



تونس | المركز العربي للأبحاث ودراسة السياسات
Tunisie | Centre Arabe des Recherches et de l'Etude des Politiques

International Conference

Contemporary Societies Facing Risks

Contexts, Actors, Experiences, and Response Stakes

Tunis, 15-16 November 2024

Call for Application

I. Invitation

The Arab Center for Research and Political Studies, Tunis, announces the organization of an international conference: "*Contemporary Societies Facing Risks: Contexts, Actors, Experiences, and Response Stakes*" The conference is scheduled for November 15th and 16th, 2024. Researchers from various scientific disciplines are invited to contribute to the conference by submitting their research paper proposals.

II. Terms of reference:

By the midst of the of the twentieth century, the world had become the scene of profound social and historical transformations sustained technological and ecological developments. Such transformations often testify to the transition from the first modernity of an industrial aspect to the second modernity, usually characterized by "cosmic risks".¹ Consistent with these transitions, the concept of risk has witnessed remarkable developments, evolving into an integrated approach adopted in the analysis of the profound changes in industrial society whereby the unforeseen consequences of human actions have become more frequent, intense, and influential, posing a threat to human existence altogether.

As such, this sociological approach serves as an introduction to the critique of the "instrumental rationality" on which contemporary industrial societies rely in their attempt to address and predict risks. It further offers an alternative rationality that opens up perspectives, elides interludes between disciplines competences expanding to include uncertainty, the complex, and the composite incorporating other different and diverse variables (whether political, social, environmental, etc.).² This broadened worldview further included societies of the Global South that are, as it turned out, no longer spared from these risks, especially given their globalization and the interplay of impact and influence globally. Furthermore, such societies produce their self-induced own specific risks such as ethnic conflicts, corruption, reckless and over exploitation of resources, climate change, prevalence of organized crime, and local and national political structures vulnerability etc....

Diverse scientific studies addressing the issue of risk (s) across different fields point to the structural and complex crisis accompanying the "second modernity". Such a crisis rendered the institutions of the national state, the capitalist market, as well as the scientific community, albeit all their developed/ing technologies, incapable of controlling what became known as "new risks".

¹ Ulrich Beck & Christoph Lau, "Second modernity as a Research agenda: Theoretical and Empirical Explorations in the 'meta-change' of Modern Society," *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 56, no. 4 (2005), pp. 525 - 557

² Ulrich Beck, "From Industrial Society to the Risk Society: Questions of Survival, Social Structure and Ecological Enlightenment," *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 9, no. 1 (1992), pp. 97 - 123.

In this view, and for the purpose of a deep and objective understanding of this phenomenon within a cross-disciplinary approach, the Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies, Tunis (ACRPS.Tunis) is organizing an international conference entitled "*Contemporary Societies Facing Risks: Contexts, Actors, Experiences, and Response Stakes*", thus proposing a rainbow of key axes stated herein: proposing several key axes.

1. Risks: Universality of Concept and Specificity of Local Contexts

The concept of risk has gained dissemination across public debates, spanning unto various arenas such as scientific communities, specialized and mass media, and civil society. Having attained social legitimacy, it has evolved into an obsession whereby international community structures, states and governments have been placed within this evolution and thus happened to be hung on such a concept which constitutes the prime of focus in their interventions and in their program development.

In this vein, "uncontrollable" risks have necessitated reconsideration which have arisen as a subject for research, prompting the delimitation of its boundaries, concept fine-tuning, enhancement of response horizons, and determination of the humanities and social sciences position. It is quite worth noting that the concept of a "risk society" is intertwined with various sub-concepts, notably "risk perception", "risk governance", risk democracy(risk allocation), "risk adaptation capacity", "vulnerability against such risks", "response", "social responsibility", and "solidarity" in the face of hazards. Additionally, key concepts such as "institutional modernity", "cosmopolitanism", "universality" and reflexivity (reflective thinking) are intertwined, shaping our perspective as a scientific community on the intricate challenges confronting our societies. Indeed, risks that both groups and social categories undergo do not arise in isolation from history, geography, identity nor are they separated from surrounding social and political environments.

Meanwhile, ongoing debates and profound revisions of the literature of modernity suggest the increasing utilization of "major disasters", with a major focus on those of environmental, technological, and global origins, moving in cross-border states and regions, being analytical examples of characteristic features of contemporary societies. This heightened focus has resulted in the neglect of other highly significant dimensions, such as political, social, and psychological aspects. Such examples tend to be macro sociological, reducing our ability to approach risks at local levels and within the context of their effect of individuals and groups' daily lives. Despite the broadening of the debate and multi-disciplinarity, we happen to be shackled at a certain view point that blurs the multitude of other hazards threatening our societies, especially those unclassified within the umbrella of modern industrial ones.

These theoretical, conceptual, and methodological precautions pose several significant challenges regarding the capacity of this conceptual framework revolving around the concept of "risks", of putting forward a sustained analytical approach, capable of identifying risks and formulating prevention mechanisms and policies within complex and diverse contexts. Hence, following its development fifty years ago and forty years of its initial usage in sociological analyses, questions

arise regarding the meaning of the definition of the concept of "risks" and its sub-concepts, especially with/in non-industrialized societies? Is the concept as such capable of analyzing new configurations of social connections and current transformations on everyday standard of living? Does this theoretical framework on the concept of risks hold procedural effectiveness capable of adapting to and analyzing the challenges posed by research on the countries of the Global South? Does this conceptual framework hold the capacity to analyze culturally and ethnically complex local contexts? Can the concept of risk and relevant sub-concepts be applied to develop theoretical to develop post- colonial and decolonial perspectives?

2. Risks: New Actors and Classification Controversy

While the concept of risk was associated, in its early stages, with economic analyses during the seventies of the twentieth century, amidst severe crises faced by capitalist market institutions that provided an opportunity for the growth of the insurance sector, the concept of risk has so far witnessed extensive use across various scientific fields which is why many researchers today contend that "everything holds risks", urging specialists consideration of risks and preparedness to effectively manage their likelihood and/or magnitude (The Risk Management of Everything).³ The monetization of major global economies has further underscored the dire need to develop economic crises management models particularly in the event of the eighties of the last century which witnessed the emergence of new types of risks in the fields of health, security, rights, and dignity.⁴ This occurred even before the rise of information risks and the concerns posed by artificial intelligence technologies today in terms of impacts and responses.

Numerous analyses particularly experimental (empirical) ones such as reports from Think Tanks and international organizations, have sought to classify risks with a view to deconstructing them and thus developing targeted Public Policies Plans, and actions, within their respective fields of expertise to better reflect various uses and contexts. Such efforts have led to the emergence of many local actors (states including all its local and national institutions, civil society organizations (CSOs), consulting and expertise offices) and international actors (United Nations agencies, international organizations, the World Bank, the World Health Organization ...). All actors have striven to develop risk classifications that would address risks and allow for the mitigation of their impacts.

In recent years, 'new risks' have gained attention, with political risks being among the most significant. The stability of the political system and its formation can have a decisive impact on the viability of societies and on the ability of the economic fabric to maintain balance. Political risks involve war (be it internal or civil), geopolitical instability, persistent corruption or/and mismanagement, organized crime, the weakness of the welfare state and/ or the collapse of its care and service systems. Additionally, new risks comprise cybercrime, harassment, and stigmatization practices, violence, assault, terrorism, insecurity and a growing concern for citizens' health and safety. In the same

3 Michael Power, "The Risk Management of Everything," *The Journal of Risk Finance*, vol. 5, no. 3 (2004), pp. 58 - 65.

4 Olivier Hassid, *Le management des risques et des crises*, 3e éd. (Paris: Dunod, 2011).

context, social and cultural risks have emerged. Such nomenclature reveals multi-faceted risks, inter alia, uncontrollable demographic change, unequal income distribution, conflicting trajectories of social mobilities, rapid changes in lifestyles, attitudes towards work, leisure, and religion, ascending consumerism, rising costs of living, and the failure of differentiation management policies.

Nonetheless, new risk classifications do not necessarily imply giving up established classifications. The inception of the idea of risks within the field of economic sciences has implicitly maintained economic risks as one of the most prominent areas of current research and a major concern for private and public economic institutions as it is a concern borne by involved economic public and private institutions while simultaneously constituting a threat to all individuals, groups and communities. Still, risks comprise downturn in the economic cycle, financial market volatility and exchange rate fluctuations. Such risks extend beyond recessions and can thus threaten economies even during periods of growth with transnational transboundary effects.

Technological risks cannot be overlooked, especially those following the significant additions made by social scientists, in the last quarter of the twentieth century with their development of analyses focused on technological risks that fall within the industrial, nuclear, and biological sectors, related primarily to companies engaged in activities such as the chemical industry, power, intensive agricultural livestock farming, used for industrial fertilizers, genetic modifications, chemical inputs and waste management. These risks also encompass various environmental impacts of various industries including the threat to ecological flora, fauna and animal diversity on land, seas, oceans and in the sky, as well as the rising number of natural disasters due to climate change due to global warming.⁵

Considering all such elements the question of how new risks are identified and contextualized can be divided into sub-questions such as: What are the new risks and the contexts in which they arise? Who are the actors involved in the process of risk categorizations and management locally and internationally? Can the new actors be identified? What are their categorizations like? How have these categorizations evolved historically? How do they differ in disparate contexts and domains? What are the conditions and tools utilized for such categorizations? What are the negotiation dynamics enabling the identification and legitimacy of such categorizations? What is the position of the scientific community, mainly academic, within this system? And how do these categorizations contribute to the development of risk management?

3. Risks: Indicators and Measurement Tools

The risk management process requires that risks be measurable and determined according to their prevalence and threat level.⁶ For instance, in terms of measuring exposure to risk,⁷ the World Bank

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Helmut Mausser, & Rosen Dan, "Beyond VaR: From measuring risk to managing risk," In: Authors Group, Proceedings of the IEEE/IAFE 1999 Conference on Computational Intelligence for Financial Engineering (CIFER) (New York: IEEE, 1999).

⁷ Robert Holzmann, & Valerie Kozel, "The role of social risk management in development: A World Bank view," *IDS Bulletin*, vol. 38, no. 3 (2007), pp. 8 - 13.

relies on the concept of vulnerability as a pivotal indicator. Thus, "Risk and Vulnerability" indicators account for the most prominent tools used by the World Bank to understand the causes of exposure to poverty, the analyses of shocks, and identification of policy gaps in social risks management. Such policies aim at developing risk-management strategies by measuring household vulnerability to risks and traumas whose assessment entail the collection of accurate data revealing their impact on individuals and their adaptive capacity, which can sometimes be challenging in developing countries. Moreover, vulnerability analyses are not confined to the economic dimension alone but could be applied on diverse aspects of contemporary life, such as health, education, nutrition, security, and access to adequate housing.

The World Bank draws on several indicators for its conducted analyses. Indeed, income volatility, dependence on agriculture, access to assets, access to social protection mechanisms and social support networks, access to education and skills, and income diversification being the most prominent indicators.⁸ Such indicators are used to assess individuals' exposure to various traumas hence, helping identify the most vulnerable populations. However, it currently does not seem to be a sufficient determinant one given the expansion of the risk map faced by societies. Therefore, many studies reveal the need to build on further indicators, mainly those relevant to levels of exposure to all forms of violence whether domestic violence or resulting from political or ethnic conflicts or organized crime. This building on other indicators should by no means neglect indicators related to media risks, artificial intelligence risks, cyber security, and personal data protection.

Accordingly, what are the most prominent vulnerability indicators? How are they featured? (Quantitative, qualitative ...) What are their sources? How can they be measured? What are the tools adopted for such a measurement? How can these indicators allow for risk management and response to their impacts? Who are the actors developing and measuring these indicators? What is the nature of their linkage and coordination degree? What is the role of the individual, who is at risk, within this system?

4. Risks :Institutional Rationality vis-à-vis Social Representations

In the preface to the French version of "*Risky Society*",⁹ Bruno Latour points out that risk theory sprang from the context of a critique of industrial and post-industrial societies in the modern Western world. It would be instrumental to renew perspectives rather than viewing our times as exceptional in terms of risks, it would rather be more appropriate to raise the question whether the West has become more sensitive to risks due to internal factors rather than because of global transformations. For instance, Population aging, the "financialization" of the economy, and media and technological competition have contributed to making anxiety an effective economic and political tool, reproduced, and distributed to create wealth. Thus, we can talk here about the risk industry, which is a process that relies heavily on social and cultural factors, as well as on individuals' awareness of the threats that surround them and their representations of such threats.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ulrich Beck, *La société du risque: sur la voie d'une autre modernité*, Laure Bernardi (trans.) (Paris: Flammarion, 2001).

Even if risks and their management mechanisms are designed in the name of a transcendent rationality of an institutional trait, they are albeit the product of human activity within the core of society, which transcends the purely technical dimension and acquires the character of humanity in the social historical sense. Indeed, the special interests, customs, beliefs, and traditions on which individuals are reared, and even of imagination and myth resources that are at their disposal, down to local rivalries and dynamics, altogether interfere with their perception, and in the community's the perception of different types of risks, in risk identification, and determination of their sources and response. Risks can be considered, at least in part, as an individual and collective mental representation aimed at predicting a possible future. Therefore, they exist mainly at the heart of the connections that exist between individuals or groups according to their social representations of their reality. In this context, institutional actors, whether specialized or non-specialized ones are subject to the same approach in risk identification, expectations, and in the interpretation of their responses though using conceptual, or theoretical or empirical/operational tools whether simple or complex.

The understanding of risks as such calls for the analyses of risk managers' perceptions as well as the perceptions of those directly exposed to such risks along with their response practices altogether and at the same time. Since they often share the field, the history, and social, political, and cultural context, which reduces the distinction between the objective and the subjective in dealing with this issue thus, weakening the ability of institutional rationality to anticipate, find solutions, or at least mitigate impact.¹⁰ This is obviously true as these representations can, as in the case of Covid 19 pandemic, turn to a barrier to risk response, resilience and to the success of urgent interventions to mitigate the ascribed impact.

Drawing upon such idea, what are individuals and groups' representations of risk? How are these representations distinct as per class? Or on cultural ground? Or on geographical-regional affiliations? Or are they gender- grounded representations? Or altogether in their overlaying and overlapping? Do risk managers and risk affected ones hold the same representation? What are the points of the convergence/divergence? Are these representations likely to undergo transformations? How? And when could such shift occur? If so, according to what logic? What methodological tools adopted to enable the extraction, understanding, and setting of operation modalities of such representations? How can the study of representations be endeavored in the development of risk management and response tools? Can such representations be an impediment to the effectiveness of state interventions and competent organizations?

5. Risks: Individual/Collective Experiences and Response Strategies

The risks and resulting threats resulting there from constitute a favorable climate for the emergence of feelings of psychological vulnerability, a constant sense of danger, and a loss of psychosocial balance. In such contexts, individuals and groups constantly feel that they are, every now and then, potential victims of these risks and thus hold to their "certainty" that these threats can befall them at

¹⁰ Hélène Joffe, "Risk: From perception to social representation," *British Journal of Social Psychology*, vol.42, no.1 (2003), pp. 55 - 73.

any time with no apparent warning.¹¹The feelings of anxiety, fear, and horror are remarkably prevalent among social categories as the World Health Organization various statistics indicate. These feelings are, in turn, subject to the principle of inequality by time, place and groups.

In more psychological case than one, is such a collective neurosis expressed, albeit seemingly hard to identify yet still predictable. An unfeatured neurosis that cannot be countered, constantly creeping without us being able to determine its impact nor its spark risk. Individuals, groups, and communities devise different strategies to address and adapt to these unexpected risks. While many negotiate such a status by resorting to mitigating risks through clinics, "body and self-care", therapy and anger and depression management techniques, such options can be expensive and even difficult to access for some groups, who alternatively tend to "disconnect" from the social interaction (disengagement)) and withdraw individually as much as possible in the hope of seeking shelter. Disengagement takes different forms whether individually in search of succour or collectively by disconnecting as evinced in the mass suicide phenomenon pursued by members of the same religious sects members who believe in the phenomenon of "hikikomori" in Japan,¹²which drives many individuals (more than one million people)¹³into seclusion and social isolation from social interaction. This silent disappearance phenomenon, sparked by the widespread of means of communication and electronic games, is currently most prevalent in many countries.

As noted earlier, individuals and groups do not face risks on equal scales. Societies experiences situations of unequal distribution among different groups based on the resources available to them. They are thereby distinctly classified into disparate groups to live through those profound, blunt experiences that remain ever vivid in their memories and their psyche.¹⁴Similarly, not all social categories and peoples experience risk and fear of risk in the same fashion as they are subject, more often than not, to the disruptive impacts of the cultural and psychological perpetual residues ingrained in the collective consciousness on their representations of the concept of risk as mentioned in the previous element. These experiences further allow for a shared life of risk that is thereby shaped around by narratives, through an arduous training, on the carving of individual and collective identities at the test of their risk tribulations.¹⁵

Accordingly, questions as diverse as the following could be raised: How do different social groups experience risks? How do individuals and groups experiences differ? What factors affect these experiences? What are the effects of risks on the individuals' psychological and mental health? What are their behavioral implications? What strategies do individuals and groups use to respond to these risks? What are their relationships to the various accountable institutions for risk management and

¹¹ Jean-Pascal Assailly & Claude Got, *La psychologie du risque*, TEC & DOC Edition (France: Lavoisier, 2010).

¹² Takahiro A. Kato, et al. "Does the 'Hikikomori' Syndrome of Social Withdrawal Exist Outside Japan? A Preliminary International Investigation," *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology*, vol.47 (2012), pp. 1061 - 1075.

¹³ Justin McCurry, "Isolation nation: Japan tries to draw its citizens out of post-Covid seclusion," *The Guardian*, 12/5/2023, accessed on 19/12/2023, at: <https://bit.ly/41KbzQB>

¹⁴ Thibault Gajdos, & John A. weymark, "Introduction to Inequality and Risk," *Journal of Economic Theory*, vol. 147, no. 4 (2012), pp. 1313 - 1330.

¹⁵ Simon Thompson, "Trust, Risk and Identity," In: Sean Watson, Anthony Moran, *Trust, Risk and Uncertainty* (London : Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2005), pp. 26 - 46.

response to their impacts? What are the implications of risk management policies and approaches on the lives of the individual and the group?

6. Risk: Space and Virtual Borders

Risks have specific areas with commonly clear boundaries, even those of assumptive in nature. Human groups and public policies endeavor to produce and invest in these areas on the human, social, and political scales,¹⁶ mainly in cases of risk mismanagement or failure in risk response become two key factors in re/bequeathing social and political/nonpolitical legitimacy, and in the shaping public opinion. In this context, groups accumulate a legacy of practices and representations concerned with risks control and loss curtailing as much as possible. Therefore, they usually provide the necessary tools and strategies to control risks (administrative breakdown, information systems, warning systems, communication systems, etc.). Risks may generate new geographic areas and spaces considering their occurrence and the ways they are managed (e.g., new preparedness models, new legislation, different lifestyles, and resource technologies, etc.).

As such, risks do not manifest themselves in "uninhabited" spaces but in populated areas, even if there is no population. It often prompts the state, groups, and various actors (central and local authorities, experts, administration, companies, civil society, etc.) to intervene for the "control effectiveness" and to contain and prevent their leakage into neighboring spaces, re-engineering the space and forming social links. As pointed out in a previous element, all of this occurs yet within different representations, perceptions, and practices that may reach disparity levels because they often express interests and visions determined not only by opposing interests but also by contradictory perceptions. Besides cultural, social, and political contexts such perceptions are also governed by the features of the geographical scope in which they arise. Once risk prevention or risk control is sought, they create visible inequalities – which are only categorical cases, constructing a state of "spatial inequality" as well. All that the state/local communities offer to individuals usually evinces a salient rift that divides human groups into "areas" "region", "camps", "ghettoes" with potential ways of risk response.

In this vein, how are the fields of risk engineered? How are they distributed among different geographical areas? Which spaces are most exposed to risks, and why are certain areas more at risk than others? What mechanisms allow for spatial risk control? Could involved actors be identified? How do risk managers address information risks, and how do they draw spatial boundaries in a virtual world?

7. Risks: Functionality and Investibility

The idea of risk has been entrenched in the perception of individuals, groups, and states in so far as it has become an excessive "obsession" ambiguously used. These growing concerns have paved the way for making the notion of risk a "science" (risk sciences) taught in universities with a view

¹⁶ Guy Di Méo, *Géographie sociale et territoires* (Paris : Nathan, 1998).

to properly managing, preventing, and minimizing them for more resilience and least possible losses.¹⁷ Such notion has also been valorized and turned into an investment area whereby knowledge and skills have been developed along with specialized companies instituted to offer their services to "secure" individuals, groups, and even entire countries from imminent risks.¹⁸

Relevant innovations and patents in this area testify that entire industries and high-quality technologies are undergoing tremendously significant development to secure people from risks. George Orwell's novel "1984" is no longer considered as a science fiction issue but has become a striking reality whose details have become quite assertive across our daily lives. Guarding and protective technology have spread unto all the fabric and finer daily life arteries,¹⁹ turning into a looming hazard through violating individuals' privacy and personal data.

The constant feeling of threat and unpredictability of hazards makes us more likely to surrender "ourselves and our destinies" to others for risk prevention and protection, albeit at the expense of our freedom, and in search of security, stability, and the pursuit of safety.²⁰ Such a soft functionality occurs through peoples' bartering thus, making them, keen on risk prevention and protection in several different locations. How are risk "production patterns" featured? What is the magnitude of risk protection related to economic transactions at the international level? How are all those goods and services promoted? What types of advertising and marketization techniques are used? What are their most prominent effects on the individuals and groups' level of awareness and perception? What are the major indicators of vulnerability in risk protection and insurance industry? And what type of indicators are they? (quantitative or qualitative). How are such indicators measured? Which developed tools are most appropriate for such a measurement? And how are these indicators able to contribute to risk management and respond to their impacts? Who are the actors that develop measure such indicators? What kind of linkages and coordination level do they share? What is the role of the individual most at risk within these systems? Any respective oversight bodies, whether national or international on their endeavor?

8. Risks: Management Policies and Prevention Mechanisms

Against most of these pervasive threats, whose sources have diversified and expanded to include all humanitarian activities in contemporary societies, inter alia, sports and recreational spaces (stadium violence, deadly digital games, etc...), societies have built, in the words of Luhmann,²¹ well-connected and inextricably bound systems. within the "risk control and prevention industry" set

¹⁷ Linda Schenk et al. "Teaching and Discussing about Risk: Seven Elements of Potential Significance for Science Education," *International Journal of Science Education*, vol.41, no. 9 (2019), pp. 1271 - 1286.

¹⁸ René M. Stulz, "Rethinking Risk Management," In: Donald H. Chew, *Corporate Risk Management* (Columbia: Columbia University Press, 2008), pp. 87 - 120.

¹⁹ Ali H. Mokdad, "The Behavioral Risk Factors Surveillance System: Past, Present, and Future," *Annual Review of Public Health*, vol. 30 (2009), pp. 43 - 54.

²⁰ Anthony Giddens, "Fate, Risk and Security," in: James F. Cosgrave (eds), *The Sociology of Risk and Gambling Reader* (New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 2006), pp.29-60

²¹ Niklas Luhmann, *La confiance: un mécanisme de réduction de la complexité sociale* (Paris: Economica-Collection Études sociologiques, 2006).

within approaches asserting risk governance.²²Such usually mingle government policy makers (state, local communities), risk managers and producers, as well as experts and private institutions that have accumulated knowledge and skills in the form of services, keen to prevent and anticipate risks and further Risk-informed development.

The climate of escalating fear of risks has concomitantly created an environment suitable for investment within large economic sectors that devote particular attention to the financial, human, and technical resources of risks (control and guarding technology GT, proactive risk anticipation software, early warning systems, insurance companies, security companies, and multidisciplinary workforce, information systems, and software...). The complexity of risks and the overlap of their components have required solidarity of several institutions, structures, and public and private actors to join hands in securing their cooperation and coordinating their intervention in order to develop strategies and build risk reducing action plans.²³ Risk governance has become, more than ever, a necessity not seeking effectiveness but also aiming at avoiding the multiple forms of deviation that have affected the plans to of risk response .

Multifarious studies have shown that disaster management is tainted with forms of corruption that turn risks into an area for profiteering and illicit enrichment, along with the spread of multiple forms of extortion and fraud. If this enormous arsenal accumulated by societies, even in various forms of risk management sciences and techniques (Kervern's risk analysis: cindynic), has achieved notable progress in the technical field, yet failure continues to haunt it through serious side-effects related to the constantly growing feeling of fear and insecurity, as well as numerous violations of human rights. The legitimacy of "new threats" hunting has allowed some states the right to monitor and eavesdrop on individuals through restricting their fundamental freedoms and putting them in a trade-off between security or hazard response individually. Besides, instances of injustice in extending insurance coverage to all groups and regions.

Could the grounds on which risk management patterns are established be identified? What tools are adopted in such tasks? What are the governance indicators in the field of risk? What are the barriers to the effectiveness of intervention between different actors? How can societies effectively govern risk intervention and management so that they do not creep into corruption? What deviant phenomena do risk management policies create, and how are they addressed? How could justice and equity be attained in insuring risk security? What are the standards of justice in this area?

In this context, and grounded on diverse questions raised above in the resource paper, our symposium seeks to be an avenue to approach and dive into the world of "new risks", analyze them, and interpret their many and complex factors and effects from multiple perspectives that reflect multidisciplinary and inter-complementarity.

We accordingly intend to think outside the box and go beyond the whole range of established ideas put forward by the early economists, pioneers of theory, whose studies focused on the economic and

²² Hassid.

²³ Mark C. Stafford & Omer R. Galle, "Victimization Rates, Exposure to Risk, and Fear of Crime," *Criminology*, vol. 22, no. 2 (1984), pp. 173 - 185.

financial risks mainly facing capitalist market institutions. This symposium also aspires to bridge the sociological approach developed by Anthony Giddens and Ulrich Beck during the eighties and nineties of the twentieth century with other, more recent approaches adopting epistemological perspectives namely the psychological approach focusing on the study of emotions, feelings and sensations as, Fear, phobia, terror, panic and a breakdown of trust in the face of growing uncertainties, without overlooking the growing uncertainty and the expansion of unexpected chaos. Allied are the geo-environmental approach on the effects of climate change and the approach to public policies and crisis management.

Therefore, along with the participants' enriching contributions, the symposium seeks to identify the recent developments in risk theory worldwide from various research perspectives, such as political science, social sciences, the humanities, geography, economics, finance, medicine, health sciences, environmental sciences, agriculture, environmental and ecological sciences, as well as other disciplines of technical dimension as media sciences, communication, artificial intelligence and digital technologies. Special emphasis will be laid on experience provision and comparison whether in the countries of the South or those of the North.

III. Scientific Committee Members:

- Mehdi Mabrouk
- Mounir Saïdani
- Mohamed Gargouri
- Ali El Hammi
- Taoufik Belharath
- Riadh Ben Khalifa
- Hassan El Moury
- Sadiq El Hammami

IV. Important Dates

- **Date of the conference:** November 15th and 16th, 2024
- **Announcement date:** December 15th, 2023
- **Deadline for submitting abstracts:** January 30th, 2024
- **Date for announcing evaluation results:** February 30th, 2024
- **Final deadline for accepting full scientific papers (Full Paper):** June 30th, 2024
- **Final announcement of accepted contributions:** August 15th, 2024

V. Participation Conditions

Registration form: The attached form can be filled out on the website (<https://rb.gy/qjdpao>), with a selection of one of the proposed axes.

- **Submission of abstracts:** Participants should mention the axis in which they are participating. The number of words for the abstract should be around 700, including the title of the presentation, the posed problem, the research methodology, and the main ideas, along with at least five keywords and a concise bibliography. While fully respecting the scientific conditions for writing the paper, footnotes, and the list of references, see: <http://carep.tn>
- **Submission of the full scientific paper (Full Paper):** The word count should range between 6000 and 8000 words.
- **Final text and summary:** For the Arabic language, use the Sakkal Majalla font, size 14, and for other languages, use the Times New Roman font, size 12 (line spacing 1.5).
- **Conference languages:** Arabic, French, English.
- **Originality of the research paper:** The research should be original and dedicated to the conference, not having been published in any electronic or paper medium, and not having been submitted to any other entity for presentation or publication.
- **Correspondence address:** Project proposals should be sent to the following email address: carep.tn@gmail.com
- **Publication:** The works of this conference will be published later, and participants will be informed later.
- **Inquiries:** Contact through carep.tn@gmail.com / (00216) 70 147 384