



BACKGROUND GUIDE

UNSC: THE FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM :

Cooperation vs autarky

HEC
PARIS

WELCOME LETTERS

Dear delegates,

Hello everybody, first of all thank you very much for being here and for your time. My colleagues and I would like to welcome you to the UNSC committee. Let me start by introducing myself. My name is Omar and I will be one of your Chairs for this diplomacy week-end. I am currently a graduate student at HEC Grande Ecole program graduating in 2020 and pursuing a Master in Management.

Before joining HEC, I spent nineteen years in Morocco, my home country, years during which I had the chance to travel to many Arab countries. My exchange program in Singapore also enabled me to visit some South East Asian countries. All of this resulted in meeting a lot of people from different cultures and backgrounds and getting sensitive to many issues, especially in the Arab world, related to security, to food shortage and to the lack of freedom and democracy.

While at HEC I wanted to share my concerns about the social, political and security issues that hit a large part of the world and get to know people's view and opinions about the subject. That's why I joined MUN'HEC earlier this year to have the opportunity to share, debate and propose solutions.

It's an absolute pleasure and honor to be heading the UNSC. The UNSC plays a major role in implementing peace and security and fostering cooperation in solving international problems. However, like other tools of the UN, the UNSC faces many criticism. While the structure and operational mechanisms of the UN Security Council have been criticized for many years, they have recently come under heightened attack given the inability of the UNSC to intervene effectively in the conflict in Syria. Particular attention has been paid to the veto mechanism, which can be enacted only by the UNSC's permanent member States. Three new proposals to reform the UNSC veto mechanism are assessed and extensively detailed in a report published recently by the independent non-profit Security Council Report. While the probability of reforming the UNSC remains low, the newly energized debate, along with the centrality of the UNSC in the international arena, warrants a fresh reflection on the veto mechanism. So how can the UNSC still play a fundamental role in promoting peace and security worldwide? Does the UNSC really need a reform? If yes, in which way? Those are some of the questions that we are going to tackle during this debate which I hope will be a constructive one.

Best,

Omar El Jal

Committee chair

Mail : omar.el-jal@hec.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Presentation of the Committee	
Committee expectations	
Historical Overview	7
Roots of terrorism	
Middle Eastern countries: a crucial prtner to tackle terrorism	
New faces of terrorism	
Current Situation	12
Different strategic approaches to fight terrorism	
Impact of terrorist attacks on Western and Arab societies	
Terrorism of a Country or its leader? North Korea, a rogue nation	
Block Positions	16
USA	
Russia and China	
UK and France	
Non-permanent members	
Questions to Consider	18
Bibliography	19

INTRODUCTION

PRESENTATION OF THE COMMITTEE

Organisation

The Security Council held its first session on January 17, 1946 at Church House, Westminster, London. Since its first meeting, the Security Council has taken permanent residence at the United Nations Headquarters in New York City. It also travelled to many cities, holding sessions in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in 1972, in Panama City, Panama, and in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1990. A representative of each of its members must be present at all times at UN Headquarters so that the Security Council can meet at any time as the need arises.

Under the UN Charter, the Security Council has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. It has 15 Members, and each Member has one vote. Under the Charter, all Member States are obligated to comply with Council decisions. The Security Council takes the lead in determining the existence of a threat to peace or an act of aggression. It calls upon the parties to a dispute to settle it by peaceful means and recommends methods of adjustment or terms of settlement. In some cases, the Security Council can resort to imposing sanctions or even authorize the use of force to maintain or restore international peace and security. The Security Council also advises the General Assembly on the appointment of the Secretary-General and the admission of new Members to the United Nations. And, together with the General Assembly, it elects the judges of the International Court of Justice.

Permanent and Non-Permanent Members :

The Council is composed of 15 Members:

- Five permanent members: China, France, Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, and the United States,
- Ten non-permanent members: elected for two-year terms by the General Assembly (with end of term date): Bolivia (2018) Côte d'Ivoire (2019) Equatorial Guinea (2019) Ethiopia (2018) Kazakhstan (2018) Kuwait (2019) Netherlands (2018) Peru (2019) Poland (2019) Sweden (2018)

Non-Council Member States:

More than 60 United Nations Member States have never been Members of the Security Council. A State which is a Member of the United Nations but not of the Security Council may participate, without a vote, in its discussions when the Council considers that country's interests are affected. Both Members and non-members of the United Nations, if they are parties to a dispute being considered by the Council, may be invited to take part, without a vote, in the Council's discussions; the Council sets the conditions for participation by a non-member State.

Mandate

Like most UN bodies, the WTO has a very hierarchical internal organization. According to the Charter, the United Nations has four purposes:

- to maintain international peace and security:

When a complaint concerning a threat to peace is brought before it, the Council's first action is usually to recommend that the parties try to reach agreement by peaceful means. The Council may: set forth principles for such an agreement; undertake investigation and mediation, in some cases; dispatch a mission; appoint special envoys; or request the Secretary-General to use his good offices to achieve a pacific settlement of the dispute.

When a dispute leads to hostilities, the Council's primary concern is to bring them to an end as soon as possible. In that case, the Council may: issue cease-fire directives that can help prevent an escalation of the conflict; dispatch military observers or a peacekeeping force to help reduce tensions, separate opposing forces and establish a calm in which peaceful settlements may be sought.

Beyond this, the Council may opt for enforcement measures, including: economic sanctions, arms embargoes, financial penalties and restrictions, and travel bans; severance of diplomatic relations; blockade; or even collective military action. A chief concern is to focus action on those responsible for the policies or practices condemned by the international community, while minimizing the impact of the measures taken on other parts of the population and economy.

- to develop friendly relations among nations;
- to cooperate in solving international problems and in promoting respect for human rights;
- and to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations.

All members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council. While other organs of the United Nations can only make recommendations to member States, the Security Council has the power to make decisions that member States are obligated to implement under the Charter.

Some UNSC's resolutions

1991: military intervention in Iraq against the invasion of Kuwait

2010: economic sanctions against Iran, ban on investing in uranium mining fields

2017: sanctions on North Korea for carrying out illegal missile launch tests

COMMITTEE EXPECTATIONS

In this conference, delegates will simulate a meeting of the UN Security Council, which follows the following set of rules:

First of all, the MUN-Security Council does not debate pre-made resolutions. Delegates debate and lobby during the conference and create resolutions together. Only complete draft resolutions can be submitted to the Chairs. Delegates are encouraged to submit amendments adding, modifying, or deleting clauses from the resolution in construction, increasing the chance the entire draft resolution will be passed. As a result, MUNSC delegates should not prepare resolutions at home; instead, they can prepare policy statements on each issue the Security Council will discuss and are free to prepare Working Papers.

Moreover, MUNSC delegates are expected to have a thorough knowledge of the oldest and latest developments in relation to the debate topic.

The MUNSC is also unique in its structure, for there can be a dialog on the floor - delegates can yield the floor to another delegate more than once in a row depending on the President. The quorum is set at ten delegates. For substantive matters (this includes voting on amendments and voting on Draft Resolutions), a vote of at least ten out of fifteen delegates is required, bearing in mind that permanent members (France, the UK, the USA, Russia, and China) can make use of their veto to block any substantive matter from passing. Regarding procedural matters, nine out of fifteen votes are required, and vetoes do not apply.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Terrorism has always been a burning issue, but during the last 20 years, especially after the 9/11 attack, many voices started questioning the role of the UNSC and how different countries can work together in order to combat terrorism in its new, more violent forms.

ROOTS OF TERRORISM

Loosely defined, terrorism is the use of violence with the aim of furthering a political or ideological goal at the expense of the general population. Terrorism can take many forms and has many causes, often more than one. It can have its roots in religious, social, or political conflicts. Some terrorist events are singular acts linked to a particular historical moment. Other terrorist attacks are part of an ongoing campaign that may last years or even generations, as was the case in Northern Ireland from 1968 to 1998.

Historical Roots

Although acts of terror and violence have been committed for centuries, terrorism's modern roots can be traced back to the French Revolution's Reign of Terror from 1794 to 1795, with its gruesome public beheadings, violent street battles, and bloodthirsty rhetoric. It was the first time in modern history that mass violence was used in such a fashion, but it would not be the last.

In the latter half of the 19th century, terrorism would emerge as the weapon of choice for nationalists, particularly in Europe as ethnic groups chafed under the rule of empires. The Irish National Brotherhood, which sought Irish independence from Britain, carried out a number of bomb attacks in England in the 1880s. About the same time in Russia, the socialist group Narodnaya Volya began a campaign against the royalist government, ultimately assassinating Tsar Alexander II in 1881.

In the 20th century, acts of terrorism became more prevalent throughout the world as political, religious, and social activists agitated for change. In the 1930s, Jews living in occupied Palestine conducted a campaign of violence against the British occupiers in a quest to create the State of Israel. In the 1970s, Palestinian terrorists used then-novel methods such as hijacking airplanes to further their cause. And in the 21st century, pan-nationalist groups like ISIS, which use social media to connect its members, have killed thousands in attacks in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia.

Causes and Motivations

Although people resort to terrorism for a number of reasons, experts attribute most of them to three major factors:

- **Political**

People choose terrorism when they are trying to right what they perceive to be a social or political or historical wrong. During the “Troubles” in Northern Ireland, which stretched from 1968 to 1998, Catholic and Protestant groups waged a campaign of violence against one another in Northern Ireland and in England, seeking political dominance.

- **Religious**

In the 1990s, a number of attacks carried out in the name of religion made headlines. The Japanese doomsday cult Aum Shinrikyo perpetrated two deadly sarin gas attacks in the Tokyo subways in 1994 and '95. In the Middle East, numerous suicide attacks since the 1980s have been celebrated as the work of Islamic martyrs.

- **Socioeconomic**

Various forms of deprivation can drive people to terrorism, namely poverty, lack of education, or lack of political freedom. The group Shining Path carried out a years-long campaign of violence against Peru’s government in the 1980s and early '90s in an attempt to create a Marxist state.

THE GLOBAL COUNTER-TERRORISM STRATEGY (2006)

The United Nations General Assembly adopted the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy on September 8, 2006. The strategy is a unique global instrument to enhance national, regional and international efforts to counter terrorism.

Through its adoption, all Member States have agreed for the first time to a common strategic and operational approach to fight terrorism, not only sending a clear message that terrorism is unacceptable in all its forms and manifestations but also resolving to take practical steps individually and collectively to prevent and combat it. Those practical steps include a wide array of measures ranging from strengthening State capacity to counter terrorist threats to better coordinating United Nations system’s counter-terrorism activities.

The adoption of the strategy fulfilled the commitment made by world leaders at the 2005 September Summit and builds on many of the elements proposed by the Secretary General in his May 2, 2006 report, entitled *Uniting against Terrorism: Recommendations for a Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy*.

The General Assembly reviews the Strategy every two years, making it a living document attuned to Member States’ counter-terrorism priorities.

The Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy in the form of a resolution and an annexed Plan of Action (A/RES/60/288) comprises 4 pillars

1. Addressing the conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism;
2. Measures to prevent and combat terrorism;
3. Measures to build States' capacity to prevent and combat terrorism and to strengthen the role of the United Nations system in that regard;
4. Measures to ensure respect for human rights for all and the rule of law as the fundamental basis for the fight against terrorism.

MIDDLE EASTERN COUNTRIES: A CRUCIAL PARTNER

Because of their geographical location, Middle Eastern countries have always been at the heart of the terrorism question, both as a theater for terrorist activities and as strategic partners in the fight against terrorism.

There are three major powers in the Middle East, **Turkey, Iran** and **Egypt** (and also **Israel** in certain regards). Amidst them, however, **Saudi Arabia** has emerged as a challenger. The inflamed rivalry between Saudi Arabia and Iran announces another turbulent year in this chaotic region.

The young crown prince Mohammed bin Salman has consolidated power, embarking on an unprecedented cultural revolution and economic reforms in Riyadh, but his foreign policy ambitions have yet to bear fruit. Instead they will continue to sap lives and resources in neighboring **Yemen**, the Arab world's poorest country, unless a political settlement is reached.

That possibility appears farther away now with the death of Sana'a's long-time strongman and president for 30 years Ali Abdullah Saleh, whose killing at the hands of Houthi rebels leaves the country with no clear end to the conflict. Saudi Arabia accuses Iran of backing the Houthis. Iran has its own domestic challenges to contend with. Hundreds of people have been arrested and at least 21 killed in the biggest challenge to the Islamic Republic's ruling clerics in recent years, in a week of protests that began against rising prices and developed into broader demands for political change.

In **Syria**, Prince Salman will have less say in how the war will turn out as the country lurches towards a political settlement with Bashar al-Assad's regime, backed by Moscow and Tehran, retaining the military momentum. The opposition is scattered, its rebels eclipsed by the local al-Qaida affiliate or owing their existence to backers in Turkey, and the politicians are in exile and out of touch with people on the ground.

Russia, Iran and Turkey hold the reins and will decide the shape of the final deal, though there is no guarantee it will end the violence or the rebellion against Assad. As global and regional powers look to a post-war Syria, the jockeying will begin for a slice of the reconstruction projects in the country.

It is there, also, that the fate of Kurdish aspirations for autonomy or statehood will be decided. Syria's Kurds have proven a valuable ally to the US-led coalition fighting Islamic State, but now that campaign is nearly over and the military aid will come to a halt. The Kurds say they only want autonomy, but their opponents in Syria see their westward expansion in the north as an attempt to carve out a State.

Whatever those ambitions, they have run up against Turkey's strenuous objections that the Kurdish militias fighting in Syria are a national security threat, and it is likely Washington and Moscow will ultimately side with Ankara.

Turkey watchers will keep an eye on the ongoing deterioration in human rights and curtailing of freedom of speech as President Recep Tayyip Erdogan strengthens his grip on power and further marginalizes the Opposition before presidential and parliamentary elections slated for 2019. Those may yet be brought forward, though the government strongly denies any such suggestion.

Turkey, Iran, and Egypt have what Saudi Arabia does not: large populations, huge domestic markets, industrial bases, highly educated populations, and deep-seated identities grounded in histories of empire. Saudi Arabia is only a regional power because of past containment policies towards Iran, and to some extents, its vast reserves in oil. Once Iran is unfettered, Saudi Arabia will unlikely be able to compete for long.

THE NEW FACES OF TERRORISM

During the last decade, many western societies have been the theater of a new kind of terrorist attacks carried by one individual, outside any command and without any material support from any group, known as lone-wolf terrorist attackers.

The term "lone wolf" was popularized by white supremacists Alex Curtis and Tom Metzger in the 1990s. Metzger advocated individual or small-cell underground activity, as opposed to above-ground membership organizations, envisaging "warriors acting alone or in small groups who attacked the government or other targets in daily, anonymous acts".

Terrorism expert Brian Michael Jenkins of the RAND Corporation prefers the term "stray dog" to "lone wolf". According to Jenkins, most individuals involved in such attacks "skulk about, sniffing at violence, vocally aggressive but skittish without backup". Though these individuals seem to be acting alone, there are often ties between lone wolves and terrorist organizations, for example through terrorist backed online content.

Lone-wolf terrorism may not be a new phenomenon but the number of people acting without a network appears to be rising.

In October 2017, more than 50 people died and at least 400 were injured when a gunman opened fire at a country music festival in Las Vegas.

In June the same year, a 48-year-old man was arrested after a van deliberately collided with pedestrian Muslim worshippers leaving the Finsbury Park Mosque, in north London, killing one person.

Just a month before, a suicide bomber suspected of acting alone killed 22 people in Manchester, while in March, a man drove a car into pedestrians on London's Westminster Bridge, killing 4 people and stabbing a police officer to death outside of the Parliament. Meanwhile, in the US in 2016, a man pledging allegiance to the Islamic State attacked a gay club in Florida, killing 49 people.

Police and intelligence agencies have struggled for years to keep this form of extremism under control, hampered by unpredictable patterns of behavior and irregular communication data. But is tracking lone wolves a lost cause? And if so, how can we mitigate the prospective damage of such attacks?

The internet can play a pivotal role in any counter-terrorism operation. Intelligence agencies can use it to track the movements and online behavior of almost anyone, allowing for a better understanding of the time frame, methods and even motive behind an attack. After the London Bridge attack that left eight people dead, Prime Minister Theresa May suggested tighter regulation of the internet might be necessary to stop future terrorist attacks. There was a need to "deprive the extremists of their safe spaces online", she said.

CURRENT SITUATION

DIFFERENT STRATEGIC APPROACHES TO FIGHTING TERRORISM

Terrorist attacks are designed to instill fear and put entire cities under virtual siege. In Europe, the strategy seems to be working. Governments are responding to a string of high-profile terrorist attacks with billions of euros in spending to harden the Continent's defenses. Buildings are being blast-proofed. Barricades have gone up on packed pedestrian promenades. It's no longer unusual to see soldiers patrolling in the center of a city.

Combating terrorism is no easy task and it is something that cannot be done over night. It is a long struggle that could be quite dangerous. One of the first things to do is to figure out all the methods that terrorists use and understand their strategies.

One of the most obvious rules is to simply have security scout the area for anything unusual. At an airport, for example, security guards should be constantly patrolling the area. There should be some sort of system to check bags for harmful items and, of course, a metal detector. Some smaller systems should be placed in any type of area that terrorists are known to attack, and not just at airports. It does not have to be as extensive as airport security; it could be for instance a scanner for explosives or harmful items.

One of the greatest tools that can be used to combat terrorism is to simply get citizens involved and make sure they understand how important it is to report anything that is out of place. This is especially true at airports where reports by passengers have helped stop terrorist attacks before. Having the citizens get involved can give the authorities thousands of eyes and ears to watch for suspicious behavior.

Politically speaking, Arab leaders, from Morocco to the Gulf States, should condemn terrorist attacks with a stronger, louder and more public voice. A good example is King Abdullah II of Jordan, who has called the battle against ISIS "a fight between good and evil" that requires military, intelligence and moral force.

Corporations and businesses may also contribute more to fortify public spaces as securely as government buildings, from concert halls to offices to hotels. Many sports stadiums, such as AT&T Park in San Francisco and Coors Field in Denver, have already started using technology systems that use fingerprints to screen fans as they enter.

Last but not least, citizens, as taxpayers, could join in the fight such as supporting larger investments in public safety and security just as they do with other vital services like health care and education. They should also learn to live with more intrusive levels of security in their everyday lives. This will mean more metal detectors, more guards, more checkpoints and more barricades as part of people's daily routines.

THE STATE OF COOPERATION BETWEEN COUNTRIES AGAINST TERRORISM:

China's main concern for the 2010s onward is to find new trade partners in order to export its. Recent terror attacks in Paris and Brussels have sadly shown the mistakes and sometimes the lack of cooperation of security services. For instance, the November attacks in Paris was planned by a Brussels-based cell whose members Belgium failed to inform France about. But what is the real state of international cooperation on terrorism?

September 11 clearly revealed the existence of transnational terrorism with worldwide terror networks. Western nations were left with no choice but to closely cooperate in terms of intelligence, know-how, and sometimes even procedures. According to the Washington Post, right after 9/11, French President Chirac advised his intelligence services to collaborate with the Americans "as if they were [their] own service". Alliance Base was born in Paris in 2002 to enable the CIA and French intelligence services to jointly monitor the transnational movement of terrorist suspects and to develop operations to arrest them. But this was an exception rather than the rule; and cooperation between nations on terrorism remains quite difficult. In fact, cooperation on this matter would involve sensitive areas such as intelligence and justice and would require operational coordination. Because of concerns over sovereignty and the sensitivity of the data that need to be shared, such cooperation is more feasible in within the framework of a bilateral partnership rather than a multilateral one. Indeed, some Western countries avoid sharing intelligence with multilateral organizations such as Europol for security reasons and to avoid the risk of leaks.

Non-cooperation

Recently, a Spanish judge bitterly complained of blatant US non-cooperation on a case of dismantling a jihadi network in Ceuta. On another occasion, a top US counterterrorism official said European countries can and should do more to screen terrorists because they do not take full advantage of the tools the US has offered in the fight against terrorism. The latest Brussels terror attacks is another instance of the lack of international cooperation in counterterrorism activities: despite repeated inquiries by Belgium, Sweden refused to provide information on Mohamed Belkaid, a key ISIL operative who was allegedly the a coordinator of the November Paris attacks and a planner of the Brussels attacks, and who had lived in Sweden for over ten years.

Positive cases

A positive example of intelligence sharing is the fact that two countries passed valuable information to Belgium - which was sadly ignored. Turkey said it had detained and then deported Brahim el-Bakraoui - one of the two suicide bombers at Brussels airport -, suggesting that Belgian authorities ignored a July 2015 warning that he was a "foreign terrorist fighter". Confirming the Turkish intelligence, the FBI warned the Netherlands six days before the Brussels attacks, which then forwarded the information to Belgium.

Morocco also informed Belgium of an imminent attack against nuclear facilities one week before the Brussels triple suicide bombings. It might be one of the countries that the West should closely work with. Indeed, Morocco provided intelligence to France after the November Paris attacks of the whereabouts of cell leader Abdelhamid Abaaoud, which led to his killing by security forces in St Denis before he could carry out another wave of terror attacks in the French capital. Moreover, just before al-Qaeda's attack in Grand Bassam, Moroccan services had warned their Ivorian colleagues of a possible imminent attack against beaches in the Ivory Coast. The country that benefits the most from Morocco's expertise on counterterrorism is neighboring Spain. In fact, their cooperation is so fruitful that it should be an example for others to follow, especially inside Europe. Regular exchange of information between the two countries has resulted in the dismantling of many terror cells linked either to ISIL or al-Qaeda.

IMPACT OF TERRORIST ATTACKS ON WESTERN AND ARAB SOCIETIES

Economic Effects

Every year, terrorist attacks make a considerable impact on the world's economy. According to the 2017 Global Terrorism Index, the impact fell by seven percent in 2016, the second year in succession that it declined. However, despite this decline, costs still reached a grim \$84 billion last year.

In 2007, economic losses from terrorism were \$41 billion. Amid the rise of ISIS, there was a surge in losses, which reached a peak of \$104 billion in 2014. Countries embroiled in conflict tend to suffer the highest economic impact from terrorism. Most of them are situated in the Middle East and North Africa, sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. Last year, Iraq suffered the highest economic impact from terrorism as a share of GDP at 24 percent. Afghanistan was also ravaged by terrorism with losses amounting to 13 percent of GDP while South Sudan had the third-highest impact at 9 percent.

Social Effects

Whereas the economic impact of terrorism can range from minimal to moderate, the same is not the case with the social impact of terrorism. The social effects of terrorism are often pronounced and far-reaching, influencing many different aspects of a society. The first of them is the change in people's beliefs and attitudes. One such belief concerns how people view other societies, especially the societies to which the terrorists belong to. In a situation of inter-group conflict, terrorist attacks increase negative beliefs about and hostile attitudes toward the group the terrorists claim to represent.

A concrete example of this is the negative stereotyping of certain communities. There have been numerous instances of this such as the rise of "Islamophobia" in the United States following the 9/11 attacks, or the increase in anti-Arab sentiments in Spain in the wake of the 2004 Madrid train bombings. Likewise, in Israel during the second Intifada, Israelis held extremely negative stereotypes of Palestinians, viewing them as dishonest, violent, and having little regard for human life.

Political Effects

In some cases, the political effects of terrorism are clear-cut and pronounced, but often it is difficult to accurately assess them because specific political outcomes cannot be casually linked to terrorism due to the multiplicity of potential causes. A government's policy or a particular political decision may be the result of any number of factors and can therefore hardly be attributed only to a terrorist attack.

While the political impact of terrorism is often hard to pinpoint, it can hardly be doubted that terrorism has political effects and influences the political process. The most obvious way in which terrorism can influence the political process is by bringing about changes in public opinion, which governments then tend to take into account when formulating their policies.

TERRORISM FROM A COUNTRY OR ITS LEADER?

NORTH KOREA, A ROGUE NATION

As one of the last truly communist country remaining, North Korea is a rising threat to all Western countries, especially with Kim Jong-un at the helm. With 5 nuclear tests at its counter, the latest one being on September 3rd, 2017, North Korea tries asserts itself as a military (especially nuclear) rival to the USA.

Washington has indeed been imposing sanctions on Pyongyang since 2008, intending to crack down upon the nuclear threat it represents. The UNSC also joined the movement, imposing the following sanctions in its tenth resolution (December 2017):

- Deliveries of petrol products will be capped at 500,000 barrels a year, and crude oil at 4 million barrels a year
- Ban on exports of North Korean goods, such as machinery and electrical equipment
- Freezing the assets of individuals and companies linked to its nuclear program and banning the export of goods and services to the country
- Drastically reducing the mobility of North Koreans working abroad

None has yet convinced Kim Jong-un to abandon his nuclear program, but diplomats hope this resolution will bite hard enough to change the country's path, or at the very least, restrict its ability to carry out additional nuclear and missile tests.

These strong new sanctions, passed with China's support, show the growing concern of the international community to the threat posed by Kim Jong-un.

However, if the recent escalation (October-November 2017) between Donald Trump and Kim Jong-un alarmed the international community, some may say that a war is still far from reality and the conflict between the two leaders is confined to the media: the US-North Korea relationship is in fact rather stable. Thus, "boasting about having a bigger button" could be nothing but political maneuvering. For Kim Jung Un, it is to strengthen his grip on power. As for Donald Trump, it is to show himself as a strong and inflexible leader internationally (given that he just finished his first year in office), as well as to better the US relations with South Korea.

BLOCK POSITIONS

USA

The USA has been through a major change in its position: with Donald Trump's new bold foreign policy, it favors a more direct confrontation. The equilibrium has already been jeopardized several times, be it with the North Korea or with Middle-East Countries (namely Iran). However, the USA's position is not that hawkish in facts: the confrontation is mainly on diplomatic grounds, while the situation remains in reality more or less unchanged.

Despite this, the USA is still claiming to lead the crack-down on terrorism: it is trying to wage a diplomatic/opinion war on what it calls "Rogue Nations"(Iran, Iraq, North Korea...), which it deems terrorist strongholds and major threats to the rest of the world. However, this stance is not that clear cut: some countries that may shelter renown terrorists remain strong American allies, due to economic and lucrative business relations.

RUSSIA AND CHINA

Russia and China are the main counterpowers in the UNSC to the "Western countries" led by the USA. Since they never not had a major terrorist attack on their soil, one can guess their positions toward terrorism and fighting it are mainly political/geopolitical:

For Russia, countering US diplomacy caters to 3 major reasons:

- The first is for the duel of geopolitical power and influence: from the ashes of the Cold War remains a rivalry between the two big world leaders. Thus, countering the USA keeps Russia on the scene as a major decision maker and a possible ally for non-western countries.
- The second reason is more geographical: with the USA entering the Middle-East and establishing military bases there, Russia feels threatened by the presence of American military forces so close to its territory.
- The third one is more blurred: Russia can benefit economically in allying with rogue nations since the Western blockade makes it a premium partner for trade. One could also raise the fact that Russia is one of the major weapon producers in the world.

Likewise, China has also 2 main reasons to act as a counterpower in the field of fighting terrorism:

- The geopolitical reason lies in the fact that China seeks to assert itself as a major political power worldwide: it wants to follow its ascend as an economic superpower with a show of geopolitical strength.
- The economic reason is deeply linked with political issues: China remains an unconditional ally to the otherwise autarkic North Korea. If one can see a fight for influence over a precious ally against a rising economic rival (South Korea) or a somewhat solidarity toward a fellow communist system, one could also point out that the North Korean soil contains lavish quantities of rare-earth elements that China is craving for to keep its electrical industry running.

THE UK AND FRANCE

As Europe's biggest armies, UK and France are willing to play a major role in the fight against terrorism: the European tenet tends to make them major mediators between the previously stated countries, and they tend to advocate diplomatic solution and cooperation in that matter. However, their public opinion is torn from the inside in the wake of the multiple terrorist attacks targeting their own territory and citizens. This leads to a rise of far-right stances preaching an autarchy solution against terrorism. Thus, the fragile equilibrium between cooperation advocacy on the international scene, and autarchy tendencies on the inside is not always found.

NON-PERMANENT MEMBERS OF THE UNSC (BOLIVIA, IVORY COAST, ETHIOPIA, GUINEA, KAZAKHSTAN, KUWAIT, NETHERLANDS, PERU, POLAND, SWEDEN)

Given their rather small weight in the UNSC and their lack of veto power, one could say that these countries find it hard to be heard on the international scene. However, they tend to represent "the rest of the world" with its issues. Regarding terrorism, they might as well try to work toward any kind of cooperation by allying themselves with heavier countries of the Council.

With no significant military or political power (compared to the 5 permanent members) and sometimes war and terrorism tearing up their land, they can be tempted to seek help from an international coalition to restore balance on their territory.

However, for a country like Sweden, which is not that concerned by security issues (even though with the recent migration crisis, it might consider its safety somewhat threatened), cooperation is not a priority, and militating for it may be only in words.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

- What are the practical ways to crack down upon the new ways of terrorism (cyber terrorism, rogue nations...)?
- What is the difference between political and religious terrorism ?
- Do all the terrorists have the same objective ?
- To what extent should states cooperate to eradicate terrorism ?
- What's the role of schools, intellectuals, preachers in the fight against terrorism ?
- What changes would you bring to the UNSC ?
- How we can tackle the new faces of terrorism ?
- How societies could prevent other attacks ?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE WASHINGTON POST

- Should you worry about a US war with North Korea? Not really.

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

- UN Security Council Adopts Resolution 2397 on North Korea.

BBC NEWS

- Islamic state: Where key countries stand.
- What government wants from tech in the fight against terror

THE HUFFINGTON POST

- *The Root Causes of Terrorism and Why No One Wants to End Them*

THOUGHTCO

- Top Major Causes and Motivations of Terrorism

THE INDEPENDENT

- 'Remote radicalisation' is making attack plans harder to detect, warns Government's terror adviser.

AL JAZEERA

- The Arab vision for fighting terrorism.

Bloc B: The emerging trading powers

- WTO. *World Trade Statistical Review*. 2017
- Ria Demertzis and Alexander Roth, "India's trade ties with the UK and EU", *Bruegel*, Oct. 2017

Bloc C: Countries with strategic geographies

- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. *Review of Maritime Transport* . 2016.

Morocco also informed Belgium of an imminent attack against nuclear facilities one week before the Brussels triple suicide bombings. It might be one of the countries that the West should closely work with. Indeed, Morocco provided intelligence to France after the November Paris attacks of the whereabouts of cell leader Abdelhamid Abaaoud, which led to his killing by security forces in St Denis before he could carry out another wave of terror attacks in the French capital. Moreover, just before al-Qaeda's attack in Grand Bassam, Moroccan services had warned their Ivorian colleagues of a possible imminent attack against beaches in the Ivory Coast. The country that benefits the most from Morocco's expertise on counterterrorism is neighboring Spain. In fact, their cooperation is so fruitful that it should be an example for others to follow, especially inside Europe. Regular exchange of information between the two countries has resulted in the dismantling of many terror cells linked either to ISIL or al-Qaeda.

IMPACT OF TERRORIST ATTACKS ON WESTERN AND ARAB SOCIETIES

Economic Effects

Every year, terrorist attacks make a considerable impact on the world's economy. According to the 2017 Global Terrorism Index, the impact fell by seven percent in 2016, the second year in succession that it declined. However, despite this decline, costs still reached a grim \$84 billion last year.

In 2007, economic losses from terrorism were \$41 billion. Amid the rise of ISIS, there was a surge in losses, which reached a peak of \$104 billion in 2014. Countries embroiled in conflict tend to suffer the highest economic impact from terrorism. Most of them are situated in the Middle East and North Africa, sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. Last year, Iraq suffered the highest economic impact from terrorism as a share of GDP at 24 percent. Afghanistan was also ravaged by terrorism with losses amounting to 13 percent of GDP while South Sudan had the third-highest impact at 9 percent.

Social Effects

Whereas the economic impact of terrorism can range from minimal to moderate, the same is not the case with the social impact of terrorism. The social effects of terrorism are often pronounced and far-reaching, influencing many different aspects of a society. The first of them is the change in people's beliefs and attitudes. One such belief concerns how people view other societies, especially the societies to which the terrorists belong to. In a situation of inter-group conflict, terrorist attacks increase negative beliefs about and hostile attitudes toward the group the terrorists claim to represent.

A concrete example of this is the negative stereotyping of certain communities. There have been numerous instances of this such as the rise of "Islamophobia" in the United States following the 9/11 attacks, or the increase in anti-Arab sentiments in Spain in the wake of the 2004 Madrid train bombings. Likewise, in Israel during the second Intifada, Israelis held extremely negative stereotypes of Palestinians, viewing them as dishonest, violent, and having little regard for human life.