OPENING REMARKS

It is clear that terrorism and measures adopted by States to combat it are both influenced by and have an impact on the enjoyment of the economic, social and cultural rights of affected individuals, as well as on broader development objectives.

Without realising this and more importantly devising affective ways to address this linkage we risk aiding the drivers of terrorism. As the OHCHR has stressed it is "impossible to achieve global security objectives without **concerted efforts towards the realization of all human rights**."

Yet, as we know well, many states unfortunately continue to pay lip service to economic, social and cultural (ESC) rights, disregarding the extent to which such neglect contributes to recruitment efforts of terrorist networks and makes the counter-terrorism efforts efficient, while at the same time resort to policies and practices which, in the name of fighting terrorism, negatively affect the enjoyment of rights.

In this context, for Europe and the rest of the world, it is not the matter of choice, and not even the matter of adhering to international obligations. It is a crucial part of building sustainable security system - national and international- and preventing the proliferation of terrorism.

ADDRESSING THE ESC RIGHTS CONDITIONS CONDUCIVE TO TERRORISM

"Nothing can justify violent extremism. But we must also acknowledge that it does not arise in a vacuum." (2015 United Nations Plan of Action on Preventing Violent Extremism)

The linkages between ESC rights violations and terrorism are complex and require careful consideration and analysis. But we already have enough research and analysis to demonstrate that they cannot be ignored if the global efforts to prevent and combat terrorism and violent extremism were to be effective.

In that respect, the findings of the UNDP latest report, entitled "Journey to extremism in Africa" (http://journey-to-extremism.undp.org/content/downloads/UNDP-JourneyToExtremism-report-

2017-english.pdf) are notable. Among the key factors which, according to this research, contribute to the decision of young men to join extremist groups are:

- Place of birth: The majority of recruits come from borderlands or peripheral areas that have suffered generations of marginalization;
- Education: 16% of voluntary recruits have 2 or fewer years of education; 39% have only 5 to 10 years of education;
- Religion: More than 1/2 of voluntary recruits cite religious reasons for joining an extremist group – yet 57% of respondents admit that they either don't read or have little to no understanding of the religious texts or interpretations;
- Economic conditions: 55% of the voluntary recruits express moderate to severe frustration at their economic conditions, with employment being the most frequently cited need at the time of joining
- Acute sense of grievance towards government: 83% of voluntary recruits believe that government looks after only the interests of a few; 71% identified government action as the final trigger that motivated them to join the organisation

Research conducted by Amnesty International produced similar findings. For example, during our recent work in Nigeria (focused on Boko Haram), we found that while in 2014 Nigeria became the largest economy in Africa, this success story masked great inequality among Nigeria's regions and a huge gap between the rich and poor. The north-east (where the Boko Haram is most active) has lagged behind the rest of the country in social and economic terms. In 2010 the northeast had the second highest rate of poverty, at 69%, with illiteracy rates almost two times lower than in the rest of the country. Children, who grow up in poverty and lack of education, eventually formed a pool of marginalized young men receptive to radical social programmes.

While such findings should be a warning to the states concerned at the first place, it is also clear that economic and social development, including through international cooperation and assistance, can play a role in reducing support for terrorism by preventing the conditions that give rise to violence in general and to terrorism in particular, and by contributing to long-term social and economic stability.

Practically this means that, as the OECD's Development Assistance Committee has stated, aid allocations should be calibrated carefully where the prevention of terrorism is a relevant development objective.

In particular, "budget reallocations [should be] preceded by in-depth analysis of need and aid effectiveness so that development aid contributes to long-term structural stability."

IMPACT OF TERRORISM AND COUNTER-TERRORISM MEASURES ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS

It is a vicious circle: violations of ESC rights fuel the resentment and discontent that terror thrives on, and both the terrorism and measures to address it have serious negative impacts on enjoyment of rights.

Terrorism can threaten social and economic development in already fragile states - destabilizing Governments, undermining civil society, jeopardizing peace and security. The phenomenon therefore poses particular challenges for states who may already lack the resources to address systemic ESC rights issues within their societies. In these circumstances governments need to be careful not to exacerbate the situation through their own counter-terrorism measures.

Efforts to address the human rights implications of terrorism and counter-terrorism measures have tended to focus on the protection of civil and political rights, with relatively little attention paid to their impact on the enjoyment of ESC rights.

This diversion of resources normally allocated to social and economic programmes and sectors (such as education, health, water and sanitation), development assistance and poverty reduction, in favour of security and counter-terrorism programming may have serious consequences for the affected countries and communities.

We know that particular groups are often targeted through counter-terrorism measures. A group of UN Special Representatives and Special Rapporteurs has "deplored the fact that, under the pretext of combating terrorism human rights defenders are threatened and vulnerable groups are **targeted and discriminated against on the basis of origin and socio-economic status**, in particular migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers, indigenous peoples and people fighting for their land rights or against the negative effects of economic globalization policies."

At the same time we need to think **through the implications of measures which have been routinely used to fight terrorism.** This does not mean they should not be used but that due diligence is required and mitigating measures be considered to lessen the negative human rights impact.

For example, **targeted sanctions** against individuals suspected of involvement in terrorist activity, such as freezing their financial assets or imposing travel restrictions on them, may be an effective means for tracking, and even preventing, terrorist activity.

However, the current targeted sanctions regime poses a number of serious challenges, in particular related to the lack of transparency and due process in listing and de-listing procedures. Targeted sanctions which result in freezing assets, imposing travel bans and other restrictions may also have serious consequences for the ability of the affected individuals and their families to enjoy economic and social rights, as their access to education and employment may be severely restricted.

It does not mean they should not be used – it means that measures should be taken to limit the negative impact of targeted sanctions on the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights.

Similarly, repressive security measures (such as control orders and the construction of physical **barriers to limit the movement of certain individuals and groups**), adopted with a view to countering terrorism, have severely restricted the ability of certain individuals and populations to work, and their rights to education, health services and a family life.

Amnesty International has multiple examples that illustrate this point – from Israel, where the physical barriers mounted for the purpose of protecting Israeli security, led to serious issues with the right to education, health and an adequate standard of living to Turkey's actions against PKK, which resulted in mass forced evictions of the Kurdish population in south-east Turkey and had dramatic negative effect on livelihoods.

There is a clear need **to analyse the impact of any proposed counter-terrorism measures on the economic, social and cultural rights of all.**

That **impact assessment should be carried out in accordance with the interpretive principles** in relation to economic, social and cultural rights such as obligations relating to ensuring the minimum core of the rights for everybody and avoiding unjustified retrogression in the enjoyment of rights.

Specifically, OECD DAC's key entry points of action provide helpful guidance, and include, among other:
- Supporting community-driven development to build the capacity of communities to resist extreme religious and political ideologies based on violence;
- Help build effective and responsible media and public information strategies as powerful tools to prevent violence;
- Give greater attention in donor programming to young people's job opportunities and education to prevent the emergence of fragile, disenfranchised youth;
- Increase focus on people transiting out of poverty;
- Strive to make globalisation an "inclusive" process which will help reduce support for terrorism--increased aid effort as well as greater policy coherence, complementarity and consistency across the whole of our governments and within the multilateral system. A focus on human rights needs to be more tangible and visible as a basis of external assistance.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As the OSCE itself has noted "**a human rights compliant state does not pick and choose the rights that apply to** it, but must apply all human rights to all persons within its jurisdiction. History is littered with examples of the denial or partial application of human rights leading to conflicts and terrorist acts." In turn, the counter-terrorism measures worldwide ultimately won't succeed if their implementation leads to the violations of human rights, effectively fuelling the same problem they are meant to tackle.