Public Diplomacy Symposium:
Meeting Emerging Security Challenges

organized by

the **United Nations Information Service Vienna**

in co-operation with

the **Permanent Mission of Slovenia to the United Nations (Vienna) and NATO Contact Point Embassy in Austria**

June 2006
Vienna International Centre

Summary of Presentations

For further information contact:

United Nations Information Service (UNIS) Vienna
PO Box 500, 1400 Vienna
Austria
Telephone: +43 1 260 60 3325
E-mail: unis@unvienna.org

Or visit our homepage: **www.unis.unvienna.org**

Security in Europe Requires Sustainable Peace in Post-Conflict "Hot-Spots" in Other Parts of World, Security Experts Say at UN Symposium in Vienna

Cooperation between International Players, Holistic Approaches to Security and Freedom of the Media Discussed

What are the connections between international security and domestic security? How do post-conflict areas impact on security in Europe? What are the links between drugs, organized crime, terrorism and ethnic conflict? What are the international and regional responses to peacebuilding, terrorism and crime? What issues confront the media in reporting on emerging security challenges? What concepts of security and what initiatives have emerged from the 2005 World Summit? Can more be done for security?

These questions were addressed at a public diplomacy symposium titled "Meeting Emerging Security Challenges", hosted jointly by the United Nations Information Service (UNIS) Vienna, and the Permanent Mission of Slovenia to the United Nations (Vienna) and NATO Contact Point Embassy in Austria, at the Vienna International Centre on 14 June 2006.

The symposium explored the scope of activities in meeting emerging security challenges in the 21st century, as identified by world leaders in the outcome document of the 2005 World Summit, including peacebuilding, organized crime and terrorism. Particular attention was paid to the Central European context, examining the role of the United Nations, regional organizations such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) and the European Union (EU), and other actors in responding to these challenges.

Seven panelists, including representatives of different international organizations and Central European countries, as well as civil society, in particular the media, engaged on these issues. The symposium was opened by Nasra Hassan, Director, UNIS Vienna, who drew attention to human security as an inseparable part of broader security, and the Permanent Representative of Slovenia to the United Nations (Vienna), Ambassador Ernest Petrič. "The security environment has changed, and is now marked by challenges like terrorism, organized crime and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, rather than the threat of a world war. In response, international organizations have adapted to meet new challenges and coordinate their activities," said Ambassador Petrič.

 "The main common denominator of international crises in the recent past is their complexity," stated Professor Anton Grizold, former Defence Minister of Slovenia and now Vice Dean and Director of the Institute of Social Sciences at the University of Ljubljana, speaking as a panelist. As an example of the links between international and domestic security, Professor Grizold highlighted how the wars in the Balkans in the 1990s had increased the threats of organized crime and smuggling of migrants in the rest of Europe. As other examples he stated that the attacks of 9/11 had adversely influenced the world economy, and relations with minorities in Europe and North America, while the Indian Ocean tsunami and Hurricane Katrina had influenced crime levels in the afflicted regions. These connections required new solutions. As a result, international organizations were increasingly sharing responsibilities, and new concepts of creating sustainable peace had emerged.

"It seems to be possible to have peace in Europe, against a background of war, civil war and poverty ravaging parts of the developing world, but it is not possible to have security," said Dr. Wilhelm Sandrisser, Head of International Affairs, EU-Coordination, Public Relations, Procurement at the Austrian Federal Ministry of the Interior, speaking on initiatives of the Austrian European Union (EU) Presidency in the security field. Most threats to European internal security were international threats, argued Dr. Sandrisser. For instance, 90 per cent of heroin sold in Europe came from Afghanistan, of which 80 per cent was trafficked via the 'Balkan route'. The Austrian EU Presidency had taken several initiatives in the external dimension of justice and home affairs, resulting for instance in the Vienna Declaration on Security Partnership, defining concrete measures in combating terrorism, organized crime and corruption, and in the area of migration/asylum. Another action had been the "Vienna Initiative", the first ministerial meeting of its kind between the European Union, the Russian Federation and the United States in the field

of internal security, held in May 2006 in Vienna. "Our concept is not war against insecurity, but partnership for security," Dr. Sandrisser emphasized.

Speaking on security sector reform and the role of the United Nations Security Council, Ambassador Marcel Peško, Head of the Coordination Unit for Security Council Matters, Slovak Ministry for Foreign Affairs, shared the experiences of his country, as member of the Security Council since January 2006. "Prioritization of security issues is the wrong approach, as security should be seen as a complex and holistic concept," said Ambassador Peško, in response to a question on international security priorities, and introduced the security sector concept, uniting all aspects of post-conflict rehabilitation. Peacebuilding had become a prime concern in international politics, reflected in the recent creation of the UN Peacebuilding Commission. Though each crisis was different, there were similarities between the issues that the international community was confronted with in conflicts such as those in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Somalia, Haiti, and Cote d'Ivoire, such as the coordination between internal and external actors, and the division of labour between different stakeholders and international players.

"No country can respond to challenges such as weapons of mass destruction and terrorism on its own," said Dr. László Botz, Deputy Head of Department, Office of the Deputy State Secretary for International Affairs, Hungarian Ministry of Justice and Law Enforcement, adding that the international community had recognized that it was not enough to deploy only military resources to respond to crisis situations: also the rule of law, and the normal operations of governments in post-crisis situations had to be assisted. He provided examples of concrete steps that Hungary had taken, such as law enforcement assistance and training programmes in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iraq and Afghanistan.

"Peacebuilding and nation building are central tenets of modern security management and require an unprecedented level of international civilian and military cooperation," said Jonathan Parish, Deputy Head of Policy Planning and Speechwriting Section at NATO HQ. The work of NATO had changed dramatically in terms of its geographical range and the type of operations it undertook. In the post-cold war era, security was radically different from the time when it was solely a military matter. Countries and organizations could not act on their own to defend values such as liberty, rule of law and democracy – proactive and cooperative approaches were required in concert with the wider international community. NATO was active on three continents - Europe, Asia and Africa, including Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq and Darfur, where NATO was airlifting African Union troops and assisting with training for that force. NATO was also providing assistance to Germany during the World Cup. Mr. Parish noted that different international organizations faced similar problems in getting their messages across to the public, and suggested two reasons: peacebuilding was a complex business and it exceeded the attention span of the public; and the average citizen did not understand that their security depended on what was happening a long way away in Afghanistan or in Darfur.

The martial rhetoric of the public debate on security, shown in terms such as 'war on terror' or 'war on drugs', was addressed by Walter Kemp, Senior Public Information Expert, United Nations *Office on Drugs and Crime* (UNODC). A key question related to these 'new wars' was how long these would take and how they would end. As 'new wars' were difficult to win, they were also long wars. Furthermore, 'new wars' needed new strategies. As interstate conflict receded, and states did not always control the full territory of their countries, the role of non-state actors must be given more attention. For instance, did non-state actors represent popular interest or self interest? Many so-called ethnic conflicts had little to do with ethnicity, but with the protection of self-interest. On the links between ethnic conflict and organized crime, Mr. Kemp pointed out that "the networks we are up against are masters of multilateralism, sometimes better at it than the international community. They are not just surviving, but prospering on the proceeds of organized crime". In response, the international community was adapting its responses, and Mr. Kemp highlighted tools such as the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the UN Convention against Corruption. Mr. Kemp also raised the issue of the privatization of wars, including outsourcing by governments and organizations to private military companies.

 "There has been a big change in the environment for journalists since the 9/11 attacks. More importance is now attached to security at the expense of press freedom," said Dr. Rubina

Möhring, President, Reporters Without Borders (Austria), Vice-President, Reporters Without Borders (International), and senior producer at ORF-3Sat television. In some instances, journalists trying to report objectively were seen as enemies. The work of journalists was dangerous: in 2005, 63 journalists and five assistants had been murdered, the largest number of victims being in Iraq. Over 800 journalists had been arrested, and over 1,300 attacked. As a result, journalists were not only journalists, they were sometimes pawns in a political game, for instance when taken as hostages. The danger for journalists in reporting from conflict areas, and in reporting objectively, had a negative impact on the ability of the public to keep informed on developments in conflict areas. The right to freedom of opinion and expression and seek, receive and impart information, however, was enshrined in Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In the endeavour for more security, these rights should be protected, and not taken for granted, urged Dr. Möhring.

The symposium was very well attended, with an audience of diplomats, including military attaches from numerous diplomatic missions, senior government officials, journalists, non-governmental organizations and civil society, experts and academia and students, engaging in a lively discussion with the panelists.

Introductory Remarks by Ambassador Dr. Ernest Petrič

Permanent Representative of Slovenia to the United Nations (Vienna)*

The world security environment has changed, and is now marked by challenges including terrorism, organized crime and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, rather than the threat of a world war. In response, international actors have adapted and are looking at further possibilities to meet the new challenges and coordinate their activities. How shall organizations respond to the new and evolving security challenges of the 21st century? The Symposium "Meeting Emerging Security Challenges", organized by the United Nations Information Service Vienna and the Permanent Mission of Slovenia -- acting also as the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) contact point embassy in Austria -- should provide some ideas on these issues.

If we want to effectively deal with new security threats such as terrorism, with all resources available, we have to improve coordination between the different international organizations, rather than to rely on the resources of any single organization. To react effectively to these new threats, we have to take into account each organization's specific expertise and capabilities. In the last few years there has been an increasingly effective cooperation between the United Nations and NATO.

In order to remain effective in defending and promoting security in this new and rapidly changing environment, NATO is engaged in an ongoing transformation. Next to the traditional responsibility (Article 5 of the Washington Treaty) of providing security and freedom to all its members by political and military means, NATO also has taken on new fundamental tasks, including new partnerships.

The United Nations is at the core of the framework of international organizations within which the Alliance operates, a principle that is enshrined in NATO's founding treaty. UN Security Council resolutions have provided the mandate for NATO's operations in the Balkans and in Afghanistan, and the framework for NATO's training mission in Iraq. More recently, NATO has provided logistical assistance to the African Union's UN-endorsed peacekeeping operation in Darfur, Sudan.

In recent years, cooperation between NATO and the United Nations has developed well beyond their common engagement in bringing peace and stability to crisis-hit regions. Consultations with UN specialized bodies now cover a wide range of issues, including civil emergency planning, civil-military cooperation, combating human trafficking, action against mines, and the fight against terrorism.

The topicality of these issues gave rise to our idea to organize a symposium in the context of the future cooperation between the United Nations, NATO and other international actors.

* The Permanent Mission of Slovenia to the United Nations (Vienna) is also the NATO Contact Point Embassy in Austria

Peacebuilding and the Impact of Post Conflict Areas on European Security

Professor Anton Grizold,
Department of Political Science – Defence studies, University of Ljubljana,
Defence Minister of the Republic of Slovenia 2000-2004

In this presentation, I will briefly frame the general context of today's security paradigm, which includes issues, problems, understandings and concepts or policies and secondly, I am going to address some issues particularly on European security.

The changing nature of security: new challenges and responses

Our recent experience has shown that the contemporary security environment is becoming increasingly complex. Complexity is by definition something we cannot grasp, predict or plan for entirely, and this has severe consequences for conceptualization and implementation of our response strategies (nationally and internationally). People, states and non-state actors in international relations are increasingly becoming interconnected in the contemporary globalizing world. But, threats also tend to be increasingly trans-national, interconnected and, consequently, unpredictable. It seems that the common denominator of several big crises in the recent past is their complexity, implying several interconnected sources of threats creating a strong destructive mixture for the local communities as well as for wider regions. Let us take a quick look at several illustrative examples:

- Our experience with the Balkan wars in the 1990s has shown that extreme escalation of military threats (such as war in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, armed conflicts in Kosovo and Macedonia) strongly influenced and increased other sources of threats, such as organized crime, illegal immigration, smuggling of drugs and weapons, environmental degradation, human trafficking and even terrorism.

- The crisis after the biggest terrorist attack in modern history, the 9/11 attacks, transcended the typical counterterrorism framework and influenced the international economy. Namely, while many stock exchange indices (Dow Jones, Nasdaq, Nikkei) dropped more than 5 per cent, major crises in the global tourist industry and airline industry erupted. This negative influence of 9/11 continued to have lesser, but also visible effects on the level of hate crimes against the representatives of Islamic communities in the United States as well as in Europe. It also has had several impacts on the quality and substance of trans-Atlantic relations, especially US-EU coordination on conflict prevention and conflict management.

- The tsunami disaster in Asia was an example of a natural disaster of extreme proportions, having strong negative influence on the level of local crime, people trafficking, drug smuggling, and economy. Additionally, it intersected with several armed conflicts, presenting opportunities for insurgents and government forces to find avenues to collaborate on humanitarian assistance or slip back into destructive cycles of violence and competition.

- Hurricane Katrina showed a similar pattern of disaster-crime-economy connection. However, this time the difference was that a superpower was affected, which reminded us how vulnerable we all are.

We can say that these examples show us that the changed security environment demands from the state and the international community new solutions as regards the provision of national and international security.

At the state level, new solutions are mainly sought in the appropriate transformation of various services within the frame of the national security structure. Crisis management is becoming an increasingly important element of this structure, which encompasses the preparation of the state in the event of various disasters and not only in the event of war as it used to be in the past.

Crisis management is a complex activity demanding many actors to participate and cooperate locally, nationally, internationally and globally. Today we see international organizations sharing

their responsibilities in the filed of various operations and having strong linkages among their headquarters and leaders. However, it seems that complexities of several security situations still overrun the complexities and flexibilities of our responses. We still have to learn and optimize our trans-national coordination and harmonization. Unnecessary duplication is still present and some level of selfish national interests as well.

Besides, new concepts of creating sustainable peace and security at the international level have emerged. Contrary to conflict management, peacebuilding is a much broader and horizontal concept which goes as far as seeking to create peace and security in the emerging international security environment.

I should stress here that compatibility in values plays an extremely important part in the process of building our global security community. Compatibility of strategies and operational concepts is also of extreme importance for successful international response. We should continue to use several tools that contribute to creating our responsive and flexible security community.

Terrorism has in many respects become a prioritized threat of the present time. This is reflected in many national security strategies and also strategies and concepts of international organizations, such as UN, EU, NATO and OSCE. Terrorism is among the most serious threats today, not only because of its destructive potential in terms of human victims and infrastructure damage, but also because terrorism—whether perpetrated by non-state groups or states—makes civilians the deliberate target. Additionally, the response to terrorism poses a dilemma as the counter-terrorism paradigms intersect with the legitimate human and civil rights of ordinary citizens and are not always compatible. The dilemma of how to fight terrorism with or without an impact on human rights and civil liberties has become one of the greatest challenges of the contemporary world.

This dilemma is actually a dilemma between a human right to be secure and a human right to be free (for example from interference in one's privacy). Both concepts of freedom and security are interconnected.

I am quite confident that a statistical analysis of the relation between freedom, security and development on a global scale would show a strong positive correlation which means that only fundamentally free societies can be fundamentally secure and developed. This also means that we should not talk about the dilemma "freedom OR security" but instead "freedom AND security".

Organized crime has become a serious problem of contemporary societies. Among all types of organized crime, smuggling of people, drugs and weapons are perhaps the most profitable and threatening. Smuggling represents a threat to national and international security since the emergence of sovereign states with national borders is integral to the international state system. It is used by those who want to evade existing national and international controls and restraints. No country in the world is actually immune to such illegal activity and perhaps the main reasons for its existence and persistence are embedded in the human greed for money and the impossibility of establishing totally secure borders in increasingly open societies. Contemporary smuggling activities result from a paradox in the development of human society, which wants to be open and closed at the same time. Open for some transfers—such as knowledge, labour and information, but closed for illicit transfers, at the same time. Smugglers exploit the gap between border openness and the impossibility of a perfect state border control.

There is empirical evidence that smuggling is strongly connected with other types of crime in today's society, such as: tax and import duty evasion, bribery and corruption of public officials, prostitution, human trafficking including trafficking in women, children, human organs, terrorism and money laundering. Drugs are often used to finance weapons, which means that internationally smuggled weapons are paid with smuggled drugs, creating a highly vicious cycle. The same channels have been frequently used in both directions: drugs in one direction and money or weapons back, people in one direction and drugs or money back, etc. In practice, this means that specialized criminal groups cooperate with other specialists in the field or that some criminal groups became multifunctional, incorporating several types of criminal activities, such as human trafficking, drug smuggling and weapons smuggling.

Europe is affected by many smuggling routes. Slovenia and Austria are mostly affected by the so-called Balkan smuggling route. This route is mainly used to smuggle in the direction of the EU. However, this route has been occasionally used also in the opposite direction, from the EU to the Balkan countries (e.g. for smuggling or diversion of precursors, for smuggling weapons in wartime, or for smuggling criminals out of the EU). If we look at drugs to illustrate the importance of this route, then it should be stressed that the Balkan route was worth 400 billion US dollars a year and handled 80 per cent of the heroin destined for sale in Europe at the end of the previous millennium. More than 382 tonnes of cocaine, 324 tonnes of opium and 591 tonnes of amphetamine-type stimulants (excluding ecstasy) were seized in the south-eastern European region in 2003.

Strong police cooperation has been established in the region to fight all types of smuggling. However, we are still getting new illegal immigrants, new shipments of drugs, and also weapons tend to leave the region of the western Balkans.

The bomb attacks in London and Madrid were presumably executed with explosives originating from this region. An additional problem is that despite many smuggling channels on the Balkan route that have been intercepted, new channels regularly form.

European Security Framework

The end of the Cold war brought about radical changes in the geo-strategic, geo-political and geo-economic factors that decisively define the security reality within the European security framework. Three basic theses should be discussed:

• European security is no longer a matter of deterring one superpower and strengthening the other;
• Security environments in Africa, Middle East, Asia, Americas, all affect European security more directly and indirectly;
• Global security joined to regional security through human displacement, economic linkages, cultural linkages, communication and media.

Understandings of security

During the Cold War period the security issues (in theory and practice) were mainly reduced to the state as the decisive player for ensuring national and international security. Therefore, the concepts of national and international security were predominantly oriented towards the military and political aspects of security. The most important means of ensuring security were represented by the armed forces and the political power of the state, while diplomacy was more of a sidekick for achieving balance between various national interests.

Regardless of the fact that we currently have various evaluations as regards the changed international security environment, there is a general consensus on the following:

• Global, international and national security linkages are stronger than ever;
• Threats are increasingly trans-national, and strategies to address them must be rooted in broad, collaborative security strategies and instruments;
• Purely military conceptualizations of security have been strengthened with understanding of human security.

Within this frame we have to strengthen co-operation between the state and non-state players at ensuring national and international security. In this sense every state has to actively contribute to ensuring international security while working for its own security.

Security and peace: three integrated strategies

Within the new security environment the following integrated strategies are needed to create sustainable security and peace at the national and international levels:

• *Conflict Prevention*
–Effective deployment of diplomatic, military and economic resources PRIOR TO an outbreak of violence;
• *Conflict Resolution*
–Negotiation strategies that seek not only to end destructive conflict, but to address its causes;
–Addressing the root causes of social and international violence to assure that it does not recur or escalate;
• *Post-conflict/Post-agreement Peacebuilding*
–Reconciliation, rule of law, development of non-violent norms of dispute resolution;
–Institutional development, governance, democracy and transparency as facilitators of security.

European Security 2006 and Beyond: Three transitions

• The post-Cold War era opened new opportunities for Europe to mature into fuller collective security against external threats;

• The aftermath of the Balkan wars generated a need to reframe security threats in a more complex way that included internal dissolution, ethnic and sectarian violence;

• The post-9/11 security environment refocused Europe on threats from both internal and external sources, often linked.

Europe's Responses to the three transitions:

• NATO enlargement and EU expansion to create a truly inclusive security and economic framework;

• EU, OSCE and NATO have had to rethink approaches to internal threats, and create new structures, mandates and instruments, especially in armed conflict;

• Proactive approach to monitoring state-civil society relations within EU and member states:
–For example, contrast Spain's successful domestic anti-terrorism strategy re. Islamic militancy, contrasted with UK's less successful approach, despite both having long experience with prior terrorism (ETA and IRA).

Four Available Actions for 21st Century Security

I will conclude with the thesis that the present security context demands at least four integrated actions in order to ensure national and international security:

• **Commonly agreed and proactive approaches to foreign policy** (some EU-only, others in cooperation with UN, Russia, the United States and others)
–Security situations in Balkans, Middle East, Caucasus, Mediterranean;
• **Monitoring of ceasefires, observance of laws of war and enforcement of agreements**
–Diplomacy combined with credible deployment of force and denial of legitimacy to violators of human rights;
• **Renewed emphasis on conflict prevention as a strategy of security**
–Placement of mediators and peacekeepers in situ *before violent events take place ;*
• **Community dialogue and civil society strengthening** to create bottom-up momentum in favor of peace and reconciliation
–Support for democratic development;
–Support for reconciliation between hostile communities within the same national boundaries and conflict resolution.

Austrian European Union Presidency 2006 – Accomplishments of the Austrian Federal Ministry of the Interior

Dr. Wilhelm Sandrisser, Head of International Affairs, EU-Coordination, Public Relations, Procurement, Austrian Federal Ministry of the Interior

The Austrian Federal Ministry of the Interior has achieved concrete results in the realm of security in Austria and the EU in six focal areas:

As part of an effort to implement the **new EU external strategy on internal security**, first steps in building a "security belt" around the EU have been taken. This is based on the concept of a "Partnership for Security" between the EU and interested third countries, which was initiated by Austria and developed at the Ministerial Conference held at the Vienna Hofburg on 4-5 May 2006. This concept is stipulated in the "Vienna Declaration". The States in the Western Balkans and in the 'new neighbourhood' bordering the east and south of the European Union contributed to this, in addition to the EU Member States and Accession States and Candidates, together with the Russian Federation and the United States.

This has laid the foundation for the first "Partnership for Security" between the EU and the western Balkan States: Under the Austrian Presidency, the Union agreed on a coherent set of measures to fight organised crime, corruption, illegal migration and the threat of terrorism in the regions east and south of the European Union. At the same time, a number of measures were adopted against drug-trafficking from Afghanistan, which usually flows along the Balkan route into the EU and Austria. The "Police Cooperation Convention for South East Europe" complements the Austrian focus on the Balkans and was signed on 4 May 2006 in Vienna. It will significantly facilitate police cooperation within the region, as well as with the EU Member States.

Global problems such as terrorism, organised crime or illegal migration require global responses. With the "Vienna Initiative", the Austrian EU Presidency accomplished for the first time a common dialogue between the Interior Ministers of the EU, Russia and the United States.

Concrete results were also achieved in the **fight against organised crime and corruption**. The green light was given to restructuring and reinforcing Europol, which was outlined in an "option paper". In the fight against child trafficking, a manual was put together which included improved interrogation and investigation methods. On the basis of a future-oriented EU *Organised Crime Threat Assessment* (OCTA), for the first time the Council defined clear priorities to fight crime in Europe. A network of national contact points was created for the recovery of assets from criminal activities. Furthermore, we have started to build a network against corruption.

In the **fight against terrorism**, the European Counter-Terrorism Action Plan (CTAP) was revised and updated, with special emphasis on a number of initiatives against radicalisation and the recruitment for terrorism. In this context, a core element was the large international conference called "Dialogue of Cultures and Religions" held in Vienna on 19 May 2006. On 10 May 2006, the first high-level political dialogue took place between the Council, the EU Commission and the European Parliament with the objective of enhancing cooperation among the EU institutions in fighting terrorism.

In the areas of **asylum, migration and border management**, strengthened cooperation within the EU and with third countries gained significant momentum. Within this context, an agreement was reached on the joint repatriation of illegal immigrants by air, which has already been put in practice. Pilot programmes were prepared in Ukraine, Republic of Moldova and Belarus, as well as in sub-Saharan Africa, in order to offer protection to those seeking help as quickly and as close to their home country as possible. In the future, those EU Member States that are under particular immigration pressure will receive support from the EU. Creating a common EU information system on the situation within migration countries of origin aims to further harmonise asylum procedures. Moreover, EU countries will have to inform their partners before taking measures that may affect other Member States. Preparations have been undertaken to create joint visa-application offices, as well as the new Visa Information System (VIS).

Negotiations on readmission and visa facilitation agreements with Russia were concluded and those with the Western Balkan states prepared. Negotiations on the European Refugee, External Border Protection, Repatriation and Integration Funds were almost completed. These funds, endowed in total with some € 4,000 million for the years 2007 to 2013, will allow for critical steps forward in favour of common asylum, migration and border management.

In preparation for the full **implementation of the Schengen Agreement**, 10 missions to the new Member States were carried out in order to evaluate the quality of local border controls, visa policies and police cooperation. In addition, we prepared the legal basis for the new Schengen Information System (SIS II). This will not only allow for the full integration of the new EU Member States into the system of EU police coordination, but also for the removal of border controls at the borders with these countries.

In the areas of **crisis and disaster management**, the foundation was laid to allow for rapid and coordinated EU action, which was also outlined in a manual. Furthermore, the Austrian Presidency provided great momentum to enhanced cooperation between the European Union and the United Nations.

International and Regional Responses to Organized Crime, Terrorism and Peacebuilding: The Role of the United Nations Security Council

Ambassador Marcel Peško
Director of the UN Department and UN Security Council Coordinator
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Slovak Republic

Slovakia joined the UN Security Council as an elected member only on January 1st this year. Therefore, it would be rather premature to try to give a full picture of the UN Security Council responses to organized crime, terrorism and peace-building, all three being very complex and difficult issues. However, given the title of the symposium, I intend to focus at least on one aspect of the emerging security challenges, which is linked with our membership in the Security Council: how to ensure sustainability of the post-conflict or peacebuilding processes, which is something the Security Council deals with almost on a daily basis.

It may seem counterintuitive, but the number of active armed conflicts in the world is in steady decline. This may be largely attributed to the numerous interventions of the international community in war-torn countries since the end of the Cold War aimed at making, keeping and building peace. Only since the beginning of 2006, the Security Council adopted 31 resolutions addressing situations in various corners of the world, including Democratic Republic of the Congo, East Timor, Cote-d´Ivoire, Sudan, Somalia, Liberia, Middle East, Afghanistan, Eritrea/Ethiopia and Haiti. These interventions, however, still show mixed results. This is because making and keeping peace appear to be easier to achieve than building it. Yet, if the transition from armed conflict to sustainable peace fails, then, in the long run, post-conflict situations may easily become pre-conflict situations and the regions of concern could turn, *inter alia*, to even more dangerous sources of organized crime and terrorist activities. In this respect, let me point to the recent developments in the East Timor, where the escalation of events in the last two months has created a highly volatile security situation, which endangers the achievements that country has made in the few years since gaining independence. Events in the last two months have, unfortunately, proved that the establishment of the security sector in the East Timor would have needed much more attention before the recent riots started and the presence of the UN needs to be strengthened.

As UN Secretary General Kofi Annan noted in his well-known report *"In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all"*, roughly half of all countries that emerge from war relapse into violence within five years. Therefore, it is fair to acknowledge that post-conflict peacebuilding has become one of the primary concerns in current world politics. The UN and other international organizations as well as donor countries have in recent years begun to prioritize and mainstream peacebuilding in their external policies. The trend has recently been manifested by the decision of the UN to reinforce its peacebuilding capacity, namely by creating the Peacebuilding Commission – an intergovernmental advisory body whose main purpose is to improve coordination among relevant actors and which, hopefully, will soon become operational. While substantial improvements have been made over the years in the international community's peace-building capacity, there are still considerable gaps in the development of concepts, policies and practice that would facilitate post-conflict peacebuilding and make it more effective.

One such gap lies in the security dimension of post-conflict peacebuilding. Not so many years ago the primary emphasis in post-conflict interventions was on economic and social reconstruction, whereas the broader – and politically more sensitive – task of building domestic capacity to provide security was often neglected. But it has to be repeatedly stressed that if the population is threatened by unaccountable and poorly managed police, armed forces or intelligence units; if the state monopoly of legitimate power is undermined by non-state actors; if former combatants, including child solders are not disarmed, demobilized and reintegrated, if the proliferation and misuse of small arms and light weapons is not curbed, if anti-personnel landmines are not cleared, perpetrators not prosecuted, victims of past crimes not provided with reparation – then building a peace will be elusive and the relapse into conflict almost unavoidable. Thus, security governance issues such as security sector reform (SSR), disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR), rule of law and respect for human rights, indeed

increasingly seem to be recognized by international security and development actors as priority peacebuilding tasks.

In that spirit, last summer the President of the UN Security Council made a statement on behalf of the Council, in which the Security Council emphasized that SSR was an essential element of any stabilization process in post-conflict environments. It also acknowledged the need for adequate attention to be accorded to SSR in the future, drawing on best practices that have been developed in this area. More recently, in its report on the 2006 substantive session, the General Assembly's Special Committee on Peacekeeping requested that the UN Secretariat conduct "a process of joint policymaking on security sector reform best practices" similar to the efforts undertaken so far in the area of DDR. Finally, the UN Secretariat is currently involved in establishing a Peacebuilding Capacity Inventory, which, in its first section, covers UN capacities in the area of security sector reform.

All this demonstrates that SSR is very much on the agenda of the UN system. Unlike any other international actor, the UN would be in a position to assist states in improving governance of the security sector through SSR in a holistic way. However, there is no common understanding, and even less a comprehensive policy framework, that would guide UN SSR programmes and projects in a coherent, consistent and sustainable way. In that vein, we believe that the topic should be addressed further in order to stimulate a discussion within the UN, which would pave the way for the development of a system-wide UN SSR concept or policy framework (though without aiming at a universally applicable model – bearing in mind that no common model of SSR exists and that each country engaging in SSR constitutes a special case). The fact that Slovakia holds the post of the UN Security Council non permanent member, presents us with a unique opportunity to draw the attention of the Council and the UN proper to this important topic by initiating a thematic debate on this issue prior to and during the course of our presidency in spring 2007. Our efforts have been strengthened by the recent adoption by the European Commission of the Concept for European Community Support for SSR, where it is also stressed that a common comprehensive approach involving all stakeholders is essential if the goals of capacity and governance in the field of SSR are to be met.

We are convinced that the time is ripe and the demand is great for a more thorough discussion on best practices, lessons learned and inherent challenges in this area. Later in the year we plan to hold a series of roundtables in New York with the hope that this discussion can lead to the adoption of a UN SC document that would provide clear and systematic guidance for future UN SSR activities particularly in the area of post-conflict peacebuilding.

Peacebuilding: The Way Ahead: Rule of Law and Counter-Terrorism Activities in Post-Conflict Areas

Dr. Lt.Gen. (ret) László BOTZ
Deputy Head of Department, Office of the Deputy State Secretary for International Affairs
Hungarian Ministry of Interior

The topics discussed at the symposium have became very important these days because peace support - and within this efforts against terrorism, organized crime, corruption, illegal migration – can be considered as a helping hand to create a safe environment, to defend the values of liberty, democracy and rule of law.

The activity of international terrorism has become global, but it is not a new phenomenon. There are quite a few countries – Germany, Spain, UK and Italy – where many lives have been lost because of terrorist activities during the second half of the last century. After September 11, we must evaluate our security in a new way. Due to new forms of international terrorism and the proliferation and use of weapons of mass destruction, we have the task of finding new methods of response. We had to recognize that no country can undertake these efforts alone and that international cooperation is the key in handling the situation.

The international community has recognized that it is not enough to use military force against these new challenges; after enforcing peace, creating a safe environment is of utmost importance to help a given country to recover from a war-torn situation. Reference is made to the European Union's resolution of June 2001 in Göteborg, that in post conflict areas it is necessary to concentrate on assuring public order, rule of law, protection of the population and assisting the normal activity of the government.

Hungary is participating in the EU's missions with police forces and providing training inside and outside Hungary, for example:

- On the basis of our Government's resolution of September 2002 we are taking part in the EU Police Mission in Bosnia-Herzegovina to mentor and monitor the structural development and law enforcement activity of the Bosnian police and border guard. In BiH there is a rather high level of corruption, there still exists the phenomenon of organized crime, that of illegal migration and smuggling. The Bosnian local police and law enforcement agencies needed international assistance to gain the necessary skills and professionalism to become effective enough and to regain the trust of the population. In such kinds of missions it seems much more important to assist the local authorities, rather than doing the job alone.

- Hungary is represented in the EUFOR ALTHEA mission - from March 2005 - by an investigating team and – from August 2005 – by a police platoon, within the Integrated Police Unit, which has the task to assist the local law-enforcement elements to control certain situations, chase war criminals, and monitor the security environment of the country.

- Hungary has had a representation in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) on the basis of the Ohrid Agreement of 2001. The President and the Prime Minister of FYROM requested the EU to conduct a police mission to assist the local authorities in handling the internal security situation. The mission was terminated in December 2005, today there are some EU personnel – in the framework of an advisory mission – to assist FYROM's integration into international institutions. The EOPOL PROXIMA mission has had similar tasks as that of EUPM, to establish rule of law, assist in fighting organized crime, and help in restructuring the police and border guard forces;

- On a bilateral basis Hungary has taken part in police training missions of Iraqi police forces in Jordan and police leaders training in Afghanistan. We offered our training abilities and facilities in Hungary to host Iraqi penitentiary officers for training in the very near future.

However, at present the level of terrorist threat to the Hungarian Republic is considered low, our Government has instructed the Minister of the Interior to set up an inter-ministerial committee and also to prepare the National Action Plan Against Terrorism in order to attain full implementation of

the tasks set by the EU Declaration on Combating Terrorism. The national system of coordination in terrorism matters has become a three-level structure: at the political level strategic decisions are made by the Cabinet on National Security, composed by the Minister of Defence, Minister of Interior, Minister of Justice, Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister heading the Prime Minister's Office. At the intermediate – administrative – level an Inter-ministerial Anti-terror Task Force was formed, chaired by the Ministry of the Interior with the task of monitoring the anti-terror policy of EU and to coordinate legislative and institutional alignment with those policies. At the operative level the Anti-terror Coordination Committee was set up in 2003 to ensure that the work of law-enforcement services and national security services is coordinated.

As far as the EU recommendations are concerned:

- in Hungary all police officers are provided during their basic training with general information on terrorist threats. Special training and briefing on current threats are provided for those units which are directly involved in the fight against terrorism such as units of the National Bureau of Investigation, Anti-terrorism and Extremism Unit, Public Security and Criminal Investigation Directorates of the National Police Headquarters;
- the Hungarian Border Guards put particular emphasis on the fight against terrorism. In 2006 a restructuring of the criminal intelligence and investigative units of the Border Guards has been started, to be completed by the Schengen-accession.

In 2004 the National Bureau of Investigation (NBI) was established within the Hungarian National Police, on the base of the Organized Crime Directorate. NBI's target sectors are organized crime, counter-terrorism and extremism, economic and financial crime.

The Department of Counter-terrorism and Extremism has duties including:

- counter-terrorism and extremism policing;
- conducting covert and criminal investigations;
- cooperation with domestic military and civil intelligence services;
- cooperation with foreign police counterparts;
- gathering, assessing and analyzing information/intelligence on national and international terrorism, sharing information with partners;
- representing the Hungarian Police at international professional fora dealing with counter-terrorism.

We consider information sharing the most important element of internal and international cooperation. To facilitate information sharing, in 2003 the Counter-terrorism Coordination Committee (CTCC) was formed with representatives of the Counter-terrorism and Extremism Department, the National Security Office, the National Security Service (technical), Information Office (civil intelligence), Military Intelligence Office, Military Security Office (military counter-intelligence), Border Guards, Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, and Organized Crime Coordination Center. This forum provides opportunity to review and discuss issues and proposals on respective activities.

The Hungarian National Police joined the Police Working Group on Terrorism (PWGT) in April 2002, which consists of senior representatives of European police services; its main objective is to enhance and promote the exchange of information and criminal intelligence as well as operational cooperation, in order to prevent terrorist activities.

Contact with EUROPOL and INTERPOL is maintained via a liaison office and officer delegated by the International Law Enforcement Cooperation Center of the Hungarian National Police.

International and Regional Responses to Organized Crime, Terrorism and Peacebuilding: The Role of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)

Jonathan Parish, Deputy Head of Policy Planning and Speechwriting Section, Political Affairs and Security Policy Division, NATO HQ

First, some general comments about NATO: A key feature of NATO is the transatlantic link – North American and European nations together. The organisation provides a standing forum for consultation and decision, and has a military structure that allows these decisions to be backed by military actions if required.

For NATO, during the Cold War, security was defined in military terms. Accordingly, NATO viewed itself as the sole actor – and that is how others also viewed NATO.

The post-Cold War situation is radically different. We now face threats from terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and from effects of failed and failing states. Our values can no longer be defended, and our security and stability can no longer be guaranteed, simply by acting on our own and adopting a reactive military approach. Instead, we must be proactive and cooperative on the need to project stability in concert with the wider international community. We need more than just military tools. NATO has recognised this and has changed. This is reflected in the greater political role the organisation plays, as well as in the range – geographical and functional - of its military operations.

Peacebuilding

- Wars <u>between</u> states are less frequent; wars <u>within</u> states (regional conflicts) are more frequent. Peacekeeping and nation-building have become central tenets of modern security management. These tasks require unprecedented levels of civilian and military cooperation. NATO can do the military part of the equation, by providing a secure environment. It can also cover other aspects, such as assisting an emerging democracy in security sector reform. But it cannot provide the other crucially important non-military pieces of the puzzle. These can only be provided by others.

- NATO is now seen by many as a major "enabler". The United Nations does not hesitate to request support from NATO's unique expertise and capabilities when the situation demands it - for example, in the Darfur crisis, and following the earthquake in Pakistan in October 2005.

Terrorism

- Terrorism constitutes a threat to all states, and to all peoples. That is why it is essential that the entire international community actively contributes to countering it. NATO's 26 Allies, both individually and collectively, will continue to play their role. Again, NATO is only one actor amongst many.

- Cohesion, coordination and strength of purpose amongst international organisations, regional organisations, and individual states are essential. And that is why we all look to the United Nations for strong leadership, and for the overarching framework for our efforts. The United Nations Secretary General made this very point in his recommendations for a global counter-terrorism strategy.

- And indeed, NATO's principal conceptual paper on defence against terrorism, emphasises that the best chance of success will come from "an overarching international strategy that integrates political, military economic, legal and social initiatives", and "fully conforms to the relevant provisions of the UN Charter and all relevant international norms, including those concerned with human rights and humanitarian requirements."

- There is a need to recognise that the fight against terrorism is primarily a political task. Could a purely military response have prevented the attacks in Madrid and London? I think not. But that does not mean there is no place for military action in the fight against terrorism – there is. But it must be anchored within a very clear overarching strategy.

- NATO is still too often viewed through the Cold War prism. This prevents the viewer from seeing the key changes that NATO has undergone. It is wrong to think that NATO can only offer a military contribution to the international effort. NATO now offers a number of political and other non-military tools that have already been used effectively in the fight against terrorism. A key tool is political dialogue.

Political dialogue

- Enhanced political dialogue has become a fundamental characteristic of the new NATO. Dialogue amongst Allies, with partners, and with other international organisations.

Political dialogue – internal

- The declaration of Artilce 5, NATO mutual defence clause, only 24 hours after the attacks of 9/11, sent a very strong politcal message of solidarity. It also showed NATO's collective determination to fight against terrorism. Dialogue features on the weekly agenda.

- Through enhanced political dialogue, one can exchange views, develop a common understanding of the threat and how best to respond, and evaluate how NATO can best add value to other international and national efforts.

Political dialogue – partners

- This dialogue within NATO is complemented by an extensive web of relationships with other countries. Twenty partners in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, stretching from Northern Europe to the Balkans, and eastwards through the Caucasus and out to Central Asia, are all committed to working closely on a wide range of measures to contribute to countering terrorism, including efforts to enhance border security. Within the framework of the NATO-Russia Council, NATO and Russia work particularly closely in countering terrorism.

- Similarly, in the political cooperation with our seven North African and Middle East partners in the Mediterranean Dialogue and our four Gulf partners in the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative, countering terrorism is a major feature. This network of 57 states represents nearly a third of the United Nations Member States. Supplemented by an increasing number of what we term "contact countries" - countries that come from all five continents, and who approach NATO for discussions that include countering terrorism.

Political dialogue – international organisations

- NATO also engages at the political level with other international organisations to ensure cooperation, and that efforts complement each other. There are frequent staff consultations with the United Nations, and the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe; and participation in the special meetings of this committee with international, regional and sub-regional organisations. All these exchanges are a vital part of constructing and maintaining the necessary cooperation and coordination framework for countering terrorism effectively.

NATO's Operations

- Today, NATO is actively engaged on three continents – in Europe, in Asia, and in Africa.

- In Kosovo, our troops continue to keep the peace and ensure a safe and stable environment in which the UN-sponsored talks on the future status of that province can take place.

- In Afghanistan, the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force is assisting the Government of Afghanistan to provide the necessary security so that democracy can take root and redevelopment can take place.

- In Iraq, NATO is training Iraqi security forces to allow them to take on more responsibility for their own security.

- In Africa, African Union peacekeeping troops are being airlifted into the Darfur region of Sudan by Allied aircraft, and we are also providing other assistance, like headquarters training, to that force.

- Alongside these commitments, NATO maritime forces are conducting an anti-terrorist operation in the Mediterranean. And we have just deployed security assistance to Germany as she hosts the World Cup.

- And we provided humanitarian relief to the victims of last year's Hurricane Katrina in the United States, as well as to victims of last October's earthquake in Pakistan.

Organised Crime

- NATO is not a principal player in the fight against organised crime, but its operations do have a positive impact on reducing these illicit activities - in the Mediterranean, NATO maritime activity has led to significant reduction in illegal activity. In certain cases, support to other organisations can be given, for example the G8 and UN in Afghanistan, UNMIK in Kosovo.

- NATO has a policy on combating human trafficking.

- NATO provides assistance in border security.

- There are trust funds for destruction of small arms and light weapons.

Public Diplomacy Challenges

- International organisations have different backgrounds, structures, and organisational cultures – yet a number of shared characteristics. They are in demand more than ever before; all are going through a period of adaptation and transformation to meet the challenges of the new security environment. The diverse roles the organisations play are not always fully understood by the broader public.   Why?

o Today's missions are very complex and long-term. The success of peacekeeping or nation-building takes years rather than weeks. This exceeds the attention span of large parts of the broader public. Thus, even when we may believe that we are making progress, the public's impression may be that of failure.

o The average citizen does not view our work in Afghanistan, or elsewhere, as relevant to his or her own personal safety, and does not appreciate that what our organisations are doing in today's crisis areas actually enhances our common security.

- Our organisations must make greater effort to explain new security challenges; to raise public awareness of our work; and to maintain public support for our various activities, missions and operations.

New Wars, Long Wars, and Privatized Wars

Walter Kemp
Senior Public Information Expert, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

It has been popular in recent years to speak of a "war on drugs", or a "war on terrorism". There is now even talk of a "war against corruption", and a campaign against organized crime.

This martial talk is confusing, especially as war is seldom declared and it is not clear who we are fighting against.

Yet it cannot be denied that warfare is changing. Most modern wars are not between States, they are within them, or against trans-national networks. Coalitions, sometimes with the support of private military companies, are fighting insurgents, bandits, and terrorists many of whom are funded by the profits of organized crime and illicit drugs.

These new wars against drugs, crime and terrorism – if indeed they are wars – are complex and hard to win. It is no wonder that they have recently been referred to as "long" wars. Looked at another way, they can be considered long-term peace-building operations on a global scale.

What can we do?

New Wars

New wars require new strategies. The international system, international organizations and the study of international relations is mainly focused on inter-State actors. And yet, many regions of States are not under the control of the internationally recognized State governments. Calling de facto authorities "non-State" actors will not make them disappear. They are a force to be reckoned with.

The starting point is to establish who are these non-State actors? What do they want? Do they represent popular interests or only the self-interests of a corrupt elite? How do they survive – and many have for more than a decade.

I submit that many so-called ethnic conflicts have very little to do with ethnicity, and a lot to do with control, power, and money. Rather than national self-determination for the many, these movements can be viewed as "selfish-determination" for an elite (and often corrupt) few.

We therefore have to pay more attention to the political economy of conflict, taking a root and branch approach.

In terms of roots, we have to identify the root causes of conflicts. Are there legitimate grievances, socio-economic issues (like poverty, marginalization, lack of access to resources), or a desire for power-sharing?). These issues can be identified and solved.

If there are more sinister forces at work, then it is time to cut the branches that keep the corrupt and criminal regime afloat: foreign assets, criminal ties, laundered money, illicit trade, external support.

The key is to have a good sense of the issues and actors at stake, address legitimate issues and figure out where the shoe pinches with the spoilers.

Links

Unrecognized de facto regimes can usually not survive on their own. They have a network of contacts that enable them to survive, even prosper. Indeed, they are masters of effective multilateralism, exploiting external contacts that keep them in business, and in power.

After all, why is it so hard to resolve some contemporary conflicts, for example "frozen conflicts" in Europe and recurrent crises in parts of Africa? Is it because the issues are so intractable, or is it that some groups have a vested interest in the status quo, and are profiting from instability? And if so, how do they do it? Chances are, one will uncover a trail that connects the main players to networks of crime and corruption.

While there are clear links between crime, conflict, drugs, corrupt regimes and even terrorist groups, one should be careful about employing a simple arithmetic. When investigating these links, we should be careful about adopting a simplistic arithmetic, particularly in relation to minority groups.

To say that some members of an ethnic community (A) are pushing for greater recognition and/or self-government, a small fraction of them (B) have links to organized crime and/or espouse violence, and (C) may even carry out terrorist acts does not mean that A = C.

In other words, one should be careful to distinguish the extremists from the moderates rather than tarring all members of an ethnic community with the same anti-terrorist/criminal/drug trafficker brush. Otherwise, the result could be a self-fulfilling prophecy where legitimate grievances are ignored and moderates are pushed into the arms of extremists. We therefore have to separate greed from grievance.

There should also therefore be a measured and targeted response. Is it sufficient to isolate a small elite (i.e. through sanctions, freezing assets, arrest warrants for crimes committed)? Or do more pervasive problems need to be addressed like tackling systemic corruption, weak law and order, poor criminal justice, poverty, minority rights/representation/self-administration? With a proper assessment, one can make the appropriate response. This is conflict prevention and peace building.

<u>New Standards and Tools</u>

The United Nations is developing new standards and tools to address these new threats and challenges.

There is a UN Convention Against Corruption and a UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime (with three protocols – on human trafficking, illicit firearms, and human smuggling).

The UN now has a Peacebuilding Commission.

Regional organizations, like the OSCE, have considerable expertise in conflict prevention and post-conflict rehabilitation.

<u>Long Wars</u>

What about so-called long wars: like terrorism and drugs?

There are 13 UN instruments against terrorism, and the UN Secretary General has recently unveiled a blueprint for a global counter-terrorism strategy.

If these are long wars, then we need long-term strategies.

On drugs, the international regimes is well-established, based on three almost universally ratified UN Conventions.

There is a broadly supported international strategy that focuses on reducing supply, cutting trafficking routes, and reducing demand.

For long term success, a key factor will be to eradicate poverty as well eradicating illicit crops. Farmers growing coca and opium in Afghanistan, Bolivia, Colombia, Myanmar and Peru live is some of the poorest communities in the world. Farmers need support to develop alternative, licit

crops in order to have a better future and reduce the world supply of drugs. And of course the consuming countries need to curb their appetite for illicit drugs. This is a shared responsibility.

Private Wars

A striking phenomenon of new wars is that violence is undertaken by privately organized groups for private purposes, usually for financial gains. This description covers a whole range of threats from banditry to State capture.

At the same time, there is a rise in the use for force by privately organized groups for private gain, although usually also a public good. That is the growth of private military companies.

In the past decade, a number of companies have sprung up that offer a range of services for hire – support firms, consultant firms and provider firms.

Traditional military operations and services are being out-sourced to a booming private sector of corporate warriors who are flying in supplies, building bases, providing intelligence and providing security for international forces, humanitarian groups, and governments, even international organizations.

The traditional monopoly on coercion which has defined the State for centuries is being sold to the most competitive bidder.

You could therefore characterize modern conflict as "bandits versus mercenaries".

Of course, private military companies do not like to be characterized as mercenaries. Indeed, they are a multi-million dollar business and some British and American firms are providing vital services to the international efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq.

For example, any idea what the second largest contingent of forces is in Iraq? It's not any national force – it's a British company called Aegis that has a 300 million dollars contract with the United States Government, managing between 10,000 and 15,000 personnel in theatre.

Another major American company, Blackwater, recently offered to go to Darfur and restore order. How far-fetched is that?

Could private military companies carry out peace enforcement or peace-keeping under a UN mandate in the future – a kind of privatized French Foreign Legion or Ghurkas? After all, more regional organizations and humanitarian groups are relying on such companies for support and protection in the field.

In a world where conflict is being defined by private, non-State actors, what scope is there for private security forces? This is an issue that deserves further attention.

To conclude, the transformation of modern conflict requires a corresponding transformation in strategic thinking and operational responses.

The old rule books have been torn up. We therefore have to think outside the box, keep up with (if not stay one step ahead of) the enemy, and build national, regional and international capacity and networks to cope with non-State actors and trans-national threats like drugs, crime and terrorism.

This is not only desirable. It is a question of mutual survival.

For further information contact:

United Nations Information Service (UNIS) Vienna
PO Box 500, 1400 Vienna
Austria
Telephone: +43 1 260 60 3325
E-mail: unis@unvienna.org

Or visit our homepage: www.unis.unvienna.org