Social, economic and ideological factors contributing to destabilization
The panel will specifically focus on the fragilization of economic systems as a consequence of the financial crisis, of economic marginalization and unemployment and of development gaps. Mass migrations and social tensions arising from phenomena connected to risks of pandemics, ethnic and religious discrimination, spread of xenophobia and extremism will also be given specific consideration. Attention will furthermore be devoted to the implications of climate change – in particular, desertification and scarcity of water and natural resources - for global security. The panel will aim at devising what international strategy is needed in order to cope with those situations.

Social, economic and ideological factors contributing to destabilization

Statement by Mr. Sandro Calvani, UNICRI Director

At G8 meeting on "Destabilising Factors and Transnational Threats"
Rome, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
24 April 2009

Distinguished colleagues, honoured guests, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, good morning.

The world today is facing a series of urgent and often inter-related threats, which require the International Community to re-assess the primary concepts of social co-existence of various differences as well as a radical change in the way we think, discuss and act.

It is important to acknowledge that globalisation has engendered asymmetry, which means that the small can affect the large, not only vice-versa. The positive sides of globalisation, such as the free movement of goods, services, trade, information or people, are being accompanied by a comparable change in people's expectations on individual and collective liberties, safety and security, which, depending on circumstances, may be beneficial or otherwise.

1

Globalisation has also brought challenges, and those who seek to reap the advantages of globalisation must also take responsibility for addressing the convergence of new threats.

Threats

To offer a three minutes executive summary of global threats, I recall that a UN High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, chaired presented in 2004 its Report "A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility". The report identified the new challenges to global security and set out a broad framework of recommendations for collective security for the new century. The main threats identified were: poverty, infectious disease and environmental degradation; nuclear, radiological, chemical and biological weapons; terrorism; and transnational organized crime.

A financial crisis was not in the forecast of the report. The financial crisis and the slow-down of the economy belong to the expertise of the next speaker. So, I leave to him to offer his analysis.

I would like to mention only the fact that the most affected victims of the crisis are the poorest part of all societies who were already at the bottom of grave inequalities in the access to resources.

The same UN Report further gives an example of the potentially tragic impact an infectious disease can cause globally. Due to the fact that international flight times are shorter than the incubation periods for many infectious diseases, any one of 700 million international airline passengers each year can be an unwitting global disease-vector. The influenza pandemic of 1919 killed as many as 100 million people, far more than the First World War, over a period of a little more than a year. Today, a similar virus could kill tens of millions in a fraction of the time.

Environmental degradation including desertification has enhanced the destructive potential of natural disasters and in some cases hastened their occurrence. More than two billion people were affected by such disasters in the last decade, and in the same period the economic toll surpassed that of the previous four decades combined.

If climate change produces more acute flooding, heat waves, droughts and storms, this pace may accelerate.

Climate change together with global access to water and sustainable sources of energy can be seen to rank with terrorism, pandemic diseases and major wars as one of the principle challenges to security in the twenty-first century.

The major characteristics of threats, - as we listened yesterday, are traditional and new, more insidious, can cross borders, expand criminal markets, infiltrate vulnerable States and infringe human rights.

When criminal groups are able to expand their illicit activities with almost complete impunity in areas that have escaped from state sovereignty, they not only jeopardize the safety and security of the state in which they establish their own control, but can also cause destabilising spill over effect into other states. The failure to effectively address issues such as migrations, economic marginalisation, ethnic and religious discrimination, xenophobia or extremism in one country, can give rise to security threats and destabilisation in, not just the home country, but in the neighbouring countries, the region, and in the entire world.

Migrations are widely seen as one of the positive trends of globalisation, open markets and dialogue among civilisations, but there is another side to this coin that is not as bright. Migrations are often followed by marginalisation. People who migrate from areas suffering from war regularly experience problems in their reception in the host countries and in their integration. There are frequent occurrences of xenophobia within the country against these groups due to fears related to the difference of the cultural values of the receiving country, and fears related to exploitation of resources and welfare systems. Gaps in the development and economic disadvantage can lead to a lack of educational and social opportunities, which reinforce the cycle of exclusion.
All of these difficulties prevent successful integration of immigrants into the society and can lead to the formation of 'pockets' in society within the groups that are being systemically discriminated against. Criminalisation can follow as a result.

These observations give evidence that <u>destabilization does not happen in a vacuum</u>, but can rather occur for reasons of economic degradation, as well as social and political alienation.

Therefore an intellectually honest change of mind should accept to no longer think in narrow terms about security; rather, we must both deepen and broaden our ways of perceiving and addressing challenges, not just to security, but also to safety and the sense of inclusiveness and belonging for all of those who feel marginalized, excluded and discriminated against.

The 7 July London bombings can be analysed as a fitting example because they involved second-generation British citizens. These citizens, seemingly fully integrated into the society, were the ones who chose to inflict such carnage against their fellow countrymen. This must be indicative of a sense of isolation and alienation, which needs to be understood and remedied.

Yet, the complexity of the change does not affect only society and organisations. The new millennium is also bringing a "revolution" that is challenging the ways we think and what we believe about managing knowledge and learning (KMS).

In order to maximize KMS capacity UNICRI has put together a group of almost a hundred experts in security innovation.

Bauman has attempted to describe this change as "Liquid Modernity". The Polish sociologist has suggested that the change from "solid" to "liquid" modernity has created a new and unprecedented setting for individual life plans, confronting individuals with a series of challenges never encountered before. One of the results is that institutional structures cannot perform the "solid" role of reference for human actions and plans, and individuals have to find other ways to organise their lives, often acting under conditions of endemic uncertainty.

Bauman's opinion confirms the analysis of Joseph Nye a few years ago on the need to strengthen and network the soft power for world security.

<u>Are there effective responses to these destabilizing factors?</u>

Governments and international organizations as well as civil societies are urgently examining the significance of this new situation. It is now recognized that no State can stand wholly alone to face these challenges, regardless of efforts to improve security. Neither can any State make itself immune to today's threat. Even the most powerful State can be held hostage by non-State actors who develop weapons of mass destruction (WMD) capabilities, especially when expertise and knowledge is available on the Internet.

Therefore, States should be in the front line in combating today's threats, and seek to overcome the boundaries by sharing responsibilities and tasks. Equally important, security should directly involve a broad cross-section of civil society, the private sector, and focus on economic development and civil liberties

In the same perspective the World Economic Forum and its Global Agenda Councils are proposing a <u>Global Redesign Project</u> based on three main pillars, namely: Strengthening Economies, Enhancing Security, and Promoting Sustainability.

<u>Genuine multilateralism</u> is critically important here. It has been often neglected in the past decade or so; today we have both a dire need and a new window of opportunity to restore and strengthen it.

The United Nations, created in 1945 "to maintain international peace and security", has addressed these new challenges by proposing the creation of a new system of collective security not only in the traditional military sense, but also in terms of economic development and civil liberties.

A significant step towards the development of a collective security was the formulation of the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. It was adopted unanimously by the UN General Assembly in September 2006 and promotes a comprehensive global strategy against terrorism that not only incorporates security-related preventative measures, but also gives priorities to conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism.

In July 2005, to ensure overall coordination and coherence in the counter-terrorism efforts, the Secretary-General established the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF) that includes the main international entities in the field of counter-terrorism.

This UN Strategy has inspired a new sense of ownership across all Member States. Instead of designing countermeasures through legally-binding UN Security Council resolutions, terrorism is now confronted through an inclusive and holistic approach. In other words, this strategy was forged on consensus amongst all States.

However, difficulties arise when global consensus has to be translated into action. There are many complex challenges, especially when policymakers from fragile states have to work with scarce human, technological and physical resources, lots of political interference and limited budgets. There are also cultural concerns that are more intimately connected with the concepts of governance and organizational learning.

UNICRI, a UN entity and a part of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF), is promoting the concept of Security Governance to remove cultural and organizational obstacles to the implementation of a collective security system.
UNICRI has become known in recent years for its dynamic, fresh and innovative approach to action-oriented analysis activities and technical cooperation interventions, often taking advantage of public-private partnership.

UNICRI promotes the development of an holistic approach through which all stakeholders, while operating autonomously, can establish common goals, identify and manage the resources necessary to achieve these goals, clearly allocate responsibilities and tasks, elaborate functioning channels of communication, create a security culture based on common learning, and ensure that lessons learnt are incorporated and communicated.

Conclusions

Different complex and simple analysis, economic, sociological or political, by bright minds, including Nobel Prize Laureates, have come to the same conclusion of the need for a unified action to create a strategy of cooperation at the international level in order to decrease and eliminate the factors leading to destabilization. To do this we must concentrate on knowledge and unity instead of narrow political interests. We must act together to respond effectively and to overcome such formidable ever-changing challenges.

The potential for exponential growth of the threats we analysed yesterday and today, is immense and therefore, we should feel <u>a sense of urgency</u> as we approach these issues and as we seek solutions. This sense of urgency should be applied when we look at creating channels for cooperation and communication between countries, because these issues cannot be overcome by a single state acting alone. The urgency of the points in question highlights the need to be pro-active and not simply reactive, to genuinely innovate, to develop strategies, and to encourage not just protection and prevention, but also resilience.

In my personal capacity I wish to add a fact that was evident everywhere and every time in the tens oh humanitarian crisis, pandemics, complex conflicts and transnational crimes where I have worked and lived in the past 29 years.

Indeed, <u>all human beings are equal</u> and all have enormous potentials to overcome their difficulties, which destabilize their lives. They just need an enabling environment to become part of the solution instead of being part of the problem.

We are not facing just a complexity for a group of 8 nations, for a group of 20, 77 or 192 nations. The real challenge is truly a re-set of opportunities for a group of 6,5 billion people, a re-boot, which concerns human rights, development and security for our and the next generations of human kind.

Thank you for your attention.