

How interlinked crises are driving a more unequal and unstable world



Selim Jahan is former director of the Human Development Report Office under the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and lead author of the Human Development Report.

SELIM JAHAN

“We live in an unequal, unstable and unsustainable world.”

The statement may sound simple, but it has far-reaching implications. Although it paints a broad-brush picture of the contemporary world, the reality is that for quite some time, the world has been facing multiple mutually reinforcing crises, occurring all at the same time.

Besides, inequality, instability, and unsustainability are interdependent: persistent inequalities in a society may result in instability, while instability in a country may give rise to unsustainability. Furthermore, inequalities, which operate on many planes—political, economic, social, cultural—might manifest not only in terms of outcome, such as income and wealth, but also in areas of opportunities in basic social services, such as education and health. Similarly, the instabilities may arise from conflicts and wars, both within and outside countries, as well as from economic shocks, recessions and meltdowns. Finally, sustainability is not just limited to the environment only; political, economic and social sustainability are equally important.

If we consider global income and wealth, the world is appallingly unequal. The top 10 percent of the global population makes 52 percent of the world's income, while the bottom 50 percent makes only eight percent of it. The contrast is even starker in wealth. The top 10 percent of the global population

owns 76 percent of the global wealth, while the bottom half of humanity owns a meagre two percent of it. Similar trends would be observed regionally or at the country level. Such inequalities have three critical implications.

First, the scenario reflects unequal access to productive resources, social services and other economic and social opportunities. However, it is also the result of the dominance of one group in controlling resources and services. In other words, such inequalities are indicative of economic division and social hierarchies globally. Second, persistent and worsening inequalities create despair and frustration among the people. Those who are deprived see inequalities as a manifestation of injustice, which can evoke anger and frustration. If pushed to the extreme, inequalities may result in social and political instability. Third, inequalities weaken the social fabric, damage social cohesion and create fragility nationally and globally. Inequalities thus dampen the economic and socio-political sustainability of societies.

Meanwhile, wars and conflicts, in most cases, give rise to global instability. Due to differences in definitions and tracking methods, there is no single agreed-upon number for ongoing wars or conflicts. However, there are some estimates. The Global Peace Index notes that there are 59 state-based conflicts, the highest number since World War II. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) reports over 120 armed conflicts, with a significant

increase in non-international conflicts. Sub-Saharan Africa continues to experience the highest number of conflicts classified as full-scale wars. Civilians are bearing the brunt of these conflicts. Over 58,700 civilians have already been killed in wars last year, with civilian fatalities in the Occupied Palestine Territory accounting for nearly one third of the global total.

Economic instability also characterises

system, making it unstable and vulnerable.

Global instability, whether originating from wars, conflicts, or economic turmoil, does not impact the different groups of people in a society equally. Well-off people have many cushions to protect them from global instabilities, or at least to minimise their negative impacts. But the poor and the marginalised become even more vulnerable under unstable global conditions as they lack

In the world today, there are 122.1 million people—almost equal to the population of Japan—who have been uprooted from their homes and are currently homeless. These people have been forced to flee from their homes because of wars, conflicts and violence, fear of life, violation of human rights, or breakdown of law and order in their communities. Out of the forcibly displaced people, 42.7 million are refugees in countries other than their country of origin and 73.5 million are internally displaced people (IDPs) within their own countries.

Globally, an estimated 1.2 billion people are at high risk from climate hazards like heatwaves, floods, and droughts. Every country is affected by environmental degradation, though the specific impacts and vulnerability levels differ. An estimated three billion people globally are impacted by land degradation, and over 200 million people will be displaced within their countries by 2050 due to the slow onset of environmental changes and disasters.

All these phenomena not only impact the environmental sustainability of our planet, but also affect the global inequality and instability. The burden of environmental impacts is borne unequally by the marginalised population of the world, and climate change impacts poor countries more than the rich ones. Besides, the fact remains that those who are affected the most by climate change are not responsible for creating it. The inertia of the developed world to help the affected countries through climate funding frustrates the developing countries and makes the relationship between the developed and the developing world tense.

In the ultimate analysis, since all the multiple crises of inequality, instability and unsustainability are interrelated and mutually reinforcing, tackling them will require a coordinated approach. The world has little choice left but to adopt such an approach, with all countries working together. Without this, the future of our world would be at stake.



FILE VISUAL: SALMAN SABIK SHAHRYAR

the global economy. It is partly due to wars and conflicts around the globe, but partly because of the global tariff hikes by the United States. Countries of the world are also moving more to something called “economic nationalism,” where the focus is more on unilateral approach, rather than multilateral action; bilateral dealings are being chosen over multilateral negotiations; policymakers are leaning more towards closed economy, rather than openness. All these have been infusing elements of uncertainty in the global economic

monetary or institutional shields. It is now well-documented that various groups of society are asymmetrically affected by wars and conflicts. For example, women and children are often used as weapons of war and form the main group of war casualties. Similarly, the poor and the marginalised groups not only suffer the most during economic shocks, but they also take more time and find it more difficult to bounce back. Thus, the impacts of instability are asymmetrical across different groups of people in countries.

Dissecting the UNSC plan for Gaza and its inevitable dead end



Jamal Kanj is the author of *Children of Catastrophe: Journey from a Palestinian Refugee Camp to America, and other books*. He writes frequently on Palestine/Arab world issues for various national and international publications.

JAMAL KANJ

US policy documents on the Middle East do not reach the daylight before Israel is given the chance to filter and gut them. The latest UN Security Council (UNSC) 2803, Comprehensive Plan, is no exception. The resolution perpetuates the same failed logic that has governed international diplomacy for decades—one in which Palestinian rights are conditioned, but Israeli obligations are delayed with no mechanism, timelines, or accountability for violating agreements.

Following two years of using food as a weapon of war and genocide, the UNSC adopted the US-sponsored resolution, not to condemn but to reward the perpetrator. The UNSC



FILE PHOTO: AFP

The resolution normalises Israeli occupation “that will remain until Gaza is properly secure from any resurgent terror threat.” An open-ended clause grants Israel a permanent military footprint in and around Gaza and the power to define and determine any so-called “resurgent threat.”

The heart of the resolution's inequity is found in paragraph seven, which authorises a foreign military force (ISF) tasked with enforcing Palestinian demilitarisation. The Palestinian Resistance must disarm, surrender weapons, accept foreign security supervision, and undergo vetting. Israel's withdrawal, however, takes place only “when conditions allow” and is to be negotiated between its army and ISF, guarantors, and the US.

Comprehensive Plan for Gaza is anything but comprehensive. It is narrow, short on details, rich in contradictions, and utterly lacking any overarching purpose.

Take the second paragraph of the resolution, for instance. The resolution “welcomes the establishment of the Board of Peace (BoP)” as a transitional international administration that will manage Gaza's redevelopment “until such time as the Palestinian Authority has satisfactorily completed its reform program.”

In other words, the recognition

of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people is contingent, sequenced, and time-bound: reform first, demonstrate worthiness, satisfy outside evaluators, and then—maybe—they can “securely and effectively take back control” of their land. Meanwhile, Israel's commitments are, at best, deliberately vague, crafted with ambiguities allowing varying interpretations, much like UNSC Resolutions 242 and 338, written purposefully in a nebulous language that enabled Israel to evade compliance for decades.

There is not one single concrete or enforceable requirement placed on Israel: to halt its extrajudicial assassinations, military attacks, complete withdrawal, or stop the expansion of Jewish-only colonies established on the same land reserved for the supposed Palestinian “self-determination.”

The resolution weakens item 7 of “Trump's 20-point Gaza peace plan”, which had called for “full aid be immediately sent into the Gaza Strip.” The new Comprehensive Plan replaced “immediately” with an emphasis on “the importance of the full resumption of humanitarian aid.” Israel's implicit obligations are further watered down to mere “consultation” and “cooperation,” giving the occupying power wide latitude to dictate interpretations and evade any real accountability.

The distortion becomes even more

humanitarian aid, orders stringent monitoring of aid distribution inside Gaza. At the same time, there is no unequivocal demand on Israel to open all crossings or stop hindering humanitarian aid delivery fully. The limited aid must be policed in Gaza, but the state that used food as a weapon and starved the population is not required to do anything differently.

In paragraph four, a foreign-controlled “operational entities” strip Palestinians of their political agency by placing them under a technocratic committee selected from abroad and subordinate to the misnomer BoP. Yet, there is nothing in the resolution about the freedom of ingress and egress, no mention of opening the seaport or rebuilding the airport. Furthermore, there are no tangible punitive measures if and when Israel fails to adhere to the UNSC Resolution.

The funding structures in paragraphs 5–6 absolve Israel of responsibility. Gaza's reconstruction is handed to donors and the World Bank, financed through voluntary contributions. Israel, the power that destroyed Gaza is not asked to contribute a dollar, let alone pay reparations or assume legal responsibility for murdering and injuring 241,000 Palestinians, destroying all the universities, 97 percent of schools, 94 percent of the hospitals and 92 percent of the residential homes.

The heart of the resolution's inequity is found in paragraph seven, which authorises a foreign military force (ISF) tasked with enforcing Palestinian demilitarisation. The Palestinian Resistance must disarm, surrender weapons, accept foreign security supervision, and undergo vetting. Israel's withdrawal, however, takes place only “when conditions allow” and is to be negotiated between its army and ISF, guarantors, and the US. Palestinians are entirely excluded from determining the terms of the Israeli withdrawal from their own land.

Even more alarming, the resolution normalises Israeli occupation “that will remain until Gaza is properly secure from any resurgent terror threat.”

The open-ended clause grants Israel a permanent military footprint in and around Gaza while also granting it the power to define and determine any so-called “resurgent threat.”

Finally, paragraph eight mandates that any extension of international presence in Gaza must be done “in full cooperation and coordination with Egypt and Israel.” Once again, Palestinians are excluded from determining their own future. It is all left for Israel since its consent is conditional on the “full cooperation.”

Taken together, these provisions expose the true nature of the so-called Comprehensive Plan: a political instrument designed to entrench, not end, the structural inequality of

occupation. And less than 72 hours following the UNSC Resolution, Benjamin Netanyahu appointed Bezalel Smotrich and Itamar Ben-Gvir, two Jewish racist ministers who openly called for the ethnic cleansing and for building Jewish-only colonies in Gaza, to be in charge of, or more likely to undermine, the second phase of Trump's 20-point plan.

In short, the UNSC Comprehensive Plan whitewashes Israel's genocide and ties the future of Palestinian self-determination to a checklist that Israel is neither bound to accept nor prevented from obstructing. A plan that will lead to exactly where previous UN Resolutions, mainly 194, 242, and 338, had gone, to an inevitable dead end.

Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh
Office of the Executive Engineer
Education Engineering Department
Pirojpur
www.ced.pirojpur.gov.bd

Tender No. XEN/EED/PIROJ/1008

Date: 25.11.2025

e-Tender Notice No. e-GP/07/EED/PIR/2025-26, Date: 25.11.2025

e-Tender is invited in the e-GP Web Portal (www.eprocure.govbd) for the procurement of following Works. Details are given below:

SL No.	Package No. & Tender ID No.	Description of works	Last selling date & time	Last submission (date & time)	Tender closing & opening date & time
01	WD-40. Tender ID No. 1168099	Construction of 6-Storeied Administrative Building with 6-Storeied Foundation Including Sanitary and Water Supply Works along with Electrification and Other Works at Pirojpur Polytechnic Institute, Sadar, Pirojpur. (Foundation Category: PILE Foundation)	16-Dec-2025 17:00	17-Dec-2025 12:30	17-Dec-2025 13:00
02	WD-86. Tender ID No. 1168066	Construction of 6-Storeied Workshop Building with 6-Storeied Foundation Including Sanitary, Water Supply & Electrification Works at Pirojpur Polytechnic Institute, Sadar, Pirojpur. (Foundation Category: SINGLE PILE Foundation)	16-Dec-2025 17:00	17-Dec-2025 12:30	17-Dec-2025 13:00
03	WD-63. Tender ID No. 1168002	Construction of 6-Storeied Academic Building with 6-Storeied Foundation Including Sanitary and Water Supply Works along with Electrification and Other Works at Pirojpur Polytechnic Institute, Sadar, Pirojpur. (Foundation Category: PILE Foundation)	16-Dec-2025 17:00	17-Dec-2025 12:30	17-Dec-2025 13:00

This is an online tender where only e-Tender will be accepted in the National e-GP Portal and no offline/hard copies will not be accepted. To submit e-Tender, registration in the National e-GP Web Portal (www.eprocure.govbd) is required. The fees for downloading the e-Tender documents from the National e-GP Web Portal have to be deposited online through any registered bank any branch up to abovementioned date & time. Further information and guidelines are available in the National e-GP Web Portal & e-GP help desk and also from e-mail: ee_pir@eedmoe.gov.bd

Md. Zahurul Islam
Executive Engineer
Education Engineering Department
Pirojpur

GD-2550