NATO member, a NATO member cannot purchase S400's from a non-NATO country. Now this is such a strange approach. Okay, well you tell me we cannot buy S400's from Russia; but Greece has purchased S300's from Russia. Why was Greece not told the same thing? There is no prohibition for Greece, but we are prohibited from doing this. I'm sorry, we cannot abide by this. Thankfully, NATO's Secretary General, Stoltenberg, made an announcement. He said: "As a partner of ours, Turkey is free in its preferences". And right now, due to the current conditions and for the defence of our country, we have taken this step. You may ask why we did not request these defence systems from the US. Well, we asked the US for a lot of things for our defence industry, but unfortunately the US gave the following response to the majority of our requests: Congress does not allow it. That is the answer they give each time. Well, it does not allow us, but does it allow for terrorist organisations like the PYD/YPG? You send a terrorist organisation 19,000 trailers worth of weaponry, ammunition, equipment and devices. You do not sell that to us but you give it to them free of charge. Now how can that happen? It is these kinds of policies that bring on economic war. Their philosophy is: I am strong, therefore I am right. And we are saying that this is not our philosophy. We believe that if you are right, then you are strong. So therefore, as a result, we are not going to give up on this economic warfare. We are going to work together as a nation. I have tremendous faith in my nation. This nation has suffered from famine, from thirst, but they have never given up on their independence.

Guest of Honour: Her Majesty Queen Rania Al Abdullah of Jordan



Summary of Her Majesty Queen Rania Al Abdullah of Jordan's Speech

Queen Rania began by praising Turkey's steadfast commitment to the millions of refugees it has welcomed inside its borders and its geostrategic significance in the region. On the other hand, Her Majesty pointed to the fact that even if nations share different worldviews, rooted deep in the core of our humanity, people share the same over-arching aspirations for the world: peace, justice and security for all. Queen Rania criticised how the political and humanitarian goodwill this incident generated was short-lived, and how the concern for the refugee cri-

sis once again receded. Unfortunately, people have become accustomed to news of displaced people dying at sea and to images of bloody children pulled from rubble. Her Majesty added that one of the key facets of human nature is the universal impulse to help those in need. On the individual level, this reflex to lend a helping hand is very effective, but in the face of mass atrocities, too often people fail to act decisively. Queen Rania, however, added that great headway has been made in turning the world into a safer, more inclusive place.



Her Majesty Queen Rania Al Abdullah of Jordan

Known for her passion for improving education and alleviating poverty, Her Majesty Queen Rania has championed initiatives in Jordan and abroad to empower local communities. An advocate for tolerance, she is an influential voice in fighting stereotypes of Arabs and Muslims, and fostering greater understanding between people of different faiths. Through her position on their boards, Queen Rania continues to contribute to the work of the United Nations Foundation (UNF) and the World Economic Forum (WEF).

Her Majesty Queen Rania Al Abdullah of Jordan's Speech

It is a pleasure to be in Turkey once more. Our two nations are bound not only by friendship, but by a long history of cooperation and shared beliefs. Like Jordan, Turkey has felt the shock waves of turmoil within our region. And like us, you remain steadfast in your commitment to the millions of refugees you have welcomed inside your borders. For centuries, this land has served as an intellectual hub where trade routes, populations and ideas intersect. Today, I am delighted to contribute to that tradition and take part in this forum. Our worldviews may be different but rooted deep in the core of our humanity we share the same overarching aspirations for the world: peace, justice and security for all. The realisation of these ideals is a constant unyielding struggle. One that no nation can wage on its own. But it must remain our common mission. Because when we falter, the innocent are the first to pay the price. Like Aylan Kurdi... It has been three years since his lifeless body was recovered on a beach near Bodrum. He along with his brother and mother lost their lives in an effort to escape the brutality of the Syrian conflict. In death, he quickly became a symbol of the struggles of more than five and a half million Syrian refugees. For a brief moment, this snapshot of senseless loss seemed poised to serve as a turning point in the global refugee crisis. It forced the world to confront the true cost of war and the terrifying outcome of global inaction. But the

political and humanitarian will it generated was short lived. Almost as suddenly as it had appeared concern for the refugee crisis once again receded: a casualty of the ebb and flow of human compassion. More than 10,000 people have since drowned attempting to make the same perilous trip across the Mediterranean. Instead of serving as a call to action, their deaths have been chewed out or treated as background noise. In decades past, experts warned that the 24-hour news cycle would desensitise us to images of horror. Today, such concerns seem almost quaint. Footage of human misery is now inescapable. Streaming constantly through our screens and flooding our social media feeds. We have grown accustomed to news of the display's dying at sea. To images of bloodied children pulled from rubble, to gutted homes and entire neighbourhoods reduced to debris. Every day we are bombarded with evidence of suffering until images that once felt painfully familiar gradually stop being painful. The names and faces blur and the mosaic of misery is distorted into static. One of the key facets of human nature is the universal impulse to help those in need. On the individual level, this reflex to lend a helping hand is very effective. But in the face of mass atrocities too often we fail to move decisively. Our hearts break when we hear the story of a mother forced to bury her child, a family targeted for their religious beliefs or a village being purposely burned to the ground. Yet much of the world remains unfazed by genocide in Myanmar where more than 25,000 Muslim Rohingya have been brutally murdered. And more than 900,000 driven from their homes. Psychologists describe this phenomenon a psychic numbing. We recognise a single person's suffering as a tragedy. But as the number of those affected piles up that tragedy begins to lose its emotional grip. This is partly a protective measure; a way to insulate ourselves from others pain. But perhaps the greatest obstacle to action is the sense of helplessness. Many resigned themselves to the idea that there is nothing they can do. They tell themselves that any effort to improve our world will be offered in vain. History, however, tells a much different and more hopeful story. The headlines may lead us to believe that the world is gradually becoming less secure, but the trend lines suggest otherwise. We have al-

Our challenge today and every day is to confront the harshest realities of our world without losing sight of our ideals and to remain steadfast in our refusal to accept the unacceptable.

ready made incredible headway in turning the world into a safer more inclusive home. Before the Industrial Revolution, war accounted for about 15 percent of human deaths. By the nineteen hundreds that figure had fallen to five percent. Today, it stands at one percent. Heart disease is now the world's leading cause of death whereas violence doesn't even crack the top ten. Meanwhile, quality of life is improving. Since 1990, nearly 1.1 billion people have escaped extreme poverty. More people have access to clean water, electricity and medical care than ever before. And we are better educated achieving an unprecedented global literacy rate of over 85 percent. We refused to accept the status quo, and so we succeeded in changing it. Time and again we have proven that progress is possible. Humankind has already made exceptional strides and the momentum is on our side. So why stop here? After all, there are many challenges we have yet to overcome. One in five children around the world are out of school, including more than 15 million in the Middle East alone. Last year 10,000 youth worldwide were killed or maimed in armed conflict. And each day

44,000 people are displaced from their homes. The task before us may seem intimidating until we remember that we are capable of incredible things. And we have come too far to quit now while we were ahead. Ask the journalists in the refugee camps, the first responders to national disasters or the aid workers helping thousands get back on their feet; they will tell you that images of desperation are one part of our planet's narrative. But they don't tell the whole story. Determination, strength, community, joy... Even in the darkest of places, the best of humanity continues to shine through. Among the heartache there is so much life left to cherish. Now is no time to disengage. Instead of despairing for all that we have lost, we must fight for the innocence we have left to protect. Mourn the dead then redouble our efforts toward the living. It was Martin Luther King Junior who said: "We must accept finite disappointment, but never lose infinite hope." Our challenge today and every day is to confront the harshest realities of our world without losing sight of our ideals and to remain steadfast in our refusal to accept the unacceptable. Thank you all very much.



Opening Ceremony



Summary of the Welcoming and Opening Speeches

TRT World Forum 2018 opened with a welcoming speech delivered by Ibrahim Eren, Director General of TRT. He stressed the importance of coming together to discuss global issues and propose solutions. He explained TRT World Forum's main objective: to provide a platform for academics, activists, politicians and journalists – with diverse experiences, knowledge and accreditations – to analyse and discuss the issues that continue to characterise the world's current socio-political situation.

Afterwards, Former Prime Minister of Turkey and Speaker of Parliament, Binali Yıldırım, gave an opening speech. He began by explaining how the world is currently facing issues that go beyond borders, where they can no longer be treated as merely regional or local. He emphasised Turkey's action on those issues, such as the Syrian refugee crisis. He made a call for greater international cooperation in

order to reach the aim of living in a world of peace, tranquillity and security for everyone. He noted that the fight against terrorism is the primary area in which cooperation is needed, emphasising that terror and terrorism should be indifferently and unconditionally rejected, regardless of the country it affects or the ethnic identity or religion it is linked to. He highlighted the ineffectiveness of the current international system and how it mostly reflects the interests of the powerful. Mr. Yıldırım emphasised that diversity must be accounted for in order to find solutions to global issues. Criticising the EU's global role, he stated that the EU is not active enough in working to tackle international problems and that its current approach to global issues is inadequate. For the EU to be more effective in addressing the challenges the world faces, it needs to place sustainable development at the heart of its agenda.

World forum 2018





İbrahim Eren

Director General and Chairman of TRT

İbrahim Eren is the Director General and Chairman of TRT. Prior to joining TRT, Mr. Eren worked in executive positions for several companies in the technology and media sectors. Beginning his career at Boğaziçi Group, he founded Who Pictures, which operates internationally in the fields of documentary and animation. He also served as General Manager of ATV Europe and Deputy General Manager of ATV, an independent Non-Executive Director at Türk Telekomünikasyon A.S. and as a member of board of Directors at Euronews.

Welcoming Speech by İbrahim Eren

Esteemed presidents, prime ministers, governor and guests, as the TRT family, it brings us great pleasure and joy to present to you this year's TRT World Forum, our second year running and one of the most important projects we have brought to life.

On behalf of myself and my agency TRT, I would like to thank you, esteemed participants, again, for honouring our invitation. In an era where we are witnessing a collapse in safety and security at a global level, it is important to be able to come together and debate issues and propose suggestions for solutions. Taking action from this understanding, in the inaugural forum that we organised, we debated how to be an inspiration for change by focusing on the uncertainties in the age we live in. I am saddened to mention that, over the past year, establishing safety and stability has not been successful. On the contrary, war, human disaster, discrimination, and as a result, fragmentation has increased. Experienced in many different regions, the battle for power and profit continues to spread instability around the world. Gun cartels, interest lobbying and terrorist organisations that feed off this battle threaten human security by continuing to exist. The effects of civil wars, as in Syria and Yemen, in all their severity, unfortunately continue to be felt across the world. Millions of civilians affected by these conflicts have taken extreme conditions into measure in order to live, and with the risk of theirs and their children's lives being at danger, are forced to search for the right to live in other countries. Many of these asylum seekers are, unfortunately, not as lucky as those who find the right to live in Turkey. Each day, in what has clearly been identified by the UN as ethnic cleansing, Rohingya Muslims are increasingly faced with oppression and discrimination. Along with recent developments, as the possibility of a just solution for Palestine gradually decreases, the living conditions for Palestinians are becoming more and more difficult. In Europe, the recent rise in Islamophobia and xenophobia leads to new divisions day by day. In addition to all of this, the eruption of trade wars and western nations' conservative and one-sided policy preferences deepens this fragmentation. We think that the greatest obstruction to a solution for all of these problems is caused by the fragmentation we see in the world. Exactly for this reason, in this year's Forum, we will once again think about how we can establish peace and security in a fragmented world. We wholly believe that each individual can deliver a positive contribution to change. We believe that what we need to solve these problems are, most importantly,

cooperation and solidarity. And a way to successfully achieve these is by coming together, debating issues and proposing new ideas and solutions. There you have it; TRT World Forum aims to provide a platform for this very purpose. Along with our country's demonstration of evolution and progress in recent years, the impact and importance of TRT's channels like TRT World, TRT Arabi, TRT Kurdi, and TRT Avaz, is increasing at an international level every day. In our broadcasts, we are continuing and will continue to show what is not shown and extend the microphone to those who are unheard.

Distinguished guests, over the following two days we will be holding open and closed sessions. Experts, politicians, thinkers, academics and activists attending the Forum from various different countries around the globe will seek to produce solutions, in regards to the problems we face, by placing people at the centre. They are going to discuss how we can tackle fragmentation.

Today, we are going to benefit from the experiences, knowledge and accretions from the contribution of over 600 guests and speakers. I hope that this Forum will produce valuable results for the conflicts we see in the world today. I hereby welcome our distinguished guests to Istanbul again, and thank you for your participation.

We think that the greatest obstruction to a solution for all of these problems is caused by the fragmentation we see in the world. It is exactly for this reason, in this year's Forum, we will once again think about how we can establish peace and security in a fragmented world.



Binali Yıldırım

President of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey

Binali Yıldırım was elected as President of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey on 12 June 2018. Previously, he served as the Prime Minister of the Republic of Turkey (2016-2018). Binali Yıldırım is the longest-serving Minister of Transport, Maritime Affairs, and Communications in Turkey's history, serving more than 11 years as a Cabinet Minister and as a Member of Parliament for Istanbul of the ruling AK Party. From 1994 to 2000 Mr Yıldırım was the General Manager of Istanbul Fast Ferries Co. Inc. (IDO). During this time, he materialised important projects that facilitated an increase in ferry traffic, helping to significantly ease vehicle congestion in Istanbul. In 1999, He was honoured with the 'Skal' Quality Award for his contribution to sea transport and tourism.

Highlights of the Opening Speech by Binali Yıldırım

Dear friends, 'Peace and Security in a Fragmented World', is an important matter. It is even more significant that we are discussing and debating this topic in this land that has sustained peace and fraternity across three continents for over 600 years.

This Forum will help to develop humankind's potential to develop common solutions to shared issues. Today, we are faced with issues that go beyond borders; we can no longer separate issues as being local or regional. Yes, our world is problematic. The region we live in is even more problematic. The renowned historian, Ibn Khaldun, says "geography is destiny". It is true. Every geography has a destiny. In order to live with its destiny, it is the duty of those who govern to ensure that the people who live in that geography are able to live their lives in peace and serenity.

Look at Syria, as a consequence of a civil war of more than eight years, we are one of the countries that are paying the highest price. Lebanon and Jordan are paying the same price. We have taken in 3.5 million of our brothers with open arms. Some countries struggle to understand this. They say "you've spent 30 billion dollars." They are not able to understand. Because when the concern is to keep someone alive, money has no value. To save one person's life is to save the whole world. Our understanding, our belief entails this. That is why we are doing this.

There is great disorder in the region and in the world and there are serious divergences in levels of development. The Earth's resources are not shared fairly. States that have advanced capabilities and technologies get to the resources first, and those that come after are left deprived. Yes, it is unsettling for citizens of the world when resources are not shared in a fair and equitable way. The source of this unrest is not only war and conflict; it is also poverty, deprivation, drought, unemployment and hopelessness. All of these make up the sources of the issues at hand. We see that less developed countries have much deeper issues. According to research, the wealth possessed by the eight wealthiest people in the world is equal to the wealth of half of the world population. This situation is a very striking example of the extent of global inequality. Of course, the deepening of national and international conflicts is another reason of increased risks of conflict.

Esteemed attendees, in order to reach the aim of living in a world of peace, tranquillity and security for everyone is possible so long as "powerful states" act in a just manner and hold to good intentions in cooperation. Counter-terrorism is at the forefront of issues that require cooperation. Terror and terrorism should be indifferently and unconditionally rejected without regard to country, ethnicity and religion. Terror should in no way be funded, nor should weapons and monetary support be supplied.

This organisation, the PKK, which also goes by the name of PYD/YPG, that massacred 35,000 innocent people, unfortunately carry on their activities in Syria. What is worse is that their ability to continue this activity is a result of the overt support they receive from those who we knew as our ally, our NATO ally. Dear friends, there is no aspect of cooperating with a terrorist organisation that can be excused. If we want to eradicate regional and global terrorism, we cannot use one terrorist organisation to destroy another.

In recent years, we have had another terrorist organisation, FETO. You will remember that on 15th July 2016, this organisation attempted a bloody coup in our country. However, that day, the power of the people triumphed over the power of tanks. Although 251 of our people fell as martyrs, and thousands were wounded; the Turkish people did not give way to this cowardice, this dishonour.

So what happened with this terrorist organisation, FETO? We see the leader of this organisation living in a manor in America, happy and protected. All kinds of documents and information are available; however, states we have known as allies appear completely unmoved. So long as there is a discrimination of my terrorist, your terrorist; just as we will not be successful in fighting terrorism, we will also fail to develop a regional and global brotherhood. It is not possible to struggle against issues that know no borders without cooperation between states and institutions. It is not possible to get rid of terrorism with weapons alone without going after the logistics and funding of terrorism.

In this respect, I would like to touch on one more point. Organisations that engage in terrorist activities against Turkey constantly complain that their rights and freedoms are not adequately implemented in Western countries. Since

2002, Turkey has been on the path to democratisation, to people's ability to express themselves freely, and very important legal and constitutional transformations have been made in the name of rights and freedom. The closure of a political party has been made impossible. And while we have done all of this, has terrorism come to an end? No, it has not. If terrorism does not come to an end despite the reforms that have been implemented and the measures that have been taken, it is apparent that none of the terrorists' demands for more rights and freedom hold a legitimate ground. This is also valid for al-Qaeda and Daesh.

One of the key reasons for the fractures in the world is the continuation of the current status quo. This status quo, created in the post-WWII era, no longer meets the needs of today's states. Defenders of the status quo must also understand the changing paradigm. In the past few days, our President, Mr. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, once again stated at the UN General Assembly that the world is bigger than five. At one end, innocent people are dying, drowning in blood. "Come on let's stop this" says the UN. One person puts up their hand and says "no" and the case is closed. This is not something that can be sustained.

In Jerusalem, in Palestine, how many resolutions passed by the Security Council have Israel not implemented? So, you

are going to say that this is an obligation for some states, and if not applied, it leads to catastrophes? When some states do not apply these resolutions, no outcome will follow? OK, so how will we get people to believe in this council, in this system? This question needs to be asked openly. For this reason, the structure of the UN Security Council certainly needs to be examined. Today, veto power serves to aggravate conflict, not prevent it. Today, we have 193 UN member states. The Organisation of Islamic Cooperation has 57 members. There needs to be a Muslim country at the UN Security Council, because 1.8 billion of the world's population is Muslim.

The EU's current approach to global issues is far from producing solutions. Based on economic and social factors, EU development is spiralling negatively due to its lack of effectiveness in most international issues. The EU is attempting to avoid its problems, hardening its borders as much it can and conducting itself in a way that reflects the old adage: "the snake that doesn't touch me can live a thousand years for all I care."

Dear guests, world issues will not be solved by someone from outer space. We must be the ones who find solutions to these man-made issues and establish an environment of peace, brotherhood, and trust. Each issue that we put off and do not solve will continue to burn us like a fireball. In this respect, it should be mentioned here that there has been an upward trend in racism and Islamophobia across the world. Racism and Islamophobia are planting seeds of hate among communities. Islam is a religion of peace. A Muslim is a person of peace. Individuals whom resort to violence in the name of Islam or Muslims consequently incriminates Muslims. The Western world must abandon this Islamist, terrorist discourse. This is discrimination and itself promotes terrorism. Terrorism has no religion, faith, race, or sect. All monotheistic religions forbid unjust killing. Those who treat Islam as a threat, and use religion to try to provoke conflict between communities, do not have good intentions. And the occurrence of these issues is of no coincidence; all of humanity must be sensitive to such events. I would like to remind those who plant seeds of hate between communities not to forget that someday, they will too be targeted by that same hate.

With these thoughts and feelings, and by taking this important topic to agenda, I would like to thank the Director General of TRT, and all of the TRT World directors and team.

It is not possible to struggle against issues that exceed borders without cooperation between states and institutions. It is not possible to get rid of terrorism with weapons alone without making cuts to logistics and funding terrorism.

TRT
d
m

TRT

TRT
world
forum
2018



Joint Keynote: Exploring a Just Peace in a Fragmented World



Summary of the Joint Keynote Speech

David Foster, TRT World Presenter and the moderator of the session, introduced the keynote speakers Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey and Stef Blok, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands who spoke about stronger cooperation with regard to the humanitarian effort in Syria and, more generally, what the future holds.

Turkey's Foreign Minister Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu began by highlighting the rise of social inequalities in our world such as terrorism, xenophobia, irregular migration, and poverty. Deliberating on the issue, he stressed on the importance of addressing these inequalities in order to attain social justice. Conflict resolution and conflict prevention are equally important for the prosperity of not only the Middle East but also the whole world. Indirectly addressing the United States, he stated that the pioneer in establishing the current international system is currently not only attacking this system but also attacking its friends and allies through trade wars. These policies further increase the inequalities gap in the world and this is why it is necessary to adopt a win-win approach and reform the rules of the international system as well as strengthen international institutions. He also added that reforms should be introduced to the United Nations in order to better respond to the global challenges and better serve humanity. He reiterated President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's saying that the "World is bigger than five" and concentrated on the importance of reforming the structure of the UN Security Council. Reform is essential to all the supranational and international organisations, including the European Union and the Council of Europe. Mr Çavuşoğlu described that the principal tenet of Turkey's foreign policy is enterprising and humanitarian foreign policy through soft power. He mentioned the recent Turkish-Russian deal in Idlib and how it prevented a humanitarian catastrophe and another mass flow of migrants to the Turkish

border, as well as towards Europe, paving the road for a full-scale agreement in Syria and the establishment of a constitutional committee. In terms of humanitarian and development assistance, he declared that in 2017, Turkey became the world's most generous giver with \$8.1 billion ranking first ahead of the US, which ranks second with \$6.7 billion. He ended his speech by stressing on the importance of enhancing the Turkish-EU relations in order to solve inevitable problems such as illegal migration and terrorism.

Stef Blok, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, touched upon the challenge of achieving just peace in a fragmented world. He described the world as being in the process of witnessing a shift in the global economy towards the east and south, and the growth of a multipolar order instead of the long-existing unipolar order. He also pointed to the growing influence of non-state actors such as ISIS. Mr Blok expressed the Netherlands' willingness to cooperate with Turkey on the refugee issue and help relocate refugees in Europe. He explained that cooperation is essential for attaining just peace and gave examples of the European Union and NATO. He noted the importance of nations working together to reach common goals. However, Mr Blok did not rule out military actions, explaining that in some cases it is necessary such as in the case of ISIS. He also added that prevention and deterrence are effective as well. He reiterated his call for the UN Security Council to refer the most serious crimes to the International Criminal Court for it is an important instrument to end impunity and achieve accountability. He pointed to the instructive role Turkey played in highlighting the plight of the Rohingya, and thus urged Turkey to become a member of the International Criminal Court. He finally stressed upon the importance of reconciliation in a range of post-war settings such as in the Balkans, Colombia and Eritrea.



Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu

Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey

Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu is the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey. He previously served as the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the 62nd 64th and 65th governments of the Republic of Turkey. He is a founding member of the Justice and Development Party (AK Party) and former Vice Chairman of the AK Party in charge of Foreign Affairs. Çavuşoğlu also served as Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator of the Republic of Turkey.

Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu's Highlights

Distinguished participants, ladies and gentlemen, exploring a just peace in a fragmented world is a very timely topic. The world is indeed very much fragmented and most of the institutions in the world and we, its members, are under risk. Terrorism, irregular migration, humanitarian crisis, poverty, xenophobia and hatred are on the rise. Inequalities are everywhere. Without addressing inequalities, we cannot talk about social justice anywhere, neither in Turkey nor in our neighbourhood or beyond. International organisations fail to deal with the actual threats. Prevention is weak and conflict resolution is even weaker. It seems that the country who was the pioneer in establishing the current international system is now attacking it. That country is even attacking its own friends and allies. I am very much disappointed to see that trade wars have become a reality. Unilateral and protectionist measures harm free fair trade rules based on the trading system in the world, and these affect all countries particularly the developing ones. Failed states, instabilities and lack of resources help radicals and terrorists in recruiting, particularly youth. Peace and prosperity in developed parts of the world cannot be sustained when the rest of humanity is suffering from hunger and poverty. That is why we need to ensure peace and prosperity for all.

This means there is a need to adopt a win-win approach and reform the rules-based international system. Strengthening international institutions is an important aspect of this agenda. The United Nations (UN) must fulfil its global role in serving humanity. The UN structure and procedures must be reformed to better respond to global challenges. That is the expectation of our societies today and we support the UN Secretary-General's pledge in that respect. The reform should also include the UN Security Council system. That is why my President has been emphasizing and underlining that "world is bigger than five." The UN is not meeting the expectations of today's world. Our regional organisations are also not meeting the expectations of our societies, in Europe particularly. Therefore, the European Union (EU), the Council of Europe and

Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) and others, should also reform themselves. When I was the President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, reform was my priority. It was the priority at the same time of the Secretary-General who is still Secretary-General of the organisation, Thorbjørn Jagland. We did not only reform the Parliamentary Assembly but even the European Court of Human Rights, which is now more effective. Therefore, reform is an ongoing process. We need to continue reforming this organisation.

While we are facing all these problems in our neighbourhood, Turkey cannot just sit back and watch. Therefore, today's Turkish foreign policy is an enterprising and humanitarian foreign policy. We must take initiatives; employ hard and soft instruments of power in order to implement this enterprising and humanitarian foreign policy in our neighbourhood and beyond. We take active roles in prevention and peaceful resolution of conflicts. Syria is one example. The memorandum that we signed with the Russians on Idlib did not only prevent the humanitarian catastrophe but also prevented another mass flow of migrants to Turkey and Europe. Now there is another window of opportunity for a political solution. Without the Idlib deal there would be no opposition and therefore no negotiations between the opposition and the regime for a new constitution or for a political solution.

Syria and Iraq are not the only problems in the neighbourhood. Look at what is happening in Yemen and Libya. I have been trying to convince my European friends that any kind of impact of the situation in Yemen to the European continent will be more than it is on Turkey. Therefore, we should continue supporting the efforts of the United Nations.

In our region, also look at the north: Crimea and the Eastern part of Ukraine. We have so many fragile regions like the western Balkans. We are on the eve of the elections in Bosnia and the recent tension between Kosovo and Serbia are a source of concern for all of us. We have so many frozen conflicts in our neighbourhood. Cyprus is another problem for which the solution has been frozen. We tried our best last year in Crown Mountain and Geneva, it did not work. Now we are talking with everybody, all the actors including the Greek Cypriots informally, to find out what we are going to negotiate next, because we cannot afford another failure.

Of course, the peaceful resolution of all conflicts is essential; however, we need to focus on the root causes. Therefore, to face or deal with the root causes of the problems, humanitarian assistance and solving the problems of the people where they are living is essential. Turkey has been very successful in that regard. And, I am so honoured to repeat that Turkey is the most generous country in the world right now.

Our humanitarian and development assistance reached \$8.1 billion in 2017. The second is the US: their humanitarian and development assistance amounted to \$6.7 billion. We have spent \$32 billion for Syrian refugees living in Turkey. We have another 500,000 refugees and migrants from different parts of the world; from Afghanistan, from Pakistan, from African countries and beyond.

More than 65 million people around the world have had to leave their homes for this or that reason. Now they face other problems where they are living. Anti-refugee and immigrant sentiments are on the rise. We have witnessed negative, hostile and misguided sentiments towards migrants and refugees all over the world, not only in the transit countries - I mean the eastern European countries or western Balkan countries or Greece - but all over the Europe and all over the world.

We need to deal with another big challenge, in our countries, in Europe, which is xenophobia, racism, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, any sort of phobia. I mean, they are all on the rise... this is the problem that we need to deal with. That is why to face all these problems I think we need better Turkey-EU relations. And to do so we need to create a more positive atmosphere. This is exactly what we are doing now.

I am very happy that we are normalising our relations, we look forward, and we have been working together with the Netherlands in many areas, particularly in counter-terrorism. We co-chair the Counter-Terrorism Forum as well as the forum on the anti-Daesh coalition. We need better intelligence and information sharing, a timely one, to actually prevent foreign terrorist fighters flowing to the destination where there are civil wars all the way back to source countries. Therefore, I would like to thank Stef here in front of you for his visit and the good talks that we have been having since he arrived. Thank you very much.



Stef Blok

Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands

Stef Blok is the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands. Blok served as a member of the House of Representatives for the People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) and the VVD's parliamentary party leader (2010-2012). He has also served as Minister for Housing and the Central Government Sector and Minister of Security and Justice. On 7 March 2018 Mr. Blok was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs in the third Rutte government.

Stef Blok's Highlights

It is not hard to show that the world is fragmented; especially before this distinguished audience of experts of international affairs. So, that part of my analysis can be brief. You are all very well aware of the facts.

After two decades of unipolarity, we now live in a multipolar world with economic power shifting towards the East and the South as old alliances try to adapt to the new reality. It is a world where multilateralism and the system of international cooperation set up after World War Two are under pressure, the principle of "might makes right" is in danger of gaining the upper hand. It is a world where states are no longer single dominant factors at play. Non-state actors are growing more and more influential. The rise of ISIS is an example of this and Turkey has borne a disproportionately heavy burden in this regard unfortunately. Second, it is true that classic threats remain, but new, often undetectable hybrid threats have entered into the mix. Third, we live in a world where people have become increasingly mobile and this has benefited many. But it can lead to disruptive irregular migration patterns. Turkey knows this all too well. As host to an astonishing three and a half million Syrian refugees, we truly appreciate this tremendous humanitarian effort. By relocating refugees to the Netherlands and providing financial support to the EU facility for refugees in Turkey, we are happy we can help this effort. Fourth and lastly, this is a world where all levels of society and governments are interconnected and sometimes collide.

This brings me back to the proposition I was asked to discuss here: achieving just peace. "Just peace" sounds simple, does it not? Two little words represent the most precious thing we have. The hardest to achieve too. How can we achieve it? Let me run through five elements that my country and I believe are essential in our fragmented world. I come from a small, open and wealthy country that is heavily dependent on trade, trade with our partners both close and far away. A country that remembers the devastation of at least one world war and the pain of decades of rebuilding. A country that has had first-hand experience of what happens when the international order breaks down and a

country that, like many others, has a tremendous interest in preserving international law and rules-based international legal order.

I consider myself a realist and I strongly believe that now more than ever dependable rules-based legal order is essential for security, stability and economic growth. When respected, such an order is our best guarantee for prosperity... This is no less true in this day and age. As a Roman writer Vegetius observed in his *Epitoma Rei Militaris*: "If you want peace, prepare for war." And unfortunately, that principle is also true today. Realists like me cannot help but concede that just peace sometimes requires more than just simply talk. We need to be ready. When all other options are exhausted to use other means and words, we need to be ready to exert real pressure to hit an opponent where it hurts. After all, by imposing punitive sanctions, the world forced North Korea back to the negotiating table and in some cases we even have to be ready to take the kinds of steps we are all working hard to fight. The threat of military action is sometimes enough.

In an uncertain geopolitical context, increased expenditure on defence is necessary to ensure stability as agreed at the NATO summit in Wales and Turkey, as a key NATO ally knows this better than anyone. The Netherlands is working towards this commitment. For its part, Turkey is one of the handful of allies that has already fulfilled its commitments. So, I commend you for it. And Turkey like the Netherlands shelters its security responsibility in the NATO alliance. Since 2010, our soldiers have served shoulder to shoulder in Afghanistan to prevent this troubled country from falling back into instability.

This brings me to my third point: Predictability breeds confidence. Confidence is the most vital component of international relations. This should never be taken for granted. Certainly not in this day and age... Building confidence is the work of all of you here and I commend you for it. Building confidence in international relations takes many different forms in many different arenas. I mentioned the EU, NATO and the UN but also forums like the Global Counter-Terrorism Forum where 29 countries worked together to tackle shared challenges.

There is another element of just peace that my own nation's history of post-war reconstruction has demonstrat-

ed. It is a simple paradigm, which may sound familiar coming from a Dutch foreign minister. Because we have been saying it consistently for so long. There can be no lasting peace without justice. We can cite the Nuremberg trials for example of how justice can enable post-war society to rebuild conform traumas and heal wounds. For this reason, accountability has been one of our priorities during our UN Security Council membership. In Syria, Myanmar, Yemen or elsewhere, fact-finding investigation and attribution are essential elements in the chain of accountability. This sent a clear message to the victims. Justice may not be swift but it will eventually be done and it also sends a clear message to the perpetrators. And this is why I won't stop calling on the Security Council to refer the most serious crimes to the International Criminal Court. In that connection, I welcome the recent announcement that the International Criminal Court's prosecutor has opened an investigation into the forced displacement of the Rohingya people from Myanmar.

In this regard, I commend Turkey for its leadership in giving the Rohingya such a prominent place on world's agenda. The important role Turkey has played in highlighting the plight of the Rohingya shows that Turkey should also be part of the International Criminal Court (ICC) family. For that reason, I would again like to urge our Turkish friends to join the ICC. This way we can work together even more effectively to combat atrocities like those taking place in Myanmar. My last point is also about accountability. Of course, accountability is not an end in itself, it is one of the elements that makes reconciliation possible. It is reconciliation that enables a wounded society to tap into its reserves of resilience and look to the future again. To move forward. To rebuild.

It takes hard work. A lot of courage. It takes people who are willing and able to do the impossible in the toughest of times. Look at Syria. The suffering and the devastation. Today it seems hard to imagine that someday Syrians will be able to look to the future again. Fortunately, history has shown us that this is indeed possible. Just look at the examples of Europe after World War Two, South Africa after apartheid, Rwanda after a genocide and Sierra Leone had a civil war. From these examples that we take inspiration when we underscore the importance of reconciliation and in a range of post-war settings.

Public Sessions



TRT World Forum 2018 hosted eight public sessions around the main theme of 'Envisioning Peace and Security in a Fragmented World' with attendance of more than 600 guests from home and abroad. The titles of the public sessions are as follows:

A World in or Out of Order?: A Hundred Years since WWI; The EU and Its Discontents: Is it the End of the European Project?; Disrupting the Established Order: Rise of the Global South; The Leadership of Women in a World of Conflict; Regional Players and the Shifting Security Equation in the Middle East; A Crisis of Connectivity: New Media and Trust Formation; Closing Ranks: International Cooperation against Terrorism; Fostering Global Consciousness in Times of Crisis.

Among the participants were scholars, journalists, politicians, NGO representatives, corporate managers and civil society members from over 20 countries and 40 panellists were hosted from the different backgrounds. Humanitarian figures like Her Majesty Queen Rania Al Abdullah of Jordan; politicians like Fouad Siniora, Former Prime

Minister of Lebanon, Hamid Karzai, Former President of Afghanistan; policy-makers like Ivo Josipović, Former President of Croatia, Franco Frattini, Former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Italy and Štefan Füle, Former European Commissioner for Enlargement and European Neighborhood Policy; leading economists like Mamphela Ramphele, Former Managing Director of the World Bank; experts like Staffan de Mistura, UN Secretary-General's Special Envoy to Syria, İbrahim Kalın, Presidential Spokesperson of the Republic of Turkey, Sergey Karaganov, Former Foreign Policy Advisor to President Vladimir Putin and Robert Dickson Crane, Former Advisor to President Richard Nixon; prominent scholars like Şükrü Hanioglu, Professor of History at Princeton University and William Hale, Emeritus Professor of Politics at SOAS; humanitarian activists like Sakena Yacoobi, CEO of the Afghan Institute of Learning and Diana Buttu, Human Rights Lawyer participated as panelists in the public sessions where they presented their arguments in a panel format, followed by Q&A sessions.

First Session

A World in or Out of Order?: A Hundred Years since WWI



- How did the post-WWI settlements shape the history of the Middle East? Are they still relevant today?
- What impact will the Trump administration have on the US Middle East policy?
- Is the Middle East going into a new and decisive phase right now?
- What role can regional actors like Turkey play in stabilising the Middle East?

Summary of the Session

The panel 'A World in or out of Order: A Hundred Years Since WWI' discussed lessons learned from history and the legacy of the post-war order in our world today.

The first speaker, Robert Dickson Crane, addressed the issue of justice and stressed that justice is the product of a harmonious interaction between peace, prosperity and liberty. He also mentioned that it is not enough to simply focus on the present but also important to focus on the long-term future. Crane explained certain countries, including Turkey, should work on filling the leadership gap since the influence of the United States is gradually decreasing.

Şükrü Hanioglu addressed the moderator's question on what lessons can be derived from the Ottoman Empire's experience in maintaining stable societies, despite the divergent religious and ethnic groups that they ruled over. He explained that the Ottoman administration was flexible and accustomed to the needs of the regions and this enabled them to maintain rule in distant lands for so long. He also stressed that the Ottoman Empire was not a colonial empire as compared to the European colonial empires for it did not have overseas territories. At its core, it was a multi-religious and poly-ethnic empire.

William Hale spoke about the legacy of the Sykes-Picot agreement in the Middle East. He explained that this agreement was produced as a consequence of trying to reconcile the interests of the western powers fighting in WWI, namely Britain and France, as well as Sharif Hussein and his sons who were also promised lands in exchange for their support against Ottoman rule. Consequently, the Middle East was ultimately left politically fragmented, the consequences of which carry on until today as witnessed by the numerous conflicts taking place in the region.

Thomas P.M. Barnett, when asked about his prediction for the region, suggested that the region would suffer high levels of violence for several decades to come. He explained that when the countries in the region begin to tire from war and realise how far they are lagging behind others, then they would start looking at regional integration schemes. Barnett further mentioned that when looking at trends of statistical analyses on a per capita basis, in contrast to the fragmentation paradigm, our current era seems to have unprecedented predictability and prosperity. Wars are less frequent. They tend to be shorter and less lethal on a per capita basis, and are occurring at the lowest rate ever seen in human history.

Robert Dickson Crane's Highlights



Former Advisor to President Richard Nixon

Dr Robert Dickson Crane is the former advisor to US President Richard Nixon. He began his career in long-range global forecasting and planning in 1962 as a co-founder of the Center for Strategic and International Studies. He was appointed to the National Security Council as Deputy Director for Planning, and in 1981, he was appointed US Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates. He was Director of the Qatar Foundation's Center for the Study of Islamic Thought and Muslim Societies from 2011-2015.

Peace, prosperity and liberty are products of justice. Where -as justice is also a product of peace, prosperity, and liberty- it is a harmonious interaction. Lack of harmony is one of our problems in the world. I will say two things about justice because I think it is important. My professional specialty is comparative jurisprudence: studying the jurisprudence of all civilisations. And the best expression I've seen is from the Qur'an: "The word of your Lord is fulfilled and perfected in peace and in justice." And there's another one: "I've created people who are guided by truth and apply it in justice." To me, that is the essence of the future of the world. I think one of our problems is that we are transactional. We focus on what to do now without an adequate vision of the long-range future.

If you look at the history of civilisations, both Ibn Khaldun and Arnold Toynbee said that civilisations rise when people meet the challenges, they fall when they no longer meet them. We are in a period of falling right now and that is one of the reasons why there is terrorism. We are disintegrating. People have lost hope; they have become desperate. And they say if we can't fix the world we'll destroy it. This is spreading as an approach. Therefore the countries of the world, and I would say Turkey has a big responsibility in this area, they have to think about the long-range future: how to work together to provide missing leadership. The United States is trying to lead, but its influence in the world is declining sharply. Because it is not leading. It is not leading in the pursuit of compassionate justice.

The United States is going in two directions at once. One direction is following a higher vision to respect both individuals and groups of people. "Haqq al-nafs" is to respect the individual. "Haqq al-nasl" is to respect the group. The

Ottoman Empire is a model for the world for many reasons but one is that it respected "haqq al-nasl". Ever since 1648, when the states were formalised, people have had no existence in international law. Peoples had existence during the Ottoman Empire. There was a central Sultan, but the people were basically autonomous; they had no reason to feel that their identity was threatened. It was not threatened. The US threatens the identity of people all over the world. Europeans created these artificial states through nation building. Nation building has one purpose: destroy all the existing nations. This is one of the major reasons why we [the US] have been involved in it, as he [Thomas P.M. Barnett] says. We have to return to the wisdom of the Ottoman Empire. This is how the [legacy of the] Ottoman Empire can lead and it can lead by developing a Turkish model going from the Atlantic all the way to China.

I am very optimistic about the US, but I am also just as pessimistic. This is one of the problems with President Trump. When he was electioneering, he said two things that impressed me. "We will no longer pursue nation building." Because that is what gets us into trouble. We are trying to destroy nations, and replace them with states, like in Afghanistan. That ridiculous, artificial state is part of Pashtunistan. The new Prime Minister of Pakistan I think may fix things and expand Pakistan to incorporate Pashtunistan and that would include two-thirds of Afghanistan. This was a vision. But he has never carried it out. Because his transactional advisers, which are three Marine Corps generals who think in terms of what we can do now, not what may be possible 5-10 years from now. A politician and a businessman focuses on the near term. They cannot afford to have vision. Presidents of countries should have a vision. Turkey has been a leader, a European power for a thousand years. It

is on the intersection of three continents. It can be a model. It was a model for hundreds and hundreds of years. It could be a model again. I would like to add just one thing. President Erdoğan in the 73rd General Assembly of the United Nations 10 days ago emphasized that the concentration of wealth, the wealth gap, is growing rapidly. It is reached in-

credible lengths. This in my view is may be the greatest of all the causes of terrorism. We need an entirely new system of money, credit and banking. Including in part Islamic banking, but much more than that. If Turkey can be a leader in this, then in the political sense we will have a model for the whole world.

Şükrü Hanioglu's Highlights



Professor of History at Princeton University

Şükrü Hanioglu is Garrett Professor in Foreign Affairs in the Department of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton University. He specialises in Ottoman political, diplomatic and intellectual history. His books include *The Young Turks in Opposition* (Oxford, 1995); *Preparation for a Revolution: The Young Turks 1902-1908* (Oxford, 2001); *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire* (Princeton, 2008); and *Atatürk: an Intellectual Biography* (Princeton, 2011).

[The Ottoman Empire] was not a colonial empire, as compared to the European colonial empires. It did not have overseas territories. And it was actually a multi-religious and poly-ethnic empire. That is true. But it did not really administer its territories as a colonial empire, so let's make it clear that it was not a colonial empire. If you look at the Ottoman Middle East in 1914, we cannot really speak about a single way of administration either. Before the start of the greatest conflict in human history, that is to say World War I, there were four different political arrangements in the Ottoman provinces and Middle East: Ottoman provinces directly administered from Istanbul such as Damascus, Aleppo and so on; legally autonomous regions such as Mount Lebanon or the Zaydi highlands of Yemen; regions under nominal Ottoman rule but in fact under the control of local leaders such as Najd under the ruler Abdulaziz ibn Saud, the founder of Saudi Arabia, and as a fourth category we have regions that had become de facto British protectorates through contracts signed between Great Britain and local leaders such as the sheikhs of Qatar and Kuwait. Consecutive Ottoman governments refused to honour these contracts and maintained that these local leaders were negotiating agreements with the British that they were not entitled to as Ottoman subjects. But if you look at the big picture in the

Ottoman Middle East in 1914, we can speak about different types of administration. It was flexible, accustomed to the needs of the regions and this is why it worked much better.

Obviously, we cannot portray the Ottoman Middle East as a kind of golden age in which nothing bad really happened. In 1840s and later on in 1860s, we had serious problems in certain regions, such as Mount Lebanon. Large numbers of individuals were killed. Ethnic clashes took place. But if you compare it to what actually happened after 1914, we might actually say that this was a much more tranquil era in the history of the Middle East. And even in 1914, we can really speak about a status quo. There was a status quo. Whether it was working well or not is one issue - but there was a status quo. However, in the current day Middle East which is highly Balkanised at the moment, we can't really speak of a status quo. There is no status quo whatsoever. If you look at the past, we speak about a Pax Ottomanica, a kind of status quo brought about by this Ottoman entity. It may not actually have worked to perfection. There were problems, there were issues but at least you can speak about a status quo.

Istanbul was the capital of a multi-national empire. Obviously, it is easy to make comparisons between Ottoman

Empire and Turkey. Turkey is a successor state to the Ottoman Empire but is not the only one. You know, if we actually start counting since 1789, 27 new states actually emerged in the Ottoman geography. So, when we compare Turkey with the Ottoman Empire, we shouldn't forget that we are really comparing apples and oranges. Because one of them was a multi-national empire and the Ottoman sultan was the Caliph at the same time; the commander of faithful in the eyes of the Sunni Muslims. It is not really fair to expect Turkey to play that kind of a role anywhere in the world. Therefore, I am not taking this neo-Ottomanism rhetoric very seriously. But if I may, I'll say one other thing about as to whether America or any other power can fix all these things in the region. If we make a comparison, as I said, in 1914 in the Middle East there was a status quo. It had problems, but there was a status quo. Whereas we have a non-status quo at the moment and the problem is how this will actually turn into a status quo. This is the major issue now. If

you really make a comparison between the two situations, a hundred years later one might say we are now witnessing the emergence of a new Middle East clearly. But unlike what happened in 1918 when the two victors the Great War reshaped the region at will, today there are numerous actors striving towards changing the status quo in their favour, not only the US. Unlike the Middle East of the pre-Great War era, the current day Middle East has become a region of utmost importance deeply influencing world politics thanks to its rich natural resources. Local actors who observed the emergence of a new Middle East as mere spectators in the aftermath of the Great War have now joined the struggle. Today, Iran, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and the oil rich Gulf states are playing significant roles in the shaping of the Middle East. Likewise, global actors have actively participated in this struggle. This time, unlike in 1918, none of them can be excluded. So, this has become a much more complex struggle.

William Hale's Highlights



Emeritus Professor of Politics at SOAS

William Hale is an Emeritus Professor in the Department of Political and International Studies at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London, and a former Professor with a specialty reference in Turkish politics. He is the author of numerous books and articles on Turkish politics, including *The Political and Economic Development of Modern Turkey* (1981) and *Islamism, Democracy and Liberalism, The Case of the AKP* (co-authored with Ergun Özbudun, 2011).

The Sykes-Picot agreement was only one of a large number of bargains, which were struck between the Entente powers and various other forces in the Middle East during the First World War. The point was that at the time these agreements were made, nobody knew whether they were going to win the war. They did not know what was going to happen. So, they drew up enormously imaginative and ambitious plans for what they expected to be the former territories of the Ottoman Empire and they had to reconcile a whole number of different conflicting forces. First of all, the dominant military power in the Middle East and in the Arab countries at the time was the British. They had the most soldiers there.

They were the dominant military power. But, in addition to that, we had France. France had relatively few troops in the Arab countries at that time, but there was a feeling because France was fighting the war in France against Germany, that it deserved some sort of reward in territories in the Middle East after the war.

Until the October Revolution of 1917, Russia was also a player in the Middle East. But after October 1917, it more or less dropped out of the picture. Then, there was the Zionist movement, which was a powerful factor in British politics of the time. In 1917, the foreign secretary Balfour gave the

declaration to the Zionist movement that there would be a, quote-unquote, "national home for the Jewish people in Palestine". Lastly, there was Emir Faisal who was the son of the emir of Mecca, Sharif Hussein. The British made promises to Emir Faisal in order to stir up a revolution against the Ottoman Empire in the Hejaz. Then of course, they felt they owed something to Emir Faisal. So, to reconcile all these different forces was what produced this terrible fragmented political fragmentation in the Middle East.

I think there are essentially three theatres of conflict in the region at the moment. The first theatre of conflict has been there since 1948. That is the conflict between the state of Israel and the Palestinian people. That remains unsettled and of course, as we have discussed earlier the United States plays a very important part in that conflict. The second conflict is the current conflict in Syria, in which I suppose we have to say that the dominant power is now Russia. What we have seen in Syria is a startling decline in American power in the region since 2012. Partly I would argue as a result of the Trump administration, but I also think the Obama administration has an important part in that conflict. The third theatre of conflict is the Gulf region. What we have here is essentially a conflict between Iran on the one side and Saudi Arabia on the other side, in which both Russia and the United States were again involved as secondary powers.

I don't think we are going to go back to the status quo ante but what sort of status we do go back to? We do see it is almost impossible to imagine, but there are several possible scenarios. Number one: the Baathist regime under Bashar al-Assad establishes rule over the whole country. This I think is unlikely. We are unlikely to go back to the situation we had before the Civil War. The second possibility I suppose is that there is a sort of division of power within Syria, that is to say, this division of power could be territorial or it could be political. The division of power will essentially be between the Alawi community, the Sunni community which is of course in the majority, and the Kurdish community in Syria. Now, this could take the form of separate regions. In other words, the Kurdish region would have an autonomy within Syria. I think we have to face up to that probability that the area around Idlib and then going up to Afrin and between Jarabulus will probably be under a substantial degree of Turkish influence and the rest will be controlled by the Baathist regime but only in cooperation with those with Russia. The big question is: What does Russia want to do in Syria?

Ghida Fakhry (Moderator): And what is your best guess?

William Hale: That is what I really don't know and I don't think Mr. Putin knows either. In other words, I feel that the Russian policy reaction was, "We must hold on to Bashar al Assad because he is our only friend in the Middle East. We have alienated almost everybody else with the possible exception of Iran. We must hold on to him. We must try and put him back in power." But it's just possible that Russia could accept a situation in which they maintain their position as a dominant power in Syria which I think they will do. But there is going to be some sort of division of political power either territorial or political between the different forces. Turkey will be a factor in that equation, but Iran will also be an important factor in that equation because Iran is the most important external supporter of the Alawi community within Syria due to religious reasons.

The Sykes-Picot agreement was only one of a large number of bargains which were struck between the Entente powers and various other forces in the Middle East during the First World War. The point was that at the time these agreements were made, nobody knew whether they were going to win the war.

Thomas P.M. Barnett's Highlights



American Military-Geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat

Thomas P.M. Barnett has worked in international security for three decades, first with the Centre for Naval Analyses and then as a professor at the US Naval War College. After 9/11, Barnett served in the Office of Force Transformation in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. In 2004, he authored a New York Times-bestselling book, *The Pentagon's New Map*. Dr Barnett has run his own consulting firm since 1998 and holds a PhD in political science from Harvard University.

I believe that the United States, based on its experience in the late nineteenth century, sought to replicate its model of interstate integration around the world after the Second World War. It was enunciated for example by Franklin Roosevelt as a new deal for the world following the Second World War. And it was that model of integration that occurred unfolded in the United States in the late nineteenth century that we sought to replicate around the planet concentrating first on the West and then hoping over time that it would spread to other countries. It has originally defined as a liberal international trade order, we now call that globalisation. And that scheme of integration and encouraging connectivity between countries has spread around the planet to an amazing degree creating for the first time in human history a global middle class of roughly 60 percent of the world's population. A quick tripling of what could be described as a middle class back in 1950. So, there was tremendous success across the Cold War replicating that model. But there are parts of the world where that model has not yet extended. Most parts of the world tend to be the places where you can find 90 percent of the intra and interstate violence, where you find virtually all that terrorist activity, where you find the famines, the political instability, where governments have a hard time keeping leaders for more than two or three years are getting rid of them in less than 30. So, the work is not yet done in terms of trying to make that model spread across the planet and create the kind of stability we want to see everywhere. But this notion that we're living in a world out of order, that we're living in a world of extreme fragmentation, uncertainty, chaos, and unending violence quite frankly is nonsense. When you look at the trends, the statistical analysis on a per capita basis, we live in an era of unprecedented predictability. We live in an era of unprecedented prosperity. Wars are less frequent.

They tend to be shorter; lethality on a per capita basis is as low as we have ever seen human history. So, in all truth, we live in a time where the world is more stable than it's ever been. The challenges we now face quite frankly have very little to do with these conflicts we obsess about, and really have to do with the rise of that global middle class and its rather insatiable demands for consumption.

The United States always set about to create a global order that would rule itself collectively. Globalisation comes with rules but not a ruler. America went overboard in response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks and tried to fix things dramatically in several parts of the world all at once. It took a military that was designed to destroy states and tried to use it to fight transnational actors. Very expensive, very bloody, and difficult to control. When the Obama administration came in, they symmetrised that conflict. Instead of sending entire military divisions to go fight individual bad actors, we downsized our force and now we fight that conflict in dozens of countries around the world with our allies using primarily Special Forces. So, we symmetrised our effort. That was natural. That made sense. Trump comes along at a point where America begins to look at globalisation as a threat, not something that helped spawn or nurtured or has contributed to global wealth in an amazing fashion over the last 50 years. It is a bit of a dodge for the United States to say we need to renegotiate our relationship with every country in the world. And yet there is this instinct, this desire rooted in American isolationism of the past, to kind of unburden itself. To look at the world as having matured as a system enough where we should not be in the position of trying to run it to such a strong degree. What happens in America's history when the middle class feels threatened is that it tends to turn inward: turns the entire political sys-

tem inward towards isolationism, towards protectionism, towards a renewed sense of ethnic identity, and we're going through one of those periods right now. It is not a surprise that America wants to renegotiate that relationship with the outside world. It has been a long time in the making that requirement. So, I think the targets that Trump addresses are accurate. We need to kind of balance out our relationship with the world. We need to admit that other great powers are going to run the world as well. We need not to get too overheated by this kind of competition that is emerging between say Russia, China, the United States and other great powers to determine what the rules of the system are. But I argue with President Trump's tactics, I find they tend to be rather boorish and ill mannered. Even though his targets are accurate, I think we can do a lot better in terms of this kind of approach. And I suspect after having several change elections in a row we're looking at a change election in the United States in about three weeks. And we'll probably have another very strong change election in the United States in 2020. So, I don't make too much out of Trump as a permanent alteration of America's approach to the world even as I admit his correction, his desire to kind of rebalance our relationship with the world, has been long in the making.

Well, I think the United States under Trump has gone all out in its support for Israel. I think that is unfortunate. I do not think it is going to really push the dynamics in any fruitful way. I think it is a hardening of the essential dynamic between Saudi Arabia and Iran with Israel obviously taking Saudi Arabia's side because of its own concerns about Iran's reach for a nuclear weapon. I don't think that will likely outlast a Trump administration in part because the primary rationale strategically inside the Pentagon and the White House for the last 50 to 60 years concerning American interests in the Middle East other than Israel, which can certainly protect itself, has been the perceived reliance of the world on Middle Eastern oil. But in truth, the Persian Gulf for many years now has been the fifth most important source of oil for the United States following the United States itself, Mexico and Canada and North America, South America and West Africa. So, if you take the Middle East out of the equation tomorrow, it impacts about three to four percent of America's energy consumption. But if you look at the rising powers in East Asia, there you're talking about the vast majority of their imported oil coming from the Persian Gulf. So, I think what Trump represents is a larger rationalisation and realisation that began under President Obama. Looking at the fracking revolution in the United States and the tremendous uptick in domestic oil production, we are now a net refiner exporter

for the first time in 40 years, and will be an exporter of crude oil within about 10 to 12 years. And we have a very large supply of natural gas accessible by the fracking technology, which will also become a major export for the United States within a 5-10 year time frame. You add that all up and you see a United States under Obama beginning to reconsider our relationships with countries that are primarily energy exporters. [...] The confidence that the Obama administration had in pursuing the nuclear deal with Iran was also reflective of this growing sense that the United States or the West is not particularly reliant on the Middle East in terms of its energy and that if you're looking longer-term, this is really more of a problem for Japan, India, Korea, China to pursue, and Russia too because of its proximity, not because of its requirement for any oil imports. The diminution of American interests in the Persian Gulf is going to continue for the next several decades and I don't think it's going to be anywhere near what it was in the past. I think the relationship with Israel will remain. But I think it's reached a very odd peaking with Trump that won't outlast his administration.

When you look at the trends, the statistical analysis on a per capita basis, we live in an era of unprecedented predictability. We live in an era of unprecedented prosperity. Wars are less frequent. They tend to be shorter, lethality on a per capita basis is as low as we've ever seen human history. So, in all truth, we live in a time where the world is more stable than it's ever been.

Second Session

The EU and Its Discontents: Is it the End of the European Project?



- Has the European Union recovered from the Eurozone crisis?
- How can the European Union cope with the financial and political problems among its member states in the context of East-West and North-South divide?
- Can Turkey offer anything to help protect the integrity of the EU system?
- What is the impact of rising xenophobic and Islamophobic movements on the continent?

Summary of the Session

The session moderator, David Foster, began the session by asking whether the European Union is a failing project. This was addressed as being particularly salient in light of the shift in attitude of some European governments and their populations towards the EU itself. Brexit, the rise of populism and the increasingly unilateral behaviour of the United States in world affairs has called the future of the EU into question. The rise of populism being witnessed today mirrors that of the inter-war years, and the subsequent rise of fascism in the lead up to the Second World War. Reflecting on these and other issues, David Foster inquired into whether these were signs of the failure of the European project and whether emerging threats to the continued stability and integrity of the EU could be feasibly addressed.

Commenting on the positive role the EU played in the post-conflict Balkans, Ivo Josipovic, Former President of Croatia, stated that Europe is first and foremost a peace project and that joining the EU contributed to significant improvements in Croatian society. The European Union also had a role in pressuring Croatia and other countries to commit to the ICTY and in holding to account those implicated in war crimes. This is in addition to aiding in the creation of legislation designed to help integrate the Serb minority in Croatia and ensure their participation in social, civil and political life. He concluded by stating that there is a need to work on the notion of European identity because Europe lacks such a collective understanding of itself. As part of the discussion, the need for new political structures to address issue such as the development of common foreign policy and the evaluation of EU membership were deliberated upon. This includes developing structures and institutions to facilitate the inclusion of all EU member states in the decision making process.

Volkan Bozkır, chairman of foreign relations committee at the Turkish Grand National Assembly, explained - regarding Turkey's status in EU acces-

sion talks - that joining the EU is not like joining the UN or NATO; it necessitates a change of outlook and approach. He discussed the perspective of how EU membership has been shown to improve the everyday life of people, this being, in his view, the primary reason Turkey is still committed to accession process. In the context of Turkish-EU relations, he discussed the results achieved by the substantial cooperation between Turkey and EU regarding the refugee crisis.

Addressing the Euro-sceptical position, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Italy, Franco Frattini, commented that it would be a mistake to take for granted all the important gains Europe has achieved since the formation of the EU. He gave the examples of mobility and security cooperation as being two of the most important. Deliberating on the rise of populism and the far right, Frattini commented that the recent election of a populist right-winged government in Italy reflects the fact that there is an increasing gap between EU administrators in Brussels and the average voter in many EU member-states. That the perception exists that EU policies do not take into enough consideration national and local priorities represents a fundamental threat to the continued success of the European project. Issues such as immigration and austerity were discussed in this context.

Former European Commissioner for Enlargement, Stefan Füle, iterated that prosperity is the ultimate guarantor of European stability. So long as there is continued growth and prosperity, the average citizen of an EU-member state would not concern themselves with administrative affairs in Brussels. However, when crises erupt, a crisis management deficit in the EU amplifies issues that sow scepticism and division. He added that politicians need to differentiate between national and supranational problems, and member states need to take into consideration their neighbours interests when seeking to solve their own problems.

Ivo Josipović's Highlights



Former President of Croatia

Ivo Josipović served as the President of Croatia from 2010 to 2015, focusing on reconciliation in South East Europe, human rights and the fight against corruption. He is also a university professor and has published several books and papers dealing with international criminal law, criminal procedure and human rights. Josipović has received prestigious domestic and international awards, namely the European Medal of Tolerance from the European Union and Premio Galileo 2000 Award for art.

As is well known, the European Union is primarily a peace project. I have to admit that in Croatia we expected more from the EU to stop the war. But after the war, the EU was definitely considered, not only in Croatia but in Europe and the other countries as well, as how to make the region peaceful. In 1999, there was the first step, some kind of permission to the states of former Yugoslavia to become members of the EU.

I think now the European Union is on the borderline and it has the big decision of whether we are going to have more or less Europe. That means more power, more responsibility, more common activities. I think this approach of 'more Europe' is going to make the European Union as a good project for future. If we continue the philosophy of 'less Europe', I do not know what the future will be. So, what is also very important is if I were the President of the European Commission, I would immediately start working on building

European identity. I think we do not have enough European identity today.

I think that if we want to have a EU capable of competing with the United States, especially the new conditions of President Trump's 'America First' doctrine, if we want to be equal partners to Russia and China, then the European Union should have clear consistency in some values and some rules and decision-making process should be of a quality to ensure that Europe can appear on the scene. If we do not do this, then we are a talking club. I think it is not possible to have carte blanche and every state will pick up with sympathy what they need. I think we should have a new political structure in the EU, making all countries and societies to participate in decision-making process. But when a decision is taken, then we have to obey.

Identity means not just to say "Okay, I am Croat and I'm European", but to feel Europe is our natural surroundings, to feel European government as our government as well. I think something that is now, the most and the biggest danger for Southeastern Europe is nationalism. Nationalism is illness that is killing societies from inside and it is killing good international relations.

I would like to see national leaders with clear pro-Europe policy and willingness to participate and to lead, not to follow. If you follow populists and populism in your country, you are a follower, you are not a leader. I think we should somehow promote leadership on the European level and a national level.

I think we should have a new political structure in the EU, making all countries and societies to participate in decision-making process.

Volkan Bozkır's Highlights



Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey

In July 2018, Volkan Bozkır was elected for the third time as the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey. Prior to this, he served as the Minister for EU Affairs and the Chief Negotiator (2014-2016). He has held several positions during his 39-years professional career including Vice Consul of the Consulate General in Stuttgart, First Secretary of the Embassy in Baghdad, Ambassador in Bucharest and Permanent Representative of Turkey to the EU.

I think we will celebrate the sixteenth anniversary of the first application [of Turkey] to the European entity. It shows how stubborn, how decided, how tolerant and patient Turkey is to maintain this relation. But it is not just becoming a member of an organisation. The European Union is more than becoming a member of the UN or to NATO... it really improves the standard [of life] of people in every issue the chapters cover. So, because of that, we still want to become a member and we still want the continuation of the process.

This unforeseen illegal migration flow was actually something nobody was expecting. We were threatened every day by 5,000 illegal immigrants fleeing or going to Greece, then to Europe. But at that moment we really did well, we had great cooperation. We really had so many political leaders coming to Turkey, more than ever. For example, President Barroso came to Turkey three times in eight years while during that period, when we were facing a difficulty with migrants, we saw the President of the Commission, President of the Council and the German Chancellor coming five times.

For the migrants in Turkey we have spent more than 30 billion dollars, and what we discussed with the EU was in two packages: three billion euros (one and a half, one and a half). But almost one third of it arrived in Turkey, because it comes through international organisations, where almost 20 percent is lost along the road. But the problem is not the money here. It is solidarity; to see that we are with the EU in difficult times, and the EU is with us in our difficult time.

Actually, the attraction for the EU replaced the American dream. In the 1950s, people dressed like the Americans

and listened to American music because it was prosperity and everything that did not exist elsewhere was in the United States. But Europe came with a different concept, with values and really important attraction for all the people in the world to become more rich, more prosperous and enjoy these wonderful fundamentals. Visionary projects actually added to the foundation of the [European] entity. Projects like Euro and Schengen made it a political entity from European Economic Community to European Union. But then came the problem: when things are good, the attraction is there, but when Europe faced with a new situation, where new countries were added to the six (totalling 28), the decision making process became very difficult. So decisions were either late or were not there when they were needed.

The problem is not the money here. It is solidarity; to see that we are with the EU in difficult times, and the EU is with us in our difficult time.

Franco Frattini's Highlights



Former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Italy

Franco Frattini is an Italian magistrate and President of the Italian Society for International Organisation (SIOI), a non-profit organisation working under the supervision of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He is currently serving as the Special Advisor to the Serbian Government for EU Integration. He twice served as Italian Foreign Minister (2002- 2004 and 2008-2011), and as Vice-President of the European Commission and Commissioner for Justice, Freedom and Security (2004-2008).

I think we used to make some mistakes by taking for granted all these extremely important achievements Europe had in the past years. It is thanks to Europe that I can freely move from Portugal to Vilnius without being controlled at the borders with my car. Thirdly, it is thanks to Europe that I have a roaming system throughout Europe without paying a huge amount of money. People tend to take [these things] for granted. That said there is a reason why Italians were dissatisfied with the functioning of Europe as it is today. Because we see a huge gap between the European Brus-

sels narrative: "Everything is okay, everything is going okay. You are to be blamed because of national mistakes while Europe is always right and the reality is my country." The reality is that my country used to be the most pro-European country, then a certain moment we felt to be left alone. We felt to be [left alone] vis-a-vis the migration crisis and the need to get out of the tunnel of the crisis because some German led austerity, fiscal policies denying any kind of investment. So, austerity versus growth, immigration versus isolation: this was the route leading Italian voters to vote.

There is a possibility Europe remains as a purely Economic [club]. We will see what happens with Brexit, because Brexit could easily aggravate the current situation also in the European Common Market. I am convinced we need a vision, which is more ambitious than a purely economic common space. We need to go beyond, towards common foreign policy and common security policy. Otherwise, we keep Europe as an incomplete project.

If I think there could be a repetition of a situation like in Greece aggravated by the dimension of other states, I am very concerned. So, when I see people saying we need more Europe, I agree. We need more Europe now, more political Europe. We need to resume the dream of our founding fathers, which was a political project: security and defence, common [foreign] policy and commonly managed economic governance.

I am convinced we need a vision which is more ambitious than a purely economic common space. We need to go beyond, towards common foreign policy and common security policy. Otherwise, we keep Europe as an incomplete project.

Štefan Füle's Highlights



Former European Commissioner for Enlargement and European Neighborhood Policy

Štefan Füle is a Member of the Board of CITIC Europe and CEFC, having previously served for years as a diplomat. He has recently served as the EU Commissioner for Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy and as the Czech Government Minister for European Affairs (2009). Prior to this, he served as the first Deputy Defense Minister. He has also served as an Ambassador to the Special Envoy for the OSCE and NATO and as a Director at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

I think the solidarity and engagement is on the long list of the challenges the European Union has to address among its own member states and between the EU and its neighbourhood. I think this is a crucial question at the heart of the EU. It is going to define whether the EU will be some kind of a closed club behind the fence or whether it will be an inclusive club where you have various levels of engagement and cooperation with those who find the rules in this club attractive.

What is important from my perspective, when it comes to Brexit, was the chance the EU missed there, because the EU has also a lot to lose from the UK leaving. Very recently, I have compared two documents. One was the document [that] we negotiated with at that time Prime Minister Cameron, which would answer some of the criticism in the UK and would create the conditions for the UK to stay. Then I compared the Bratislava Declaration, which was adopted only weeks after the referendum on Brexit. We are talking about one EU. Are we talking about two completely different documents? It is about two completely different past and the future of the European Union and I am afraid that we walked through that crossroad without actually a real reflection.

Is it the end of the European Project? Absolutely not. If you ask me what I would change, [I would change] a number of things, but I will tell you only two. The first, I would change my own position on Spitzenkandidat and making the European Commission more political. There was a mistake I participated in. I think you cannot have a commission more political and at the same time more objective, neutral and guardian of the treaties and defending the interests of the small countries. That was one thing I would change. And the second thing I would change, and I hope it will come

with the next commission over the next two institutions, is a more engagement abroad. I am terrified if I look at the Eurasian continent and I look at the EU, Eurasian Economic Union and One Belt One Road. Those are three integration projects that are completely different. I am not comparing them, I am not saying they are sort of equal to each other, but you have three different systems of the rules, of the norms. If we fail to find a certain compatibility among those three projects, we will have new dividing lines in Europe in no time.

I think the solidarity and engagement is on the long list of the challenges the European Union has to address among its own member states and between the EU and its neighbourhood.

Third Session

Disrupting the Established Order: Rise of the Global South



- What strategies have emerging countries used to pursue and achieve their objectives?
- Do emerging countries seek to reform the liberal world order? Or do they seek induction into the select club of Western countries?
- How have the established powers from the Global North reacted to the rise of the Global South?
- What are the ways to mitigate the potential clash between the Global North and the Global South due to their respective diverging geopolitical views?

Summary of Hamid Karzai's Keynote Speech

Dr. Hamid Karzai, former President of Afghanistan, began by recalling the long-established Turkish-Afghan relations that rooted back to the Ottoman Empire. He praised Turkey's role, particularly that of President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, in pushing for peace in Afghanistan and improving its relations with its neighbour Pakistan. He added that there is a slow but sure movement of power from the West to the East as the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are finally emerging on the global stage. He further illustrated that this was due to the wars that the West launched on the rest of the world, especially in the Muslim world. The war on terror and

the illegal invasions by the very same countries that were responsible for the stewardship of the liberal order of the world violated those very principles on which it was built. Dr Karzai pointed to the fact that if western countries do not want to see refugees at their door, then they should not cooperate with policies that force these refugees to flee their lands. The emerging global powers in the new world order, such as China, Russia, India and Turkey, carry the responsibility of providing peace and security. He ended his speech by calling for global cooperation and not competition among traditional and emerging world powers.

Hamid Karzai's Highlights



Former President of Afghanistan

Hamid Karzai served as the first democratically elected President of Afghanistan from 2004-2014 and was elected Chairman of the Interim Administration of Afghanistan at the Bonn Conference in 2001. In the 2004 and 2009 Presidential elections, Karzai won by a majority vote. Mr Karzai holds BA and MA Degrees in Political Science and International Relations from the Himachal Pradesh University, is fluent in several languages including Pashto, Dari, Hindi and French and enjoys reading philosophy.

Ladies and gentlemen, Turkey and Afghanistan have such old relationships, way back to the eighteenth century, when Ahmad Shah Durrani, the founder of the modern Afghan state was seeking advice and consultation, perhaps even permission, from the then Ottoman Khalifa of the day. And then, nearly a century and a half later, with the emergence of modern Turkey under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and the independence of Afghanistan in 1919, a fundamentally new relationship started between the two countries, between Sharmlah and Ke-

mal Atatürk, which saw an unprecedented flourishing of relations between the two countries. Where the experts, educational and military from the new Republic of Turkey came to Afghanistan to help the building of the Afghan state. The military institutions, the education institutions, and all that continued right till 2002, when we began this new order in Afghanistan with the help of the international community, of which Turkey was again an extremely important component in helping us towards betterment in our country.

I remember very well in the initial days when I began to consult with our brothers in Turkey, with leaders, with President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, who was so kind to help with our peace process and the launch of the tripartite conversations between Afghanistan and Pakistan under the auspices and leadership of Turkey in Istanbul and in Ankara. This demonstrated the will of Turkey in helping Afghanistan and ushering in peace, which was so much in our need, and better relations between us and our neighbour Pakistan.

Thus, today the two countries [Turkey and Afghanistan] are national partners in this changing world. Towards, I hope and we all aspire, a better world. So, we come to ask ourselves, what do the current geopolitical upheavals mean for us, for this region? What role do we envisage for ourselves in shaping future geopolitical outcomes, in a multipolar world, if you choose to call it that?

After all, you will agree that we are witness to a momentous shift of sands. The slow, but sure movement of power from the west to east, what we just called the 'Global South', I believe. The term that connotes those countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, who are now seeing themselves finally emerging on the global stage.

The end of the Cold War for many of us meant the rise of a new order. A new order in which the United States was the undisputed leader with expectations of security and a more harmonious world with it. Unfortunately, that did not happen. Rather after a short interval, we saw the images of a multi-centric world appear. This was, and remains, a critical instructive development when multipolarity leads to multilateral action among the key powers shape the world. That is where we hope new seeds of a better world order would appear.

The war on terror, the illegal invasions, the very same countries that were responsible for the stewardship of the liberal order of the world violated those very principles on which it was built. Whether it was internationalism, humanitarianism, or indeed sustainable development, let alone liberalism and all that. So this practice of illiberalism by the champions of liberalism is a study without a doubt in hypocrisy.

The reform of the international financial institutions, Bretton Woods, as Mr Nawaz has referred to, the IMF and the

World Bank... I was in government for 12-13 years, I know how they function. While in principle, they see the world impartially, and they are for the world, but they actually worked in a manner where the poorer remained poor and the richer remained rich. I hope this has changed and I hope this has changed not by the sheer fact of the Global South arising out of the new multipolar world, but by the sensibility of the formerly dominant or the currently dominant, if you may call them so. So the West and the new rising world hopefully will cooperate in amending these institutions to better function for all of us.

Then, we come to the UN Security Council. When this body was created over 70 years ago, there were nations that were still living under the tutelage of colonialism. Today, there are fortunately many more independent and free countries who are part of the UN. And the structure of the world, and the economics of the world, and the power politics of the world is such that the current Security Council membership is not just, it is tilted towards the West. Let us hope that this will change. The realisation is there. Everybody speaks about the change and the need for change in the Security Council, but someone is still trying to prevent it. I think that time is slowly passing away because the recognition is there and the forces are now available politically and economically to bring about this change for a more just, representative UN Security Council. Geographically, if you want religious wise or if you want to call that cultural wise, there is this fundamental need for reform of the Security Council, to represent the current global realities.

As we discussed reform in the UN Security Council and the financial institutions as we discussed the rise of the Global South, we also must be mindful, as this order begins to emerge, responsibility comes with it too. The new powers, I hope will recognise that the emerging centres of power also need to be careful about how they function themselves into the workings of the world and how they relate themselves to the rest of the world. That this new order of this multi-centric world works together with the rest of the world in harmony, in real multilateralism, rather than, let's call it the national interest centrism, if I could use that word. 'National interest centrism' is what got us into the trouble that we are in. Let us go beyond this national interest centrism. It is fine to have national interests. It is all right. We all have national interest. But not such massive human cost to other people, other nations, other regions.

Let us hope that the emerging order has recognised that there is a need for a different functioning, a cooperative functioning in the enterprise, in business and politics and adjudication of disputes. And all of that, there are mega-countries with mega-projects. China, Russia, India, all have mega-projects massively in our part of the world with effects on the rest of the world.

It is important that these countries begin to think of constructing a new security mechanism. Whereby local issues are resolved locally, where there is a regional localised mechanism as well. That can address issues and remove difficulties that we have. So, on a global scale, and internationally, we hope this will happen.

Ladies and gentlemen, for Turkey, a close brother of ours in view of the past and its present, and the fact that it's a connecting bridge between the East and the West, or Islam and the rest of the world, I think of no better country that can lead us by example... And I hope that the countries of this region will put aside differences, if any, to work, to serve for the progress and common good of all.

This brings me to Afghanistan, my country. After September 11, the people of Afghanistan welcomed the United States and its allies with open arms. With tremendous expectations that we will do better and we did better in certain areas for which were very grateful. For the help that the rest of the world gave us, for the help that the United States gave us, for the help that Europe and all others delivered to us including major powers in our own region and Turkey, we are grateful for that. However, unfortunately, America's stated objective of defeating terrorism did not happen. The consequences of that failure was tragic for the Afghan people. Massive human loss; seventeen years on, every day we have people killed. Just yesterday, we had 26 people killed in eastern Afghanistan in an election rally. And the consequences of that not only for the Afghan people losing lives daily on a massive scale but also, the rise, the further rise of terrorism and extremism and extremist groups. Now we have, in addition to al-Qaida, Daesh as well, in Afghanistan, which is turning into a menace for us and for the region.

Given this background and what we know today, the new US strategy for Afghanistan has only brought us more destruction, more death. We hope, very much that the United States would adopt a method other than war and would

seek cooperation within the region, with big powers in Afghanistan and would work for peace in Afghanistan and that is the only possible way for us, the people of Afghanistan, to advance our objectives as a peaceful country, as a sovereign country. And I hope that the United States will show sincerity towards bringing peace to Afghanistan, and I must emphasise again, by working cooperatively and collaboratively with other stakeholders our neighbours and the region.

Look at Europe, the arrival of hundreds of thousands of refugees in Europe, the change in the political environment in Europe... Politics have changed, orientations have changed and the result is that the fantastic liberal heritage of Europe is now undergoing a change. Populist governments with the different orientations have emerged and are trying to protect their identity. We do not blame them, but we asked them, that if they do not want refugees to arrive at their doors, they must not cooperate with policies that cause those refugees to go there. From Africa to the Middle East, lives were destroyed, homes were destroyed, people were killed, millions were made refugees. Naturally, some of them find ways to the neighbourhood, the neighbourhood in Europe. Therefore, it is upon Europe and us together to work together for a better future as part of this changing global order.

We hope that some of these major powers of the new order who are in our part of the world; China, Russia, India, Turkey can work together and apply the means to bring peace and stability to Afghanistan. This is a test. When you claim a position, with it comes responsibility, with that comes expectations from others. We, the Afghan people, expect that this world order in the form of these major countries will join hands to bring peace to Afghanistan. And to address the issues as they need to. And we also hope that the United States and Europe will join hands.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us band together. To shape this new world order, let's create a new geopolitics of cooperation, rather than competition and let us hope the United States and some of its allies will cooperate with this new order and not compete with it. And it is for us, the rising South, to see that we don't go ahead in competition with the former world or the older world. Let's be wiser on all fronts and get it right for the rest of us in this world. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

Summary of the Session

Adnan Nawaz, moderator of the session, raised questions about the rise of new powers and the leadership struggle that is being witnessed. Is the current world order considered as unipolar, bipolar or multipolar? He added that so much has changed since the 1944 Bretton Woods System and the establishment of the United Nations in 1945 and asked whether the rise of new global influencers is upsetting the traditional post-war order?

Regarding the current world order, Sergey Karaganov, former foreign policy adviser to the Kremlin, expressed his pessimism and explained that the world is in a moment of destruction of the so-called liberal world order, which he believes was anything but liberal for it did not allow the freedom of choice. He stated that the North is not willing to share with the South. He also added that the world order is changing; countries like China and Turkey are gaining momentum and cannot be exploited anymore. The world is moving towards regionalism, unlike 30-40 years ago when it was heading towards a world government.

Mamphela Ramphela, former managing director of the World Bank, commented that the Global South in fact began reorganising its own platform. She also added that the current economic order is not sustainable, and if the goal is to meet the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), then it is necessary to develop new ways and strategies in order to limit and compensate for the current level of consumption. She stressed that the world is currently at the cusp of a new emerging world order that involves a regenerative socio-economic system supported by a human-centred political governance system.

When asked whether the rise of the South threatens the North, Baghdad Amreyev, Secretary General of the Cooperation Council of Turkic States, iterated that the rise of what he called the Global South is not a threat for the North. On the contrary, this rise could contribute to achieving the common goals of developing this world and granting prosperity to all nations.

Commenting on why the North does not invest in the South as much as it invests in wars, David McWilliams, an economist author and journalist, simply stated that the reason is because the North does not know the South. In fact, the real question should focus on whether the US can preserve a political and economic system that is sufficiently flexible to deal with this disruption.

Haiyan Wang, Managing Partner of the China India Institute, mentioned that the gravity centre of the world is shifting to Asia. She also iterated her belief that by 2030, China is bound to become the largest economy in the world and India most likely the third largest economy. Wang added China has benefited enormously from the liberal order led by the United States and it might not be in favour of disrupting it.

David McWilliam's Highlights



Economist, Author and Journalist

David McWilliams is an economist, author and journalist. He is an adjunct Professor of Global Economics at Trinity College Dublin and is ranked 10th most influential economist in the world. He founded the world's only economic and stand-up comedy festival Kilkenomics. He was an economist at the Irish Central Bank, UBS and the Head of Emerging Markets Research at Banque Nationale de Paris. McWilliams advises the Woodford Funds and Nedbank on global strategy.

The problem I have known with disruption is that it disrupts. Disruption disrupts people and those people, now for the first time, ever happen to be the people in what we call the North, the former top dogs, to a degree Northwestern Europe and the United States. And I think it is incumbent on us to understand their anxieties, because in a democracy if you disrupt via either migration or via moving the industrial capacity of the North to the East and consequently bring down the real wages of working class people, it is not surprising that there is a certain democratic kickback and that kickback is Brexit, or Trump or the various populist movements in Western Europe and of course in North America.

If a Chinese company turns up in my hometown and puts a factory there, builds a supply chain, builds a supply line, pays people, your average person doesn't care where the money comes from if their life is made slightly better, if their kids can get slightly better educated. If they can have a perspective in life, which is not "I am worried about next week," but, because of the Chinese investment, "I am actually only worried about next year." I think this is the key. However, if the long-term ramifications of this geopolitical change are that more people's lives are changed ever so slightly for the better, this is enough. Moreover, I come from a country that has no aspiration to be on any bloody council at all, because we are very small. Small countries have a very different worldview to big countries, because we have been kicked around all of our history. Therefore, our view then is just how we get through to next week without being kicked around, without having this ludicrous pomposity of thinking that, you know better than somebody else. So in my sense what is happening is that the United States is waking up to the fact that China, as we

pointed out, has done a really brilliant job at crystallising everything, that China is doing very well. The Americans are a little bit fed up because they feel their pain a hell of a lot. The question for us is can we preserve a political and economic system that can deal, that is sufficiently flexible to deal with this disruption?

If China is happy to allow the United States grudgingly come to terms with its own fragility in a non-confrontational manner and the last 20 years has provided a global system that is not perfect, but we should never let the perfect bully the pretty good.

The United States is waking up to the fact that China, as we pointed out, has done a really brilliant job at crystallising everything, that China is doing very well.

Sergey Karaganov's Highlights



Former Foreign Policy Advisor to President Vladimir Putin

Sergey Karaganov is the Dean of the Faculty of International Economics and Foreign Affairs of the National Research University Higher School of Economics and the Honorary Chairman of the Presidium of the Council on Foreign and Defense Policy. From 2014 to 2015, he was a member of the High-level Panel of Eminent Persons on European Security as a Common Project under the OSCE and in the 1990, he served as a member of the Presidential Council of Russia.

10-15 years ago, we were still living in an illusion of an international liberal order, which was not international. We have started a new stage in world history and I am happy, because we are moving first towards the disruption of several orders, including the liberal order. European order is melting, Atlantic order is melting and we have presented the creation. Therefore, what will happen I do not know, but I am not nostalgic about the order we are leaving behind. It is a moment of destruction.

The world is moving back to the initial state and the world is moving back towards regionalism. Economic globalism develops, but politically we are moving right in the opposite direction and we have to adapt to that first. I think that is natural, because we, at one point in history, dreamed of unreal worlds, as we in the Soviet Union dreamed of world of communism. It was a very idiotic idea, but it was so nice to dream about that. The liberal world was exactly the same idea. Therefore, we are back to normal. And we have to work within this back to 'normal world', which is more Westphalian.

We are living through a terminal period. But I am very optimistic. First, because Russia remerged and I am Russian. Second, because we have paired with China, for the time being, and I hope forever -for the time being- because the United States was stupid enough to bring us together and we wanted to be together anyway. I mean our cumulative might is much stronger already.

Adnan Nawaz (Moderator): Sergey should the South be preparing for the beginning of the end of the American empire of Pax Americana?

Sergey Karaganov: First, we have to understand that we are living in the future already... There is no South anymore. I mean, let me remind you that five hundred-seven hundred years ago, the countries that you would call 'South', were 75 percent of the world GDP. In addition, culture and most of the inventions in the fifteenth century were made in the Arab world, here in Byzantine, in China and India. Therefore, I mean we are returning to normalcy and we have to return also in our mentality. And there will be a Greater Eurasia with China playing a leading role. But the real danger is if it wants to become dominant. If it does not want to become dominant and if it is surrounded and balanced by the great powers of Turkey, Russia, India, Iran- I mean, we will have a very real centre of the world here. Europe, by the way, will be a Western Flank. However, for Europe, there will be a fight over the next two decades, whether it belongs to the greater United States or to greater Eurasia. Unfortunately, Europe -and it is to me a regret, because I am culturally European here- Europe, I do not think will play a leading separate role in the future world, but it will be a world where Russia would feel very much comfortable because we are balancing, we are sitting on several benches and it is not so bad.

Mamphela Ramphela's Highlights



Former Managing Director of the World Bank

Dr Mamphela Ramphela is a renowned academic and is actively engaged in an ongoing project to reimagine and rebuild South Africa. Dr Ramphela is currently a trustee of the Nelson Mandela Foundation, and a board member of Women Strong International. She is the founder of the Open Society Foundation for South Africa and the Citizens Movement and is Co-Founder of ReimagineSA. Dr Ramphela is the author of several books and publications on a variety of socio-economic issues in South Africa.

I think we are seeing the Global South have a stronger, more confident voice. When I first got to the World Bank in 2000, it was young people who were protesting against that global order. Now, we not only have protested, but we have the Global South reorganising its own platform, like the BRICS and my own continent of Africa. After many years of talking 'unity,' they have actually lowered the colonial boundaries and they are in the process of creating greater opportunities for intra-African trade. And I think there is a spirit of optimism, confidence that we can, in fact, have a different order. Moreover, I believe that we also are hearing voices from economists, who are saying that the current economic order is not sustainable. If we want to meet those SDG's (Sustainable Development Goals), we will need three to four Earth's, if we continue the same level of consumption... Therefore, people are talking about going back to learning from nature.

We are at the cusp of a new beginning of an emerging order in which those who want to see a regenerative, socio-economic system supported by a political governance system, which is human-centred and I think those voices are on the ascendant.

I do not want us to have this idea that we are waiting for the North to come and invest in the South. I come from a country, which has all it needs. In a continent, that has youthful populations, huge natural mineral resources, it is a question of those who got the most to gain. And starting my own country, which with all of its wealth is underperforming because we didn't attend to dealing with the legacy of humiliation and the divisions between people, to build the foundations of a constitutional democracy, where we can proudly call us all South Africans. That is not going to be held by anybody from our side. Therefore, we are going through a

healing process, which starts with imagining just what it would look like if we were to deploy our own resources. Because once we do that, we can become together with Nigeria and with many countries in the East, the real engines of growth of Africa. Then, the North will have to come and learn from us.

I am very pleased to see that particularly over the last meeting between China and Africa, there is a shift. Moreover, I am encouraged to see that particularly the Chinese presidents spoke strongly about the need to engage for the long term. And that, for me, is very promising. Second, I think China also sets an example for African leaders that a long-term view that they take in terms of their own development. Moreover, if they also do that in terms of helping us in Africa to take the long-term view, I think, it will be a win-win situation.

I would hope that when we talk about the markets, we are not talking about the kind of market that we have, this financialised global economy. We do need to have a restructuring, a rethinking of how the market economy should work in a way that is regenerative, that is more inclusive of women and young people. Moreover, I think that what China has done effectively is by having this mix of regulating the markets; they have managed to achieve a lot more than allowing rampant financialised markets to riot in places like our countries and my continent Africa. I think it's that one of the things we like to see more and more of is greater attention through matters human culture, sustainability of the environment, the natural environment, because we are becoming more and more aware that we are dealing here with diminishing resources. And we've got to be better at collectively looking after Mother Earth so that we can have sustainable development.

Haiyan Wang's Highlights



Managing Partner of the China-India Institute

Haiyan Wang is the co-founder and Managing Partner of the China India Institute, a Washington, DC based research and consulting organisation focused on creating global strategies that leverage the transformational rise of China and India. Haiyan is currently ranked at #28 by Thinkers 50 as one of "the world's most influential management thinkers." She was previously listed by Thinkers 50 'On the Guru Radar' and short-listed for the 2013 Global Solutions Award and 2011 Global Village Award.

Back in 2000, the share between emerging and developed markets was 20 versus 80 percent. Today it is 40 to 60. By 2025, the share between developed and developing will be 50 to 50. When we talk about the rise of the Global South, it is in essence at the core the rise of emerging Asia, foremost China and India. At a time of China joining the World Trade Organisation (WTO), China's GDP was only 3 percent of the global GDP. Today it is 15 percent of the global GDP. By 2030 China is bound to become the largest economy and India most likely the third largest economy. So the centre of gravity in the world is really shifting to emerging Asia. However, we must bear in mind that China is not yet a superpower and will not be for quite some time to come.

If you look at the military power, China's military spending is 1/5 that of the US. China has only one small overseas base and that is dual use. The US has dozens of military bases in every corner of the world. If you look at the US dollar power, the Renminbi accounts for less than 1 percent of the central bank's foreign exchange reserves, less than 2 percent of the global trade settlement. If you look at technology power, earlier this year when the US banned chips to be sold to China as the second largest Telecom equipment manufacturers to ZTE, it brought the Chinese ZTE to knees. And when you look at all of the key technologies such as the aircraft engines, China is yet to develop its own core technologies.

To lessen the dependence on the US dollar is, of course, also in China's interest; however, to get this is going to be very very challenging. There will be some swap agreement. There will be some trade in local currencies. However, US dollars is still going to be a safe haven currency

for reserves. I do not think we see a substitute. Now, when China can really play its economic power is when China becomes not just a net exporter, but become more of a net importer.

We need to remember that when China becomes the largest economy, China's per capita GDP is only going to be one quarter that of the United States. We also need to remember that as much as there is a saying that "China's miracle is because of socialism with Chinese characteristics," in reality there is a lot of capitalism with Chinese characteristics. When you look across emerging markets, the paradigm shifting forces helping an economy to grow are not towards more state, but towards more market. It is this fundamental change of the DNA; from bureaucrats to enterprisers, from state to market, from rural to urban, from agriculture to industry, to services from illiterate to literate leveraging the power of technology. These are fundamental market forces that have brought China to where China is today.

China must undertake fundamental structural reform and that reform is to do exactly what the Chinese government, what the party, promised back in 2012: to let the market play a dominant role, to let the country be governed by the rule of law. The danger is for China to isolate itself, to go back to state stimulus to stay away from the market economic reform, as well as to stick to the blueprint of deepening reform going more towards market forces. And all of that and globalisation should be fundamentally about letting the market play its role.

Baghdad Amreyev's Highlights



Secretary General of the Cooperation Council of Turkic Speaking States

Ambassador Baghdad Amreyev is the Secretary General of the Cooperation Council of Turkic Speaking States. From 1996 to 2017 he served as the Ambassador of Kazakhstan to Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Turkey and Iran respectively. In 2014, he was appointed as Advisor to the Prime Minister of Kazakhstan. Amreyev has held various additional positions during his 38-year professional career including the post of Special Envoy of Kazakhstan to the OIC, WTO, IEF.

Regarding the relations between the North and the so-called Global South, 30 years ago we have been talking about the rise of the Third World. Now we are calling it the rise of the Global South, which I believe is more empowering to encourage a reconsideration of all of the relations between developed North and the Global South. I believe that the rising Global South is not a threat to the North. Not at all, on the contrary, this house can greatly contribute to achieving the common goals of developing our world and granting prosperity to all the nations. Therefore, I believe that the regional organisation like Turkic Council can play a greater role in balancing these relations. So, Turkic [Council] as you mentioned was founded by four Turkic speak-

ing nations: Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Turkey nine years ago by the way. Today, we are celebrating the ninth anniversary establishment of our organization. Therefore, I believe that the regional organisations like Turkic Council and others can play a very positive role in softening the tensions that relations between North and the Global South are facing.

Countries like China, India and Turkey have been regarded as developing countries. Now, they have become the centre. Therefore, I believe that these differences will be less and less in future. This is the reality we face and this is the reality we have to deal with.



Fourth Session

The Leadership of Women in a World of Conflict



- What are the practices that disadvantage women from pursuing leadership roles?
- Is patriarchy a source of the conflictual make-up of world politics today?
- How can society create an environment that can lead to women's individual and collective empowerment?
- What is the role of cultural relativism in empowering women?

Summary of the Session

Session moderator, Stavroula Logothettis, began by describing the status of women around the world and the lack of female representation. She stressed that women are critical to the economic development of any healthy society and for good governance. According to the United Nations, only two countries around the world have 50 percent or more women in parliament, Rwanda (61%) and Bolivia (53%), and according to one study, only 14 out of 234 major companies examined had a female as their CEO. She also added that one in three women experience some form of domestic violence or sexual assault. Logothettis finally highlighted and questioned how staggering the numbers are and how these issues are still discussed in 2020.

Deliberating on the aforementioned issues, Monique Villa, CEO of Thomson Reuters Foundation, stated that out of the 189 countries around the world, only 22 countries give women equal rights with men. However, she reiterated that the process of women's equality, as much as it is ongoing, is a slow one. Women are different from men in the sense that they not only have a day job but they also have a family to look after. This makes it imperative to take into consideration women's particularity.

From her side, Dr. Sakena Yacoobi, the CEO of the Afghan Institute of Learning, highlighted three main issues that contribute to the disempowerment of women. Firstly, that women do not sufficiently support each other. Secondly, women suffer from lack of education and thirdly, the cultural stereotypes surrounding women's perceived inability to do the so-called

jobs of men. Dr. Yacoobi stressed that unless the above issues are addressed, the status of women will not improve. She added that women have high potential and capacity and should be given equal opportunities and educational rights. Most importantly, she described women's empowerment as essential to the development of societies. A woman who works and is able to contribute to her household will help fight poverty, which will prevent wars and other calamities. An empowered woman can also contribute to her children's education, which is essential in creating productive and literate societies.

Diana Buttu, human rights lawyer and former spokesperson for the Palestine Liberation Organization, explained that the main problem is that the world is dominated by patriarchy. She highlighted the role of Palestinian women as being at the forefront of leading the struggle against the Israeli military occupation. She criticised the quota system, which prevents many women from being in leadership positions. She also stressed how a lot of potential is lost because of the lack of utilisation of women.

Anita Alban, Former Minister of environment of Ecuador, highlighted the importance of actions rather than discussion to end the gender inequality. She also pointed to the vast difference between the rural and urban areas and how this can affect the provision, quality and access of education to women.

Monique Villa's Highlights



CEO of the Thomson Reuters Foundation

Monique Villa is the CEO of the Thomson Reuters Foundation where she has created high-impact programmes including TrustLaw, a global pro bono service, and Trust Conference, a movement to fight slavery and empower women worldwide. She received the Champions for Change Award in 2015 for her effort in the fight against human trafficking and modern slavery, and was the recipient of ECPAT-USA's inaugural Freedom Award in 2017 in recognition of her leadership in the fight to end child trafficking.

First of all, I would like to thank all of the men attending this session for your interest in this issue. As a result of the patriarchal society we live in, women would not be able to make progress without men's full understanding of the issue.

22 out of 189 countries in the world provide women equal legal rights with men. It is really symptomatic, not in their economic deals. Women set off with a handicap, which is to not have the same legal rights as men. According to the World Bank, women globally spend 90 percent of their salary in their family. It can be said that, examining these data, women should be granted more jobs in order to help the world become less poor and more efficient. However, we remain very far from reaching the goals that we have as women.

Nonetheless, in the last 50 years, there has been a significant amount of progress in the world for women... The #MeToo movement in the US, albeit that I think it will witness a backlash, gives men an opportunity to understand what girls may face at the age of 12 or 13. Many men, that I know, were not aware that girls and women are constantly thinking about this problem in everything that we do. If we extrapolate this security concern that women face to then living in a city for instance, where by 2050, 75 percent of the world population are set to live in big cities. Women subjected to three jobs a day: dealing with children, domestic labour, as well as being career owners, may often feel reluctant to take up a job offer that would require commuting a distance. There are many issues surrounding women, however, it should be highlighted that violence against women is still very high.

If we take examples of female leaders such as Margaret Thatcher, Theresa May, Indira Gandhi, Bhutto, Aung San Suu

Kyi, to name a few, in regards to the idea that women govern in an alternative style in comparison to men, it is simply not true. That said, women have considerably changed the ways that jobs are done. For example, if we look at how media is shaping discussions around the world... We can see that 40 years ago, wars were covered in a different light. Essentially, journalists were most likely to be men, whom were more interested in technology, the army and progression. Women from around the world started to be sent as world correspondents and thus, presented a human angle. Today, there are more wars covered from the human angle than ever before. I am not speaking of Yemen or other places where nobody is witness, or very few, but women have changed the ways to approach reality and write about issues. In government, women do not seem to be different. As CEOs, and I am one, they do not seem to be very different.

It has been proven that diversity in senior positions enables good management. In a country like India with a population of 1.3 billion people, equality of rights would enable promising economic power; it would be one of the leading economies in the world. Women continue to face many challenges due to a number of factors, one of them being violence against women which is not addressed, and in India, this issue impairs 50 percent of the population to be able to blossom and reach positions dominantly held by men.

It is important to stress the education of boys on the issue of gender disparity. The more you educate boys that girls are equal members of society, the more they will recognise the problem at hand. One example is female genital mutilations; you have 3 million girls a year who are still cut today. There is a combination of patriarchy, tradition and so-called culture and the only way to overcome this human rights violation is by convincing men in rural areas about their wrongdoing.

I will continue to fight against modern slavery, an area I have been fighting for the past 8 years. This is a growing crime affecting 40 million people around the world, many of them women and children. Those who are subjected to modern slavery, work with no pay and are under the threat of vio-

lence, among all kinds of other horrors around the world. This is not something that should exist in the twenty first century, however, continues to be a problem in every country, and I will do a lot more in this field.

Diana Buttu's Highlights



Human Rights Lawyer

Diana Buttu is a Canadian-Palestinian human rights lawyer. In 2000, Buttu moved to the occupied West Bank where she served as a legal advisor to the Palestinian negotiating team and later to the Palestinian president. She resigned from her post in 2005 and remains a frequent commentator on Middle East politics and human rights. Her op-eds have been published in the New York Times, The Washington Post, The Guardian, BBC, CNN and Al Jazeera among others.

I think it is important to think about the ways that women work. This is not a question of compassion, but it is a question of putting other humans first, rather than putting structures first. You see this in the way that women approach work, by something as simple as making sure those things are done.

But people get a sense that they're able to be heard. In all of the groups that I've worked with, with women in the past that were able to produce so much more because nobody feels as though they are been excluded or that there's a top down approach to things even when women are commanding positions of power. For example, there was one very powerful moment where a young Palestinian man was often being arrested by the Israeli army. Three, and four, and five women would come and pull that child away from the soldier and say, "this is my son." Now obviously, they can only have one mother, but the fact that all of these women came together was so indicative of us working together as a society and as a community, rather than one person trying to take all of the accolades which is what we see with men.

Very few women are in leadership positions now; [they] are there primarily because of the quota system that we have in place. And rather than this patriarchal system making way and giving room and giving space for 51 percent of the pop-

ulation and not just 51 percent of the population but definitely more capable percentage of the population they're holding onto positions of power. The irony is that in universities now in Palestine 60 percent of university entrants are women. And yet at the end of their four years of study they're going to be less than 20 percent of the workforce. And that shows you that women's energy, women's brains, are actually not being utilized or energy is not being utilized. And instead we're still stuck in the same system of patriarchy. Unless we begin to address that equation, I do not think that we are going to be able to move forward not just as a Palestinian society, but a society as a whole. When you see these numbers that are coming out of the Arab world and you see how much energy, how much brainpower is being squandered you just think of what the possibilities and the potential is if they were not being squandered.

That it is true, we are progressing. However, when I think of my country of birth Canada, Canada has had one female prime minister and that was 25 years ago and it hasn't progressed since. So, things are definitely moving in the right direction but I think that there's a lot more that needs to be done. We have to get to a place where men become educated about women's rights, where men become educated about violence against women, where men become educated about what is considered appropriate, what's consid-

ered inappropriate, so that we don't have to hear another testimony like Brett Kavanaugh.

I will continue my work as before, which is in efforts for the liberation of Palestine. The work that I focus on now is organising and working with others and trying to get a cohesive Palestinian group that is pushing to hold Israel account-

able, that is pushing to hold the world accountable, that is pushing to preserve the rights of Palestinians and to protect Palestinians, to keep them on their land, to keep them in their homes, to make sure that their homes don't get demolished. This is the work that I have been doing in the past that I'm going to do that I'm doing right now and that I'll continue to do in the future until Palestine is free.

Anita Alban's Highlights



Former Minister of Environment of Ecuador

Anita Alban is a lawyer and the former Ecuadorian Minister of State for the Environment. In 2008, she was named Executive Director for the newly created Ecuadorian Agency for International Cooperation (AGECI) and in 2010, she was appointed as Ecuador's Ambassador to the United Kingdom. She has consistently been involved in various charity and community development projects and since 2016, she has managed an environmental fund that is responsible for financing environmental projects in the region.

The issues [that] women face will stop being a problem when we are able to stop talking about them. That is, when being a woman involved in politics, the army and so on, becomes normalised. That is when we will stop talking about this; when we think that we have all that we should have.

If we look at examples of female leaders such as Theresa May and Margaret Thatcher, it is true that they are not seen as great examples, but society does not expect women to be part of armies. In some societies, being part of an army is related to status; it is part of the elite. In those same societies, women are also expected to bear compassionate traits, be nice, tender, etc. The case in most societies around the world is the lack of access women have to power, to education, to decision-making positions. So, that is the real gap; allowing women to be in those spaces doesn't matter if you have the education. It is a question of how women help women, and how men do not allow a woman to be part of that circle. This is a problem prevalent in today's patriarchal society, and depends on the law of each country. It depends on how things are practiced in some societies.

To give an example from my country, Ecuador, the right to vote was given to women in 1924. Currently, the vice pres-

ident of Ecuador is a woman, the president of the National Assembly is a woman. In my country if you, as a woman, want to do something, you can do it. Men and women do have the same rights.

It is not enough to speak of education in terms of learning how to read and write, what we need is much more than that. We must also focus on education at a human level; how to behave towards one another, how to communicate well, and how to preserve culture without being aggressive to each other.

The next step for me is to really spread what I am doing. I manage the Environmental Fund and we currently aim to collect funds and use revenues to work on environmental projects in Ecuador. This is in regards to my professional platform, however, I wish to add some other lines of work including more people in conversations around preservation and productivity of environmental issues. There are not many sources to inform people on how to use resources in the best way, and to obtain revenues for further development and sustainability.

Sakena Yacoobi's Highlights



CEO of the Afghan Institute of Learning

Dr Sakena Yacoobi is the CEO of the Afghan Institute of Learning (AIL), which she founded in 1995 in response to the lack of education and health care that the Afghan people were facing after decades of war. She is also co-founder and Vice President of Creating Hope International (CHI). In addition, Yacoobi has established private facilities in Afghanistan: 4 schools, a hospital and a radio station. She is an advisor to the Fetzer Institute, and is a member of the US-Afghan Women's Council.

One issue is that women are not supporting each other. Women must stand together and support one another.

Secondly, the lack of education hinders women's empowerment and development. Women have been prevented from education because it is believed that women do not have the capacity or knowledge, and are thus isolated. Superstition and culture create barriers for women who wish to attain senior positions. Overcoming these barriers necessitates a shift in peoples' mind-sets, where the lack of knowledge and education about women obstructs any room for progress in light of gender equality. Women must be encouraged to pursue higher education and achieve the skills to be in positions of power.

Currently, half of the women in Afghanistan are empowered. Although there are many problems in Afghanistan right now, women are enthusiastic, they are learning, obtaining skills, and taking CEO positions. Women in leadership positions must show men that they are more benefit than their counterparts; women are exceptional organisers, handle economic situations in a sophisticated manner, and are surpassing carers of children. As a result, I trust that women are capable where granted the environment, support and education.

Women desire to acquire training and a job however fear the risk of being targeted. Security is a major issue in Afghanistan; if we solve the issue of security, women will definitely play a more active role in society because a large sum of women are skillful and educated. Today in Afghanistan, we have a female minister, governor, and women in various positions of government.

Women are good negotiators; they listen well and have great communication skills. Listening is key in any negotiation; it is important to understand the other side before

you can deliver a winning idea. Listening is not a position of weakness; rather, it is a great tool to ensure that you fully understand the goals and concepts that the person you are meeting with is trying to deliver. Good communication and working as a team, or as a team leader, paves the way for more impactful results.

It should be highlighted that culture and superstitious practices tend to be ignored. First, we must work with the culture of the people, because we are trying to educate them according to the culture, custom and religion. I believe this is the main source; and before any kind of training or education, we must venture to explain the ways, for example, a young boy will be learning.

Another factor that affects the women's development is the issue of poverty. Poverty leads to corruption and therefore results in security dilemmas. This is an issue in every country and in most developing countries approximately 80 percent of the population live in rural areas. In these rural areas, people are not able to read and write. We tend to focus on big cities, yet in big cities, people are attending university. The majority of the population are simply following tradition or superstition. If we are not educating the people inhabiting rural areas, there is no way to change their mentality and press on the importance of educating girls and boys, and bring attention to the issues we face.

I will continue to keep educating and encouraging women in Afghanistan to achieve higher positions and to participate in the political arena. The next step is to open a television station that me and my team are currently working on. Through media, we can spread education more efficiently and effectively. I am also working on a project to build a women's university in Afghanistan.

Fifth Session

Regional Players and Shifting Security Equation in the Middle East



- What do we mean when we reference a ‘changing Middle East?’ How does the discourse of instability affect perspectives of and policies towards the region?
- How do global events and geopolitics influence events in the region?
- Where is the region heading, and how can intra-regional efforts towards establishing peace and stability be capitalized on in a sustainable way?
- What are the near-term prospects for reconstruction in Syria?

Summary of Fouad Siniora's Keynote Speech

Former Lebanese Prime Minister, Fouad Siniora, participated at the 2018 TRT World Forum where he gave a keynote speech about envisioning peace and security in a fragmented world. He mentioned that the world is suffering from a serious phenomenon, known as the trust deficit disorder, such as trust in national and international institutions, trust among states and trust in the rule-based global order. Furthermore, he continued to emphasise that people are also losing faith in political establishments where polarisation is on the rise and populism is on the march.

Siniora described the present world as undergoing a period of transition towards a new global order, or disorder. He linked the destabilisation of the Middle East to the US invasion of Iraq and the dismantling of the Iraqi army. According to Mr. Siniora, the repercussions of the Arab Spring led the Middle East to fall into disarray, and ultimately to a greater interference from the main world players, which is well demonstrated with Russia's involvement in Syria. Meanwhile, regional players, like Iran and Israel, chose war and violence over peace and did so through direct and indirect interventions, and by that further complicating the political, social and economic problems in the region. Mr. Siniora asserted that the oppression and injustice that have been exerted on millions of innocent individuals in many countries of this region by decades of authoritarianism and authoritarian regimes have led to further marginalisation and turbulences. Unless effective and sustainable reform is not promoted and free, democratic and representative regimes are not established, then the Arab world would continue to deteriorate into further conflict.

Mr. Siniora also mentioned that the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and parts of Syria and Lebanon is creating injustice and instability in the Middle East. He added that the most threatening crisis of modern history is the unresolved Palestinian issue for it remains an important key to unlocking many problems in the Middle East. The Israeli regime continues to inflict on the Palestinians the most merciless displacement policies in an effort to force them out of their hometowns. Mr. Siniora condemned the US decision

to relocate their embassy to Jerusalem and their support of laws on the Jewishness of the Israeli state.

Nevertheless, over the past decades, the Arab states have failed to deal with their socio-economic and political issues. These problems have been left simmering for a long time, allowing for a growing interference in the region, most notably by Iran who has been fuelling sectarian rifts in the region, especially in Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen and partly in Lebanon. Hence giving the other regional powers and especially Iran and Israel a growing role in fostering the increased destabilisation in the region. All this has been taking place at the time when many Arab governments and leaders are held responsible for mishandling their ethnic and religiously-diverse populations.

The conflicts in the Middle East have mounting negative and damaging effects not only on the region but beyond it as well, which is fuelled by significant waves of migrations towards Europe and elsewhere. Mr. Siniora emphasised that these conflicts in the Middle East have also had a considerable economic impact on neighbouring countries like Turkey and Iran.

He reiterated that the Arab League has to take an initiative supported by the major Arab countries, such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia, to try and fill the Arab void by employing their potentials and capacities to achieve Arab reconciliation. This is essential in order to bring regional reconciliations, starting with neighbouring countries like Turkey, which represents a strategic, political, cultural and economic prospect for the Arab region.

Speaking of Syria, Libya and Yemen, Mr. Siniora stressed that reconstruction requires stability and unity, with the premise of conventional political solutions and national reconciliation that puts an end to foreign interventions. He ended his speech by stating that the Arab world is in urgent need of new approaches that equally promote human development and education. This should happen simultaneously with the promotion and establishment of the civil state that respects human rights and human dignity.

Fouad Siniora's Highlights



Former Prime Minister of Lebanon

Fouad Abdel Basset Siniora is a former Prime Minister of Lebanon (2005-2009) and former Member of the Lebanese Parliament and head of the al-Mustakbal Parliamentary Block (2009-2018). He served as the Finance Minister of Lebanon from 1992 to 1998 and again from November 2000 to November 2004. He is also a former business leader having served as the Chairman-General Manager of the Groupe Méditerranée. At the present, Mr. Siniora is still active on the political scene in Lebanon and the wider Arab World.

During the last century, as you know, our world has experienced the multipolar era of the inter-wars years; the bipolar one of the Cold War, the unipolar period of the 1990s, and the fragmented world that we are experiencing at the present times. Today, our world is suffering from a serious phenomenon known as the 'trust deficit disorder,' as people are feeling troubled and insecure more and more every day. At present, trust is at a breaking point; trust in national and international institutions, trust among states, trust in the rule-based global order... And within countries, people are losing faith in political establishments where polarisation is on the rise and populism on the march. Moreover, cooperation among countries is less certain and more difficult. Furthermore, the world order is increasingly chaotic where power relations are less clear, universal values are being eroded and the rule of law is being undermined. The world has started to face a new set of paradoxes as it is getting more and more connected where societies are becoming more fragmented. Challenges are growing outward while many people are turning inward and multilateralism is under fire. When the world needs it most and needs a real commitment to rule-based order as well.

Dear friends, the theme of our forum revolves around the world that, at present, is in a period of transition towards a new global order or probably a new global disorder. A period that is characterised by the absence of global leadership, less cooperation, more uncertainty and lower levels of trust. In this environment, we come to talk about the Middle East and the Arab world, and the status and position of this region at the global scene while this region is still in pursuit of justice.

Ladies and gentlemen, the US invasion of Iraq and its dismantling of the Iraqi army and later the Iraqi state has led

to furthering destabilization of the Middle East region. Later, shocks emerged that made the situation even more serious after the repercussions of what became to be known as the Arab Spring. Thus, leading the Middle East region into a new disarray and ultimately to a greater interference of the main world players and particularly after the comeback of Russia in the wake of the Syrian war. Meanwhile the regional players, particularly Israel and Iran, have chosen war and violence instead of peace and coordination and they did that through their direct and indirect interventions, which had added and further complicated the already existing political, social and economic problems in the region. No doubt that the oppression and injustice that have been exerted on millions of innocent individuals in many countries of this region by decades of authoritarianism and authoritarian regimes have led to more marginalisation and turbulences. That is why, unless an effective and sustainable reform is encouraged that can contribute towards creating regimes built on freedom, democracy and respecting diversity, problems will continue to emerge in the Arab world leading to more wars and lost dignity. The Israeli occupation of the West Bank and parts of Syria and Lebanon remains a major source of injustice and instability in the Middle East region. Allow me here to point out that the Palestinian unresolved problem is the most dangerous crisis of modern history as it remains an important key to unlocking many problems in the Middle East. The Israeli regime is still inflicting on the Palestinians, the most inhumane uprooting policies to force them out of their hometowns. But what makes the situation even more complicated is the fact that it has been lately suffering from major additional setbacks. The recent US decision on Jerusalem that surely violates international law that is solely the only guarantee for international peace and security. To add to that the recent Israeli laws especially on the Jewishness of the state of Israel add to it the harsh Israeli measures and

the disgraceful apartheid measures against the Palestinians, make the situation much more complicated. In addition to the above, it has to be said that over several decades the region suffered from the continuous failure of many Arab states in dealing with their socio-economic and political problems properly. Actually, these problems that have been left simmering for too long have led to a growing interference in the region and most notably by Iran during the last four decades. Iran has been fuelling sectarian rifts to further its hegemony in the region hands and consequently, it has led the region to growing rifts and violence and deeper religious and sectarian divides especially in Iraq, Syria, Libya, and Yemen, and partly in Lebanon. All this has been going on in the midst of a growing Arab void, and the near total absence of Arab countries in playing any role in determining the fate of the region. Hence, giving the other regional powers and especially Iran and Israel, a growing role in furthering the increased destabilisation in the region that has been taking place while many Arab governments and leaders have been to a great extent responsible for mismanaging the ethnic and religious diversity of the region. Hence, in these particular countries, instead of using their diversities as an opportunity, they turned it in to an explosive crises. Moreover, some Arab states have also failed to manage and regulate their common relations within the Middle East region. That contributed to a new situation whereby non-state actors have thrived and started to play a much bigger role, feeding on and therefore feeding back violence and conflict as it is currently the situation in Iraq, Syria, Libya and Yemen. These conflicts and the above mentioned countries, as well as other conflicts, will continue to have growing negative and destructive effects on the entire region and beyond that are fuelled by significant waves of migration from the region towards Europe and beyond. These waves have negative political and social consequences, which are being experienced in many countries outside the region contributing towards the rise of populism and extremism in many European countries. Brexit for instance, is an example. And other examples lie within the rise of the far right in elections in many European countries. Ladies and gentlemen, on the one hand, the instability in the Arab region and the repercussions that it has caused combined with the major changes that are taking place at the levels of world politics and the world economy have all started to have a real and painful economic impact on many regional powers such as Iran and Turkey. These two regional power players are both bleeding financially and economically which requires from them immediate attention to addressing these mounting problems. On the other hand and in sum, the use of some Arab coun-

tries by the regional and global powers as a field of combat rather than a medium of active collaboration and a war zone, rather than a zone for economic trade and prosperity, this is starting to have a grave impact on the whole region towards unsustainable levels. So what to do? So what to do Ladies and gentlemen? And how do we avoid further deterioration? And accordingly build sustainable solutions that may guarantee justice and stability that can prevail in the region.

In my opinion I can talk about two important factors that I can see there are emerging and may prepare the Middle East region to become ready for some positive change. The first you may be surprised. It is that it is the building on the continuous bleeding fatigue and the need to avoid more widespread dangers and risks. The second has to do with a significant common interests among the countries of the region that are there. And that can be developed further for the benefit of all. Let us look around us and draw the right conclusions from the example of the recent reconciliation and historic peace arrangement that took place a few weeks ago between Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Djibouti. After decades of wars and conflicts that have depleted them economically and politically thus forcing them to realize that the only way out is to collaborate and partner together to get out of the deep hole that they were digging with their unstoppable fighting. There are increasing risks at the regional level as well as the conflicts that are causing more bloodshed and frustration together with the state of fatigue that all regional players have reached should force all concerned parties to seriously start considering how to get out of the big hole they all contributed in digging for themselves before it is too late. In principle, the need is essential pressing to avoid furthering the gravity of the situation where they have let themselves and more and more actually, they were pushed into it by international powers and regional powers. This should lead them to realise that the common interests of the regional powers can be used as well as a catalyst to open the door for higher levels of collaboration among themselves. But for this to happen there are prerequisites. The Arab countries and especially Egypt and Saudi Arabia urgently because of their size and their role during history and at the present time. Especially Egypt and Saudi Arabia urgently need to step up and see that it is in their higher interest to realize the magnitude of the threats they face and the impossibility of facing them without a significant boost to the levels of collaborations among themselves with the other Arab countries and as well with the other regional powers and players. In this context, The Arab League has to take an initiative supported by the major Arab countries

to try to fill the Arab void and start exerting serious efforts to achieve Arab-Arab reconciliations to be followed by regional conciliations starting with Turkey, which represents a strategic political cultural and economic horizon for the Arab region. Meanwhile, it has to be said that it is in the interest of the Islamic Republic of Iran to understand what brings it and the Arab world together. Ranging from history to geography to common interests that is much more than what separates them. Therefore Iran should realize that gains from peace and stability in the region are much higher and more sustainable than the temporary and costly gains of wars if there is any. In other words, I think the Arab world should extend the hand to Iran. But before that Iran has to really make a serious step of stopping its policy of Velayet-e Fakeh across national frontiers. Otherwise, there is no way out of this situation that is really messy for everybody. The whole region together with the main international powers should then stand unified behind finding a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the Palestinian problem which currently calls for a two state solution as per the Arab Peace

Initiative in Beirut of 2002. This is again, if for no other reason than the avoidance of further risks and dangers. Ladies and gentlemen, sustainable solutions. In that tone and tortured nation have to be found, a new democratic regime built on peace stability and respect of diversity has to be built to put an end to the waves of oppression that have been contributing towards furthering the deterioration of the region for decades. Only a political solution that is acceptable to all will open the door for the sustainable reconstruction of Syria in order to close this hole of hell that has been attracting many of the demons of the world. There is an urgent need to collaborate to end the Syrian war that has served enough as a battlefield for all the parties. It is high time for all concerned to start looking for their real interests and gains from striking a peaceful settlement as its continuation as a fertile land for warlords will be at the expense of the future of the car of their countries and the future of many generations to come. What holds for Syria holds also for Libya and Yemen. Reconstruction requires stability and unity, which in turn required acceptable political solutions and national reconciliation that limit and then eliminate all foreign intervention in these states. It has to be clearly stated in here that the Arab world desperately needs new approaches that promote human development and education for all while promoting the concept and the implementation of the civil state which constitutes a guarantee for human rights and human dignity. This path as well calls out for an upgraded and a modern religious discourse that is adapted to the major changes that are happening in the 21st century and that cherishes diversity and critical thinking.

Ladies and gentlemen, to conclude the continued disorder and instability in the Middle East and the Arab world is a part of this order in the world. If and when progress can be achieved in striking peaceful solutions in the region with the consent and active participation of the international powers who in my opinion have a real vested interests in this in order to resolve many of the old and renewed conflicts in the region and beyond peace and stability may be achieved. Moving in that direction may contribute to the prevalence of a new world order and as well in furthering peace and stability in addition to more active and constructive cooperation in the world.

Dear friends, ladies and gentlemen, time is pressing. Time is pressing and the choice is clear. We either start addressing our collective problems together or we keep on digging deeper in the hole of sectarianism isolation and economic and social ruins. Thank you for your patience.

The Arab League has to take an initiative supported by the major Arab countries to try to fill the Arab void and start exerting serious efforts to achieve Arab-Arab reconciliations to be followed by regional conciliations starting with Turkey which represents a strategic political cultural and economic horizon for the Arab region.

Summary of the Session

The future of the Middle East remains one of the most oft debated and controversial issues today. Intermittent conflict remains a defining feature of the region, with the Syrian conflict being only the most recent example. In "Regional Players and the Shifting Security Equation in the Middle East," Imran Garda, the moderator of the session, addressed questions to diplomats, analysts, and mediators regarding the future of the Syrian question and the implications for the wider regional order. The specifics of the Syrian question were then discussed with Turkish presidential spokesperson, İbrahim Kalın, and UN Special Envoy to Syria, Staffan de Mistura. They highlighted the importance of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) secured by Turkey and Russia regarding Idlib, and the importance of this achievement in furthering the potential to reach a political solution to the conflict. Maha Yahya, Director of the Middle East Center (Carnegie), and Mokhtar Lamani, the former head of the UN-League of Arab States, also analysed the feasibility of reaching a political solution in Syria through these means, and the likelihood of their success.

Intermittent conflict in the Middle East has contributed to the widespread economic disparity and socio-political imbalances that the region has witnessed over the course of the past century. Within this framework, İbrahim Kalın highlighted the issue of the power-imbalance that characterises the world today, which has led to a general sense of insecurity in the region. He advocated strong public governance and holistic approaches to political and social issues as means to achieve stability. Similarly, the discussion with Staffan de Mistura and İbrahim Kalın emphasised the importance of the peace process in Syria to the stability of the region as a whole. The Idlib agreement between Russia and Turkey was emphasised by the two discussants, as Kalın proposed that Turkey should not be the sole party responsible for maintaining the terms of the accord. Other key international players such as the US, the EU

and the Gulf States also have a significant role to play. In that regard, Mistura proposed that Turkey would be faced with major challenges if it pursues the Idlib agreement without significant international participation. He thereby agreed with Kalın, and advised that working towards a political solution whereby different players actively participating in the region partner with Turkey.

The discussion then shifted to the more general issue of the failure to reach a political consensus in the Middle East. Major regional issues with international consequences, such as the Palestinian issue, the Syrian conflict, and the war in Yemen are exacerbated by this lack of consensus. In this respect, Maha Yahya argued that, due to lack of common interests among the different players, establishing a common framework currently represents a difficult challenge to overcome. This, in turn, makes the region vulnerable to further political fragmentation. In light of the increasing fragmentation, Mokhtar Lamani highlighted how the ongoing conflicts in the region lead to an augmentation of social and political mistrust between regional stakeholders and key international actors, resulting in derailed peace processes and unconsolidated policy initiatives.

In the concluding remarks, the resiliency of the people of the region was stressed. The importance of political determination was emphasised as being necessary for furthering, and, ultimately consolidating stability. However, as mentioned, the capacity to reach viable solutions fails to be achieved when political actors do not orient their regional outlook in a way that prioritises the establishment of a stable political order. In this regard, the Idlib agreement can be pointed to as a rare success. However, increased collective and cooperative action between regional players is needed in order to curb and eventually find solutions to the ongoing conflicts plaguing the region.

Ibrahim Kalin's Highlights



Presidential Spokesperson of the Republic of Turkey

Ibrahim Kalin served as Assistant Undersecretary of State and Senior Advisor to the Prime Minister of Turkey before taking up his current post. He is the founding director of the Foundation for Political, Economic and Social Research (SETA) serving as its director from 2005 to 2009. His academic work focuses on the Islamic intellectual tradition and its relevance for the contemporary world. Dr Kalin has published widely on Islamic philosophy, Islam and the West and Turkish foreign policy.

I want to begin with the words of greetings of peace: "Sa-laam," because we are talking about security-insecurity. I cannot imagine a situation where we will have peace or security, safety for all, without at least thinking about what peace means... And it's more than just peace obviously in the political sense of the term; it is peace within our souls, it is peace in the world. Actually, it is one of the divine names: As-Salaam. The reason I want to emphasise this aspect of peace is that every time we talk about the region, the Middle East, immediately what we think of is war, conflict, economic deprivation, occupation, civil wars, conflict so on and so forth. That has not been the story of the Middle East or the middle Islamic world until about a century ago. In fact, this part of the world has produced some of the most enduring achievements of world culture and civilisation and philos-

ophy and science, in education and architecture, in many other fields.

The "I am powerful, therefore, I am right" approach; that is what causes insecurity in the world. I feel insecure when I hear some world leader or political leader saying that "I am superior to you because I have x, y, z." The world feels insecure when the leader of the most powerful country in the world says to another sovereign nation that "you wouldn't survive without us for two weeks." The world feels insecure about these things, and one has to take responsibility and one has to take this sort of political posturing to task before we talk about security in the Middle East, security in the Gulf, security here and there. The problem of security is a global problem. It is not just about Muslim countries; it is not just about Muslim nations or the Middle East. I feel very insecure when I see the rising tide of Islamophobia in Europe, when in fact, Muslim minorities have tried their best to integrate into the societies in which they live.

"I am powerful, therefore, I am right" approach; that is what causes insecurity in the world. The world feels insecure when the leader of the most powerful country in the world says to another sovereign nation that "you wouldn't survive without us for two weeks."

A sustainable peace is possible only when it is based on justice. You have this principle in the case of Palestine. Why don't we have a lasting peace or sustainable enduring peace in Palestine? Because, all the options that have been offered so far in regards to the Palestinian questions have lacked one basic principle and that is the principle of justice. What they propose is that occupation shall continue under different guises. That is not justice. The Palestinians will never accept it. We will never accept it. And I think the countries, and the nations, and the communities of the world with conscience will never accept it. When we talk about the Syrian conflict, the political turmoil in Iraq or Yemen or in Palestine, without justice we cannot have peace in any [of those mentioned]. It will be a superficial, temporary imposition of the interest of certain nation states, rather than a peace that is sustainable because it is based on justice.

Staffan de Mistura's Highlights



UN Secretary-General's Special Envoy to Syria

Staffan de Mistura is the Special Envoy for Syria of the United Nations Secretary-General. Prior to this, he served as the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Iraq (2007-2009) and Afghanistan (2010-2011), as well as Deputy Italian Foreign Minister. During a career of over four decades with United Nations agencies, he has served in numerous conflict zones directing complex relief operations in Sudan, Ethiopia, Albania, Afghanistan, Iraq, Lebanon, Bosnia and Somalia.

Yes, I am the image, the person, who is representing the constant attempts by the international community. So far, not achieving what they want, but also let me be frank, also the constant determination of the international community and the countries who are part of it to not abandon Syria and just to say: "Never mind, we continue this military solution which apparently was the aim at the beginning." Remember, mediation is based on the fact that there is a stalemate. In other words, two sides who are finding themselves in a moment when they need a mediator in order to try to find common ground.

So, let me address the point which I think is the most crucial one. Timing. Timing is everything in life, in love and in friendship, in war and in peace. Timing is now. Why? Because, we are getting not any more in a proxy war, proxy war is over. Look at it. Look how many countries, how many armies are involved directly inside Syria today. And, in fact, their regional and international potential of a direct misunderstanding is enormous. That is dangerous. That is bad, but is also potentially an opportunity for a wake-up call and the wake-up call is taking place. You want an example: I would say what happened in Idlib is a very, very dangerous moment. These days as the last major potentially catastrophic battle, the mother of all battles, for the conflict of Syria; three million people, on the other side, ten thousand terrorists, but three million people... In a combination, I must say we have to welcome it and support it, a cocktail of a combination of diplomatic and political negotiations.

Now, where are we in the political process? That is a right question. Well, we had and we have 2254 [Security Council Resolution]. But, let's be frank. Realpolitik is also taking over. And realpolitik has always been the reality when you get at

the end of a conflict. So now, that has been focusing on one area; constitutional committee. Through the constitution, as you know, that is when you actually make changes that is when you discuss everything; the tenure of a president, the way you organise elections, the separation of power... So, it is fundamental and that one is the last, but crucial element, which can be linking a solution, what we call political solution.

So the bottom line, this is a moment when we have to support the Idlib, the MoU [Memorandum of Understanding], need to be sustained and kept alive because it gives us a window of opportunity to end the war and start instead with a new process called constitutional committee.

Ask the Syrians; they want the end of this horror. Five million refugees, three million here. Five hundred thousand people killed. I don't want to tell you, how many wounded, how many displaced people, how many people have been suffering out of it. They want the end of this conflict. The Constitutional Committee, it is not the solution of everything but it is the icebreaker, is the entry point, is the ways through which you enter the DNA of a political solution because it does include all what we mentioned. It needs to be accompanied by all of these, having a Constitutional Committee meeting in Geneva is not enough. It needs to be accompanied by all that. Otherwise, people will not believe in it. But we need to start, and the timing is now, during this window of opportunity. If we miss it, we go back to the military solution. That means perhaps military territorial victory, but no victory or peace and no sustainability of peace. That means no rehabilitation, reconstruction, a return of refugees in a country divided.

Maha Yahya's Highlights



Director of the Middle East Centre at Carnegie

Maha Yahya is the Director of the Middle East Centre, Carnegie. Prior to joining Carnegie, Yahya worked on Participatory Development and Social Justice at UN-ESCWA and with various international organisations on socio-economic development and post conflict policies in Lebanon, Pakistan, Oman, Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Iran. She is a member on several advisory boards including the Asfari Institute for Civil Society and Citizenship, Refugees Deeply and The Arab Forum for Alternatives.

Syria was a key player in the region. It is now the stage on which much of regional and global instability is played out in. We also have, well Iraq, thankfully seems to be at least moving, has taken one step in the right direction with the election of President Barham Salih and the appointment of a new prime minister. We also have the longstanding occupation of the Palestinian territories.

This is a region that is facing declining economic growth. The end of the rentier state is very much there. The rentier state was what marked the relationships between states and their citizens over decades, where citizens willingly gave up, or at least were encouraged to give up, political rights in exchange for social welfare. This is over now... We are seeing policies being implemented across the region that are removing subsidies on a large number of goods.

The rentier state was what marked the relationships between states and their citizens over decades, where citizens willingly gave up, or at least were encouraged to give up, political rights in exchange for social welfare.

The people that are being impacted by this directly are the poorest of the poor. So, violence, increasing violence, is at a very different societal level. We constantly talk about non-state actors and what they are doing. But there is also state violence. What we are seeing in Egypt today is also very disconcerting to say the least. The kind of clampdown in emboldening autocratic tendencies across the region is very evident. So, at every different level, I think we are moving towards a very worrisome future that can only get worse if we continue along this path.

When you are drawing up a constitution in an environment where there is a victor-vanquished mentality, where there are very little concessions to be made and where the process of putting together the constitution is for many people, a big question mark. I think it is very important for Syrians to have the possibility of importing, and I mean large numbers of Syrians not just those who are actually working on this in the current environment. The right of return for refugees is I think fundamentally important. It does not need to be tied in. You mentioned a lot of the issues that are related to the right of return, i.e. protection, law number 10, military conscription, the ability to go back home without being persecuted. These are fundamental conditions for Syrians. The issue of transitional justice; I don't think we can postpone it. It's something that needs to be on the table and needs to be discussed when you talk to all the refugees in Lebanon and Jordan and Turkey wherever you are, they say it is important. We need to know that there will be some accountability. I have talked to refugees who will say "I don't care to hold the person who stole my house accountable. I understand that will not happen." They distinguish between different levels of accountability, but they do want those that murder their families held accountable.

Mokhtar Lamani's Highlights



Former Ambassador of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference to the UN

Mokhtar Lamani is a Senior Fellow at the University of Ottawa and the former Head of the Office of the UN League of Arab States, Joint Special Representative for Syria in Damascus (2012-2014). Prior to this, Lamani served as Ambassador of the Organisation of the Islamic Cooperation to the United Nations (1998-2004). His distinguished career in international diplomacy includes a number of positions within the General Secretariat of the Arab League, including Deputy Permanent Observer to the UN.

I was a witness in Syria, as well as in Iraq, to see one of the most dangerous things: sectarianism. Things are moving very strongly to sectarianism, to push people even to identify themselves according to sectarianism, then national dimensions. There is also the danger of disintegration of the country and they ended by having a kind of wars by proxy and nothing is working.

The Syrians are not actors anymore. Now, with all the interventions, what is going to happen? Are they going to stay in the same state? Or how, especially when linked to the question of sectarianism, are things going to be in ten or twenty years? And when you link it to the problems that exist now between Saudi Arabia and Iran with that sectarian dimension. What are we doing in this part of the world, it is really scary in which you see that even the notion of the state as it was after Sykes-Picot. Is it the end of it?

During the 90s, we were witnessing a new notion of a failed state in international law. What was happening in Somalia and some parts of Africa? When I linked Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Lebanon, all kinds of problems, are we going to be talking in the coming years or months about a whole region as failed?

What we are facing in the Middle East? It is inside state and the approach on the ground, it's so far from the agreement agreed from the diplomatic conferences. Why? I am going to tell you when the Russian and the Americans and when I used to go to Geneva I told them. That is agreed about having Geneva to settle the question of Syria for both Lavrov as well as Kerry. It's become an objective. Lavrov said, "OK, I'm going to bring the Syrian government and the American were going to bring the opposition and we're going to have Geneva." What I was witnessing inside Damascus; the government doesn't want to go to Geneva and said, "if we are going to go, [it is] just to please the Russians."



Sixth Session

A Crisis of Connectivity: New Media and Trust Formation



- How do traditional media outlets adapt to the new media environment?
- How are social media platforms utilised to ensure trust towards traditional media outlets?
- How does corporate market power in online platforms contribute to the crisis of fake news?
- Can fake news be the element preventing meaningful engagement in online debates?

Summary of the Session

"A Crisis of Connectivity: New Media and Trust Formation" dealt with one of the most pressing issues of the twenty-first century: the new era in information consumption ushered by social media platforms, and the speed and magnitude of their influence on users worldwide. Leading journalists provided their views on the decline of traditional media, as well as the challenges of living in what some have termed a "post-truth" era. Together, they unpacked the complexities of relying on social media for information, and the difficulties raised by the lack of effective regulatory mechanisms to limit hate speech and propaganda. Ultimately, our panellists suggested that the way forward is to educate the masses to adopt a more critical approach towards social media in the future, whilst establishing necessary regulations to curtail the phenomenon of "fake news."

The subject of "trust" which the digital empire has brought upon its users shaped the central argument amongst the panelists. Even though social media streamlined major revolutions such as the Arab Spring, the Cedar Revolution and Green revolution in Iran, Haroon Siddique also proposed that the contradictory element of uncontrolled reach and functioning of digital media has resulted in the creation of a "monster" in today's era. However, this claim was refuted by Riyaad Minty as he stated that the idea of trust remains rooted between people and that mainstream media fails to accommodate the power of connectivity that digital platforms have put forth.

As the discussion followed, Rageh Omar underlined how digital media has allowed the ease of access to a story in conflict-ridden areas through local citizens. However, David Patrikarakos argued that the elements of media that vouch for freedom of expression also come with contradictions, especially when the state uses it against the oppressed.

Another paradox, which was mentioned regarding digital media, was the concept of allowing the creation of silos as digital space permits, each community conversing online with each other based on common perceptions and prejudices. This factor was then associated with rising populism in today's world which has not only led to a declining democracy but also a transformation in its global meaning. In conclusive remarks, Rageh Omar highlighted the lack of authenticity that comes with social media outlets; where news on Syria remains in the same feed as with what a socialite like Kim Kardashian does. As a result, as much as new media has allowed the world to become closer in terms of sharing ideas, its drawbacks come with unrestrained barriers which will shape the global discourse for years to come.

Haroon Siddiqui's Highlights



Editorial Page Editor Emeritus of the Toronto Star

Haroon Siddiqui is Editorial Page Editor Emeritus at the Toronto Star, a senior Fellow at Massey College, University of Toronto and Distinguished Visiting Professor at Ryerson University. He has covered Canadian affairs for 50 years and reported from over 50 countries. He is author of 'Being Muslim', a bestseller, based on his travels through Europe, the Middle East, South Asia and the Far East and is a recipient of the Order of Canada, the nation's highest civilian honour.

When you deal with this topic, the first thing that comes to mind, of course, are the high tech and digital empires. The internet and especially social media have of course shrunk the world connecting all of us, connecting friends and families all over the world and has done a great deal of good for grassroots organisations, done a great deal for human rights. It was instrumental in the Green Revolution in Iran, was very helpful in the Arab Spring and helpful in the Maidan and the Cedar Revolution. All of this, without saying, has been good for humanity. But, after about 30 years of totally unregulated functioning, we have ended up with a monster. We have ended up with a big monster, which is that all of these companies have become overly powerful, overly rich. The combined market value of the five big high tech companies is almost near the GDP of France, for example. Their reach is absolutely enormous. I mean people do not remember this and do not realise that Facebook has 2.2 billion users a month. It owns Whatsapp. That's about 1.2 billion users a month. It owns Messenger. That is another 1.2 billion. Instagram is 700 million. So, this company by itself, has reached 5.2 billion people every month, which is enormous. I mean more than the combined population of China and India and so on. Google has 3.5 million hits every day which owns YouTube and has 1.5 billion users a day. Twitter has 1.6 billion users. So, this is an enormous reach that humanity has never known before and this is in the hands of monopolies and duopolies which happens to be American corporations and we can continue to discuss as we go forward.

There are two aspects to what you have just said. Number one is it is addictive. It is not an accident that Facebook employs 15,000 psychologists to manipulate you and me. They know what they are doing in terms of colour, music,

background and so on and so forth. That is one. Number two [...] is Facebook is being used in Libya to trade arms, for example. You talk about trust, but those are some of the smaller issues. The larger issues are about the invasion of citizen privacy. Billions of people are serving in the corporate empires of Facebook and Google and so on and so forth. You are handing over valuable data, which is being monetised.

It is a Wild West frontier which is totally unregulated and we are being so over-awed by this thing, we think it's wonderful, but it's not wonderful. The total [worth] of Facebook is \$550 billion. Even after losing whatever they lost on July 15th and so on. Mr. Zuckerberg paid 44 million dollars to buy neighbouring properties in his California home. You and I are paying for all of this. Okay, fine, somebody gets richer, I don't care. But, at the same time, what is happening to the national sovereignty of nations like Turkey. These people operate across borders. They really pay little or no taxes. They remain unregulated. So, these are issues that really go well beyond being bamboozled by these gizmos that we all like. I'm as guilty as anyone else.

The European Union has done a lot and the world needs to follow them. The European Union in fact fined Google five billion euros last year because it said it has been behaving illegally, immorally and not following practices and competition in effect. Number two is that the European Union passed anti-hate law and said you are in fact responsible for the content that you create. I mean it is a genius thing to do because by saying they are a neutral platform, creating this myth that we are a neutral platform, they absolve themselves of others' responsibility of their content. What is their content? Their content is used by Daesh and al-Qa-

eda to show beheadings, to show bombings and so on. What do right-wingers do? They produce the most hateful, poisonous kind of messages that are anti-Semitic, anti Islamic, misogynistic and so on. These people say "Oh it is nothing to do with us" but no, it does, you are responsible. The House of Commons Committee in Great Britain passed a report 10 days ago which said that digital giants must be responsible for their content. Why don't they do it? They don't do it because it costs money. It costs money to Al Jazeera, TRT and my newspaper in Toronto Star, to have editors, fact checkers and lawyers and so on. These people don't want to spend money and the last resort they claim the First Amendment, censorship, free speech, which is rubbish because they are already censoring things. They are already cooperating with states to provide state surveillance. Number two they already censor child pornography for example. They censor a potential terrorist threat. So, what is this argument about censorship? So, it is a selective argument. That's what it is.

Much more different than the old printing press and competition and so on. What we are and what we have is this sea of misinformation and fake news. Citizens have lost their right, have lost the ability to figure out what is true. Previously, we used to say read newspapers or watch television stations to get to the truth. We are drowning in a sea of misinformation. It's unrealistic to expect citizens to know what is the truth here, number one. Number two, the point you make about education of course, good luck. You know for the next generation it might come in. But the problem is now -I disagree with you that social media have done a wonderful thing- they've done wonderful things for the New York Times and The Washington Post and Wall Street Journal. The rest of the news media has been killed by social media, by these giants and so on.

What has happened to mainstream media is that the old business model has broken down. We need not shed any tears because technology changes things. But Facebook now was up 75 to 90 percent of the digital revenues that went to newspapers. Facebook alone in the United States collects more advertising revenue than all the newspapers combined. We now have hundreds of news communities that are without a local newspaper what we call the news desert is in effect. New York Times is doing well, top ones are doing well. The Toronto Star is managing, we are doing all right. But the traditional media has been wiped out. You and I need not shed any tears for them but we need to shed

tears for the fact that the local communities, city after city, that don't have a local newspaper. The only source of information is misinformation.

We are all in our own tribes now. I listen and I talk to only people that I agree with, who share my prejudices who share my biases, my bigotry, my misogyny. The common square which was a central basis of a democracy is being diluted. Plus, we're talking about trust is lost in mainstream institutions and end result is what? And result is this sharp rise in populism, the Trumps of this war. And, therefore, you get these parallels to the 1930s and so on. We have a serious crisis of confidence in liberal democracies and the rise of authoritarianism. Ibrahim Kalin was talking about the rise of Islamophobia and so on in Europe. Much effort is attributable to the sins of social media. As great as they are in smaller respect. So, let's not lose the forest for the trees here.

We are all in our own tribes now. I listen and I talk to only people that I agree with, who share my prejudices who share my biases, my bigotry, my misogyny. The common square which was a central basis of a democracy is being diluted.

Riyaad Minty's Highlights



Acting Director of Digital for TRT World and TRT Arabi

Riyaad Minty is the Acting Director of Digital for TRT World and TRT Arabi. Previously with Al Jazeera, Riyaad was a founder of AJ+, one of the world's largest news outlets for the digital generation and contributed towards the network's global strategy as Head of Social Media. He is recognised as a leader in the space of digital media and regularly speaks at conferences and universities around the world. He joined TRT World in Istanbul in 2016 to help build the digital arm of the new network.

So, I think from my side I wouldn't say 'new media.' It is media at this point and trust formation goes beyond just digital platforms. People trust people first and I think the bigger crisis we are having is, as a media industry, these trust bonds have been broken across different spheres. So, if you read the latest Edelman's study by the Trust Barometer, trust in media is at an all-time low and that's traditional mainstream media and largely people have shifted to digital platforms because they don't feel this connection, they don't feel representation from these big media organisations. People are going to suddenly tell their own stories if you are not going to represent me or my voice. I am not going to get those stories. You touched on the Green Revolution in Iran or the Arab Spring or many of the different platforms that were there. One of the challenges you have is these platforms and the people tweeting or posting online have been doing it in English to a large extent, which is only a small subset of the actual population. And often, in a lot of countries, people are posting online that might be doing it in their own language. And mainstream or additional media will kind of jump-in because they may not have language access, and this is representative of an entire population versus taking the time to step back and actually contextualise it.

We as media have let people down. And I don't think it's an issue with the platforms as much as it's an issue with us, as humans with humans. If you want information and different voices, you can go in different pages. You can go and consume on different platforms, but we choose to reinforce our own eco bubbles and as media we kind of push that on.

This talk of regulation and everything is very much needed, but we should go all the way back to the invention of the printing press. When the printing press first came out, there

was pushback from the Church, there was pushback from governments who actually wanted to regulate it because they feared what this access information would do to the general public who weren't equipped well enough to deal with all of a sudden having information. We are at that same sort of tipping point in history and humanity and the scale for which these platforms have grown. We just haven't kept up with our understanding of it. I fear that if we don't step into the education phase, if we don't step into actually guiding audiences as well as ourselves as media organisations of how to navigate this, we are actually going to lose the benefit that we can get out of this platform, which is to connect us. We are going to push us back towards the sort of very echo chamber sort of approach. I am seeing a lot of the platforms now on Facebook, schools are starting to act a lot like a traditional cable media broadcaster in terms of picking and choosing who can be on the platform. There should be regulation in terms of fake news for news broadcasters. I would love to see a broadcast where there is breaking news and someone says, "here's what we don't know" instead of saying "here's what we do know" because every broadcaster is rushing in this information space, trying to keep with this. But take a step back, let's slow things down and educate our audience and get out audience across this journey of fact checking. This is how we are fact-checking: "We don't know this. This is where we're looking for the information, this is how we verifying it" and bringing that sort of transparency to how we actually do our business to help with the education process through audiences.

Rageh Omaar's Highlights



ITV News International Affairs Editor

Rageh Omaar is an award winning and highly acclaimed journalist. He operated as a broadcast journalist for the BBC World Service and later became a producer and reporter for Newshour (1994-1996). He served as a Senior Foreign Correspondent for the BBC, where he reported from Baghdad during the US invasion in 2003. In 2006, he moved to Al Jazeera English and since 2013 he has been an International Affairs Editor and Senior Presenter for ITV news.

We cannot delude ourselves that there are many places around the world where it is becoming harder and harder to gain access to. I mean take the war in Syria; I mean if it was not for what's called 'user generated material', I mean the footage coming out of there particularly the siege of Aleppo, we would not have known what was going on in Syria. Similar cases are sort of true in Congo. So, social media, the immediacy of putting people on the spot in places where journalists are targets, journalists are being kidnapped. Rivals, factions, and governments do not want things reported or seen. The fact that all you need... I mean, a recording studio is essentially your mobile phone, and [it] puts reportage and reporting in the hearts of sort of situations where you know other forms of traditional sort of media can't get to. So, I don't think we can throw the baby out with the bathwater with regard to social media.

Facebook is not a news organisation. It does not have news values, it does not have a newsroom where, you know, checking facts, it's not. But it is a news broadcast in every sense, without any sense of just caring about controlling and that's not what it does. [...] But the other point is that, the picture that you know, was just being described, the channels that people watched, weather it was pro-Israeli or pro-Palestinian, and those channels, you know, if they put out a lie or said something we'd have to go to Ofcom in the UK. We will have to answer to regulators. Facebook does not face that problem at all. It can just say well, "whatever."

I think, actually I'm sort of more of an optimist [...] I mean, you look at the state of American journalism, [it] is in a pretty good place. I mean, look at CNN today, where it was seven years ago. Look at the New York Times. I mean, look at the Washington Post. They are doing amazing stuff. And

also they will sort of saying these social media giants will recognize that they have a fundamental problem that they know they have to answer for. You know, they are having to answer for the fact that they are a threat to liberal democracy. So I think, actually, we are sort of in a much better, I wouldn't say golden age of journalism. But, journalism traditionally has really responded incredibly well showing signs that there is life in it. Yet it hasn't sort of waved the white flag.

When you use social media, you're looking at yourself in the mirror. I mean how you consume it and how you see it is a reflection of you. If you want, you know, to use social media because it is a snapshot and it is just one avenue of a very complex mosaic, then fine. But as an echo chamber, then it's a real problem. I mean, I've got teenage kids, I asked them (their dad is a broadcaster): "Where do you get your news?". They get it from Snapchat.

Facebook is like, you know, that is like hieroglyphics. [...] It is kind of this, you know, instantly consumable. There is a bit of Kim Kardashian and then there is a bit on Syria, then they have a bit on the migrant crisis. So again, it's just a sort sweet shop of which they can, you know, get serious stuff but then they just have a little bit of you know a dog skate-boarding. So that's really a worry for future generations who are just don't see this kind of thing of mainstream media or anything for them. I mean you know what happens when Facebook commissions or Google decides that it is going to open news bureaus all over the world. You can just get your news, unvetted news, and that is what is scary.

David Patrikarakos' Highlights



Writer and Journalist

David Patrikarakos is the author of 'War in 140 Characters: How Social Media is Reshaping Conflict in the 21st Century' and 'Nuclear Iran: the Birth of an Atomic State'. He is a contributing editor at the Daily Beast, and a contributing writer at Politico. He has written for the New York Times, Financial Times, Wall Street Journal, and many other publications. He is also a Non-resident Fellow at St Andrews University and Poynter Fellow at Yale University.

The genesis of my book [War in 140 characters] evolves from the year I spent in Ukraine covering the war between Russia and Ukraine, and I also look at ISIS and I look at Hamas-Israel. The profile of a young girl called Farrah Baker, who during 2014, you know, became a source of information coming out of Gaza, because, you know, she was literally stuck right in the centre of things, she could not escape. Through her, you did get documented; sort of day by day, hour by hour, minute by minute documentation of the war or at least a part of the war from one side of the war. And that is correct. But what we have to understand is, you know, I often talk about what Evgeny Morozov termed 'Cyber Utopianism', which is this idea in the beginning that give a man or woman access to the internet and it will set them free and it will empower them and it will democratise things and, to a degree, for a while that's true. But in the end, the tools used by the oppressed will always become used by the oppressor and the state.


Propaganda is as old as war itself. There is nothing new about propaganda. But, traditionally propaganda operations in the media have supported military operations on the ground. What I was seeing in somewhere like Ukraine was military operations on the ground supporting propaganda operations inside this place. Simply put, because, the goal of Vladimir Putin was not a military one. [...] Putin never had any intention of militarily defeating Ukraine. What he did was he sent in troops to clear out a space just to allow the free flow of propaganda to disunite the country and social media was absolutely critical to that. So look, it is not a zero-sum game. Rageh is right when he says "baby out with the bathwater," we cannot do that. But having looked at this, having looked all these conflicts on balance, now two

things: First of all, democratic states are always behind authoritarian states because they are not constrained by the same democratic norms of that. [...] But you set up a troll farm in London or New York, give it a month, it'll be exposed. All right, Putin, how many times has the troll farm been exposed? Doesn't matter, he's not accountable to the media. So that is one thing, we are always going to be behind the second thing: the technology is always increasing. Now, for example, you know we have Russian interference in the US elections.

The genie is out of the bottle. Now, Facebook has problems. You know, five years ago [when] you thought Facebook; you thought puppies, cats and likes. Now, you think Russian meddling. Facebook realises this. Look, whoever spent an hour on social media and got off feeling better about the world? You know, this is a problem. We get anywhere from body image to bullying all the way to propaganda and fake news. You talk about this thing you know we were sold this thing like "Oh my God! We get all this content and it's all for free." But it wasn't for free was it? This is my point. [...] I always say this: the person that invented social media, great. The people that invented the language around social media, genius. Why is it called social media, when it actually is not really particularly social? Why is it called a news feed, when it does not really consist of news? But the greatest of all is 'platform'. Now, 'platform' is a wonderful word. It has this very neutral connotation of this place that we all stand up, we have a little chinwag, but these are not platforms. These are businesses and they are designed to make money and their product. What is their product? It is us. And this means two things: One, it doesn't want to kick people off its service. The second thing is that it wants to keep us on for

as long as possible. And here we know all about the famous algorithms, but where this is dangerous and this was picking up on the point made by the guys here. It is the fact that this is how you exacerbate hatreds. You know, 20 years ago we would watch a war, Arab-Israeli [war] let us say for the sake of argument. There would be pro-Arab, pro-Israelis, but they would both watch the same content coming out of BBC, CNN, ITV whatever and this content would be created by professional journalists, photographers, cameramen and whatever. They would then draw their own conclusions. They would still be reading from the same reality. Now, flick though to 2014, Operation Protective Edge, Hamas-Israeli [war]; Israeli researcher Giled Lotame mapped out a graph of nodes about where each side got their information from. It looked like pro-Palestine, one cluster, pro-Israel another cluster. Only Haaretz, the left leaning Israeli magazine, was the only point of overlap. Now, what we have here is two realities, two realities that mean that if Rageh is pro-Israel and I'm pro-Palestine or vice versa. We can't sit down and say "listen, you are wrong." It's like "no, you're a liar. I've seen it I've read it, I've heard it. You are a liar." Thus, hatred is exacerbated; division is exacerbated. [...] They refuse to accept that their content providers because then they have to pay because they are a business.

The problem is again though is the nature of the platform. So, we start with like Facebook and Twitter, these are platforms that reward sensationalism and work away from nuance. Now, Twitter allows you to say now two sentence instead of one. The truth is nuanced. So you know you can tweet "all immigrants are rapists" and it's just sensationalist. And the truth is, if you want to look at immigration, there are positives, but no one wants to hear that. You know, Twitter is not designed for this. You know the most depressing thing on Facebook is seeing "see more" and it is opening in another window. No one wants to read your 8-paragraph status. And what we're doing now is we're seeing the young gravitate first of all from Facebook to Twitter. So, we go from somewhere you can at least write a paragraph to somewhere you can only write a couple. Now to Instagram and Snapchat which is almost post-literate, it's just images. So, actually we are looking at platforms that reward the sensation. That's why Donald Trump is the first social media president. People say Obama was, because he used it to fundraise. But he's not. Obama you remember the speeches, Trump you remember the tweets. That is why Twitter, a very short medium that rewards the sensational and the charisma of certainty, is perfect for Trump. Twitter is unique in what it allows Trump to do.



Seventh Session

Closing Ranks: International Cooperation Against Terrorism



- What kind of international mechanisms does the world need for the global fight against terrorism?
- What are the prospects of reaching a workable, non-elusive definition of terrorism accepted by the international community?
- Is there anything new about terrorism in the post-Daesh era?
- Is it possible to create international mechanisms to curb state-sponsored terrorism?

Summary of the Session

“Closing Ranks: International Cooperation against Terrorism” brought together experts on non-state actors and discussed the difficulties of curbing terrorism worldwide. The speakers attempted to address the causes of terrorism and the various types of extremist organisations associated with it. They pointed out various ways in which terrorism can be addressed: ranging from military force to more subtle attempts to de-radicalise terrorists by considering their motivations. They also considered the harsh yet true reality that often nation-states can be complicit in facilitating non-state actors, which serve their interests, at the expense of the broader security of the international order. Ultimately, greater international cooperation was deemed necessary to eliminate terrorism, along with attempts to come to a definition of it, which serves the interests of the whole international community, and not merely a small section.

There is a component of individuality that comes with the participants of terrorist activities, as each different group and member maintains a different agenda. Therefore, this makes it difficult for nation-states and intelligentsia to come with a universal definition and understanding of terrorism. Ufuk Ulutaş broke down the concept of terrorism into three categories during the discussion; he associated terrorists as historically being psychopaths, pragmatists with a personal agenda, and perpetrators of a certain ideology. Additionally, according to Robert Fox, a form of mental synchronisation exists amongst terrorists along with antisocial traits. The discussion then underscored the lack of international cooperation that exists to curtail terrorist organisations. One example given by Burhanettin Duran was

US support to the YPG, a PKK extension in Syria, which enables a more persistent terrorist threat in the region.

During the panel, Peter Van Praagh reiterated Robert Fox’s remarks on the individual characteristic of each terror group, for instance, the dissimilarity that exists between PKK and Daesh. Turkey’s role was also appreciated to mitigate terrorist activities within the backdrop of constant terror attacks that took place in the country two years ago. It was also argued that international actors must accompany themselves with a basic understanding of terrorism, as Ali Asghar Soltanieh pointed out that there is common ground between major states in condemning terrorism, but a lack of understanding of what terrorism really is. The discussion between Peter Van Praagh and Ali Asghar Soltanieh also highlighted the sponsorship of terror groups throughout history by various state and non-state actors.

As the session followed closing remarks, it was emphasised that in the long run terrorist organisations can be degraded and diminished, but their activities cannot be obliterated. Undoubtedly the divisive political structures in weak states are an incubation ground for non-state actors to participate within the fragile environment. Similarly, the changing nature of warfare was stressed upon; from cyber warfare, to the usage of Artificial Intelligence for autonomous weapons, and biological implications that come with chemical weapons. As a result, the evolutionary factor that terror-groups and activities follow cannot be undermined and must be looked into as dynamics of warfare change over the course of time.

Robert Fox's Highlights



Defence Editor at the Evening Standard

Robert Fox is the Defence Editor at the Evening Standard and has been a journalist and writer for 50 years, having worked previously for the BBC and Daily Telegraph. He has extensive experience reporting from conflict zones around the world including Iraq and Afghanistan. He is a Senior Associate Fellow at the Centre for Defence Studies at Kings College London and an Honorary Fellow at Exeter University's Strategy and Security Institute where he teaches on defence and security studies.

Why does somebody, who has gone to school, university, or even a high achiever, drop out and become a complete antisocial? By antisocial, I mean, an associative maladaptive is the psychological categorisation of Mohamed Atta who led the attacks on 9/11. I have been through probably nearer a dozen, [more] than half a dozen terrorist campaigns. Close friends in journalism have been victims. Two things are going to make this discussion very difficult. One: these cases are highly individual. It is highly individual how the perpetrator of the attack as you rightly mentioned in Manchester came into that. There is also, which I think can help us out, a discrete culture. There is a subset of mental language and each terrorist movement has its code and they know how to communicate in that code. And what you do is, you don't just look at the perpetrator, you look at the code. There are ways of looking at it now because as you have been hearing in previous sessions, things like the internet, big data, but above all social media, can help us give clues. But what you cannot legislate for about being a journalist for 51 years, you cannot tell why that particular person and oddly it's generally more a man than a girl will suddenly flip and become a terrorist. Quick definition of terrorism: it has to have a component of a greed just outrageous ethical attack on innocent civilian people by surprise. It is that ethical component.

There is a terrible tendency to say when you see an egregious act against your national interest and call it terrorism. That is too easy. That is sloppy thinking. I actually think the UN could do more about working on terrorism because, as we say down on the farm in Somerset: "if you can't make the cow go through that, you work around and you pull it through." The fact is that there are instruments, conventions of genocide of crimes against humanity. And you attach it into that because I don't think you're going to get a

pure rubric. The convention against terrorism; it is an aspiration rather than instruction, but it can be done. Point two: I think that you have raised a huge question and the ambassador quite rightly, international cooperation. Yes, you can, and you must encourage it. But if there's one thing I've learned watching it in several countries, as with the nature of the terrorist, they are particularly individual, they attain to a particular culture, whether it's Daesh, whether it is the extreme end of Taliban suicide bombers or whether there's something particular there.

What you will get with counterterrorism, you will get selfish interest and the collective interest. There are nations involved in this, like my own, will guard very closely their own national approach and strategy to this and they will not give much of it away. Very quickly, why the Brits found it very difficult to testify against Liebig and Karadzic at the Hague in the International Court was because they didn't want to give away their counterterror [strategies]. I'm not saying those two were necessarily terrorists, but their counterterror techniques of surveillance which they used against the IRA, they still use it by the way. So, you're going to have national interest, self-interest, and then you will have a shared culture and that's the way in which you could do it. Now the Brits have got quite an elaborate counterterrorist procedure. They've got a thing called the "Prevent Strategy" which I think is far too restrictive on civil liberties and particularly intellectual liberties of children. By the way and they've also got modes of operation with a joint antiterrorist analysis committee which has been incredibly successful in following them.

I'm part of a cell at King's College London which is dealing with 'nonobvious warfare'. It's not a term that's generally used, but it should be used. Artificial Intelligence (AI) is go-

ing to change things so much because one of the things that we were looking at was autonomous weapons. That is something you could leave at, it would generate and cause a catastrophic effect to act on its own in the hand of a malign terrorist group. I will give you two others which we didn't go into too much detail and they're going to come by

the end of the century. Terrorist groups, we found this with al-Qaida in Afghanistan, are interested in chemical [weapons]. Chemical [warfare] is very worrying. More worrying is biological because you can then go further and get into things like genetic warfare. These are other things that we have to think about.

Ufuk Ulutaş's Highlights



Chairman of the Center for Strategic Research

Ulutaş served as the Middle East Program Coordinator at SETA Foundation's Washington DC office and as a founding board member at the Mogadishubased Heritage Institute for Policy Studies. He worked at the SETA Foundation as the Director of Foreign Policy Studies and lectured at the Social Sciences University of Ankara's Department of International Relations as an assistant professor. He is currently the Chairman of the Center for Strategic Research (SAM) at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

All of the actors, all of the militants who join ISIS are different and there are different reasons for why they're there. My major categorisation of the main motivation for the participation of the ISIS militants were threefold actually. The first one [category] are the psychopaths. I mean those who dealt with petty crimes in their past history. In their previous lives, they were either involved in petty crimes like bank robbery, especially if you look at those you know perpetrators in European capitals, you would find it of criminal activities in their previous lives, either bank robberies, rape, distortion, these kinds of crimes. They are just transferring their experience from their past psychopathic life to ISIS and giving probably a new trick, new meaning to what they have been doing. ISIS was a kind of a scene where they can act their previous performances in any setting. And the second group are most of pragmatists. I mean they have other agendas, and ISIS is just giving them a tool to achieve their own goals. These pragmatists were especially those who were either in Syria or in Iraq in order to reach their own local personal goals, personal objectives. They worked with ISIS and they participated in ISIS. The third and I think the most dangerous part was the ideological core: who believed in the ideology and who believed in almost everything written by the past Salafi jihadist; their method of fighting against 'infidels'. They saw themselves in a kind of a cosmic role. At the end of the day, they want to redeem themselves through the work that they

have been doing in their own societies. Now, it was time to carry those activities into a new setting in Iraq and in Syria. These are I think the most critical components of all different types of militants who join ISIS, because of the fact that there are going to be the most resilient ones. The others can take part from the ISIS organisation, but those who are in line with the ISIS ideology, for years, who were indoctrinated with the ISIS ideology, tried to apply almost everything that the pamphlet that you mentioned, the management of savagery, the guidebook of the ISIS back at the time who applied all those points in their lives. It is very difficult to de-radicalise them. It is going to be our biggest challenge from now on.

I think we are overemphasising the importance of finding a common definition for terrorism, because the real problem is not finding a definition. The real problem is putting that definition into practice. Now, I think PKK is a great case in that sense. The PKK is designated as a terrorist organisation by the United States, by the European Union as well as the UK and Turkey. But when it comes to practice, as we have seen in Syria, the practice may be different than the designation.

The statistics may be misleading. And those kinds of statistics have misled us before. I mean during the Iraq War,

for example between 2007 and 2009, when the US Army came out and said “the mission is completed we won the war against the radicals in Iraq the al Qaeda in Iraq is down,” and regained the territory back from the al-Qaida in Iraq. It took only two years for al-Qaida in Iraq to come back with a different package; with the creation of ISIS, new methods with a bigger population and controlling a bigger portion

of the land in both Syria and Iraq. Of course, ISIS has been degraded due to several military operations against ISIS in both countries. You can degrade terrorist organisations using military means, but you cannot obliterate them. In order to obliterate them there has to be some simultaneous political social tracks, which also should include a reconstruction period.

Burhanettin Duran's Highlights



Professor at Ibn Haldun University and General Coordinator of SETA Foundation

Burhanettin Duran is a professor at Ibn Haldun University and General Coordinator of SETA Foundation. Prior to this, he held various academic positions including Assistant Professor at Sakarya University and Visiting Scholar at George Mason University. In 2013, he became head of the Department of Political Science and International Relations at İstanbul Şehir University. He has also worked as a professor at the Ankara Social Sciences University and is the author of several articles and books.

For the case of PKK: this organisation is an ethnic separatist movement and Turkey is fighting with this terrorist organisation in the last 40 years and actually lost many people, 40,000 people, in this fight. When it comes to evaluate the factors that Turkey did not prevent this terrorist organisation attacking Turkey, actually it is because of Turkey's unstable, insecure neighbourhood. In Turkey, we separate this issue into three parts: one part is security; another part is an identity issue; and another one, ethnic separatist movement, a terrorist movement. In terms of economic warfare and security issues, domestically it is okay, but for identity issues in the last 10 years, Turkey made many things, many achievements in that regard. But when it comes to fighting with terrorism you have to cooperate. You should receive cooperation from your neighbours and internationally. But, when you look at just in 1997 the US listed PKK as a terrorist organisation. And thanks to the political consciousness that was created after 9/11 there was a fight against terrorism in a cooperative manner by our allies. But today, we face an enormous threat coming from the US support to YPG, a branch of PKK terrorist organisation in Syria. When you do not get enough international support even from your allies, it's not easy to face this terrorist organisation.

There are arms coming from Washington to PKK and we still face this threat on our borders. That is the basic explanation for the continuation of PKK terrorism.

Istanbul is as safe as London and Paris are. After the 2015-16 bombings, Turkey started to follow a new policy of security, dealing with security and combating with terrorism beyond its borders. After 2016, Turkey has conducted two operations: the Euphrates Shield operation and Olive Branch operations, as well as in the conflict zones in Idlib. These three operations are actually the manifestations of Turkey's will to face these terrorist activities beyond the borders. For example, regarding Daesh, Turkey has killed more than 2,000 Daesh militants. More than 5,000 suspected militants were arrested and more than 50,000 people were deported from Turkish lands. So, this strong will to fight with terrorism helped, of course, for peace and, at the same time, to lead some reconstruction abilities in northern Syria meaning Azaz, Jarabulus, and later in Afrin, to settle Syrian refugees there. At the same time, you should think of Turkey's ability to secure these refugees both domestically and to separate them from other militants. There is a great task for Turkey in Idlib and to face this reality is something that, and I believe that, Turkey will achieve completely.

Peter van Praagh's Highlights



President of the Halifax International Security Forum

Peter Van Praagh is the President of the Halifax International Security Forum. He has served as Senior Director for Foreign Policy at the Washington DC-based German Marshall Fund of the United States, Deputy Vice President of Programs at the National Endowment for Democracy in Washington DC, and Chief of Party for the National Democratic Institute both in the former Soviet Union and in Turkey. From 2006-07, Peter served as Senior Policy Advisor to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada.

I do want to congratulate Turkey on its anti-terrorism measures. You mentioned the Reina nightclub in your opening remarks. There was also the attack at the airport. There has been attacks outside of a football stadium and also in mass gatherings. You'll notice that it has been almost two years since a major terrorist attack in Turkey and that is not because there are no terrorists, it is because of the Turkish security forces who are doing an outstanding job keeping Turks and keeping visitors to this incredible country safe and that is something that everybody needs to understand, including people from the West who don't always understand the specific challenges that Turkey is facing.

I'd like to echo remarks made by Robert earlier which is, each case has to be looked at individually if you look at Daesh that is much different than PKK which is much different than the Taliban which is much different than you mention the IRA or ETA. All of these are terrorist organisations, and all of these have different, Robert used the word "codes", but they have different (in French) *raison d'être*, a reason for being and trying to understand all of them I think is very important, but also to understand that you're never going to understand. There is no justification for terrorism. It is something that has to be not allowed in any type of international structures. It just has to be all nation states, all international organisations do have to have a baseline understanding of terrorism and the images that you described, Maria, are exactly the images that terrorists use to gain fear into the population, which is the ultimate goal. It is also important for people here and others to know that terrorism is on the decline. Terrorism declined. It is declining in 2018, it declined in 2017, it declined in 2016, it declined in 2015, the peak year for global terrorism was 2014. So, something is working, and I think it's important.

Understanding what drives the terrorists, I think, has increased over time and that approaches have been changed since the initial 9/11 attacks which sparked what was called the global 'War on Terror'. In regards to American support for the Kurds in Syria who were fighting ISIS. First of all, every nation makes mistakes. The United States makes mistakes and because the United States is a very big country when it makes mistakes, it makes big mistakes. The support for this is true. The support for fighters inside Syria is not and was not intended to support separatist movement PKK terrorists. That is the result, but that was not the intent. The intent was to use an available force to kill Daesh fighters. I believe that Turkey has a legitimate concern and a legitimate gripe against the United States on this specific issue. And I know that conversations are ongoing but it's important to know that the United States is not intending to support PKK separatism from Turkey that's not the intent, the intent was fundamentally to fight ISIS.

When we talk about what drives a terrorist, there are some terrorists who are for hire. There are some terrorists who are ideologically driven. Again, it's different in every case. I do think, as we are defining and trying to find a global definition for terrorism, it is important to know that to get at the root cause is these are officially non-state actors, but there is the role of state diplomacy and state intervention, state to state, to stop these things. In the opinion of the US government at this time, Iran sponsors terrorism and as a result of that it is taking state measures to try to change Iran's behaviour. And that is the opinion of the US and it's verbalised in a way that is probably not as diplomatic as other past presidents have. And by the way the policy hasn't changed drastically. They have pulled out of a deal, but issues related to US-Iran relations are not a secret to anybody in this room.

Ali Asghar Soltanieh's Highlights



Iran's Former Permanent Representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency

Ali Asghar Soltanieh is a nuclear scientist, university professor and former diplomat with 38 years of experience in international relations and diplomacy. He was the Director of Nuclear Research Centre of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran (AEOI) between 1980 and 1990. From 1996 to 1999, he served as Advisor to the Foreign Minister of the Islamic Republic of Iran and has twice served as Iran's ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) (1982-1987 & 2006-2013).

We need international mobilisation for this deplorable phenomenon, which is expanding. Unfortunately, while there is a consensus condemning the terrorists, there is no consensus on a definition of terrorism. The United Nations is not doing its job even just to work out some sort of definition for terrorism and also to work on its root cause. We can understand that poverty, discrimination, military invasions, these are all breeding terrorism, because one bloodshed will create more bloodshed. As a nuclear scientist, in nu-

clear fission reaction one neutron starts, and then billions of neutrons, and then we have huge energy for reactors or a nuclear bomb. We have also global terrorism chain reaction. It means one terrorist act could bring another terrorist because of hatred, because of many other consequences. In fact, we have to also look to a historical moment when it is thought that we are paying the price right now in the region by Daesh. Daesh is a chain reaction creation of what they did 20 years ago because of hatred, therefore, there is, unfortunately, no consensus on the definition.

Unfortunately, while there is a consensus condemning the terrorists, there is no consensus on a definition of terrorism. The United Nations is not doing its job even just to work out some sort of definition for terrorism and also to work on its root cause.

Regarding sanctions, sanctions are also economic terrorism. Since I worked on the United Nations convention against corruption, sanctions create corruption because it means that you, the recipient, as supporters, as importers and exporters should circumvent the regular regulations for exporting and also financial transactions. It creates corruption. US is violating this convention which 186 countries are party to it.

I do not think we cannot distort history. Our leader is the victim of terrorism for more than 30 years. 17,000 Iranian children and women have been victims of terrorism. I gave these documents to the United Nations when I was ambassador in Vienna and they were all committed by MEK [People's Mujahedin of Iran], a terrorist group harboured and supported by United States. Recently the Trump administration have supported them to use them for a so-called regime change. But of course, there are others giving their words for a war against terrorism, but we took action. You can see many funerals in Iran of people that are massacred and killed by Daesh and beheaded, and we are having a funeral in Iran. Therefore, we take action. This is a time to have international cooperation, an international forum to

work together against these phenomena and also require real action.

Rather than the US hiring a terrorist group to combat the Soviet Union, they could have raised this in the United Na-

tions. The United Nations is to find out how we could act against an invasion and other countries. Therefore, this was a wrong way from the beginning.



Eighth Session

Fostering Global Consciousness in Times of Crisis



- Are there workable mechanisms for re-establishing security and the rule of law in post-conflict societies?
- How can we harness the momentum from painful events that have gone viral in mass communication outlets?
- How can humanitarian workers, social justice and peace activists harness public empathy generated by these events in order to produce real change?
- What role does the international community, individual states and civil society have in fostering global consciousness?

Summary of the Session

“Fostering Global Consciousness in Times of Crisis” expanded on this year’s Forum’s theme of increased international cooperation, and the adoption of collective solutions rather than competitive ones. The panellists spoke on the importance of various institutions, humanitarian organisations, the media, and even individuals in alleviating poverty and combating systematic and widespread injustices. In addition, they highlighted the importance of state participation in this process and of their working in tandem with worldwide humanitarian organisations.

The fragmented aspect of the today’s global order was analysed and put forward by the Director General and Chairman of TRT, İbrahim Eren. Holding onto the theme of collective action to ensure human security, İbrahim Eren emphasised the purpose of establishing TRT World; with its central mission to produce human stories with a balanced approach. In similar regard, Francesco Rocca emphasised the importance of how the migrants are portrayed by the media and how their human stories deserve to be told in a true and refined fashion, away from the dehumanising element that most politicians pursue.

As the panellists proceeded with their discussions, the shared approach by various international players was highlighted, especially with

regards to the ongoing refugee crisis around the world. Borge Brende in this retrospect put forth Turkey’s accommodation of 4 million refugees, along with German and Scandinavian countries who have hosted refugees based on their population proportion. It was further stressed that the root-causes of such patterns shall be looked into along with creating opportunities for younger generations who are the victims of various conflict-ridden societies. Pierre Krahenbuhl accommodated similar prospects by suggesting opportunities to be provided to young men and women, allowing them to nurture their future.

In this regard, creating the right environment becomes necessary and key powerful political players hold responsibility to restart a course of action to address humanitarian issues. Conflicts are not just fuelled by local actors but also by external players, and accountability at all fronts becomes necessary. The discussants argued amongst these prospects and how the changing world dynamic amongst key-players should also accommodate policies towards emerging economies in order to provide balanced opportunities for every individual as a whole.

İbrahim Eren's Highlights



Director General and Chairman of TRT

İbrahim Eren is the Director General and Chairman of TRT. Prior to joining TRT, Mr. Eren worked in executive positions for several companies in the technology and media sectors. Beginning his career at Bogazici Group, he founded Who Pictures, which operates internationally in the fields of documentary and animation. He also served as General Manager of ATV Europe and Deputy General Manager of ATV, an independent Non-Executive Director at Türk Telekomünikasyon A.S. and as a member of board of Directors at Euronews.

Last year, the Forum highlighted the challenges the world has been facing for some time, and the subject was "Inspiring Change in an Age of Uncertainty". Little has changed since the last year and this year forum team is on the question of fragmentation because the world is fragmented today more than ever. The international community fails to effectively address the most fundamental issues of our time. And then, this leads to deepening the problems of injustice, inequality, cruelty and discrimination across the world. So, call for justice are becoming louder, yet there is no mechanism to deliver that justice. The United Nations, which is charged with addressing these issues, falls short of fulfilling the demands. Conflicts, wars, and terrorism are producing millions of refugees. Xenophobia, hatred, Islamophobia are forcing us to question if mutual understanding and ideals ever existed in the first place.

The need to develop a collective response to our shared issues is desperately becoming more apparent. With this in mind, fostering global consciousness is very important. So, the first step is placing the notion of human security at the top of our agenda. And we believe that it is not just TRT World, but everyone's responsibility to find a solution to diverse problems on all levels, and media networks also have a large share of the responsibility. As Malcolm X once did say: "the media is the most powerful entity on earth. They have the power to make the innocent guilty and to make the guilty innocent. And that is power because they control the minds of the masses."

Of course, the media has transformed. New forms of media and platforms we have seen now exist. But still the mainstream media, the TV and other media is the first source of news consumption. And so we thought that to be TRT

World's responsibility, because we think that media outlets should be responsible for images which are very powerful and can make global headlines, define narratives and move leaders to take action. And we have two concrete examples in the last two years, one of which is Aylan Kurdi in Aegean Sea and the second one is Omran Daqneesh in Aleppo.

Without differentiating ethnicity, religion or region, we place human at the centre of our media coverage. We thought that human life is more important than anything else. Sometimes I give the example that if you, as a journalist or as a cameraman, when you are in the field see a position that you'd like to shoot that scene; but, if the person is in danger and you have to help, then you drop the camera [...] this is the first training that we gave to cameraman in the first phase. It is a different approach from, I think, all the other news outlets. And for this reason, to have such collective understanding in the newsroom, we initiated a platform called TRT World Citizen. We are making humanitarian aid not by the public sources, by the source of the TRT World employees, but the main idea was to integrate the editorial guidelines we have with the life, the people that work for the TRT World. So, like our Syria coverage, let's say, has centred mostly on the stories and lives of the refugees and their obstacles as opposed to political calculations.

Ghida Fakhry (Moderator): So, can it be done completely objectively devoid of this political calculation?

İbrahim Eren: At TRT World I don't use the word objective, I use the word balanced. Because you can't be objective as a human being. There is sometimes right to do and you are trying to be just balanced rather than being objective.

Francesco Rocca's Highlights



President of International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Francesco Rocca is the President of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. He served as Vice- President (Europe) from 2013 to 2017, and was the Italian Red Cross representative on the IFRC Governing Board from 2009-2013. Prior to this, he had a distinguished career with the Italian Red Cross, first as its Head of Emergency Operations in 2008 and its Extraordinary Commissioner before being appointed National President of the Italian Red Cross Association in 2017.

The way many media are depicting the migrants at this moment is a way that is stealing their story, their dignity. When you label a person only as irregular, this means that you are forgetting intentionally what they are fleeing from, that they are human beings with a story, with their own feeling of belonging to a country that they were forced to flee. Of course, the media are following the politicians many times.

When it is only treated as a security and dehumanising problem, this is increasing the threat. It is not the problem that we normally face, when you treat and deal with the problem of the people, this lead us to simplify the dynamics at social level. I think that is the way the Western countries and Europe, in particular, are approaching these phenomena is just starting from the word that they started to call it an "emergency", denying that it was a phenomenon. And I want to give you just an example that I often use in my humanitarian experience. I started to be a volunteer in Italy more than 30 years ago dealing with people who were fleeing the Horn of Africa. After 30 years in Europe, we are receiving people fleeing from the North Africa. This shows how big the failure of the international community is in dealing with this crisis. This is a matter of fact that is undeniable.

I think one of our biggest responsibilities as a humanitarian organisation is to be accountable. Accountable to our donors, accountable to those who we serve. I immediately worked with my colleagues to increase our policies for having a zero tolerance on fraud and corruption which is a top priority for us in dealing with at all levels, at the Geneva level but also on the ground. We cannot be forgiven if we waste our only one Euro for what we are doing to save those in need. The other point, which we are working on, is to have zero tolerance on sexual abuse and harassment.

In addition to this, the partnership of the private sector is extremely important. I think that we would love to fill the gap between the continued statements that we hear from the leaders all over the world about taking care of the refugees, the action on the field and the policies that they are setting up at national level. This is the biggest reason for all concerns. Because if any political leader or global leader really followed what they always stated in every arena or podium that they normally use with concrete action, maybe many crises would be fixed.

I think that humanitarian aid is not enough; dignity is something more. Many of these people do not have any possibility or opportunity to work; not because there is no commitment, but because it does not give them enough opportunities. So, I wonder if the global finance is enough, now time to let this economy grow. Because we have to create new opportunity for a country that is hosting many people, in Turkey, now they reached 3 million. You need that economy to grow. It is not only about rice or chicken and food.

We tried to respond to emergencies. But what we do need in this moment in the world is to increase the cultural awareness about human security. Our first principle is humanity but what I mean from humanity, as you touched, human security. This is extremely important, more than the national security. If our leaders, our politicians will restart in dealing with the word humanity, I think we really could have a better world.

Børge Brende's Highlights



President of the World Economic Forum

Børge Brende is President of the World Economic Forum. He previously served as the Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Minister of Trade and Industry and Minister of the Environment. He also served as Deputy Chairman of the Norwegian Conservative Party and as a member of the Norwegian Parliament for more than ten years. Alongside parliamentary roles, he held the roles of Chairman of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development and Secretary-General of the Norwegian Red Cross.

On the larger refugee issue, we have now around 65 million people that are refugees globally that we all have a responsibility to deal with. But, at the same time, I would say that there are a lot of crises globally, but also as Her Majesty Queen Rania underlined, we also have seen progress in many areas during the last decades. We also know that we really can make a huge difference if we collaborate and pull together. That is why, for example, the sustainable development goals by 2030 are eradicating all extreme poverty. This is possible, but it is not possible if we do not work together. [...] I think we also have to recognise that many European countries have taken big responsibility when it comes to receiving refugees. Let's not forget that Germany received a million. We have also seen the Scandinavian countries, Sweden received many hundreds of thousands.

Besides, as addressed here, we cannot solve this problem without going to the root causes and the root causes are proxy conflicts. The root cause is poverty, illiteracy and all this has to be dealt also when it comes to creating opportunities for younger generation. And if we don't step up to a 'Marshall Plan', when it comes to investment and creating the right conditions for development in Africa, those problems are not African problems. These are global problems and not at least European problems so we have just seen the tip of the iceberg.

When there is an acute crisis, we have to rely on the humanitarian organisations, they should be also sufficiently financed, of course. But when you are building back or you have a recovery phase, I think we can also rely more on the private sector. But we would have been better off giving the people cash so we could have still kept some of the infrastructure, food production which is local. We know

that illicit financial flows are a big problem. We also know that corruption is a huge problem, for example, twenty-five percent of the GDP just disappears in some countries because of the corruption. Totally unacceptable, we should be much tougher.

I think education is a prerequisite for development and especially among the young. And there are still 17 million children today that don't go to school. I think this cannot continue. We have to really make sure that we don't lose additional generations. And for me also education for girls is so important. Educated girls if they are in school, marrying later they also have a tendency to then be working. And, of course, then, you also can increase the level of welfare in your society if more people do take part in the workforce.

I think we are in many ways at the crossroads globally these days. Are we going to continue to believe in a win-win world? Are we going to live in a world where we also would like to include emerging economies in the global economy? Or are we going to choose another path that will create the same kind of opportunities?

Pierre Krähenbühl's Highlights



Commissioner-General of UNRWA

Pierre Krähenbühl has served as the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA) since March 2014 and has over 27 years of experience in humanitarian, human rights and development work. Previously, he served as Director of Operations at the International Committee of the Red Cross (2012-2014) and directly oversaw the organization's response to conflicts in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Colombia and Libya.

Whenever I travel around the world, I think about how one can best communicate for what it means today to be a Palestinian refugee. And what does it mean for a community to have been in a refugee situation for seven decades. Over the entire period since the end of World War Two, Palestinian refugees have been refugees. And I think one of the incredibly important issues is to deeply and resolutely refuse anonymity in suffering during the conflict because the reality is that human beings are at the heart of conflicts. And I cannot accept that one reduces the victims to precisely numbers and statistics. It is a way of paying tribute to the individuals to not forget the humanity that lies at the heart of their circumstances. This is probably one of the most important tasks that we have collectively. Otherwise, it makes the distance with which we may look at conflicts far too easy and it may even lead us to greater inaction over time.

The decision that was taken by the United States to cut funding to UNRWA was taken for political reasons. All funding to Palestinian related issues, including the funding to UNRWA which is sincerely said quite unprecedented in my experience in terms of politicisation of humanitarian aid. This is exactly what should be prevented. One should not pursue political objectives with humanitarian funding. That is a very key issue.

And therefore, I think it is absolutely correct to expect that every single member state of the United Nations should contribute. I want to pay tribute here in Turkey to the Turkish efforts, very remarkable, but also Gulf countries Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Kuwait have each contributed 50 million per country in this time of crisis. So, I really want to signal that, both, it is a time of existential crises, but there has also been a collective mobilisation that is quite remarkable.

I think the partnerships are at all levels, of course, there is a state responsibility, because we receive the mandate from the General Assembly so states have a real stake in UNRWA as part of the multilateral system. Much of what we have inherited after World War Two as global frameworks, institutions, references whether

it's the UN Charter, the Human Rights Declaration, the Geneva Conventions or the refugee conventions are under assault and being questioned very severely.

I think we really need to redevelop the consciousness around the rejection of the notion that wars are inevitable. It is just too simple to tolerate the idea when you see the human consequences of them. We give in to this notion that wars are inevitable much too easily. And I think it needs for us to rediscover that, at the end of the day, conflicts are solved by talking to one another. And much more should be invested in conflict resolution, rather than in conflict management. As I always say, you can manage the Israel-Palestine conflict forever and you will have UNRWA forever in that equation. Put energies into resolving the conflict and we can create a different horizon for Palestinians, for Israelis, for everyone in the region and in particular for Palestine refugees.

Ghida Fakhry (Moderator): What kind of actions would you like to see taken to deal proactively with the issue of Palestinian refugees?

Pierre Krähenbühl: It is to resolve the conflict between Israel and Palestine but not just to pay lip service. We go to international meetings and people will pledge their renewed allegiance to the two state solution. But I can pledge my allegiance to world peace. It means nothing if I do not act on it. Surely, a collective remobilisation on the political solution is required. My biggest discovery when joining UNRWA after 20 years with the International Red Cross was not so much about the emergency side of work. The food distributions, the medical assistance things that you normally associate with an armed conflict. It was the education. [There are] 526,000 boys and girls in UNRWA education system from Aleppo to Rafah in Gaza. This is something which allows you to not look at the person only as a victim of violence and dispossession but also as an actor of his or her own destiny. And there is nothing more powerful than to be able to give these young boys and girls a horizon a prospect and something that can allow them to meet with their aspirations.

Closed Sessions



As part of the TRT World Forum 2018, 11 closed sessions were held parallel to the public sessions with participating politicians, policy makers, officials, journalists and leading global experts on politics and security from over 20 countries and various backgrounds.

The purpose of the closed sessions was to promote in-depth and intellectually engaging discussions on “Envisioning Peace and Security in a Fragmented World” by examining developments in the MENA region, the US, EU, China and Turkey, as well as the role of emerging economies, new media, and developments in international terrorism and security.

The closed sessions were based on Chatham House Rules and were held as private round-table discussions, conducted off the record, allowing speakers and participants to freely use the information received. Attendance was by invitation only, and the sessions involved 2-3 speakers and 20-25 distinguished participants. The sessions were run for 90 minutes; each speaker was allocated 10 minutes followed by 60 minutes of discussion with fellow participants. Members of our research team took notes to prepare and publish a conference report based on the speeches and discussions that took place. The titles of the public sessions are as follows:

- **Belt and Road Initiative and its Implications for MENA**
- **Western Mainstream Media and Coverage of the Muslim World**
- **Perpetuating or Breaking the Syrian Stalemate?**
- **Muslim Minorities in South Asia: India, Myanmar and Sri Lanka**
- **Is there a Trump Doctrine in American Foreign Policy?**
- **Activities of Terrorist Groups Abroad: FETO and PKK**
- **The Political Atmosphere in Egypt: Reconciliation or Regression?**
- **Turkey’s Security Policy: National Defence Industry and Cross Border Operations**
- **The Fate of Palestine: The Crisis Deepens**
- **Turkey’s Political Landscape under the New Presidential System**
- **Turkey’s Foreign Policy in an Age of Crises**

Belt and Road Initiative and its Implications for MENA



Summary

China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) is a comprehensive connectivity and cooperation plan that spans over three continents, representing 60% of the world's population (across 65 countries) and 30% of global GDP. It is one of the most ambitious infrastructure projects in modern history and has the potential to reconfigure and optimise global trade routes. The initiative aims to deepen and expand links between Asia, the Middle East, Europe, and Africa by recreating the ancient Silk Road trade routes through both land (the Belt) and sea (the Road). The Middle East is integral to the success of BRI, while the region holds great appeal for China. The Middle East's shipping lanes, energy resources (including more than half of the world's oil reserves), demography, and financial capacity, hold great potential for BRI stakeholders from Casablanca to Shanghai. Chinese companies continue to expand their presence in the Middle East across a wide range of industries including ports development, finance and banking, construction and infrastructure, energy projects (including petrochemicals) and, more recently, within the defence space. China has loaned and invested billions of dollars in developing countries in order to initiate BRI. China's growing economic influence, more broadly, challenges the status quo of the established order, which has hitherto been principally led by the US.

Discussion Themes of the Session:

- What are the opportunities and challenges of the Belt and Road Initiative for the Middle East?
- How will Chinese companies contribute to the various "Vision" programmes in the GCC and broader Middle East?
- Will China take on a more political- and security-oriented role in the region, as the US slowly retreats from the Middle East? Or will other players such as India and Pakistan be more important in the longer term?
- How will soft power figure within the BRI-MENA relationship?
- Several MENA countries (including Turkey and Saudi Arabia) are members of the Asian Infrastructure and Investment Bank (AIIB) – what is the significance of this? And where will the majority of financing come from for BRI-MENA infrastructure projects?
- What role will China and the BRI play in post-war reconstruction in the Middle East?

Western Mainstream Media and Coverage of the Muslim World



Summary

The focus was on the coverage of the Muslim World during the post-9/11 period that was characterised by the exacerbation of conflicts – such as the US wars in Iraq and Afghanistan – intrastate conflict in Syria, civil war in Libya and general political instability in the Muslim world. Consequently, Islam has come to be associated with violence and terror in the coverage of the Muslim world by mainstream Western media. Instead of delving into the complex historical, geopolitical, political, economic, and social dynamics underpinning the conflicts in the Middle East, Islam has been depicted as the core reason behind the prevalence of anti-modernism, exclusiveness, and hostility to outsiders. This disjunction between the roots of the current conflicts in the Muslim world and their portrayal in the mainstream Western media were discussed in this session.

Discussion Themes of the Session:

- How does western media construct the discourse of religious violence?
- How have journalism and media evolved in the post-9/11 world?
- Does the media in the Muslim world have a role to play in challenging the narratives of mainstream Western media?

Perpetuating or Breaking the Syrian Stalemate?



Summary

While the Syrian crisis is clearly a stalemate, hope for a viable solution remains. The United States, Russia and other global and regional actors have all attempted to occupy the moral high ground in defence of their various interventions. The US has framed their interventions against the Syrian regime as humanitarian intervention, while Russia has largely justified its actions as defence of the sovereignty of Syrian government and fighting terrorism. Such interventionism resulted in further entrenching of stalemate in Syria. Additionally, a wide array of non-state and sub-state internal actors have been the part of the conflict under the umbrella justification of a 'peaceful future,' highlighting the importance of civil society and armed opposition in determining war and peace. Taking into account external and internal actors in the Syrian case, this session aimed to question the dynamics of perpetuating and breaking the Syrian stalemate in the context of external and internal factors affecting the Syrian crisis.

Discussion Themes of the Session:

- Describe the attitudes of the two poles (Russia-West) in Syria.
- Explore the costs and benefits of the external interventions in Syria.
- Discuss the status of opposition and armed groups in conflict resolution and peace processes.
- Examine the possibility of a diplomatic solution for the Syrian crisis.
- Discuss Turkey's position as an effective mediator in peace talks.

Muslim Minorities in South Asia: India, Myanmar and Sri Lanka



Summary

The session aimed to discuss the issue pertaining with the Muslim Minorities of South Asia, looking closely at India, Myanmar and Sri-Lanka. Historical factors in all three societies within the framework post-colonial timeline were discussed and analysed. Rising Islamophobia along-with emergence of hard-line Hindu and Buddhist sentiments has punctuated the anti-Muslim / minority attitude in these regions. In India, the current ruling government comes with the rhetoric of India being a Hindu state. Likewise, in Myanmar and Sri-Lanka, Buddhist extremists have subjugated the Rohingya and Muslims populations respectively. As the crisis seem to continue, experts called in to reach a joint collective international approach to curb down the bigoted attitudes against the Muslim minorities.

Discussion Themes of the Session:

- Discuss the state of Muslim Minorities in three South Asian countries: India, Myanmar and Sri Lanka.
- Provide a historical context of the issue.
- Different factors that have led to emergence of hardline anti-Muslim sentiments across the countries.
- Prospect of working on a collective solution by introducing policies that would ensure participation of Muslim and Non-Muslim countries

Is there a Trump Doctrine in American Foreign Policy?

Summary

Even before President Trump took office, the question of how the new administration would approach U.S. foreign policy had become an issue of discussion. As Trump approaches two years in office, scholars, journalists and pundits have offered diverging perspectives regarding Trump's foreign policy. It is widely held that Trump does not have a coherent grand strategy geared towards the execution of purposive actions and that his foreign policy is strategically incoherent, even anti-strategic. The counterpoint is that Trump does have coherent foreign policy doctrine, but that it is ill conceived and ill prepared to serve the strategic interests of the United States. Trump's rhetoric against free trade, multilateral institutions and alliance politics, and his reluctance to assume global leadership have cast doubt on the fate of the existing world order. Based on these developments in American foreign policy, scholars concerned with the survival of the liberal order have drawn attention to the illiberal characteristics of President Trump's foreign policy preferences, their implications and potential consequences, and have called for an urgent defence of liberalism. Against this backdrop, this session delved into the fundamentals of the US foreign policy and discussed Trump's foreign policy vision and its implications for the world.

Discussion Themes of the Session:

- The liberal world order: is it a myth or reality? Is it in retreat?
- Does the uncertain character of Trump's Foreign policy represent a danger to the established world order?
- Rhetoric vs. praxis: Does Trump's rhetoric reflect his actual foreign policy practices?
- Will Trump's intervention in the Korean conflict prove to be an example for other long-running conflicts?

Activities of Terrorist Groups Abroad: FETO and PKK



Summary

Terrorism today is a trans-national phenomenon, which has fundamentally changed the nature of counter-terrorism. Terrorist organisations have long sought foreign support for their causes. However, the undertaking of direct advocacy in foreign countries is a relatively new phenomenon employed by some organisations in the last few decades. The PKK and FETO provide clear examples of how terrorist organizations operate overseas under a chain of command that functions through the organisations that they establish abroad. The PKK and FETO operate mainly in Europe and the US, exploiting the democratic rights and freedoms in these countries for their political purposes. The primary strategy of these terrorist organisations abroad is to wage a psychological and political war in order to gain leverage and legitimacy for their cause. This session sought to shed light on this relatively new phenomenon and provide functional strategies against such activities of terror groups.

Discussion Themes of the Session:

- Reasoning of the Turkish government deal with the terrorist organisations in the transnational context.
- Engagement of the PKK and FETO in Turkey and overseas.
- Turkey's strategies and actions.
- The parasitic relationship between a terrorist group and a third country.

The Political Atmosphere in Egypt: Reconciliation or Regression?



Summary

Once perceived as one of the icons of the Arab Spring, Egypt has come to symbolise the counterrevolutionary wave that has swept across the region. The recent decision to remove several prominent figures from its official list of “terrorists”, which included prominent members of the Muslim Brotherhood, has sparked discussion about the possibility of reconciliation between the outlawed Muslim Brotherhood organisation and the Egyptian government. This session aimed to unpack the ambiguous signs of possible reconciliation in Egypt between the state and its long-time scapegoat, the Muslim Brotherhood. Is reconciliation a real possibility? On the other hand, is this primarily a publicity stunt engineered by President Abdel Fattah el-Sisi to appease international actors and human rights organisations?

Discussion Themes of the Session:

- Recent Egyptian social and economic crises, with special reference to the societal views and support for the government post-coup.
- The state of post-coup human rights violations and civil society repression by the Egyptian government.
- The possibility of reconciliation between the ‘deep state’ and civil society and the future of political Islam in Egypt.
- Is the ‘Arab Spring’ still relevant for the democratisation process in the Middle East?

Turkey's Security Policy: National Defence Industry and Cross Border Operations



Summary

Turkey's security policy has been reviewed to strengthen the national defence industry and apply hard power in foreign policy. Primarily, historical experience had played a key role in the development of Turkey's defence industry when Turkey faced the US arms embargo following the 1974 Turkish military operations in Cyprus and the conflict with the PKK, which generated a need for effective weaponry. Turkey has invested tremendously in their national defence industry during the AK Party era for the sake of being self-sufficient and technologically advanced. Simultaneously, it has been necessary in protecting the country from the increasing terrorist threat by PKK and Daesh. Turkey has conducted two major operations, namely Operation Euphrates Shield and Operation Olive Branch, in 2016 and 2018 respectively. The types of terrorism within Turkey have also evolved, as demonstrated by the July 15 coup attempt by FETO. This session sought to identify key elements of Turkey's evolving security policy through a discussion of the national defence industry and cross-border operations.

Discussion Themes of the Session:

- Discuss Turkey's security policy in the national defence industry and cross-border operations.
- Explore the aim of Turkey's expanded National Defence Industry.
- Analyse the dynamics of Turkey's cross-border operations in Syria and Iraq.
- Question the possibility of clash between Turkey and NATO about respective security priorities.
- Discuss Turkey's strategy for the new type of terrorism as in the FETO case.

The Fate of Palestine: The Crisis Deepens

Summary

This session aimed to discuss the question of Palestine in light of the most recent developments. While there has essentially been a de-facto acceptance of the Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territories by world powers, local Palestinian opposition and resistance in various forms have remained. The internationally recognised two state solution – originating in 1974, UN Resolution 3236 – has seemingly lost its relevance. Most recently, the Trump administration's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and his so-called 'deal of the century' has severely complicated the peace process and effectively eliminated any hope for the two-state solution. The situation in Palestine continues to be neglected, particularly in light of more immediate regional and global crises. The crisis continues to deepen and needs to be addressed unequivocally. This session sought to address the current fault lines of the question of Palestine and aimed to provide a platform for balanced discussion.

Discussion Themes of the Session:

- Discuss the question of Palestine and the reluctance of global actors to propose a solution
- Explore the different positions of Palestinians on the future of the crisis
- Put the question of Palestine in the wider context of the political landscape of the Middle East
- Prospect the chances for a two-state solution
- Discuss the Palestinian diaspora and its influence on the global representation of Palestine.

Turkey's Political Landscape under the New Presidential System



Summary

The referendum of April 16th, 2017 marked a monumental transformation in Turkey's political system. People voted in favour of replacing Turkey's parliamentary system with an executive presidential democracy. Accordingly, the Turkish presidential system is not a carbon copy of other models but rather a distinct system that has taken Turkish political history, culture and values into account. The executive branch, which had hitherto been elected by and from the parliament, would now be elected directly by the electorate by popular vote. The first election for transitioning to the new presidential system was held on June 24th, 2018. In the course of the electoral process, new political alliances emerged on the parliamentary level, namely the *Cumhur Alliance* (AK Party and MHP) and *Millet Alliance* (CHP, İYİ Party, DP and SP), signifying how the presidential system could fundamentally change the political arena in Turkey. The Turkish political landscape is open to potential unexpected developments regarding the formation of alliances and their consolidation. The election resulted in a first-round victory for President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and a parliamentary majority for the *Cumhur Alliance*. Partly due in light of these changes, this session aimed to identify the potential fault lines and dynamics of the presidential system in Turkey.

Discussion Themes of the Session:

- The separation of the executive branch from the parliament regarding the governing process.
- The role of the parliament in the new political equation.
- The prospective adaptation of bureaucratic and decision-making processes to the presidential system.
- Discuss impacts of the new system on the rights and freedoms.

Turkey's Foreign Policy in an Age of Crises



Summary

This session aimed to discuss Turkey's foreign policy in the light of the most recent developments in the Middle East. In the course of the first two decades of the 21st century, Turkey has arguably faced a more challenging foreign policy environment than at any other time in its modern history. In turn, each of the successive crises has uniquely shaped various aspects of Turkey's developing foreign policy. While Turkey has taken proactive roles in regional and global affairs, a seemingly never-ending tide of change has continually swept over the global landscape.

Ranging from an unpredictable leadership in the United States, to various humanitarian crises, financial uncertainties in Europe and an ever more complex and turbulent Middle East, there emerges an acute sense of global uncertainty. Any productive analysis of Turkish foreign policy today must consider these multifaceted and complex issues.

In this session, Turkey's foreign policy was analysed in light of its diplomatic policies and practices as well as the discursive constructions related to Turkey's geopolitical and cultural positioning in the world. How can we better understand changes in Turkey's global positioning vis-à-vis its geopolitical and cultural positioning beyond the trope of the East-West divide?

Discussion Themes of the Session:

- The future of the Turkey-EU partnership.
- Turkey's involvement in the Middle East and the role it plays in contributing towards stability in the region.
- The Russo-Turkish relationship beyond its historical parameters and implications of this relationship for Turkish foreign policy.
- Change and adaptation in Turkish foreign policy in light of an unpredictable US administration



Envisioning
**Peace and
Security**
in a Fragmented World

TRT
**world
forum**



Keynote

**Queen Rania
Al Abdullah**



Speaker
Haroon Siddiqui



Speaker
Sakena Yacoobi




Guest of Honour

Recep Tayyip Erdoğan



Speaker
Pierre Krähenbühl




Keynote

Hamid Karzai



Speaker
Maha Yahya



Speaker
İbrahim Eren



Speaker

Børge Brende



Speaker
Burhanettin Duran



Speaker
Peter Van Praagh



Speaker

Monique Villa



Moderator
Adnan Nawaz




Speaker
Mokhtar Lamani




Speaker
Ali Asghar Soltanieh




Speaker
Şükrü Hanioglu



Moderator
Fatih Er



Moderator
Imran Garda



Speaker
David Patrikarakos



Speaker

Francesco Rocca



Moderator
David Foster



Moderator
Sergey Karaganov



Speaker
Riyad Minty



Moderator
Ghida Fakhry



Speaker
R. Dickson Crane



Speaker

İbrahim Kalın



Moderator
Stavroula Logothetis




Speaker
Volkan Bozkur



Speaker
William Hale



Speaker
Ufuk Ulutaş



Speaker

Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu



Speaker
Diana Buttu



Speaker

İbrahim Kalın




Speaker
Haiyan Wang



Speaker
Robert Fox



Speaker
Thomas P.M. Barnett



Speaker

Staffan de Mistura



Speaker
Ştefan Füle



Speaker
Franco Frattini



Moderator
Maria Ramos



Speaker

Ivo Josipović



Speaker
Raghed Omaar



Speaker
Baghdad Amreyev



Speaker

Mamphele Ramphele



Moderator
Kamali Melbourne



Speaker

Fouad Siniora



Speaker

Stef Blok

Memories from the TRT World Forum 2018



İbrahim Eren, Director General and
Chairman of TRT, being interviewed
about TRT World Forum 2018.



Şükrü Hanioğlu, Professor of History
at Princeton University

Sergey Karaganov, Former Foreign Policy Advisor to President Vladimir Putin



Participants awaiting the start of the upcoming sessions at TRT World Forum 2018.



Director of TRT World Research Centre, Pinar Kandemir, being interviewed about TRT World Forum 2018.



Robert Dickson Crane, Former Advisor to President Richard Nixon

Partners



Official Airline Partner



Global Communication Partner



Global Media Partner



Telecommunication Partner

