

CLEIMUN19

“Collaboration in a Polarized World: Hope for the Future?”

A Research Report

COMMITTEE: DISEC

QUESTION OF: The Supply of Non-Military Materials and Equipment to Terrorist Groups.

AUTHOR: Kyle Sminchak

Introduction & Background

Terrorist groups that attack and harvest fear off of nations are sometimes protected by their local ones. The implication that a nation can support a terrorist group, even if it is not militarily, that attacks others could incite war between the two nations. For example, George W. Bush declared war on Afghanistan almost immediately after the events of 9/11 because he heard they helped support the group that attacked the World Trade Center, without even looking into the facts behind the attacks, the aid, and the actions of the opposing nation.

Is it Okay for Nations to Support Terrorist Groups?

Preserving self determination of nations should always be a prime directive of the United Nations, and telling nations who they can and cannot ally with may be infringing upon self determination and sovereignty by taking away a nation’s choices. Nations should be allowed to do what they want, but is there a limit to this sovereignty? Is there an instance in which your choices impact another nation’s, not directly through you but through who you support?

How Do Terrorist Groups Acquire Resources From the UN, and How Can This be Prevented?

In some LEDCs, there are terrorist group-established checkpoints to seize, tax or steal UN-granted funds or resources for the group's personal use instead of for the nation's need. Whether or not this is an issue of the groups acting out or the government's assignment for said groups, this is misallocation of UN grants, and this must be dealt with. For example, there are three checkpoints that tax UN supplies in Somalia en route to Mogadishu, and the stolen goods are used to fund Al Qaeda's operations. Dealing with uprisings such as these may be a prime directive for nations that both give the funds and those who are supposed to receive them.

Is the Aiding of a Terrorist Group that Attacks Another Nation an Act of War?

There are three different perspectives that must be analyzed in order to debate this question: that of the aiding nation, the victim nation, and any unaffected nations. The unaffected nations would potentially have an unbiased view on the incident, so they can hopefully make a valid conclusion. However, this may not always be the case, as alliances exist. Another way this can be interpreted is whether or not the aiding nation accepts or rejects the actions of the group. If the nation is contempt with the actions of the group, then it may be assumed that it was a backed attack, and responding with aggression may come from the victim nation.

Past Efforts To Solve This Problem

The UN has attempted on many occasions to implement Peacekeepers as watch for their goods, and in an attempt to keep the peace in places where terrorist groups run rampant. Not all

of these incidents have been successful, and this method becomes too expensive to run every time.

Possible Solutions

Whether it is infrastructure change, the acceptance of groups within nations, or more pressure from the UN to distance nations from terrorist groups, outcomes of this question are imperative to improving the lives of all. Whether it is agreed that nations can aid who or what they want without repercussion, or if any support of terrorist groups is eventually banned, the outcome of this question and the resolution that a country adheres to should reflect their opinions on the existence of these groups, and on their influence on providing aid that may be hijacked, or if their nation benefits from said hijackings.

Works Cited

<https://www.cnn.com/2018/02/12/africa/somalia-al-shabaab-foreign-aid-intl/index.html>