

# THE IMPACT OF CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN SOUTH SUDAN DEVELOPMENT

**By Prof . Gabriel Alier Riak, PhD\* & PhD Candidate Dut Bol Ayuel Bill**  
*Upper Nile University*

**\*Corresponding Author: -**

---

Among all the good in the world, and all the progress being made in global issues, there is still much more to be done. Given the overwhelming disasters that nations, including the U.S., have been or still are going through, it is important to be aware of the most pressing global issues.

## 1. Climate change (extreme risks)

According to current estimates, unmitigated greenhouse emissions are likely to lead to global temperature increases of 2.6°C to 4.8°C by 2100. If this happened, there'd likely be significant humanitarian harms, including more severe weather, food crises, and the spread of infectious diseases which would disproportionately affect the world's worst off.

But there is a non-negligible chance that unmitigated emissions will lead to *even larger* increases in global temperatures, the results of which could be catastrophic for life in Earth. Though the chance of such large increases is relatively low, the degree of harm that would result is very high, meaning that the expected value of working to reduce these extreme risks may also be very high.

You are more likely to think that extreme climate change is among the most pressing global problems if you think that we have obligations to people who do not yet exist and that there is great value in ensuring that human civilization continues in the long term.

Options for working on this problem include academic research into the extreme risks of climate change or whether they might be mitigated by geoengineering. One can also advocate for reduced greenhouse emissions through careers in politics, think-tanks or journalism, and work on developing lower emissions technologies as an engineer or scientist.

### What is our analysis based on?

We mainly drew on the Open Philanthropy Project's reports on anthropogenic climate change, extreme risks from climate change and geoengineering research.

### What is this problem and what are the arguments for working on it?

According to current estimates, unmitigated greenhouse emissions are likely to lead to global temperature increases of 2.6°C-4.8°C by 2100. If this happened, there'd likely be significant humanitarian harms, including more severe weather, food crises, and the spread of infectious diseases which would disproportionately affect the world's worst off.

But there is also a non-negligible chance — perhaps around 10% — that unmitigated emissions will lead to global temperature increases *even higher* than 4.8°C. More generally, estimates of temperature increases resulting from greenhouse emissions have a “fat” right tail, meaning that there is a low, but non-negligible chance of very high temperature increases:

What's worse, expected harms from temperature changes get worse with each increase in temperature — going from 3°C to 4°C is expected to be significantly worse than going from 1°C to 2°C. If temperature gains exceed 4.8°C this would likely have catastrophic consequences. Read more.

In sum, there appears to be an uncomfortable probability — small, but non-negligible — of seriously bad outcomes resulting from unmitigated greenhouse emissions. We call these the extreme risks from climate change.

### Arguments for working on this problem

- Though the chance of catastrophic outcomes is relatively low, the degree of harm that would result from large temperature increases is very high, meaning that the expected value of working on this problem may also be very high.
- Although climate change as a whole gets a lot of attention, only a small part focuses on research into the likelihood of the extreme risks of climate change, and on research into the feasibility, likely side-effects and risks of geoengineering (large-scale interventions in the Earth's climatic system with the aim of limiting climate change).

### What are the major arguments against working on it?

**Somewhat crowded** – Climate change as a whole gets a lot of attention and funding already. The US government spends about \$8 billion per year on direct climate change efforts and more on regulations designed to limit carbon emissions. The UK spends about e --- a global public health problem

Look at any ecosystem and there could be multiple forms of contamination—streams full of toxic chemicals from industrial processes, rivers overloaded with nutrients from farms, trash blowing away from landfills, city skies covered in smog. Even landscapes that appear pristine can experience the effects of pollution sources located hundreds or thousands of miles away.

## 2. Pollution

Pollution may muddy landscapes, poison soils and waterways, or kill plants and animals. Humans are also regularly harmed by pollution. Long-term exposure to air pollution, for example, can lead to chronic respiratory disease, lung cancer and other diseases. Toxic chemicals that accumulate in top predators can make some species unsafe to eat. More than one billion people lack access to clean water and 2.4 billion don't have adequate sanitation, putting them at risk of contracting deadly diseases.

### What do sea turtles eat? Unfortunately, plastic bags.

Plastic has only been mass-produced since the 1940s, but it's having a devastating impact on sea turtles. Many of us are doing our part to reduce plastic pollution by recycling and reducing single-use items, but governments must also step up to take accountability and end this pollution epidemic.

### Causes

Many of the activities and products that make modern human life possible are polluting the world. Even places that are relatively untouched by 21st-century developments experience the effects of pollution.

### TOXIC CHEMICALS

By 2000, the world's chemical production had increased 400 fold since 1930. Chemicals have made much of modern life possible, but they've also contaminated landscapes around the world. They can travel great distances by air or accumulate in the bodies of animals and humans who absorb chemicals through the skin or ingest them in food or water. While some chemicals may be harmless, others can cause damage. Increasingly, there is particular concern lately about three types of chemicals: chemicals that persist in the environment and accumulate in the bodies of wildlife and people, endocrine disruptors that can interfere with hormones, and chemicals that cause cancer or damage DNA.

### OCEAN LITTER

Litter in the world's oceans comes from many sources, including containers that fall off ships during storms, trash that washes off city streets into rivers that lead into the sea, and waste from landfills that blows into streams or directly into the ocean. Once in the ocean, this debris may degrade slowly and persist for years, traveling the currents, accumulating in large patches and washing up on beaches.

### PESTICIDES AND FERTILIZERS

Use of pesticides and fertilizers on farms has increased by 26-fold over the past 50 years, fueling increases in crop production globally. But there have been serious environmental consequences. Indiscriminate pesticide and fertilizer application may pollute nearby land and water, and chemicals may wash into nearby streams, waterways and groundwater when it rains. Pesticides can kill non-target organisms, including beneficial insects, soil bacteria and fish. Fertilizers are not directly toxic, but their presence can alter the nutrient system in freshwater and marine areas. This alteration can result in an explosive growth of algae due to excess nutrients. As a result, the water is depleted of dissolved oxygen, and fish and other aquatic life may be killed.

### AIR POLLUTION

Air pollution brings to mind visions of smokestacks billowing black clouds into the sky, but this pollution comes in many forms. The burning of fossil fuels, in both energy plants and vehicles, releases massive amounts of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, causing climate change. Industrial processes also emit particulate matter, such as sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide and other noxious gases. Indoor areas can become polluted by emissions from smoking and cooking. Some of these chemicals, when released into the air, contribute to smog and acid rain. Short term exposure to air pollution can irritate the eyes, nose and throat and cause upper respiratory infections, headaches, nausea and allergic reactions. Long-term exposures can lead to chronic respiratory disease, lung cancer, and heart disease. Long-term exposures also can lead to significant climatic changes that can have far reaching negative impacts on food, water and ecosystems.

### NOISE AND LIGHT POLLUTION

Artificial light and noise often drown out natural landscapes. In the Arctic, the sounds of oil and gas explorations are so loud that belugas, bowhead whales and other sea life have had difficulty feeding and breeding. Light pollution disrupts circadian rhythms for both humans and animals alike and may even contribute to the development of cancer. Light pollution also can impact sea turtles. Adult and hatchling sea turtles are drawn toward lights along the beach, thinking they are heading toward the moon. Coastal developments, therefore, are encouraged to turn off their lights or cover them at night.

### Impacts

Human activities contaminate ecosystems around the world—from pole to pole, from the highest mountains to the ocean deep. Toxic chemicals can be found in pristine forests and the blood of Arctic animals. Litter floats beneath the surface of oceans miles away from land. Even excess noise and light are interrupting natural patterns and disrupting the lives of animals and people.

### **PREDATORS FULL OF POLLUTANTS**

When toxic chemicals and metals enter the environment, organisms may absorb them through their skin or ingest them in their food or water. Animals higher in the food chain accumulate these toxins in higher and higher concentrations, a process called biomagnification. Top predators—including fish, birds, and mammals—can have much higher levels of these toxins in their bodies, making them more likely to experience the diseases, birth defects, genetic mutations, and other deleterious effects of these poisons.

### **WATER POLLUTION**

Clean freshwater is an essential ingredient for a healthy human life, but 1.1 billion people lack access to water and 2.4 billion don't have adequate sanitation. Water becomes polluted from toxic substances dumped or washed into streams and waterways and the discharge of sewage and industrial waste. These pollutants come in many forms—organic, inorganic, even radioactive—and can make life difficult, if not impossible, for humans, animals and other organisms alike.

### **HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOMS AND DEAD ZONES**

Human activities, especially agriculture, have led to large increases in the levels of nitrogen and phosphorus in the environment. In water, this overabundance of nutrients, a process called eutrophication, can fuel the excessive growth of phytoplankton and algae, which can sometimes have devastating consequences. Harmful algal blooms—blooms of species that produce deadly toxins and sometimes known as “red tides” or “brown tides” for their appearance in the water—can kill fish, marine mammals and seabirds and harm humans. And when the algae and other organisms that had been allowed to bloom because of the nutrient excess eventually die off, bacteria may suck up all the oxygen from the water as the algae decompose. This hypoxia creates a “dead zone” where fish cannot live. More than 400 areas around the world have been identified as experiencing eutrophication and 169 are hypoxic.

### **ACID RAIN**

When water in the atmosphere mixes with certain chemicals—particularly sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides emitted during the burning of fossil fuels—mild acidic compounds are formed. This acid rain can leach toxic aluminum from the soil, which at low levels can stress fish in lakes and streams or, at higher concentrations, kill them outright. Acid rain also weakens trees in forests and contributes to air pollution that can harm humans.

### **OCEAN GARBAGE PATCHES**

Plastics and other marine debris that can float may persist in the oceans for years, traveling the currents. Some of this material accumulates in the centers of ocean gyres, creating great garbage patches. The term “garbage patch” brings to mind floating islands of trash, but little of the debris can be seen on the surface. Garbage patches, instead, are areas where concentrations of flotsam and jetsam, mostly small pieces of plastic, are particularly high. This litter can distribute toxic chemicals throughout the oceans, snag and tear corals, and harm animals if they ingest pieces of plastic or become entangled in the debris.

### **Impacted Species & Places**

- Amur-Heilong
- Congo Basin
- Dolphins and Porpoises
- Dugong
- Galápagos Penguin
- Great White Shark
- Gulf of California
- Humphead Wrasse
- Marine Iguana
- Mesoamerican Reef
- Polar Bear
- Sea Lions
- Sea Turtle
- The Galápagos
- Tuna
- Whale
- Whale Shark
- Yangtze
- Amur-Heilong
- Congo Basin
- Dolphins and Porpoises
- Dugong
- Galápagos Penguin
- Great White Shark
- Gulf of California

- Humphead Wrasse
- Marine Iguana
- Mesoamerican Reef
- Polar Bear
- Sea Lions
- Sea Turtle
- The Galápagos
- Tuna
- Whale
- Whale Shark
- Yangtze
- Amur-Heilong
- Congo Basin
- Dolphins and Porpoises
- Dugong
- Galápagos Penguin
- Great White Shark
- Gulf of California
- Humphead Wrasse
- Marine Iguana
- Mesoamerican Reef
- Polar Bear
- Sea Lions
- Sea Turtle
- The Galápagos
- Tuna
- Whale
- Whale Shark
- Yangtze
- Amur-Heilong
- Congo Basin
- Dolphins and Porpoises
- Dugong
- Galápagos Penguin
- Great White Shark
- Gulf of California
- Humphead Wrasse
- Marine Iguana
- Mesoamerican Reef
- Polar Bear
- Sea Lions
- Sea Turtle
- The Galápagos
- Tuna
- Whale
- Whale Shark
- Yangtze
- Next

**What WWF Is Doing**

One of WWF’s two main approaches for preserving the world’s biodiversity is the 2050 Footprint Goal, an aim that by 2050 [humanity’s global footprint](#) will stay within the planet’s capacity to sustain life and that natural resources will be shared equitably.

WWF has identified 100 companies that most directly impact the species and places that the organization is trying to protect. By engaging with these companies, WWF works to reduce the environmental impact of these businesses and champion sustainable solutions.

**ADVOCATING TO REDUCE POLLUTION**

Pollution is regulated at local, national and international levels. WWF works at all three levels to push for measures that will minimize the impacts of development and reduce pollution.

### **INSPIRING LOCAL CONSERVATION**

WWF works to encourage local conservation and environmental awareness. For example, in June 2012 WWF helped organize the first Coral Triangle Day, to bring to light the importance of the oceans and the need to protect them. The regional celebration will involve beach and river cleanups, selling of handicrafts made from recycled materials, and local campaigns which raise awareness of the need to keep the marine environment clean.

### **PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE LIVING**

WWF, in partnership with Toyota, helps to make the Galápagos a model of sustainable living. Achievements include international environmental certification of the fuel-handling facility on Baltra Island, a four-year renewable-energy teacher education campaign, the creation of the first Municipal Department of the Environment on Santa Cruz Island, and an oil-recycling program. Our vision for the future is to help create a successful waste management and recycling system on all four inhabited islands. We continue to strive for innovative solutions, such as a new type of landfill being constructed on Santa Cruz that will offer environmentally sound disposal of solid waste. We also educate the local communities about the need to reduce waste and recycle, and to create a culture of responsible consumption.

### **3. Violence**

Violence has probably always been part of the human experience. Its impact can be seen, in various forms, in all parts of the world. Each year, more than a million people lose their lives, and many more suffer non-fatal injuries, as a result of self-inflicted, interpersonal or collective violence.

Overall, violence is among the leading causes of death worldwide for people aged 15–44 years.

Although precise estimates are difficult to obtain, the cost of violence translates into billions of US dollars in annual health care expenditures worldwide, and billions more for national economies in terms of days lost from work, law enforcement and lost investment.

#### **Defining violence**

Any comprehensive analysis of violence should begin by defining the various forms of violence in such a way as to facilitate their scientific measurement.

There are many possible ways to define violence. The World Health Organization defines violence (2) as:

The intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation.

The definition used by the World Health Organization associates intentionality with the committing of the act itself, irrespective of the outcome it produces. Excluded from the definition are unintentional incidents – such as most road traffic injuries and burns.

The inclusion of the word “power”, in addition to the phrase “use of physical force”, broadens the nature of a violent act and expands the conventional understanding of violence to include those acts that result from a power relationship, including threats and intimidation. The “use of power” also serves to include neglect or acts of omission, in addition to the more obvious violent acts of commission. Thus,

“the use of physical force or power” should be understood to include neglect and all types of physical, sexual and psychological abuse, as well as suicide and other self-abusive acts.

This definition covers a broad range of outcomes –including psychological harm, deprivation and maldevelopment. This reflects a growing recognition among researchers and practitioners of the need to include violence that does not necessarily result in injury or death, but that nonetheless poses a substantial burden on individuals, families, communities and health care systems worldwide. Many forms of violence against women, children and the elderly, for instance, can result in physical, psychological and social problems that do not necessarily lead to injury, disability or death. These consequences can be immediate, as well as latent, and can last for years after the initial abuse. Defining outcomes solely in terms of injury or death thus limits the understanding of the full impact of violence on individuals, communities and society at large.

#### **The visible and the invisible**

The human cost in grief and pain, of course, cannot be calculated. In fact, much of it is almost invisible. While satellite technology has made certain types of violence – terrorism, wars, riots and civil unrest – visible to television audiences on a daily basis, much more violence occurs out of sight in homes, workplaces and even in the medical and social institutions set up to care for people. Many of the victims are too young, weak or ill to protect themselves. Others are forced by social conventions or pressures to keep silent about their experiences.

As with its impacts, some causes of violence are easy to see. Others are deeply rooted in the social, cultural and economic fabric of human life. Recent research suggests that while biological and other individual factors explain some of the predisposition to aggression, more often these factors interact with family, community, cultural and other external factors to create a situation where violence is likely to occur.

#### **A preventable problem**

Despite the fact that violence has always been present, the world does not have to accept it as an inevitable part of the human condition. As long as there has been violence, there have also been systems – religious, philosophical, legal and communal – which have grown up to prevent or limit it. None has been completely successful, but all have made their contribution to this defining mark of civilization. Since the early 1980s, the field of public health has been a growing asset

in this response. A wide range of public health practitioners, researchers and systems have set themselves the tasks of understanding the roots of violence and preventing its occurrence.

Violence can be prevented and its impact reduced, in the same way that public health efforts have prevented and reduced pregnancy-related complications, workplace injuries, infectious diseases, and illness resulting from contaminated food and water in many parts of the world. The factors that contribute to violent responses – whether they are factors of attitude and behaviour or related to larger social, economic, political and cultural conditions – can be changed.

Violence can be prevented. This is not an article of faith, but a statement based on evidence.

Examples of success can be found around the world, from small-scale individual and community efforts to national policy and legislative initiatives.

### **What can a public health approach contribute?**

By definition, public health is not about individual patients. Its focus is on dealing with diseases and with conditions and problems affecting health, and it aims to provide the maximum benefit for the largest number of people. This does not mean that public health ignores the care of individuals.

Rather, the concern is to prevent health problems and to extend better care and safety to entire populations. The public health approach to any problem is interdisciplinary and science-based (1). It draws upon knowledge from many disciplines, including medicine, epidemiology, sociology, psychology, criminology, education and economics. This has allowed the field of public health to be innovative and responsive to a wide range of diseases, illnesses and injuries around the world.

The public health approach also emphasizes collective action. It has proved time and again that cooperative efforts from such diverse sectors as health, education, social services, justice and policy are necessary to solve what are usually assumed to be purely “medical” problems. Each sector has an important role to play in addressing the problem of violence and, collectively, the approaches taken by each have the potential to produce important reductions in violence .

The public health approach to violence is based on the rigorous requirements of the scientific method. In moving from problem to solution, it has four key steps (1):

Uncovering as much basic knowledge as possible about all the aspects of violence –through systematically collecting data on the magnitude, scope, characteristics and consequences of violence at local, national and international levels.

Investigating why violence occurs – that is, conducting research to determine:

the causes and correlates of violence;

the factors that increase or decrease the risk for violence;

— the factors that might be modifiable through interventions.

. Exploring ways to prevent violence, using the information from the above, by designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating interventions.

. Implementing, in a range of settings, interventions that appear promising, widely disseminating information and determining the cost-effectiveness of programmes.

Public health is above all characterized by its emphasis on prevention. Rather than simply accepting or reacting to violence, its starting point

## **4. Security and Well Being**

Saving future generations from the scourge of war was the main motivation for creating the United Nations, whose founders lived through the devastation of two world wars. Since its creation, the UN has often been called upon to prevent disputes from escalating into war, or to help restore peace following the outbreak of armed conflict, and to promote lasting peace in societies emerging from wars.

### **Security Council**

Over the decades, the UN has helped to end numerous conflicts, often through actions of the Security Council — the organ with primary responsibility, under the United Nations Charter, for the maintenance of international peace and security. When it receives a complaint about a threat to peace, the Council first recommends that the parties seek an agreement by peaceful means. In some cases, the Council itself investigates and mediates. It may appoint special representatives or request the Secretary-General to do so, or to use his good offices. It may set forth principles for a peaceful settlement.

When a dispute leads to fighting, the Council's first concern is to end it as soon as possible. On many occasions, the Council has issued ceasefire directives, which have helped to prevent major hostilities. It also deploys UN peacekeeping operations to reduce tensions in troubled areas, keep opposing forces apart, and create conditions for sustainable peace after settlements have been reached. The Council may decide on enforcement measures, economic sanctions (such as trade embargoes) or collective military action.

### **General Assembly**

According to the Charter, the General Assembly can make recommendations on the general principles of cooperation for maintaining international peace and security, including disarmament, and for the peaceful settlement of any situation that might impair friendly relations among nations. The General Assembly may also discuss any question relating to international peace and security and make recommendations the Security Council is not currently discussing the issue.

Pursuant to its “Uniting for Peace” resolution of November 1950 (resolution 377 (V)), the General Assembly may also take action if the Security Council fails to act, owing to the negative vote of a Permanent Member, in a case where there appears to be a threat to, or breach of peace, or an act of aggression. The Assembly can consider the matter immediately in



order to make recommendations to Members for collective measures to maintain, or restore, international peace and security.

### **Secretary-General**

The Charter empowers the Secretary-General to "bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security." One of the most vital roles played by the Secretary-General is the use of his "good offices" – steps taken publicly and in private that draw upon his independence, impartiality and integrity to prevent international disputes from arising, escalating or spreading.

### **Conflict Prevention**

The main strategies to prevent disputes from escalating into conflict, and to prevent the recurrence of conflict, are preventive diplomacy and preventive disarmament. Preventive diplomacy refers to action taken to prevent disputes from arising or escalating into conflicts, and to limit the spread of conflicts as they arise. It may take the form of mediation, conciliation or negotiation.

### **Preventive diplomacy**

Early warning is an essential component of prevention, and the United Nations carefully monitors developments around the world to detect threats to international peace and security, thereby enabling the Security Council and the Secretary-General to carry out preventive action. Envoys and special representatives of the Secretary-General are engaged in mediation and preventive diplomacy throughout the world. In some trouble spots, the mere presence of a skilled envoy can prevent the escalation of tension. These envoys often cooperate with regional organizations.

### **Preventive disarmament**

Complementing preventive diplomacy is preventive disarmament, which seeks to reduce the number of small arms in conflict-prone regions. In El Salvador, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste and elsewhere, this has entailed demobilizing combat forces, as well as collecting and destroying their weapons as part of an overall peace agreement. Destroying yesterday's weapons prevents their use in tomorrow's wars.

### **Preventing Genocide and Responsibility to Protect**

Prevention requires apportioning responsibility and promoting collaboration between the concerned States and the international community. The duty to prevent and halt genocide and mass atrocities lies first and foremost with the State, but the international community has a role that cannot be blocked by the invocation of sovereignty. Sovereignty no longer exclusively protects States from foreign interference; it is a charge of responsibility where States are accountable for the welfare of their people. This principle is enshrined in article 1 of the Genocide Convention and embodied in the principle of "sovereignty as responsibility" and in the concept of the Responsibility to Protect.

The Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide acts as a catalyst to raise awareness of the causes and dynamics of genocide, to alert relevant actors where there is a risk of genocide, and to advocate and mobilize for appropriate action. The Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect leads the conceptual, political, institutional and operational development of the Responsibility to Protect. The efforts of their Office include alerting relevant actors to the risk of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, enhancing the capacity of the United Nations to prevent these crimes, including their incitement.

### **Peacekeeping**

United Nations peacekeeping operations are a vital instrument employed by the international community to advance peace and security.

The first UN peacekeeping mission was established in 1948 when the Security Council authorized the deployment of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) to the Middle East to monitor the Armistice Agreement between Israel and its Arab neighbours. Since then, there have been more than 70 UN peacekeeping operations around the world.

Over 70 years, UN peacekeeping has evolved to meet the demands of different conflicts and a changing political landscape. Born at the time when Cold War rivalries frequently paralyzed the Security Council, UN peacekeeping goals were primarily limited to maintaining ceasefires and stabilizing situations on the ground, so that efforts could be made at the political level to resolve the conflict by peaceful means.

UN peacekeeping expanded in the 1990s, as the end of the Cold War created new opportunities to end civil wars through negotiated peace settlements. Many conflicts ended, either through direct UN mediation, or through the efforts of others acting with UN support. Countries assisted included El Salvador, Guatemala, Namibia, Cambodia, Mozambique, Tajikistan, and Burundi. In the late nineties, continuing crises led to new operations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Central African Republic, Timor Leste, Sierra Leone and Kosovo.

In the new millennium, peacekeepers have been deployed to Liberia, Côte d'Ivoire, Sudan, South Sudan, Haiti, and Mali. Today's conflicts are less numerous but deeply rooted. For example, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Darfur, and South Sudan today, are in a second or third wave of conflict. And many are complicated by regional dimensions that are key to their solution. In fact, some two-thirds of peacekeeping personnel today are deployed amid ongoing conflict, where

peace agreements are shaky or absent. Conflicts today are also increasingly intensive, involving determined armed groups with access to sophisticated armaments and techniques.

The nature of conflict has also changed over the years. UN peacekeeping, originally developed as a means of resolving inter-State conflict, has been increasingly applied over time to intra-State conflicts and civil wars. Although the military remains the backbone of most peacekeeping operations, today's peacekeepers perform a variety of complex tasks, from helping to build sustainable institutions of governance, through human rights monitoring and security sector reform, to the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, and demining.

### **Peace building**

Within the United Nations, peacebuilding refers to efforts to assist countries and regions in their transitions from war to peace and to reduce a country's risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict by strengthening national capacities for conflict management, and laying the foundations for sustainable peace and development.

Building lasting peace in war-torn societies is a daunting challenge for global peace and security. Peacebuilding requires sustained international support for national efforts across the broadest range of activities. For instance, peacebuilders monitor ceasefires, demobilize and reintegrate combatants, assist the return of refugees and displaced persons, help to organize and monitor elections of a new government, support justice and security sector reforms, enhance human rights protections, and foster reconciliation after past atrocities.

Peacebuilding involves action by a wide array of organizations of the UN system, including the World Bank, regional economic commissions, NGOs and local citizens' groups. Peacebuilding has played a prominent role in UN operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Kosovo, Liberia and Mozambique, as well as more recently in Afghanistan, Burundi, Iraq, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste. An example of inter-state peacebuilding has been the UN Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea.

Recognizing that the UN needs to better anticipate and respond to the challenges of peacebuilding, the 2005 World Summit approved the creation of a new Peacebuilding Commission. In the resolutions establishing the Peacebuilding Commission, resolution 60/180 and resolution 1645 (2005), the UN General Assembly and the Security Council mandated it to bring together all relevant actors to advise on the proposed integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery; to marshal resources and help ensure predictable financing for these activities; and to develop best practices in collaboration with political, security, humanitarian and development actors.

The resolutions also identify the need for the Commission to extend the period of international attention on post-conflict countries, and where necessary, highlight any gaps which threaten to undermine peacebuilding.

The General Assembly and Security Council resolutions establishing the Peacebuilding Commission also provided for the establishment of a Peacebuilding Fund and a Peacebuilding Support Office.

### **The Rule of Law**

Promoting the rule of law at the national and international levels is at the heart of the United Nations' mission. Establishing respect for the rule of law is fundamental to achieving a durable peace in the aftermath of conflict, to the effective protection of human rights, and to sustained economic progress and development. The principle that everyone – from the individual to the State itself – is accountable to laws that are publicly promulgated, equally enforced and independently adjudicated, is a fundamental concept which drives much of the United Nations work. The main United Nations organs, including the General Assembly and the Security Council, play essential roles in supporting Member States to strengthen the rule of law, as do many United Nations entities.

Responsibility for the overall coordination of rule of law work by the United Nations system rests with the Rule of Law Coordination and Resource Group, chaired by the Deputy Secretary-General and supported by the Rule of Law Unit. Members of the Group are the principals of 20 United Nations entities engaged in supporting Member States to strengthen the rule of law. Providing support from headquarters to rule of law activities at the national level, the Secretary-General designated the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as the joint global focal point for the police, justice and corrections areas in the rule of law in post-conflict and other crisis situations.

### **Demining**

In 2014, landmines and explosive hazards killed approximately 10 people every day — most of them children, women and the elderly — and severely maim countless more. Scattered in some 57 countries and 4 territories, landmines and other explosive hazards are an ongoing reminder of conflicts which have been over for years or even decades.

The UN aims for a world free of landmines and explosive remnants of war, where individuals and communities live in a safe environment conducive to development and where the needs of victims are met. Twelve UN Departments and Offices of the Secretariat, specialized agencies, funds and programmes play a role in mine-action programs in 30 countries and three territories.

Mine action makes it possible for peacekeepers to carry out patrols, for humanitarian agencies to deliver assistance, and for ordinary citizens to live without the fear that a single misstep could cost them their lives.

Mine action entails more than removing landmines from the ground. It includes high impact efforts aimed at protecting people from danger, helping victims become self-sufficient and active members of their communities.

A jointly developed policy is the "Mine Action and Effective Coordination: the United Nations Inter-Agency Policy". It guides the division of labour within the United Nations. Much of the actual work, such as demining and mine risk education, is carried out by nongovernmental organizations. Commercial contractors and, in some situations, militaries,



add humanitarian mine-action services to this. Furthermore, a variety of intergovernmental, international and regional organizations, as well as international financial institutions, fund operations and provide services to individuals and communities affected by landmines and explosive remnants of war.

The UN Mine Action Service (UNMAS) coordinates the UN's mine-related activities. UNMAS ensures an effective, proactive and coordinated response to the problems of landmines and explosive remnants of war, including cluster munitions. It assesses and monitors the threat posed by mines and unexploded ordnance on an ongoing basis and develops policies and standards. The Service mobilizes resources, and advocates in support of the global ban on anti-personnel landmines. UNMAS sets up and manages mine-action coordination centres in countries and territories as part of peacekeeping operations, humanitarian emergencies and crises. More recently, UNMAS has increasingly focused on the threat posed by improvised explosive devices.

The UN has addressed the problems posed by landmines since the 1980s. It acted decisively to address the use of weapons having indiscriminate effects when it sponsored the 1980 Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. In 1996, that Convention was strengthened to include the use of landmines in internal conflicts and to require that all mines be detectable.

Eventually, a growing public outcry, combined with the committed action of non-governmental organizations involved in the International Campaign to Ban Land Mines (ICBL), led to the adoption of a comprehensive global agreement.

The landmark 1997 UN Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (Mine-Ban Convention) bans the production, use and export of these weapons and has nearly universal support. As of November 2016, it had 162 States parties.

A UN International Day for Mine Awareness and Assistance in Mine Action is observed every year on 4 April.

In 2015, the UN Secretary-General designated the renowned actor Daniel Craig as the first UN Global Advocate for the Elimination of Mines and Explosive Hazards.

### **Women and Children in Conflict**

In contemporary conflicts, up to 90 per cent of casualties are civilians, mostly women and children. Women in war-torn societies can face specific and devastating forms of sexual violence, which are sometimes deployed systematically to achieve military or political objectives. Moreover, women continue to be poorly represented in formal peace processes, although they contribute in many informal ways to conflict resolution.

However, the UN Security Council in its resolution 1325 on women, peace and security has recognized that including women and gender perspectives in decision-making can strengthen prospects for sustainable peace. The landmark resolution addresses the situation of women in armed conflict and calls for their participation at all levels of decision-making on conflict resolution and peacebuilding.

Since the agenda was set with the core principles of resolution 1325, the Security Council adopted three supporting resolutions — 1820, 1888 and 1889. All four resolutions focus on two key goals: strengthening women's participation in decision-making and ending sexual violence and impunity.

Since 1999, the systematic engagement of the UN Security Council has firmly placed the situation of children affected by armed conflict as an issue affecting peace and security. The Security Council has created a strong framework and provided the Secretary-General with tools to respond to violations against children. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict serves as the leading UN advocate for the protection and well-being of children affected by armed conflict.

### **Peaceful uses of outer space**

The UN works to ensure that outer space is used for peaceful purposes and that the benefits from space activities are shared by all nations. This concern for the peaceful uses of outer space began soon after the launch of Sputnik — the first artificial satellite — by the Soviet Union in 1957 and has kept pace with advances in space technology. The UN has played an important role by developing international space law and by promoting international cooperation in space science and technology.

The Vienna-based United Nations Office for Outer Space serves as the secretariat for the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and its subcommittees, and assists developing countries in using space technology for development.

## **5. Lack of Education**

Today, education remains an inaccessible right for millions of children around the world. More than 72 million children of primary education age are not in school and 759 million adults are illiterate and do not have the awareness necessary to improve both their living conditions and those of their children.

### **Causes of lack of education**

#### **Marginalisation and poverty**

For many children who still do not have access to education, it is notable because of persisting inequality and marginalization.

In developing and developed countries alike, children do not have access to basic education because of inequalities that originate in sex, health and cultural identity (ethnic origin, language, religion). These children find themselves on the margins of the education system and do not benefit from learning that is vital to their intellectual and social development. Factors linked to poverty such as unemployment, illness and the illiteracy of parents, multiply the risk of non-schooling and the drop-out rate of a child by 2.

Undeniably, many children from disadvantaged backgrounds are forced to abandon their education due to health problems related to malnutrition or in order to work and provide support for the family.

### **Financial deficit of developing countries**

Universal primary education is a major issue and a sizeable problem for many states.

Many emerging countries do not appropriate the financial resources necessary to create schools, provide schooling materials, nor recruit and train teachers. Funds pledged by the international community are generally not sufficient enough to allow countries to establish an education system for all children.

Equally, a lack of financial resources has an effect on the quality of teaching. Teachers do not benefit from basic teacher training and schools, of which there are not enough, have oversized classes.

This overflow leads to classes where many different educational levels are forced together which does not allow each individual child to benefit from an education adapted to their needs and abilities. As a result, the drop-out rate and education failure remain high.

### **Overview of the right to education worldwide**

#### **Most affected regions.**

As a result of poverty and marginalization, more than 72 million children around the world remain unschooled.

Sub-Saharan Africa is the most affected area with over 32 million children of primary school age remaining uneducated. Central and Eastern Asia, as well as the Pacific, are also severely affected by this problem with more than 27 million uneducated children.

Additionally, these regions must also solve continuing problems of educational poverty (a child in education for less than 4 years) and extreme educational poverty (a child in education for less than 2 years).

Essentially this concerns Sub-Saharan Africa where more than half of children receive an education for less than 4 years. In certain countries, such as Somalia and Burkina Faso, more than 50% of children receive an education for a period less than 2 years.

The lack of schooling and poor education have negative effects on the population and country. The children leave school without having acquired the basics, which greatly impedes the social and economic development of these countries.

#### **Inequality between girls and boys: the education of girls in jeopardy**

Today, it is girls who have the least access to education. They make up more than 54% of the non-schooled population in the world.

This problem occurs most frequently in the Arab States, in central Asia and in Southern and Western Asia and is principally explained by the cultural and traditional privileged treatment given to males. Girls are destined to work in the family home, whereas boys are entitled to receive an education.

In sub-Saharan Africa, over 12 million girls are at risk of never receiving an education. In Yemen, it is more than 80% of girls who will never have the opportunity to go to school. Even more alarming, certain countries such as Afghanistan or Somalia make no effort to reduce the gap between girls and boys with regard to education.

Although many developing countries may congratulate themselves on dramatically reducing inequality between girls and boys in education, a lot of effort is still needed in order to achieve a universal primary education.

## **6. Unemployment**

Unemployment — and the lack of necessary skills for employment, particularly among youth under age 25 — is one of the issues I hear about most as I speak with world leaders, hotel owners and employees in the thousands of communities where Hilton operates. It's no surprise why: The Economist estimates that there may be as many as 290 million 15-to-24-year-olds not participating in the labor market. These 290 million bright minds — a group almost as large as the U.S. population — could be making our communities stronger and bringing fresh solutions to the world's biggest challenges. By failing to invest the time, energy and resources needed to help these young people succeed, we're jeopardizing the future of the global economy.

This crisis has many roots. In some countries, the reasons are cultural - for instance, girls not receiving the same schooling or job opportunities. In others, they're tied to poor economic conditions or geopolitical issues like the refugee crisis.

There's also a real skills gap. Even in developed economies, where enrollment in upper secondary schools is often near 100 percent, nearly one in five students do not acquire a minimum level of basic skills needed to be gainfully employed. And McKinsey reports only 43 percent of employers can find enough skilled entry-level workers. Schooling and technical skills alone aren't enough; young people also need "soft skills" like communication, problem-solving and cross-cultural competencies to be successful.

One thing is certain: We are not investing nearly enough in creating opportunities for youth. A recent study by the International Youth Foundation (IYF) and the Center for Strategic and International Studies found multilateral agencies, bilateral donors, corporations and foundations allocated USD \$1.8 billion toward youth economic opportunity programs in developing countries in 2014. While that may sound like a lot, it's a drop in the bucket compared to other complex global issues. For example, IYF estimates water and sanitation programs received nearly \$13 billion in 2014, while agricultural development projects received \$12.65 billion.

The good news is we already have an important part of the solution. We know millions of young people are searching for jobs, and there are many sectors within the economy that are looking to hire. In fact, the travel and tourism industry - the largest employer in the world - is expected to generate 86 million new jobs by 2026. Having a strong base of passionate, driven, hard-working employees to fill those jobs is essential to our continued growth.

That's why companies across our industry are investing in training programs and partnerships with governments, NGOs and schools to ensure young people are prepared for and finding short-term jobs and longer-term career opportunities. In fact, Hilton has committed to helping at least one million young people by 2019 by connecting with them through our supply chain and volunteer programs, preparing them through our mentorship and training programs, or employing them directly. We're already halfway to this goal thanks to initiatives like our Youth in Hospitality Month, which this year reached more than 100,000 youth through projects in 74 countries.

But because this issue is bigger than any one company or industry, and because it's so multifaceted, we need to expand our response. This requires a broader commitment to helping young people become employable and employed. It also means sharing best practices and investing in research on what works so we can make faster and better progress. For example, we partner with IYF on The Global Youth Wellbeing Index, which summarizes data on youth wellbeing in key domains like education and employment to develop more effective solutions. Finally, it means investing more government dollars in the public-private apprenticeship programs that have been so successful in getting young people ready for work. Right here in the D.C. area, for example, Virginia Governor Terry McAuliffe has launched an apprenticeship program as part of a comprehensive effort to help young Virginians join and succeed in the workforce. We need much more of this type of action.

## 7. Government Corruption

Corruption is both a major cause and a result of poverty around the world. It occurs at all levels of society, from local and national governments, civil society, judiciary functions, large and small businesses, military and other services and so on. Corruption affects the poorest the most, in rich or poor nations, though all elements of society are affected in some way as corruption undermines political development, democracy, economic development, the environment, people's health and more.

Around the world, the perception of corruption in public places is very high:

But it isn't just in governments that corruption is found; it can permeate through society.

The issue of corruption is very much inter-related with other issues. At a global level, the international (Washington Consensus-influenced) economic system that has shaped the current form of globalization in the past decades requires further scrutiny for it has also created conditions whereby corruption can flourish and exacerbate the conditions of people around the world who already have little say about their own destiny. At a national level, people's effective participation and representation in society can be undermined by corruption, while at local levels, corruption can make day to day lives more painful for all affected.

A difficult thing to measure or compare, however, is the impact of corruption on poverty versus the effects of inequalities that are *structured into law*, such as unequal trade agreements, structural adjustment policies, so-called free trade agreements and so on. It is easier to see corruption. It is harder to see these other more formal, even legal forms of corruption. It is easy to assume that these are not even issues because they are part of the laws and institutions that govern national and international communities and many of us will be accustomed to it—it is how it works, so to speak. Those deeper aspects are discussed in other parts of this web site's section on [trade, economy, & related issues](#).

That is not to belittle the issue of corruption, however, for its impacts are enormous too.

### Rich Countries involved in corruption abroad

When asking why poor countries are poor, it is quite common to hear, especially in wealthier countries that are perceived to have minimal corruption (at least domestically) that other countries are poor because of corruption. Yet, corruption is not something limited to third world despots. Rich countries too have been involved in corrupt practices around the world. As Professor Robert Neild from Trinity College, Cambridge University writes in *Public Corruption; The Dark Side of Social Evolution* (London: Anthem Press, 2002), Rich countries and their agencies ... commonly have been and are accomplices in corruption abroad, encouraging it by their actions rather than impeding it... (p.209). Specific problems he highlights include:

- The impact of Cold War corruption (supporting dictatorships, destabilizing democracies, funding opposition, etc);
- Firms from rich countries bribing rulers and officials from developing countries to gain export contracts, particularly in the arms trade and in construction (even justifying it by suggesting bribery is customary in those countries, so they need to do it to, in order to compete);
- The corruption-inducing effects of the purchase, by the rich countries and their international corporations, of concessions in Third World countries to exploit natural deposits of oil, copper, gold, diamonds and the like. Payments made to rulers often violate local (and Western) rules, keeping corrupt rulers in power, who also embezzle a lot of money away.
- The drug trade. Neild suggests that international law and national laws in rich countries that prohibit drugs may serve to produce a scarcity value irresistible to producers, smugglers and dealers. Governments and civil society in the third world are often undermined, sometimes destroyed by the violence and corruption that goes with the drug trade. This is probably the most important way in which the policies of rich countries foster corruption and violence. Yet the effect on the Third World seems scarcely to enter discussion of alternative drug policies in the rich countries. Legalizing drugs, a system of taxation and regulation, comparable to that applied to tobacco and alcohol might do more to reduce

corruption in the world than any other measure rich countries could take, he suggests. (See this site's section on [illicit drugs](#) for more on that aspect.)

Rich countries have been used to it, too:

Bribery may be pervasive, but it is difficult to detect. Many Western companies do not dirty their own hands, but instead pay local agents, who get a 10 per cent or so success fee if a contract goes through and who have access to the necessary slush funds to ensure that it does. Bribery is also increasingly subtle.... Until recently, bribery was seen as a normal business practice. Many countries including France, Germany and the UK treated bribes as legitimate business expenses which could be claimed for tax deduction purposes.

### **A Cold War Legacy: The Curse of Natural Resources; Inviting corruption**

Professor Neild is worth quoting at extensive length on the impacts the Cold War had in terms of encouraging or exacerbating corruption in the developing countries:

Many Western covert and overt military operation were motivated, in part at least, by the view, which may have been fearfully exaggerated, that the West's supplies of raw materials and oil were threatened by communist intrusion into Third World countries. A feeling of vulnerability was understandable. The Soviet Union ... was largely self-sufficient ...; the West, in need of increasing supplies for its growing industrial production, depended heavily on imports from Third World countries.... Western governments used diplomacy plus overt and covert military operations to counter the Communists. Meanwhile western firms paid rulers to obtain concessions to extract oil and minerals.

The business of obtaining oil and mineral concessions has always been conducive to the use of bribes, omissions, gifts, and favors, and remains so since there are huge rents (i.e. windfall profits) to be shared by the parties to a deal.... Third World governments rarely use auctions [for concession, which, when done honestly, removes the opportunity for buyers to bribe sellers]. They commonly sell concessions by negotiation. For which there are some good reasons. It is often necessary for the foreign company that buys a concession to build infrastructure, such as ports, pipelines, roads and dormitory towns for their staff; to make this worthwhile, a whole oil field or major mineral deposit has to be given to one foreign company, rather than split between many competitors; and that one company, which will become the source of a significant, perhaps dominant, part of the nation's revenue, will acquire substantial economic power *vis-à-vis* the government. Hence strategic and diplomatic consideration enter the calculation: the government will want to give the concession to a company backed by a government which it believes will be helpful to it in its international relations—and in supplying it with arms and mercenaries. But .... there is [also] the prospect of bribes. Those who run a government that has a concession to sell will know that **negotiation creates a strong incentive to the potential buyers to offer them bribes**: they will know this from the point of view of the buyers, a sum that will only add a small percentage to, say, a billion dollar deal, will be worth paying in order to win the concession. Once negotiation is adopted as the means of allocating concessions, the dominant incentive is for bidders to engage competitively in the bribery of local rulers and fixers.

But Neild feels that this same attitude has affected rich countries' domestic political behavior, too. Of particular concern to Neild in this is

the apparent tendency for bribery, which is intense in the business of seeking resource concession and selling arms, to become a secret habit of western firms and politicians that infects their domestic political behavior. Of this there has been considerable evidence in scandals that have occurred recently in Britain, France and Germany.... *Le Monde* published an outspoken editorial commenting on the [French company, Elf Aquitaine, corruption] affair:

For too long French policy in Africa has been neither moral nor effective.

... It would be wrong to deny that corruption is indispensable in the obtaining of drilling concession, though that does not mean that one should not try to stop it. M. Tarallo [a senior Elf Manager] is unfortunately right when he says that all petrol companies use it... But the sins of others do not absolve Elf. Added to which ... Elf has used its money to keep in power dictators whose principle aim has been not the development of their country but their personal enrichment. In exchange, Paris could count on their support in its diplomatic battles and could offer captive markets to French firms...

This neo-colonialism was put in place during the presidency of General de Gaulle and has been maintained by subsequent governments regardless of party...

Looked at today the picture is not glorious. A former colonial power has taught corruption to its African clients—who were willing pupils—and there is nothing to persuade us that they have not rewarded their friends in Paris...

... In one case at least, lack of natural resources has apparently been an incentive to anticorruption policies: the tough ruler of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew, is reported to have said that he came down hard on the corrupt because his tiny country with no natural resources has to rely on its good name to remain a center of banking and technology.

### **Globalization, Multinational Corporations, and Corruption**

Corruption scandals that sometimes make headline news in Western media can often be [worse in developing countries](#). This is especially the case (as the previous link argues) when it is multinational companies going into poorer countries to do business. The international business environment, encouraged by a form of globalization that is heavily influenced by the wealthier and more powerful countries in the world makes it easier for multinationals to make profit and even for a few countries to benefit. However, [some policies behind globalization appear to encourage and exacerbate corruption](#) as accountability of governments and companies have been reduced along the way. For example,

For multinationals, bribery enables companies to gain contracts (particularly for public works and military equipment) or concessions which they would not otherwise have won, or to do so on more favorable terms. Every year, Western



businesses pay huge amounts of money in bribes to win friends, influence and contracts. These bribes are conservatively estimated to run to US\$80 billion a year—roughly the amount that the UN believes is needed to eradicate global poverty. Dr Hawley also lists a number of impacts that multinationals' corrupt practices have on the South (another term for Third World, or developing countries), including:

- They undermine development and exacerbate inequality and poverty.
- They disadvantage smaller domestic firms.
- They transfer money that could be put towards poverty eradication into the hands of the rich.
- They distort decision-making in favor of projects that benefit the few rather than the many.
- They also Increase debt;
- Benefit the company, not the country;
- Bypass local democratic processes;
- Damage the environment;
- Circumvent legislation; and
- Promote weapons sales.

### **IMF and World Bank Policies that Encourage Corruption**

At a deeper level are the policies that form the backbone to globalization. These policies are often prescribed by international institutions such as the World Bank and IMF. For years, they have received sharp criticism for exacerbating poverty through policies such as [Structural Adjustment](#), rapid deregulation and opening barriers to trade before poorer countries are economic ready to do so. This has also created situations ripe for corruption to flourish:

As Western governments and the World Bank and IMF shout ever more loudly about corruption, their own policies are making it worse in both North and South. Particularly at fault are deregulation, privatization, and structural adjustment policies requiring civil service reform and economic liberalization. In 1997, the World Bank asserted that:

any reform that increases the competitiveness of the economy will reduce incentives for corrupt behavior. Thus policies that lower controls on foreign trade, remove entry barriers to private industry, and privatize state firms in a way that ensure competition will all support the fight.

The Bank has so far shown no signs of taking back this view. It continues to claim that corruption can be battled through deregulation of the economy; public sector reform in areas such as customs, tax administration and civil service; strengthening of anti-corruption and audit bodies; and decentralization.

Yet the empirical evidence, much of it from the World Bank itself, suggests that, far from reducing corruption, such policies, and the manner in which they have been implemented, have in some circumstances increased it.

Jubilee Research (formerly the prominent Jubilee 2000 debt relief campaign organization) has similar criticisms, and is also worth quoting at length:

Rich country politicians and bank officials argue that because dictators like Marcos, Suharto, and Mobutu were kept in power with western arms and were given loans to squander on ill-judged and repressive schemes, that the people of those countries—who often fought valiantly against those dictators—cannot be trusted not to waste the money released by debt cancellation. This may seem confusing to people not familiar with the logic of the IMF and World Bank. In summary:

- Creditors colluded with, and gave loans to dictators they knew were corrupt and who would squander the money.
- Creditors gave military and political aid to those dictators—knowing arms might be used to suppress popular opposition
- Therefore, successor democratic governments and their supporters, who may have been victims of corruption and oppression, cannot be trusted.

To many people in the South, this seems irrational and illogical—the logic of blaming the victim. It is the logic of power rather than of integrity, and is used to benefit the rich rather than the poor in developing countries.

A similar logic argues that if the World Bank and government export credit agencies promoted inappropriate and unprofitable projects, then southern governments proved their inability to control money because they accepted the ill-advised projects in the first place. Thus, if money is released by debt cancellation, it must be controlled by agencies which promoted those failed projects.

This is the logic that says if people were stupid enough to believe cigarette advertising, then they are too stupid to take care of themselves and the reformed cigarette companies should be put in charge of their health care.

The same institutions who made the corrupt loans to Zaire and lent for projects in Africa that failed repeatedly are still in charge, but their role has been enhanced because of their success in pushing loans. Can we trust these institutions to suddenly only lend wisely; to not give loans when the money might be wasted?

Preventing new wasted loans and new debt crises, and ensuring that there is not another debt crisis, means that the people who pushed the loans and caused this crisis cannot be left in charge.

The creditors or loan pushers cannot be left in charge, no matter how heartfelt their protestations that they have changed. Pushers and addicts need to work together, to bring to an end the entire reckless and corrupt lending and borrowing habit. And in terms of how lack of transparency by the international institutions contributes to so much corruption structured into the system, Hanlon and Pettifor continue in the same report as cited above:

Structural adjustment programs cover most of a country's economic governance.

... The most striking aspect of IMF/World Bank conditionality [for aid, debt relief, etc] is that the civil servants of these institutions, the staff members, have virtual dictatorial powers to impose their whims on recipient countries. This comes about because poor countries must have IMF and World Bank programs, but staff can decline to submit programs to the boards of those institutions until the poor country accepts conditions demanded by IMF civil servants.



There is much talk of transparency and participation, but the crunch comes in final negotiations between ministers and World Bank and IMF civil servants. The country manager can say to the Prime Minister, unless you accept condition X, I will not submit this program to the board. No agreed program means a sudden halt to essential aid and no debt relief, so few ministers are prepared to hold out. Instead Prime Ministers and presidents bow to the diktat of foreign civil servants. Joseph Stiglitz also notes that reforms often bring advantages to some groups while disadvantaging others, and one of the problems with policies agreed in secret is that a governing elite may accept an imposed policy which does not harm the elite but harms others. An example is the elimination of food subsidies.

As further detailed by Hanlon and Pettifor, Christian Aid partners (a coalition of development organizations), argued that top-down conditionality has undermined democracy by making elected governments accountable to Washington-based institutions instead of to their own people. The potential for unaccountability and corruption therefore increases as well.

### **Corruption everywhere; rich and poor countries, international institutions**

It goes without saying, almost, that corruption is everywhere. Corruption in poor countries is well commented on (sometimes used dismissively to explain away problems caused by other issues, too). It would be futile to provide examples here (see also the sources of information at the end of this document for more on this).

Rich countries, also suffer from corruption. Examples are also numerous and beyond the scope of this page to list them here. However, a few recent examples are worth mentioning because they are varied on the type of corruption involved, and are very recent, implying this is a massive problem in rich countries as well as poor.

The first example is [the US government, accused of outsourcing many contracts without an open bid process](#). Jim Hightower notes that an analysis by the Times found that more than half of their outsourcing contracts are not open to competition. In essence, the Bushites choose the company and award the money without getting other bids. Prior to Bush, only 21% of federal contracts were awarded on a no-bid basis.

Another example is Italy, where former Italian Prime Minister [Silvio Berlusconi](#) and some of his close associates were held on trial for various crimes and corruption cases (though Berlusconi himself has not, to date, been found guilty of any charges). Many key teams in the massive Italian soccer league, Serie A were also found to be involved in a massive corruption ring.

In the United Kingdom, the arms manufacturer, [BAE was being investigated for bribing Saudi officials to buy fighter planes, but the government intervened in the investigation citing national interests](#). The *Guardian* also reported that [BAE gave a Saudi prince a £75 airliner \(\\$150m approx\) as part of a British arms deal, with the arms firm paying the expenses of flying it](#). This seemingly large figure is small compared to the overall deal, but very enticing for the deal makers, and it is easy to see how corruption is so possible when large sums are involved.

International institutions, such as the United Nations and World Bank have also recently come under criticism for corruption, ironically while presenting themselves in the forefront fighting against corruption.

The recent example with the UN has been the oil for food scandal, where the headlines were about the corruption in the UN. In reality, the figures of \$21 billion or so of illicit funds blamed on the UN were exaggerations; it was \$2 billion; it was the UN Security Council (primarily US and UK) responsible for much of the monitoring; US kickbacks for corrupt oil sales were higher, for example. (This is discussed in more detail on this site's [Iraq sanctions, oil for food scandal section](#).)

At the World Bank, headlines were made when its recent president, Paul Wolfowitz, was forced to resign after it was revealed he had moved his girlfriend to a new government post with an extremely high salary without review by its ethics committee.

Paul Wolfowitz's appointment was also controversial, due to his influential role in architecting the US invasion of Iraq. A former member of staff at the World Bank also noted [concerns of cronyism related to Wolfowitz's appointment](#) way before the scandal that forced him to resign.

The US nominee for the next president is the former US Trade Representative and currently an executive at Goldman Sachs, Robert Zoellick. His nomination is also coming under criticism. Bush supports it, saying Zoellick is the right man to succeed Paul in this vital work. Former World Bank chief economist, and Nobel Prize winner for economics, [Joseph Stiglitz feels that instead of a political appointee, it would be better to get an economist who understands development](#).

As also reported by the BBC, [Paul Zeitz, executive director of the Global AIDS Alliance, said that he thought Mr Zoellick was a terrible choice](#) because Zoellick has no significant experience in economic development in poor countries, and that he has been a close friend to the brand-name pharmaceutical industry, and the bilateral trade agreements he has negotiated [for the US] effectively block access to generic medication for millions of people.

While the US typically gets its preferred nomination to head the World Bank, Europe has typically got its preferred person to head the IMF. Critics have long argued that this lacks transparency and is not democratic. While not illegal as such, it does feel like a form of corruption.

### **Tackling corruption**

What can be done to tackle this problem?

#### **Strengthen Democracy's Transparency Pillar**

One of the pillars of democracy is transparency; knowing what goes on in society and being able to make *informed* decisions should improve participation and also check unaccountability.

The above-cited report by Hanlon and Pettifor also highlights a broader way to try and tackle corruption by attempting to provide a more just, democratic and transparent process in terms of relations between donor nations and their creditors:

Campaigners from around the world, but particularly the South, have called for a more just, independent, accountable and transparent process for managing relations between sovereign debtors and their public and private creditors.

An independent process would have five goals:

- to restore some justice to a system in which international creditors play the role of plaintiff, judge and jury, in their own court of international finance.
- to introduce discipline into sovereign lending and borrowing arrangements—and thereby prevent future crises.
- to counter corruption in borrowing and lending, by introducing accountability through a free press and greater transparency to civil society in both the creditor and debtor nations.
- to strengthen local democratic institutions, by empowering them to challenge and influence elites.
- to encourage greater understanding and economic literacy among citizens, and thereby empower them to question, challenge and hold their elites to account.

#### **Address weaknesses in the global system**

The *Bretton Woods Project* organization notes that [the World Bank, under pressure of late, has suspended a number of loans due to concerns of corruption](#). These include loans to Chad, Kenya, Congo, India, Bangladesh, Uzbekistan, Yemen, and Argentina. The Bank has also started internal investigations of Bank corruption. However, despite high-profile moves by president Paul Wolfowitz, the root causes of corruption—underpaid civil servants, an acceptance of bribery by big business, and dirty money—remain largely unaddressed.

The *Bretton Woods Project* adds that the normalization of petty corruption in developing countries has in part been driven by

- IFI conditions;
- The aid industry for overpaying consultants and turning a blind eye to corruption in some regimes; and
- The World Bank's pressure to lend where staff are rewarded for the volume of the portfolio they manage;
- The World Bank's slow pace in investigating and disbaring companies found guilty of corrupt practices such as bribery, fraud or malpractice;
- Failing to increase transparency of some of its own procedures;
- The IFI's central part of an international financial system which has both actively and tacitly supported the global proliferation of dirty money flows including, for example, the financing of various despotic rulers that have siphoned off a lot of money to personal offshore accounts.

To help address these problems, the *Bretton Woods Project* suggests a few steps:

- Greater transparency of World Bank processes, allowing greater visibility for elected officials and civil society in recipient countries;
- Strengthening internal mechanisms within the Bank itself, to monitor integrity of Bank functions, and allow truly independent audits of Bank operations;
- Minimum standards in governance, transparency and human rights that must be fulfilled before approving oil, gas and mining projects in institutionally weak countries.
- Not always tying loans with economic policy conditions in such a way that some governments surrender their policy-making space.

During the [2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development](#), the *BBC* broadcast a mini debate on globalization, poverty, and related issues, and had a panel of around 30 experts, from both the developing and rich countries. One person on that panel was Vandana Shiva, a vocal critic of the current form of globalization and its impact on the environment and people in the third world. She was asked why people should listen to concerns from the third world when they cannot sort out the rampant corruption first. Her answer was simple: rich countries need to stop dictating policies that encourage corruption in the first place.

Like Shiva, Professor Neild feels that the solution is philosophically simple. However, as Neild acknowledges, in reality it is far harder to do, due to the power interests involved:

It is hard to see how the international economic agencies and their member governments can introduce incentives that would cause corrupt rulers to [attack corruption]... Not only are the rich countries and their agencies in this respect impotent, they commonly have been and are accomplices in corruption abroad, encouraging it by their action rather than impeding it.

... It is hard to see any solution other than transparency and criticism. It would take an unprecedented degree of united dedication to the checking of corruption for the international community to agree that the oil and mining companies of the world should boycott corrupt regimes, somehow defined, let alone manage to enforce an agreement.

#### **Improve Government Budget Transparency**

A trusted government is more likely to result in a positive political and economic environment, which is crucial for developing countries, as well as already industrialized ones.

The International Budget Partnership (IBP) is an organization that looks at public budgets by governments around the world. Why is this important? Produced every 2 years, in October 2010, they released their 3rd [Open Budget Survey](#) report. These reports assess how transparent and accountable the budgetary process for a number of countries around the world (currently just under 100) and ranks them accordingly.

Their introduction (p.2) explained the growing importance of budget transparency:

- Experts have increasingly concluded that making budgets transparent and building adequate checks and balances into the budget process can enhance the credibility and prioritization of policy decisions, limit corrupt and wasteful spending, and facilitate access to international financial markets.
- Budget transparency has become central to a number of international development discourses, ranging from the financing of climate change mitigation, to country-level actions to meet international development commitments like the Millennium Development Goals, to accounting for the revenues from the sale of natural resources, and to examining the amount of international aid given to developing countries and how it is spent.

Of the 94 countries assessed, they had the following findings:

1. The overall state of budget transparency is poor. Only a modest minority of countries can be considered to have open budgets while a large number of countries provide grossly insufficient budget information.
2. The general trend toward open budgets is nonetheless favorable. Budget transparency is improving substantially, especially among countries that provided little information in the past.
3. Budget engagement by the audit institutions and the legislature is typically weak and is strongly correlated to the lack of budget information made available to these institutions and the public.
4. There are many simple steps to opening up budgets that governments are failing to undertake. Such steps can be taken by the executive branch, the legislature, and the supreme audit institutions alike.

In many cases, where budget documents were made public, essential information was often absent, or some of the documents remained internal. Those that performed poorly on their index were also low income, low democracy, and/or dependent on aid or oil revenues. On the plus side, the IBP found that some countries that fared very poorly in their earlier analysis fared much better this time, sometimes through the simple and cheap step of simply making their budget documents available on their web sites.

As such, the IBP recommended that all key budget documents which are already produced should be made available to the public, for free, while the authority, independence, and capacity of budget oversight institutions should be strengthened. The IBP also recommends strengthening the voice of the public as a complementary check and balance. They even called for a global norm on budget transparency to be established.

### **Make it harder to embezzle billions**

For years, stories of people embezzling millions — even billions — away to tax havens and other financial centers, have caused uproar, but little ever seems to have been done about it despite some various organizations and campaigns trying to highlight these deeper causes and potential solutions for many years. A lot of powerful interests of course are what has always made corruption so difficult to address.

In the wake of the [global financial crisis](#) that started in 2008, this issue has caught attention in the mainstream more than usual.

This site's section on [tax havens](#) looks at this further, with links to other sites and organizations that are highlighting the issues further.

### **Lessons from the past: US's New Deal in the 1930s**

Another strategy for tackling corruption may come from history and seeing how the US New Deal in the 1930s help remove a lot of corruption.

Before 1932, the administration of public relief in the US was widely regarded as politically corrupt. Political opponents of the New Deal often complained about the use of relief for political purposes, but by 1940, these criticisms of corruption and political manipulation had diminished considerably.

How this happened was detailed in a paper titled [Politics, Relief, and Reform](#); *Roosevelt's Efforts to Control Corruption and Political Manipulation during the New Deal* by John Joseph Wallis of the University of Maryland, Price V. Fishback of the University of Arizona, and Shawn Kantor of the University of California at Merced.

The authors of the paper asked New Deal reforms is often castigated as bureaucratic, but rarely corrupt. What changed? How did the country enter the Depression with a public welfare system riddled with political manipulation and emerge with one that was not?

Our answer is straightforward. The president, Franklin Roosevelt, and other members of the executive branch gained little or nothing from the kinds of local corruption involved in public relief. But they stood to incur enormous losses if the New Deal relief program was perceived as politically manipulative and corrupt by the voting public. Roosevelt and the Democrats brought relief to millions of families every month, and the gratitude of relief recipients was Roosevelt's political payoff.

Other politicians—senators, representatives, governors, and mayors—wanted to control relief and use it for political gain. They maneuvered, manipulated, and cajoled to get their hands on a share of the billions spent each year on relief. So what did Roosevelt do?

Although Roosevelt made substantial concessions to Congress and to state and local governments in the administration of relief, he sought to curb corruption at the state and local level by his influence over the discretionary allocation of relief funds, by establishing offices to investigate complaints of corruption, and, in the long run, by bureaucratizing the administration of public welfare.

During the New Deal, when the relief programs were reorganized to give the Roosevelt administration more control over the distribution of funds within states, it used that control to limit state and local political manipulation and increased the responsiveness of the allocation of funds within states to the high-minded goals of relief, recovery, and reform.

The authors stress that it wasn't necessarily a superior morality that drove out this New Deal:

Politics was paramount in the structure of New Deal relief programs; it just turned out that the best political outcome meant a reduction in corruption at the state and local level. This does not mean that Roosevelt did not use the administration of relief for his own political ends. There is ample evidence that presidential politics mattered in the distribution of relief funds. Corruption by others was curbed because it was in Roosevelt's political interest to see it curbed.

### **Direct Grassroots Action**

As the effects of the [2008 global financial crisis](#) are felt more and more, as food prices around the world increase, and other inter-related conditions get worse for many around the world, some of the resulting public unrest and disquiet is being channeled into anti-corruption concerns.

India, it seems, has had so much persistent corruption, that many are often resigned to it as a sad part of life.

*Inter Press Service* noted the extent of corruption in India:

In November 2010, the Washington-based Centre for International Policy said in a study that since it gained independence in 1947, India may have lost 452 billion dollars in illegal transfers abroad and estimated the current annual loss to be close to 20 billion dollars.

Julian Assange, founder of the non-profit media group WikiLeaks that collects and publishes classified government documents, provided more evidence in an interview given to the Times Now news channel on April 26. There is more Indian money in Swiss banks than any other nationality, Assange said.

However, recently a number of high profile corruption cases, such as the illegal award of contracts for the 2010 Commonwealth Games, and many more have flooded Indian mainstream press, and this time citizens are less reluctant to just accept it.

A strong growing anti-corruption movement has emerged, with people such as Anna Hazare capturing the imagination of many. Hazare, a 74 year old man has vowed to fast to death to see corruption tackled.

His non-violent civil disobedience has created a mass of followers many of whom liken his approach and struggle to that of the iconic independence leader, Gandhi. Some of the public protests against the governments attempt to weaken proposed anti corruption bills have seen hundreds of thousands gather and rally.

This [non-violent form of protest appears of have been more effective in its short period than various violent ones](#) (on other political issues) that have plagued parts of India for many years.

Against such a force, the government seems to have responded quite poorly and there is great hope among many in the country that maybe corruption will start to be addressed like never before:

As people across Indian cities and towns and villages rallied in support of Hazare, it was a warning to not just the centrally ruling Congress party but the entire political class that India's civil society was truly fed up with their corrupt ways.

The conflict between the government and civil society is taking place as Asia's third largest economy grapples with unprecedented levels of corruption that is said to be undermining the liberalisation-led growth of this nation.

With political parties of all shades losing credibility, the field opened up for civil society to move in and Hazare's campaign for a strong ombudsman gained extra power.

[Paranjy Guha Thakurta, a prominent commentator on political and economic affairs] added that rising food prices may have added to public ire. India has a huge food inflation on top of corruption scandals. So naturally there is popular discontent that we see surfacing as mass support for Hazare's movement.

[Nepal has also seen mass demonstrations, inspired by Hazare's protests in India](#). Diverse groups such as former ministers, womens' groups and students have held public fasts against corruption and pressed the new government on post-monarchy reforms. The protests have not appeared as dramatic in their effect as has been in India, perhaps because Nepal is just coming out of a long civil war. However, the inspiration is there to continue the protests as some promising developments have occurred.

Various organizations across numerous African countries are trying to come together to [tackle an emerging trend of various African countries considering setting up off-shore tax havens](#), supposedly to kick-start their own financial sectors and streamline red-tape. Tax-havens are a major problem that can hide corruption and undermine democracies and is discussed more on this site's section on [tax havens](#).

[Brazil is also seeing a rise in action against corruption](#). It is thought that corruption, which is deeply rooted in politics and economics in Brazil, is costing the economy some \$43 billion a year. Inspired by the rise in protests in Spain following the effects of the 2008 global financial crisis on the country, many movements in Brazil have seen the rise accompanied by an explosion in use of social networks and technology to help organize and by-pass the institutionalized mainstream media avenues closed off for most citizens.

As an extremely severe [global economic and financial crisis](#) takes hold, corruption is likely to increase. Many governments are considering New Deal or Keynesian style macroeconomic policies to help stimulate their economies. It is perhaps a critical — or at least opportune — moment to renew efforts to tackle corruption. Some politicians may have honest intentions, while others (many others, it may seem), may not. In either case, the rewards for stamping out corruption would be significant.

### **8. Malnourishment & Hunger**

Currently there are [795 million](#) people who do not have enough to eat. Long-term success to ending world hunger starts with ending poverty. With fighting poverty through proper training for employment, education and the teaching of cooking and gardening skills, people who are suffering will be more likely to get jobs, earn enough money to buy food and even learn how to make their own food to save money.



## 9. Substance abuse

The World Health Organization defined substance abuse as “the harmful or hazardous use of psychoactive substances, including alcohol and illicit drugs”. Substance abuse touches millions of people worldwide each year. It is estimated that about 76.3 million people struggle with alcohol use disorders contributing to 1.8 million deaths per year. As is the case with some global issues, substance abuse is unequally represented— the developing world, marginalized groups and communities being the most vulnerable to this reality. For example, in North America, Indigenous communities are particularly vulnerable to drug and alcohol addictions. The United Nations reported that around 185 million people globally over the age of 15 were consuming drugs by the end of the 20th century. The most commonly mentioned drugs were marijuana, cocaine, alcohol, Amphetamine-type stimulants (ATS), opiates and volatile solvents.

Many people use drugs as an escape from their reality. Drug abuse does not necessarily correlate to how wealthy or poor one is. Some may argue that wealthier individuals can "afford" to buy more drugs than someone living in poverty who might resort to abusing less expensive addictive substances such as in the case of sniffing glue to alter one's physical and mental state. Hence, different circumstances may have led them to the same end - substance abuse. It is important to note that substance abuse is a problem that affects us all differently but that holds the same consequences of harm, withdrawal from the community, and even death for all the lives it touches.

### INDIGENOUS PERSPECTIVE

Substance abuse has been an ongoing issue for the world's Indigenous peoples. It is a social and health issue for Indigenous communities worldwide, and has been the focus of many studies. Some have pointed out that the high rates of substance abuse among Indigenous people are due to factors such as colonization, and takeover of their lands. One source however points out that drugs and alcohol were prominent in these communities worldwide, prior to colonization. However, the communities were very tight knit, with tough regulations on who could “use” substances of any kind. It is possible that colonization could have changed the levels of social cohesion imposed upon Indigenous communities. With new cultural groups taking over the lands, some argued that this destroyed many families bonds, and due to the extreme changes in everyday life, Indigenous people felt lost and turned to drugs and alcohol. The perpetual use of drugs in Indigenous communities has been linked to feelings of despair from the days of colonization, the breakdown of their social values, family bonds and the inability for Indigenous to rightly claim what was once theirs. Like many people who cannot afford “expensive” drugs such as cocaine and marijuana, many youth in some Indigenous communities are using solvents for intoxication, such as sniffing gasoline. The effects of this have led to family and community breakdowns and continues to be a prominent struggles in many Indigenous communities.

### Lead & Get Others Involved

However tragic and common the stories of substance abuse are, there is always an inspiring story to be told. Forty-one year old David Parnell is an Indigenous man, living in Canada who has a story to tell. David began using drugs (marijuana initially) at the young age of 13. He quickly moved on to “harder” drugs such as methamphetamine. For 23 years, Parnell says that drugs were the focus of his life. After years of misery, he tried to take his own life, unsuccessfully, which left his face severely disfigured. After this incident, he vowed to change his life. At present, David takes his story on the road, traveling around North America primarily speaking to youth (both Indigenous and non-Indigenous) about the dangers of substance abuse. He brings hope to those who are trapped in the cycle of drug use and shows the dangers of drug abuse to those who haven't yet explored it.

Substance abuse has also been a prominent issue in the world of sports and it is commonly referred to as "doping". The World Anti Doping Agency (WADA) was created in 1999 as a collective international effort to "promote, coordinate, and monitor the fight against doping in sport in all its forms" (<http://www.wada-ama.org>).

Fair play and good health is the main goal of advocates for a drug abuse free world. *What will you do to create change on this issue?*

## 10. Terrorism

Today's world is still a dangerous place. The fall of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War did not bring forth the “End of History” or a new dawn of world peace and harmony. Instead, this change brought into sharper focus serious global problems and threats.

You've heard the list before: ethnic conflict, weapons proliferation, environmental degradation, Untenable population growth, international crime, and terrorism.

All these global issues directly affect our well being and security. They therefore have high priority in the foreign policy agenda of the Clinton Administration.

Perhaps none of these issues has caused Americans more anxiety than terrorism.

Terrorism, which we define as politically motivated violence against non-combatants, is an ancient evil, and American interests have been targeted by terrorists abroad for years. But now, the threat seems to loom larger, perhaps because the threat of conventional war against the United States has declined, and because we've been struck by two major terrorist acts at home — the World Trade Center and Oklahoma City bombings. Also the two bombings of U.S. forces in Saudi Arabia and the pipe bomb at the Atlanta Olympics.

It is a paradox that although terrorism kills relatively few people, compared to other forms of violence, and although the statistical probability of any of us being killed by terrorists is minuscule, we are preoccupied by terrorism, and governments pay extraordinary attention to combating it. Why?



First, terrorism provokes deep fear and insecurity — more than other forms of violence. Terrorists strike innocent civilians, often randomly, and without warning.

We think we can protect ourselves against other forms of violence, but we feel defenseless against terrorists.

Terrorists know this, and they seek to use intimidation to impose their political or other agendas.

Killing is only a means to that end. By creating fear and panic, terrorists try to extort concessions or to weaken and discredit governments by showing they are unable to protect their citizens.

Terrorism is also used as low--cost strategic warfare, sometimes by rogue states using surrogates, and sometimes by groups motivated by ideology, religion, or ethnicity to overthrow governments and change the course of history.

Terrorists also use violence in a less focused way to express protest and rage, to advance messianic and fanatic religious agendas, and for even more obscure pathological reasons.

One can argue that terrorism has failed historically as a strategic weapon. But that's no cause for comfort. There is no doubt that it has caused great damage to American interests and those of our friends around the world. For example, terrorism has prolonged the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the North Ireland conflict for decades. Real progress toward peace making in these struggles has come only when terrorism has been renounced and its practitioners marginalized.

Terrorism also has a high economic cost. The U.S. government alone spends about \$5,000million a year to guard against terrorism, at homeland abroad, and these costs will doubtless rise.

Terrorism can also cripple entire economies. For example, in Egypt, by targeting a few tourists, terrorists almost shut down the vitally important tourist industry for many months.

Technology has also added to the terrorist threat.

In 1605, the terrorist Guy Fawkes planted 29barrels of explosives in a plot to blow up King James and the British Parliament. Today, a small explosive device in a purse could achieve the same effect. And bomb making recipes are readily available on the Internet.

Terrorists use computers, cellular phones, and encryption software to evade detection, and they have sophisticated means for forging passports and documents. Ramzi Ahmed Yousef and his gang, convicted for a plot to blow up 12 U.S. airliners over the Pacific, used all these tools.

Even more dangerous is the specter that terrorists will turn to materials of mass destruction — chemical, biological, or nuclear — to multiply casualties far beyond traditional levels. The sarin gas attacking the Tokyo subway in 1995 by Aum Shinrikyo, the apocalyptic Japanese sect, showed that the threat of chemical terrorism is now a reality.

And the willingness of some fanatic or crazed terrorists to commit suicide while carrying out attacks makes terrorists using weapons of mass destruction an even more sinister threat.

Finally, terrorism today is far more devastating than in the past because of the mass media. No story plays better, or longer, than a terrorist attack.

Today's media, especially television, multiply the fear effect of terrorism by vividly conveying its horror.

And this greatly increases our collective sense of vulnerability.

The terrorists, of course, know this. And they seek to exploit media coverage to put us and our governments on the psychological defensive.

What about the current trend in terrorism? Who are today's terrorists? And what is the U.S. government doing to combat them and put them on the defensive, where they belong? First, the trend. There is good news and bad. The actual number of international terrorist incidents has declined in recent years, from a high of 665 in 1987 to an average between three and four hundred in recent years.

#### **There are various reasons for this positive trend:**

The Soviet Union and almost all of the many revolutionary terrorist groups it supported are now history. After 50 years of war and terrorism, Arabs and Palestinians are struggling for peace. The

PLO has renounced terrorism, and most Arab states have also condemned it unequivocally.

Only a few rogue states continue to sponsor or support terrorism. There is a growing international consensus today that killing innocents for political reasons is absolutely unacceptable, whatever the motivation or cause. And there is a corresponding willingness by the majority of states to crack down on terrorists by all means available, especially by using the law to combat terrorism.

#### **But there is also a negative side of the ledger.**

Notwithstanding the commitment of the Palestinian and Arab mainstream to peace in the Middle East, groups like Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad in 1995 carried out a vicious rear guard campaign of bombings in Israel in an effort to defeat the peace process And an Israeli terrorist assassinated Prime Minister Rabin for the same purpose. Iran, notwithstanding U.S. efforts to contain it through sanctions, continues to use terrorism as a weapon of foreign policy to kill dissidents and disrupt the peace process. Libya, although U.N. sanctions have curtailed its terrorism abroad, still defies the U.N.'s mandate to deliver two suspects in the bombing of Pan Am103 at Lockerbie to a British or U.S. court for trial. Exploitation of religion by terrorists may also be on the upsurge. In previous decades, most terrorist groups were secular, but more and more terrorist today claim to act on behalf of religion, especially Islam. Some are part of organized groups such as Hamas, the Lebanese Hizballah, and the Egyptian Gamaat. Others are ad hoc Islamic elements, such as Ramzi Ahmed Yousef's gang, many of whom received training in Afghanistan. Exploitation of religion for political purposes, and violence, is an age-old phenomenon. It is important to remember that all religions have produced deviant and dangerous fringe groups, and Islam, like Christianity and Judaism, preaches peace and non-violence. Terrorists

who claim to speak for Islam are abusing their faith, and they are increasingly condemned throughout the Islamic world. Domestic terrorism — terrorism that does not involve the citizens or territory of more than one state — has waxed and waned over time. Today it seems to be waxing, for example, in South Asia. Messianic cults, like the Japanese Aum Shinrikyo, who use terrorism to fulfill their visions of Armageddon, could also be a growing threat. They are all the more dangerous when they have access to money and technology.

**The United States is doing a lot to combat terrorism.**

Our policy is to seek out relentlessly and punish terrorists wherever they may be, using the combined assets of U.S. law enforcement, diplomacy, and intelligence. Our ability to bring to justice the World Trade Center terrorists, the conspirators, including Sheik Abdul Rahman, who planned to blow up New York's Holland tunnel, the U.N. and federal buildings in New York, and the gang who plotted to blow up U.S. airliners over the Pacific, are major success stories. We make no concessions to terrorists. We refuse to bow to demands for political concessions or ransom. We designate states who sponsor terrorism, impose economic sanctions, and ask our friends to do likewise. In a speech in Stuttgart, directed to our European allies, Secretary of State Christopher said "working together against state sponsors of terrorism is an imperative, not an option....Our principled commitment to free trade simply does not oblige us to do business with aggressive tyrannies like Iran and Libya. We must join forces on effective multilateral measures to deny these rogue regimes the resources they crave."

The United States stresses the rule of law in dealing with terrorists, and insists that terrorism is an unmitigated crime, whatever its motives or causes. By strengthening U.S. laws against terrorism, and aggressively promoting international treaties and conventions against terror, of which there are now 10, we have led a worldwide trend to use the law as our most effective tool against terrorists. **Also:** We have superb military assets for use, when in rare cases the situation demands. Since terrorists operate in the dark, we are investing heavily in the collection and analysis of intelligence. The Department of State's Bureau of Diplomatic Security has trained over 18,000 foreign government officials from over 80 countries in counterterrorism techniques and aviation security through our Anti-Terrorism Assistance Program.

We have a strong program of research and development in counterterrorism technology, especially in explosives detection. And finally, cooperation with other states is indispensable to stop terrorists, as terrorism becomes increasingly transnational. For this reason, President Clinton has given high priority to counterterrorism in our diplomatic agenda. We consult with dozens of governments annually, and we promote multilateral action, such as the Sharmel-Sheik Peacemaking Summit and follow-up counterterrorism meetings in Washington, and the G-7 ministerial conference on terrorism in Paris. We can be proud of the successes we've achieved, using these policies and tools. But we can't be complacent, since terrorism is a dynamic, moving target.