

Why Does an International Organization Fail? A Theoretical and Systemic Approach to the Developing Eight (D-8)

Abstract

The Developing Eight (D-8) grouping was one of the organizations that brought the key countries from the Islamic world. Initiated with huge enthusiasm by the leadership of Turkey in 1997, the D-8 has not been able to live up to expectations so far in terms of economic development and increasing inter-trade relations among members. In this article, first the failure of D-8 is analyzed from three major IR theories and shed some light on why the organization in the third world failed. Second, D-8 is located within the systemic character of the Muslim world. It is the argument of this article that any Muslim organization is likely to fail, should it not include Saudi Arabia. It is not the only mover-and-shaker of the Islamic world, but at least its silent approval is needed. Whatever the reason, from a Muslim world perspective the failure of D-8 to some extent should be attributed the absence of Saudi Arabia as a member.

Keywords: D-8 (the developing eight), International organizations, regional system, the Islamic world, the OIC

Mehmet Özkan

Associate professor of
International Relations at
Turkish National Police
Academy. Ankara.

Uluslararası Bir Organizasyon Neden Başarısız Olur? Gelişen Sekize (D-8) Teorik ve Sistemik Bir Yaklaşım

Öz

Gelişen Sekiz Ülke (D-8) gruplaması, İslam dünyasından kilit ülkeleri bir araya getiren örgütlerden biriydi. 1997'de Türkiye'nin öncülüğünde büyük bir coşkuyla yola çıkan D-8, ekonomik kalkınma ve üyeler arasında artan ticari ilişkileri geliştirme konusunda şu ana kadar beklentileri karşılayamamıştır. Bu makalede, ilk olarak D-8'in başarısızlığı üç ana Uluslararası İlişkiler teorisi doğrultusunda analiz edilmiş ve organizasyonun üçüncü dünyada başarısız olmasının nedenlerine ışık tutulmuştur. Bununla birlikte D-8, Müslüman dünyasının sistemik karakteri içinde yer almaktadır. Bu makalenin argümanı, Suudi Arabistan'ı bünyesine dahil etmeyen herhangi bir Müslüman örgütün başarısız olacağıdır. Suudi Arabistan İslam dünyasına yön veren tek aktör değil, ancak en azından sessiz onayına ihtiyaç var. Sebep ne olursa olsun, Müslüman dünya bakış açısına göre D-8'in başarısızlığı bir dereceye kadar Suudi Arabistan'ın üye olmamasına bağlanmalıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: D-8 (Gelişen Sekiz Ülke), Uluslararası kuruluşlar, bölgesel sistem, İslam dünyası, İTT

«لماذا تفشل المنظمة الدولية؟ مقارنة نظرية ونظامية للدول النامية الثمان (د-8)»

الملخص

لقد كان تنظيم الدول الثماني النامية (د-8) أحد التنظيمات التي جمعت الدول الإسلامية المهمة تحت سقف واحد. ولكن لم يستطع هذا التنظيم الذي تم تأسيسه بقيادة تركيا في عام 1991 محملا بأمال كبيرة أن يحقق هذه الآمال المرتقبة منه حتى الآن في موضوع التطور الاقتصادي وتطوير العلاقات الاقتصادية بين الدول الأعضاء. ولقد تم في هذا البحث تحليل أسباب فشل تنظيم الدول الثماني النامية د-8 وفقا للنظريات الثلاثة الأساسية للعلاقات الدولية وتسليط الضوء على أسباب فشل هذا التنظيم في العالم الثالث. بالإضافة الى هذا يقع تنظيم الدول الثماني النامية ضمن الطابع النظامي للعالم الإسلامي. منطلق هذا البحث هو أن أي تنظيم إسلامي لا يضم المملكة العربية السعودية في بنيتها سيكون غير ناجح. المملكة العربية السعودية ليست الفاعل الوحيد الذي يوجه العالم الإسلامي ولكن موافقتها ولو بشكل ضمني سيزيد من نسبة النجاح. ومهما كان السبب فانه يجب ربط عدم نجاح تنظيم الدول الثماني النامية د-8 حسب وجهة نظر العالم الإسلامي بعدم كون المملكة العربية السعودية عضوا في هذا التنظيم.

الكلمات المفتاحية: د-8 (الدول الثماني النامية)، التنظيمات الدولية، النظام الإقليمي، العالم الإسلامي، منظمة التعاون الإسلامي

الإسلامي

Introduction

In the post-Cold War environment, the increasing importance of international organizations has been emphasized by many in understanding international relations and promoting stability. In this paper, the role of Developing 8 (D-8) will be analyzed from the perspective of promoting stability and economic development. Although initiated in 1997 with huge excitement and expectations, the D-8 has been in a recess period until recently. Why has the D-8 not been so successful in its aims, what was the obstacles and what should be done are the questions that this paper tries to answer. It organized in three parts. First, a general but concise history of the D-8 is introduced. Second, the D-8 is analyzed in the lens of three theories namely neo-realism, neo-liberalism and critical theory. Third, international and regional systemic settings of the Islamic world are discussed with regard to D-8. In the last section, what follow is the conclusion and general comments.

Developing Eight (D-8): A New Building in the Old Town

While one can see many regional/international groupings to further cooperation in the Islamic world; the Developing Eight (D-8) was founded among eight prominent Muslim countries, namely Turkey, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Iran, Egypt, and Nigeria on 15 June 1997. The main architect of the D-8 was Necmettin Erbakan who served as Turkey's prime minister in 1996-1997. The idea of establishing such an organization that brings 'key' countries from the Islamic world gripped during Erbakan's visits to some Muslim countries in Africa and Asia as prime minister in 1996. The members of D-8 have two main characteristics: they are part of developing world and Islam constitutes an overwhelming majority of the people in member countries.

Before one goes through details of the D-8 through the lens of theories, it is necessary to understand the environment in which D-8 grouping came to existence. Especially in the post-Cold War era, Muslims have increasingly felt isolated from global economic and political decision-making process. Despite constituting one fourth of global population, no Muslim state has representation in the United Nation Security Council- the main global body- with a veto power. Indifference of international community/society against killing of Muslims especially in Bosnia and Kosovo convinced Muslims in a way that they have no trust in international community or international organi-

zations. In addition, the double standard of international community against Muslims, such as while international community criticize Pakistan because of its nuclear weapons, not to do so in the case of Israel and India, has also contributed to develop such an understanding among Muslim masses. In the early period of the post-Cold War era, Islam (and Muslims) has experienced a 'geopolitical exclusion' from global politics and Muslims have lost their trust in international community/organizations as a 'neutral problem solver'.

Having depicted the environment in which D-8 was founded, it can be argued that D-8 grouping was a response by Muslim countries against this global exclusion and a try to be heard. Against economic and political marginalization from international community, D-8 sought to develop economic relations among the key Muslim states. As globalization is shrinking, in order not to be marginalized not least economically, D-8 countries found it necessary to cooperate extensively in the economic, commercial and financial fronts. D-8 countries in a way or other represent the 'core' of the Islamic countries, which represented by Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC). With the exception of Saudi Arabia, all D-8 member countries are the mover and shakers of the Islamic world. As Aral indicates, the data shows that when D-8 was founded in 1997, its members had a share of 54 percent of the total exports and 55 percent of the total imports realized by Muslim countries. The total GDP of D-8 member states constituted nearly 60 percent of the total GDP of the OIC countries at the time. The total population of the D-8 countries was nearly 800 million, which meant that they made up about 65 percent of the overall population in the Islamic world. This corresponds to some 13.5 percent of the world population. Mainly due to rapid growth in the past, a large part of their population is and will continue to be young for the foreseeable future, constituting a factor of dynamism in D-8 countries.

It can also be argued that there are two main features at the time that affected the character of D-8 grouping. First of all, the 'urgency' to respond deteriorating global conditions against Muslims played a crucial role in 'exhilarate the process'. This led the initiative to be weak at the later stage, because the necessary political and economic strategic planning have not been done properly. This feature can also be found in the foreign policy approach of the Refah (Welfare) Party- then ruling party in Turkey- toward the Islamic world. Though Refah was in power for only eleven months, with its leader Erdogan it initiated and orchestrated huge projects like D-8. Second element that played a crucial role in establishing D-8, was to decrease bureaucracy if possible.

Not surprisingly, the founders of D-8 were aware of the pitfalls of proper functioning of Islamic organizations mainly of the OIC, which is undermined with too much bureaucracy and outside intervention. D-8 grouping wanted to overcome these obstacles while revitalizing a small but strong group of Islamic countries. In larger analysis it was to serve to revitalize Muslim world and thus participate in global politics, both economically and politically.

After the inaugural summit of D-8 grouping on 15 June 1997, the Istanbul Declaration identified the principles on which this cooperation ought to be based. D-8 leaders 'declare [d that] the main objective of D-8 to be socio-economic development in accordance with the following principles: peace instead of conflict; dialogue instead of confrontation; co-operation instead of exploitation; justice instead of double-standards; equality instead of discrimination; democracy instead of oppression'. In the same declaration D-8 countries have also identified the main goals and principal areas of cooperation among the members. These are mainly among others 'trade, industry, finance, banking and privatization, rural development energy, agriculture, science and technology'.

From the foreign policy perspective of Turkey, the initiator of the D-8, setting up of this new grouping was meant two elements that was also the foreign policy priorities of the then ruling party in Turkey, Refah Party. First, through this grouping, Turkey sought to restore its long-neglected ties with the Islamic world. And for the Refah Party and its leader Erbakan it would demonstrate their commitment to the unity of Muslims worldwide. Moreover, this initiative would spell out the conviction that Turkey should take up the role of leadership and be a catalyst in bringing Muslim nations together in developing world. Actually, Turkey's current president Recep Tayyip Erdogan has actually taken such a role enforcing and expanding Ankara's interest Muslim world politics since 2002. Erdogan deepened Muslim dimension of Turkish foreign policy more than any other leader in the past. Second, Turkey's desire to find new markets for Turkish exports was equally important. To widen the economic horizons thoroughly by developing relations with the countries from Asia and Africa was not alternative to the existing the Custom Union agreement with the EU, but it was hoped that it would give a leverage power in Turkey's relations with Europe. Erbakan believed that the more Turkey has deep relations with the eastern part of the world, the more it will be powerful in its relations with the EU.

International Relations Theories and the Failure of the D-8

a. Neo-Realism

In general, the approach of international theories to international institutions rests on the belief that institutions are 'a key means of promoting world peace'. Except neo-realists, this idea has widespread support and most of the debate goes around this general claim.

From a neo-realist perspective, international system is a brutal arena where states look for opportunities to take advantage of each other. International actors (only the states for neo-realists) have little trust in each other and therefore must behave in a self-help system. However, the strong emphasis on self-help does not preclude states from forming alliances. But alliances are only 'temporary marriages of convenience', since the states act according to their own self-interests. In that sense, neo-realists simply argue that institutions are basically a reflection of the distribution of power in current world politics and are based on the self-interested calculations of the states (mostly great powers). According to neo-realists, institutions have no independent effect on the state behavior and world politics in general without the authorization of member states. Basically, international institutions have no identity per se and are not an important cause of peace. For the neo-realists, institutions matter only on the margins.

From such an understanding, the establishment of the D-8 needs to be re-considered. In 1997, when the D-8 was initiated, the establishing members were concerned in different interests rather than purely economic development. Priorities of the members in joining any organization are as much critical as the common aim of the organization. If each member's motivations stem from different considerations and those considerations cannot be articulated through a 'common channel', the chances to success of such organizations are less. In other words, the means should be coherent with the ends. To illustrate this point, As Aral aptly argues, at the time when D-8 came to existence the motivations and goals of each member did not represent a united front with clear, well-defined and unified objectives. Rather than representing the general view of the founding members, each had its own reason to take part in this grouping driving largely from domestic consideration. This accounts for a couple of reasons. Of most important was that each member state has had different reasons to join the grouping, and through D-8, aimed at achieving different aims. To mention a few, Nigeria and Iran were trying to break isolation against them in international fore. Nigeria was then ruled by

a military government and was more or less ostracized by the international community. By the same token, due to America's 'dual containment' policy Iran was also ostracized. They hoped that D-8 would give a modicum of recognition to the both regimes, at least in respect of the Islamic world. Thus from the beginning, D-8 grouping faced such a dilemma that made the grouping 'ineffective'.

Besides emphasizing the difficulties of cooperation among states due to systemic reasons, neo-realists also argue that it is always difficult to sustain cooperation, be it under an institution or not. Two factors inhibit cooperation: relative-gain considerations and concerns about cheating. Relative-gain consideration means that in the international system states are deemed similar in terms of needs but not in capabilities for achieving them. The positional placement of states in terms of abilities primarily defines the structure. The structure then limits cooperation among states through fears of relative gains made by other states, and the possibility of dependence on other states. In the case of D-8, the motivation for relative-gain consideration was existent when it was initiated. Through mutual projects, all the members would gain some sort of economic benefit and eventually leading to be a prosperous country. Unfortunately, none of the proposed projects was realized before the organization to be doomed. So relative-gain consideration of the member states does not explain the failure of D-8, since there was nothing to gain yet. Similarly, concerns about cheating do also fall into same category. The possibility of cheating the members` each other was not possible in terms of cooperating with the others, and nor they leave the group for the sake of other benefits.

Neo-realism contributes more to understand D-8 case from systemic level than cheating and relative-gain consideration issues. For the neo-realists, the nature of the international system, be it bipolar or unipolar, defines the behavioral scope of the actors. From the very beginning, the D-8 grouping was an Islamic initiative aimed at creating a common Islamic market among Muslim world. It was designed to be an alternative to G-8 summit and was ambitious in its standing. International community or great power(s) was hesitated what would be outcome of such initiative. Therefore, it was not surprising that almost all the governments who initiated the D-8 grouping was toppled from the power in a short time, making the D-8 almost dead-born.

Similarly, some circles (especially pro-Zionist lobbies) in the West and in particular in the US, expressed outright hostility to D-8 that, in their view, was unacceptably antagonistic towards the West. They blamed D-8 grou-

ping for harboring 'fundamentalist and anti-western' ambitions. Such an existing global environment towards D-8 made the grouping more cautious and their criticism of the prevailing economic and financial system and call for action were not couched in the confrontational language. Because, any language that used by D-8 against prevailing economic order was smacked as anti-Westernism. Under this condition that has become like the sword of Damocles, the D-8 has so far deemed to fail to deliver its promises.

b. Neo-liberalism

Neo-liberalists, like neo-realists, argue that competition, exchange, and consequent pressures for efficiency are the dominant environmental characteristics driving the formation and behavior of organizations. According to neo-liberalists, institutions have capacity to change outcomes demonstrably, but they are not as autonomous as critical theorists assign. Similarly, international institutions do not have a purpose independent of the states that comprise them. International institutions exist, neo-realists argue, in a condition that power struggle dominate states' behaviors. They facilitate cooperation by reducing the costs of making agreements through established rules and practices, and most importantly by providing information about to what extent to which governments were following these rules.

In neo-liberalist understanding, the failures of international institutions are attributed more to the materialistic and other powers located outside of the organization. Neo-liberalists posit that state preferences and constraints are responsible for understanding of the behavior of international organizations' failure. They argue that international institutions are weak, as a general precaution, it is important not to put more weight (read as expectation) on such institutions that they can bear. According to neo-liberalists, putting too much weight on international institutions, before they are sufficiently legitimate to bear that responsibility, is 'a recipe for deadlock, disruption and failure'. Looking at the D-8 from this point of view does shed a light to understand why the D-8 is ineffective. From the very outset, the rhetoric and discourse regarding the expectations from the organization were very high. It is arguable whether such a notion led to failure itself, since the projects of the organization have never got off; but it is certain that such a notion created an understanding that the D-8 might be dangerous for global politics. As analyzed in the neo-realism section, some groups from the West have raised their objection. Success for an organization does not only depend on support

of others, sometimes, to gain the others neutrality or not objection at least might be crucial. The D-8 case, as an organization with the possibility of threatening or decreasing the role of others in the Muslim world, can also be understood from such perspective.

Inspired mostly by the metaphor of the Prisoner's Dilemma (PD), neo-liberalists also maintain that individually rational action by states could impede mutually beneficial cooperation. Institutions would be effective to the degree that they allowed states to avoid short-term temptations to renege, thus realizing available mutual benefits. In that sense, most of the D-8 members could not be able to avoid their short term temptations to realize the long-term mutual benefits. Since most of the short-term temptations originated from their domestic politics, neo-liberalists are not adequate to explain such development. As Martin and Simmons rightly observed, neo-liberalists have generally neglected the role of domestic politics over the international institutions. They treated the states as rational unitary actors and assigned preferences and beliefs, a similar approach with the neo-realists'.

c. Critical Theory

Critical theorists locate the institutions at the very centre of their understanding of international politics, as their central aim is to later the constitutive and regulative norms of the international system. They take ideas very seriously and in fact they believe that discourse or how we think and talk about the world largely shapes our knowledge and practice. In other words, ideas are the driving force of history. According to critical theorists, states behave according to the norms and institutions that they created, in turn, such norms and institutions underpin collective security. Furthermore, states would 'identify positively with one another so that the security of each is perceived as the responsibility of all'. In short, critical theorists argue that international system is 'characterized not by anarchy, but by community' that defines and decides about the future.

In the light of those above understanding of international politics, the establishment of D-8 can be seen as the reflection of the intentions, ideas and desires to change economic and political development in the Islamic world by enhancing the relations among them. Once the ideas are defined as driving force behind events, the existence of the D-8 has much to do with the rhetorical change in the Islamic world. Non-recognition of the demand of

Muslims for being heard and their anger toward the double standard of the West was clearly illustrated in the case of Bosnia. The West's reluctance to stop killings for years led the conviction that Muslims should not trust in the international system as 'a Neutral Problem-solver' anymore.

Critical theorists believe that international organizations can sometimes be dysfunctional and inefficient. This, more commonly, can emanate from the 'attempts to reconcile competing worldviews' that they attach to the organization. As Hass argued, organizations may develop contradictory sets of preferences that brought in by the members. Consequently the organization representing different normative views will suggest to or expect from the organization different goals, resulting in an overtly or covertly clash of perspectives that might generate organizational ineffectiveness.

The failure or ineffectiveness of the D-8 is understandable from such a perspective, since from the inception the members expected to reach different goals through the D-8 undermining the main goal of the organization: economic development. As Aral aptly argues, at the time when D-8 came to existence the motivations and goals of each member did not represent a united front with clear, well-defined and unified objectives. Rather than representing the general view of the founding members, each had its own reason to take part in this grouping driving largely from domestic consideration. This accounts for a couple of reasons. Of most important was that each member states have had different reasons to join the grouping, and through D-8, aimed at achieving different aims. To mention a few, Nigeria and Iran were trying to break isolation against them in international fore. Nigeria was then ruled by a military government and was more or less ostracized by the international community. By the same token, Iran due to America's 'dual containment' policy was also ostracized. They hoped that D-8 would thus give a modicum of recognition to the both regime, at least in respect of the Islamic world.

The failure or ineffectiveness of the D-8 can also be analyzed from the rhetorical perspective. However, such a change should be attributed more to the domestic rhetorical change rather than an international one. As Robert Putnam put it, states pursue their policies in an environment where 'two-level game' is in place. This understanding does also apply when a state involves in an international organization. As domestic problems have a tendency to spill over and become international problems, the international issues can have spill over effect on domestic issues creating instability.

Developments in Turkey just proved this point overwhelmingly. In Turkey, the leading country in the D-8, the setting up of D-8 eventually become 'the long-sought-for evidence' to oust Erbakan, the main driving force behind the D-8, from the government in Turkey on to base of his 'Islamist and anti-Western leanings'. D-8 initiative, mainly because of domestic contingencies of Turkey and the fear of political Islam, is regarded as a 'beginning of an alternative foreign policy based on Muslim solidarity'. His fall from power only a few months after the founding of D-8 through a 'post-modern coup' meant that the D-8 grouping had to proceed at the absence of its architect. Even some of foreign ministers emphasized the role of Erbakan and Turkey and they argued that D-8 would not move forward effectively without Erbakan as prime minister. After the then Turkish Prime Minister Erbakan was ousted from power and then, from politics altogether, similar domestic problems occurred in the others. Then deputy prime minister of Malaysia, Anwar Ibrahim was put in prison on a myriad of charges and only to be released in 2004. Nawaz Sharif, the prime minister of Pakistan was likewise toppled by a military coup while similarly President Suharto of Indonesia forced to step down through a combination of domestic opposition and international pressure. Turkey and Malaysia have also been struck by devastating economic and financial crisis in the last five years due to poor performing of their economies. Nonetheless, there occurred good developments in the member states too. For instance, Nigeria has established democracy after the election in 1999 and Iran's had followed a more balanced foreign policy instead of purely anti-Western stand with the election of Mohammed Khatami. However, these developments were not able to produce any good results for the aim of D-8 grouping, because the turmoil in aforementioned countries was so apparent to dominate D-8 agenda.

As Barnett and Finnemore aptly argued, the demands from the states can be extremely important determinants of the organization's behavior. While a Turkey with Erbakan's premiership (mostly because of his Islamic orientations) was more prone to develop relations with the D-8 members and use the organization as the main vehicle, a Turkey under the leadership of other parties have not paid special attention to the D-8. Similar development was also observed before and after when Anwar Ibrahim and Nawaz Sharif lost their powers in Malaysia and Pakistan respectively.

Systemic Character of the Muslim World and the D-8

When the D-8 initiated, expectations to create Islamic economic zone, development of economic relations was very high. Given the statements and projects that were announced, this was not naïve at all. However, although it was possibly looked upon by many as the incipient model of a future 'Islamic common market' on account of pronounced goal of economic cooperation and deepening trade ties, as Aral rightly argues in his well-researched article D-8 was not designed specifically to constitute the nucleus of a future 'Islamic common market' or a 'Muslim custom union'. Rather it mainly aimed at enhancing economic relations among Muslim developing countries. From the beginning, the founders of the D-8 avoided any resort to terminology of an emerging bloc that would challenge existing international norms and institutions. Instead, they turned their attention to economics and trade among themselves. Because of this nature, some tends to argue that D-8 resembles the group of Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) because of its emphasize on fair trade, economic cooperation among member states, justice and freedom.

However, it might be more explanatory if the D-8 grouping be located within the globalization and global governance context. The interconnectedness among different regions, as many researchers have recognized, is a response to the globalization. Globalization as a threat and opportunity needs to be problematized from international economy perspective as well as international global order. The ongoing process of political contest and transition with regard to global economy is directly related to global governance and might have far-fetched implications for global governance norms and institutions. As emphasized by Higgott, the global governance agenda is still 'driven by an understanding of governance as effectiveness and efficiency, not as greater representation, accountability and justice' (emphasis original). This is not only prone to generate new forms of resistance, but also to search for new alternatives. From the very beginning, the D-8 grouping was an economic as well as political response to globalization and increasing legitimacy deficit in international order. If that is the case, (how) can an Islamic organization without the involvement of Saudi Arabia, one of the key countries from economic and political perspective in the Islamic world, be successful?

In post-Cold War international environment especially in Islamic world, Saudi Arabia is one of the critical mover-and-shaker. It is not only the largest country on the Arabian Peninsula, but also from religious perspective, Saudi Arabia is called 'the land of the two holy mosques', a reference to Mecca and

Medina, Islam's two holiest places; to which every year more than two million Muslims pay a visit to be pilgrim. Economically, with one billion barrels of oil reserves (about 24% of the world's proven total petroleum reserves, as of 2003), Saudi Arabia occupies the central place in economic development. Especially in a time, when oil prices are increasing and dependency to oil is a main concern, Riyadh's participation to any Islamic development project or organization is outmost important. The non-participation of Saudi Arabia to D-8 can be seen as a reason for the D-8's ineffectiveness. It is not because Saudi Arabia has prevented or blocked any project of D-8, but it is because of Riyadh's influence in moving things in the Islamic world that D-8 cannot succeed. Even it be so, it will be limited.

Non-participation of Saudi Arabia can be explained in the context of 1990. First, Riyadh did not want to be seemingly supporting Islamism in the Middle East and international level, as some considered D-8 as an expression of it. Second, Saudi Arabia has always been cautious in any newly emerging regional grouping, unless she is the main initiator of such a move. Thirdly, there is an unspoken rivalry between Turkey and Saudi Arabia in shaping the regional politics at several levels. The fact that Turkey has played a key role in the formulation of D-8, at least Saudi Arabia did not want to be part of this; perhaps considering that in future if the organization gains prominence at international level, Riyadh could consider joining it. One underlying point for this is that there is no officially negative expression toward D-8.

A historical account of Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) illustrates this point. As the largest explicitly Islamic international organization, the OIC, is not a 'fundamentalist' Islamic organization but is clearly one of the significant institutions of global political Islam, or Islamic polity. It was established in 1969 by a group of Muslim states following an attack by an arsonist in Jerusalem on Al-Aqsa mosque, which at that time had just recently come under Israeli control. In retrospect, the inter-state dispute among the OIC members has always prevented the OIC to be a respective and credible international player, despite most of the OIC members have played critical role by supplying the most needed energy, oil, to the global market. Such disagreements and disputes among the OIC members have emanated from either intra-religious issues (e.g. Sunni- Shiite) or leadership competition. Especially the strong states within the OIC, such as Iran, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and even Egypt have turned the OIC into an arena where they sought the support of their own cause rather than the one for ummah.

In that regard, Sheikh argues that Saudi Arabia used the OIC to de-politicize global Islamism in 1970s by championing and supporting Islamic cause through the OIC. By the time, Islamic movements were on the verge and pan-Arabism was at its heyday. A Saudi sponsored OIC, by claiming a supreme representative of Muslims in the world, did not only de-politicize global Islamism, but also used as a balance to pan-Arabism. Interestingly enough, after the Iranian Revolution in 1979, Saudi Arabia has resorted pan-Arabism in order to prevent (and to some extent balance in global politics) Iranian exportation of Islamic revolution. Such an inclination from Saudi leadership has derived mostly from the seeking or surviving the leadership role of Saudi Arabia, which has gained especially through the OIC after the demise of pan-Arabism, rather than solving the problems of the Islamic ummah at large. Since establishment of the OIC, Saudi Arabia has served as a catalyst in direction of the OIC. Most of the OIC sub-organs have their headquarters in Saudi Arabia and receive major funding from the kingdom. This has created a de facto leadership or domination of Saudi Arabia in the OIC decision-making process, turning the OIC into a permanent institution through which the Saudis could express their views and their special role in the Islamic world.

Deriving from the OIC experience, Saudi Arabia's involvement or not rejection at least is needed and crucial for any organization in the Islamic world. Saudi Arabia alone cannot sustain any Islamic project organization, but Saudi Arabia alone can disrupt them from political, economic and religious perspective. Therefore, one of the main failures of D-8 was not to include Saudi Arabia within the organization. Although, whether Saudis rejected the invitation, or they never received an invitation is not clear, but judging from today's understanding, non-inclusion of Saudi Arabia might have caused to dead-born of D-8 grouping.

Secondly, the inclusion of Nigeria to the D-8 initially had brought more harm to the organization than fruit. Nigeria, as the most populous country in Africa, is one of the key countries along with Egypt and South Africa. In principle, the choice to include Nigeria within the D-8 was politically and economically right. However, the timing and the domestic politics of Nigeria was harmful for the organization. After a brief democratic experience after 1990, Nigeria's democratic transition efforts were halted by then military leader General Abacha, after he removed all civilians from power through military coup in 1995. In that time, in African context, while there was a democratization process going on, especially with then the new-comer democratic South

Africa after decades of apartheid regime, Nigeria was turned its direction against such trend.

To put in a nutshell, by 1995 when Nigeria was being ruled by military leader Sani Abacha, South African President Nelson Mandela intervened personally after Abacha regime detained Chief Moshood Abiola who was the frontrunner in Nigeria's annulled June 1993 presidential election. During the Abacha regime in Nigeria, Pretoria pursued a policy of 'quiet diplomacy' that sought to save dissidents like Ken Saro-Wiwa and to push that regime toward democracy. Mandela attempted to rush to the rescue when a tribunal convicted former (and current) president General Olesagun Obasanjo and 39 others on coup-plotting charges. In November 1995, when Nigerian ruler Sani Abacha executed nine environmental activists, including Ken Saro-Wiwa, an enraged Mandela unilaterally called for boycott of Nigeria's oil and expulsion from the Commonwealth.

Mandela's call for boycott and expulsion put Nigeria in a difficult position. Mandela's international standing as a moral leader was also important, and contributed to gather support for his standing. When the D-8 initiated, Nigeria had been facing both a domestic instability problem and international exclusion/isolation. Nigeria's involvement in the D-8 process was seen as an opportunity to create a gateway to break international isolation cycle and to create some sort of legitimacy for the military regime. The main concern of Abacha regime was neither economic development among Muslim countries nor to create an 'Islamic common market' eventually, it was legitimacy and recognition. This affected the D-8 grouping negatively in two ways. First, as explained above, different intentions and expectations of members from the D-8 could not be able to create a common understanding and coherent policy implementation. Secondly, as also partly explained above, it gave a reason for international community to criticize and call the D-8 grouping anti-systemic.

Above all, domestic instability and turmoil in most of the member states victimized the D-8 grouping from the beginning as a project because it was located at the centre of domestic politics. As mentioned above, after Turkish Prime Minister Erbakan was ousted from power, then deputy prime minister of Malaysia, Anwar Ibrahim was put in prison on a myriad of charges and only to be released in 2004. Nawaz Sharif, the prime minister of Pakistan and President Suharto of Indonesia either toppled down or forced to step down through a combination of domestic opposition and international pressure.

Overall, in spite of all talk about deepening co-operation and preferential trade arrangements, the intra-trade among D-8 member states has not increased in a significant way. The extent of industrial and agricultural cooperation remained well below than expected. According to the Commission that prepared the report for the 4th Summit of D-8 held in Tehran on 17-18 February 2004, intra trade among D-8 member states constituted a very small fraction of its overall trade with the rest of the world. Despite showing an increase of about 50 percent between 1999 and 2002, \$21.3 billion out of \$500 billion trade margin realized among the D-8 members. This statistic, in comparison to the trade indicators that the members conduct with their other partners, represents only a very small portion. The summit meetings held since 1997, from Dhaka (1999) and Cairo (2001) to Islamabad (2012) and Istanbul (2017) Summits of Head of States and Governments have discussed little advances (if not failures) rather than successes. They have discussed the global economic, financial and trading system and criticized them for their injustice natures; however, they failed to consider special needs of developing world.

In addition to economic cooperation, it was initially expected by the founders and supporters alike that D-8 would eventually extend its range of activities 'to cover cultural, social, political and even military cooperation in future'. This has not however materialized in any significant way due to same reasons for the economic one. In retrospect, a view from today to the place of D-8 grouping within the members states' foreign policy strategies shows that D-8 was never (and still not) rationalized as a development project, but victimized in a sense of emotional domestic policy context.

Conclusion

Organizational failure is one of the issues that international theories differ. Application of different understanding of organizational failure to the Developing Eight (D-8) shows this point clearly. For the neo-realist, D-8 failed because of systemic reasons, since D-8 was seen as a dangerous move by the key players. Neo-liberalists argue that the failure of D-8 should be attributed to huge expectations from the organization. Although this point is not exactly clear, it has certainly contributed in creating a psychological trauma after the initial failure, which has de-motivated the members, killing the revivalist optimism. Critical theory has a better chance to help understand D-8 failure. Since the ideas shape our actions, different expectations of the members from D-8 have made the organization redundant. Similarly the

changing of domestic political settings in the member countries has also played an important role in the failure of D-8.

From a systemic perspective, the inclusion or/and non-inclusion of a key player in Islamic world can determine the future of that organization. In D-8 case, the non-inclusion of Saudi Arabia was a great loss or wrong start for an organization that aimed to develop economic and political relations among Muslim countries. As the OIC experience shows, it is difficult to try to move things further in the Islamic world without involvement or at least a covert approval of Saudi Arabia. This does not mean that Saudis are great power and leader. Contrary, once they feel that they are excluded or not given enough credit that, according to them, they deserve, they have power to blow things up. Some states might not have enough power to construct ideas and action alone, but they might have enough power to destroy it. In that sense, Saudi Arabia is the mover-and-shaker not only in the Arab world, but also in the Islamic world in general.

The ends that an organization wishes to reach must be coherent with the means that this organization uses. As an increasingly isolated country in Africa and international arena, Nigeria's membership to D-8 was a wrong start. Similar to what is said above with regard to Saudi Arabia, is also true for Nigeria. A state might have much destructive power (albeit unwillingly) than to construct. Because of its international standing at the advent of D-8, Nigeria had been a destructive power for the organization in the international arena. It brought more criticism and distributed negative signals to outside world.

It has been a commonplace that in current world domestic politics plays key role in defining international political relations. Unstable domestic settings of D-8 members are also contributed to create 'unstable' organization, which has less coherence. And most importantly, some domestic contingencies in D-8 members used as a tool to support their position in internal politics and thus victimized it within their power struggle, rather than seeing it as truly a development project.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alan, Bulent (ed), D-8, Developing 8 Countries: A New World, Istanbul: Yorum, 2001.
- Al-Ahram Weekly (Cairo), 15-21 February 2001, Issue no 521.
- Anaz, Necati, "Understanding the contemporary United States and European Union foreign policy in the Middle East", *Estudios Políticos*, 38, 2011, pp. 175-194.
- Aral, Berdal, "An Inquiry into the D-8 Experiment: An Incipient Model of an Islamic Common Market?", *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations*, 4 (1&2), Spring & Summer 2005.
- Ashley, Richard K., "The Geopolitics of geopolitical space: Toward a Critical Social Theory of International Politics", *Alternatives*, 12 (4), October 1987.
- Barnett, Michael N., and Martha Finnemore, "The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organization", *International Organization*, 53(4), Autumn 1999.
- Bozbas, Gokhan, "İslam ve Demokrasi" Tartışmaları Üzerinden Bir Algi Yönetimi", *Turkish Journal of TESAM Academy*, 4 (1), 2017, pp. 133-153.
- Bromley, Simon, "Blood for Oil?", *New Political Economy*, Vol 11, No 3, September 2006, pp.419-434.
- Voll, J. Obert, "Relations among Islamist Groups", in John L. Esposito (ed), *Political Islam: Revolution, Radicalism, or Reform?*, London: Lynne Rienner,, 1997.
- Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1998.
- Davutoglu, Ahmet, *Civilizational Transformation and the Muslim World*, Kuala Lumpur: Mahir Publications, Quill, 1994.
- Davutoglu, Ahmet, *Stratejik Derinlik, Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu (Strategic Depth, Turkey's International Position)*, Istanbul: Kure Yayinlari, 2001.
- D-8 Istanbul Declaration, <http://www.developing8.org/documents/summit/istanbul-declaration-1997/> (accessed 27 October 2018).
- "D-8 Developing Eight Countries", <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VdOBuhZ86Qc&mode=related&search=> (accessed 27 October 2018).
- Esposito, John L., *Islam and Politics*, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1984.
- Falk, Richard, "False Universalism and the Geopolitics of Exclusion: the Case of Islam", *Third World Quarterly*, 18 (1), 1997.
- Gallarotti, Giulio M., "The Limits of International Organization: Systemic Failure in the Management of International Relations", *International Organization*, 45 (2), Spring 1991, pp.183-220.

- Grieco, Joseph M., "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism", *International Organization*, 42 (3), 1998.
- Haas, Ernst, *When Knowledge is Power: Three Models of Change in International Organizations*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Higgott, Richard, "Multilateralism and the Limits of Global Governance", paper presented at United Nations University conference on 'Learning from the Crisis: Where do we go for Global Governance?', Buenos Aires, Argentina, May 19-21, 2004.
- Katzenstein, Peter J., "Regionalism in Comparative Perspective", *Cooperation and Conflict*, 31(2), 1996.
- Keohane, Robert O., *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "The Club Model of Multilateral Cooperation and Problems of Democratic Legitimacy", paper presented at the American Political Science Convention, Washington, D.C., 31 August-3 September 2000. Available at <http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/prg/nye/clubmodel.pdf>, (accessed 25 October 2016).
- Landsberg, Chris, "Promoting Democracy: The Mandela-Mbeki Doctrine", *Journal of Democracy*, 11(3), July 2000.
- Lebow, Richard Ned, "The Long Piece, the End of the Cold War, and the Failure of Realism", *International Organization*, 38 (2), Spring 1994.
- Makovsky, Alan, "How to Deal with Erbakan", *The Middle East Quarterly*, 4 (1), March 1997.
- Martin, Lisa L., and Beth A. Simmons, "Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions", *International Organization*, 52 (4), Autumn 1998.
- Mearsheimer, John J., "The False Promise of International Institutions", *International Security*, 19 (3), Winter 1994-1995.
- Ozfaturo, Mustafa N., "(D-8) Developing Countries and the Facts", *Turkiye (Turkish Daily)*, 17 June 1997.
- Ozkan, Mehmet, "El Oriente Medio en la Política Mundial: Un Enfoque Sistémico", *Estudios Politicos*, 38, 2011, pp.99-120.
- Ozkan, Mehmet, "Turkish Activism in the Middle East after 1990s: Towards a Periodization of Three Waves", *Turkish Review of Middle East Studies*, 17, 2006, pp. 157-185.
- Ozkan, Mehmet, "Turkey in the Islamic World: An Institutional Perspective", *Turkish Review of Middle East Studies*, 18, 2007, pp. 159-193.
- Ozkan, Mehmet, "Islamic Politics, Arab Spring and Turkish Model", in K. Chatterjee, P. Singh (ed), *The Dilemma of Popular Sovereignty in the Middle*

- East: Power from or to the People, New Delhi: KW Publishers Pvt Ltd, 2014, pp. 89-104.
- Piscatori, James P., "Islamic Values and National Interest: The Foreign Policy of Saudi Arabia", in Adeed Dawisha (ed), *Islam in Foreign Policy*, London: Cambridge University Press in Association with The Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1983.
- Putnam, Robert D., "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games," *International Organization*, 42 (3), Summer 1988, pp. 427-460.
- Robins, Philip, "Turkish Foreign Policy Under Erbakan", *Survival*, 39 (2), Summer 1997.
- Robins, Philip, "Confusion at Home, Confusion Abroad: Turkey Between Copenhagen and Iraq", *International Affairs*, 79 (3), 2003.
- Sheikh, Naveed S., "Postmodern Islamism?: The International Politics, and Polemics, of Contemporary Islam", *Journal of Third World Studies*, 19(2), Fall 2002.
- Sheikh, Naveed S., *The New Politics of Islam: Pan-Islamic Foreign Policy in a World of States*, London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.
- Sick, G., "Rethinking Dual Containment", *Survival*, 40 (1), March 1998.
- Tickner, J. Ann, "You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements between Feminists and IR Theorists", *International Studies Quarterly*, 41, 1997.
- Wendt, Alexander, "Anarchy is What States Make of it: the Social Construction of Power Politics", *International Organization*, 46 (2), Spring 1992.
- White, Jenny B., "Pragmatists or Ideologues? Turkey's Welfare Party in Power", *Current History* 96, January 1997.