

THIERRY DE MONTBRIAL

President and Founder of the WPC

I will not attempt to draw any real conclusions from these two days. It will take time to think about everything that was said. Instead, I will limit myself to a few remarks.

The objective of the *World Policy Conference*, which we plan to hold every year, is to make a positive contribution – and I want to emphasise the word “positive” – to meeting the most urgent and serious collective challenge for the planet as a whole. We are not going to reshape global governance from one day to the next – we would be very naïve to think so – yet it is true that time is short. In an increasingly interdependent world, the lack of appropriate governance methods can only lead to tragedy.

Over the past two days, we have seen that the problems addressed are multi-faceted and that we have to master them if we want to be constructive and effective. We do, of course, face some formidable technical challenges. That is obvious in the economic and financial arena. While the field of economics has made enormous strides in recent decades, there is still a lack of consensus on many subjects among the well-informed. There is much to discuss and discussion often requires the latest knowledge – the financial sphere being just one example of this.

The same holds true for security. A useful conversation about political and military issues demands special training, a special vocabulary and openness to different ways of thinking. Of course, if you consider other, more specialised, governance issues such as those we have also discussed these past two days – water, food, energy, health – each of them assumes a framework of specific references and knowledge. In terms of governance, we should not rest content with generalities and just chit-chat, even though common principles may inspire a search for solutions.

To complicate matters, technology is often tinged with ideology. We see that constantly. For example, in economics, being a monetarist or Keynesian doesn't only reflect a theoretical or empirical choice. There is an ideological dimension as well. Typically, the “right” tends to be monetarist and the “left” Keynesian. If you talk about environmental or health issues, everyone will understand that ideology is involved without putting too fine a point on it. Ideology encompasses technology and vice versa, which complicates debates and discussions.



In addition to technical aspects mixed with ideology, there are the political aspects as well. What exactly do we mean by “political”? Let’s take the example of the “Gs”, those somewhat fuzzy groups which, as a whole, have conceptually replaced the old directorate idea, a subject of great debate in the early 1960s within the Atlantic framework. Each group can only function if its members all share the political will to achieve positive results. Why is the most famous group – the real G5, the Security Council’s group of permanent members – ineffective? The answer, of course, is because its composition does not reflect the realities of the early 21st century, and because, for historic reasons, the five permanent Security Council members never seem able to agree on a positive action plan. They continue to play a zero-sum game, meaning that a gain for some members must be a loss for others.

If, on a certain issue, the relevant G does not agree to a positive action plan transcending the individual conflicts of interest among members, the group’s work will only lead to disappointment. That was why I recommended yesterday that each G create a charter of rights and responsibilities and, of course, an appropriate organisation. That is not the current state of affairs.

To my mind, the two currently most important G groups are: first, in political matters, the G5, which I have just discussed (the permanent members of the Security Council); and, second, in economic matters, the G20. It is necessary to reform the G5 and improve the G20, after which the G8 could probably be eliminated. Again, we must clearly redefine or adjust the composition and responsibilities of these two groups along the lines I specified. The situation can only be clarified in a positive spirit of cooperation. We are still very far from that point.

Another key factor, which I believe clearly emerged during our discussions, is the cultural aspect. I would like to return to this subject and I’m very pleased that the message conveyed yesterday morning by His Majesty King Mohammed VI focused on the human and cultural aspects.

When I was young, it was fashionable to talk about cultures and civilisations. In reality, this dialogue was often reduced to bar-room philosophising. It is not a matter of bringing together imams, a Catholic priest, a Protestant pastor, an Orthodox pope, a rabbi, some Buddhists and a few other good souls for light to shine forth. It comes down to an issue that I raised yesterday morning: what is manifestly clear, including during the types of discussions we’re having there, is that even though we are often close to one another in certain respects, we remain enclosed in different mindsets. We sometimes use the same words, but behind the verbal façade lie more or less incompatible preconceptions. Naturally, we cannot truly understand each other under such conditions. This fact goes well beyond the simple question of language because language



expresses culture, as has been mentioned a number of times. Some even consider language as a sort of third memory or collective unconscious in the Jungian sense.

We are all aware that in today's world, growing interpenetration, a characteristic of globalisation, is producing a cultural stratum that trends toward uniformity, including the way we speak. But this phenomenon is superficial. You don't have to dig too deep to reach other, thicker layers. One of the speakers mentioned the universal language, meaning English – but which English? “Universal” English is not the real English language, which is extremely rich and complex like all languages of high culture.

The problem is that the thin layer of the globalised sub-culture tends to impoverish conversation and even aggravate the lack of understanding at the most basic level. This even occurs in international politics. I want to go back to an example I alluded to yesterday morning. During a recent conversation, a high-level Chinese official told me that in his opinion Westerners (the United States and European Union) tend regularly to interpret his country's positions negatively, whereas the Chinese typically base their criticisms of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars on thousands of years of experience. In fact, the Chinese don't necessarily seek to manipulate us every time they tell us something! And when the Russians claim the Georgians attacked South Ossetia, are they totally wrong? We all read history in our own way. Through a Western cultural prism, the Russian military intervention in Georgia demonstrated a return to a form of imperialism. When the Russians see American or Western efforts to expand NATO to Georgia, they also feel attacked. We are convinced we are spreading the good word, leading a human rights crusade, etc. We always stay in the proselytising mode, while pretending to ignore – or worse still, actually ignoring – the tangible interests hidden behind our own ideology, which we dress up in the name of universal values.

At a minimum, let us recognise that in addition to conflicts of interest in the strict sense of the term, the different ways of interpreting things may be based on extremely different mindsets. This goes right to the heart of the cultural and ideological dimension of geopolitics. Let's at least be sufficiently tolerant and try to understand others' points of view as we would like others to understand ours. Someone said yesterday that rather than “tolerance”, he preferred the term “empathy”. I, too, like the idea of empathy – the ability to put yourself in someone else's shoes in order to understand his or her perspective. If we don't all make efforts of this kind, we will find it very difficult to create governance methods suited to the high level of interpenetration characteristic of globalisation – even in specialised areas such as climate change and health.

As one last example to illustrate this idea, I would like to return to the issue of borders. When Western countries state that the province of Kosovo must become an independent State, they are basing this argument on a certain interpretation of a nation's right to self-determination. But if the South Ossetians demand implementation of the same principle for their own benefit, the same



Westerners change their interpretation. Are there two sets of rules? That is why international law is essential: we need common standards. The development of common standards is an integral part of governance. When a problem with minorities becomes acute, do we favour their right to self-determination or the inviolability of borders? Do we favour a concerted effort to redraw the borders, as did the Group 4 + 2 for German reunification? Borders are a latent issue in every part of the world. In Europe, the Trans-Dniester strip of land – legally part of Moldova – could one day provoke a major conflict in the absence of good governance.

When each party in the name of its own vision, its own mindset, claims it is right and “others” wrong, we fall into a binary tragedy: the good and the bad. And that leads to nothing other than calamity.

I think that these issues – cultural in the strongest sense of the term – logically precede any calculation of self-interest and any strategic consideration, even based on the broadest consensus of what this means. Of course, self-interest can be superimposed on profound anthropological realities and that is generally the case. The fact remains, however, that cultural factors are the most basic element and deserve close examination in any discussion of governance.

Allow me to add a last comment on this matter by coming back to the issue of translation in the linguistic sense of the term. What is the basis for the American Constitution’s success? Stanley Hoffmann, whom a number of us here count as a friend, often says: “If you could only use one word to define the identity of the United States, it would have to be ‘*Constitution*’”. In France, two words would be necessary: *State* and *language*. The American Constitution is a brief text. It’s a sober text. It’s a text that goes right to the heart of the matter. It’s a literary text. It’s a text that arouses emotion from the very first paragraph. How are you going to arouse emotion if different people create a potpourri hundreds of pages long that must be literally translated into 27 languages? This question may seem technical. It is, in fact, of crucial importance, in my opinion, and has not been sufficiently thought out. If I were to oversee the creation of a European Constitution, I would call upon a great writer to produce a short text and leave the details to implementation treaties. I would not attempt to translate the text literally but have it recreated in each language based on the genius of that language. Didn’t Baudelaire say when translating Edgar Allan Poe, “Only a poet can translate a poet”?

One day, in the United States, I found a bilingual edition of Mallarmé’s poems. Mallarmé’s work is already somewhat hazy in French! In fact, the “translator” had composed new poems with thoughts equivalent to those in the original, but expressed in the genius of the English language.



In my view, that is an avenue worth exploring, especially in the light of what I was trying to say about culture. I hope that in future sessions of the *World Policy Conference* we will pay more attention to the cultural, and even anthropological, foundations of governance.

Finally, the last point I would like to address is the issue of global versus regional.

“Regional” has two meanings: regional from above and regional from below. During the last mini-session, we discussed – certainly much too quickly – the issue of regional from below, which deserves further attention. But what I would like to talk about now is the question of regional from above. We generally agree that many global governance problems should be managed at a regional rather than international level. Why should the Security Council directly handle East Timor or any other crisis occurring in an obscure corner of the world foreign to most people? To illustrate this remark, let me point out that hardly anyone who became passionate about Chechnya after the fall of the Soviet Union previously knew anything about the existence of the Chechens or the complexity of the Caucasus.

Conflicts should be settled at the regional level if at all possible. This common sense remark refers to what the European Union calls the “subsidiarity principle”. Having said that, I come to a basic difficulty of a geopolitical nature in the most profound sense of the term, leading us back to culture and ideology: how do we define regions? During the session on security, the statement was justifiably made that India should play a more prominent role in world governance. The Kashmir conflict mobilises considerable resources. As a result, Pakistan refuses to redeploy the forces it needs to fight the Taliban on its Western flank, making it all the more difficult to stabilise Afghanistan. Complicating the picture is Afghanistan’s other large neighbour, Iran, which is largely at odds with the “international community”, mainly because it wants to cross the nuclear threshold, possibly to produce nuclear weapons, now possessed by Israel and Pakistan. Does that mean we must include India if we are to define a Middle East region based on the objective of good governance?

This question of how to appropriately define regions is very sensitive and deserves more thorough exploration on the part of all those who aim to advance thinking on global governance.

Among the subjects we did not address during this conference, despite a very full schedule, is digital technology. We undoubtedly overlooked other topics as well and I would be grateful to you for any suggestions you may have.



The time has come to conclude the conference. The *World Policy Conference* process will naturally continue and I hope to expand it. I also would like to see as many of you as possible stay involved.

I wish to warmly thank all of those who made this beautiful conference in Marrakech possible. Several teams took part: the IFRI staff, of course, with great devotion and commitment. And the Moroccan teams, which played a decisive role in our success. All deserve our appreciation.

I am especially grateful to our sponsors, without whom none of this would have been possible. I hope that we lived up to the confidence they showed in us.

I would like to conclude by acknowledging the interpreters. I know they did a remarkable job.

Lastly, ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank all of you for participating in the discussions and making them as valuable as they were.