



**BRAZIL**  
**70<sup>th</sup> Session of United Nations General Assembly**  
**Sixth Committee: "Measures to eliminate international terrorism"**

*12 October 2015*  
*check against delivery*

Mr. Chairman,

Allow me to express my satisfaction at seeing you preside over our deliberations. I am confident that, through your leadership and expertise in the field of International Law, the Sixth Committee will reach positive outcomes. You can count on my delegation's full support in this endeavor.

Mr. Chairman,

Brazil fully aligns itself with the statement delivered by Ecuador on behalf of CELAC. I would like to take this opportunity to address some issues from a national perspective.

Terrorism must be condemned in all its forms and manifestations. Repudiation of terrorism is enshrined in the Brazilian Constitution as a guiding principle of our foreign policy. My country is signatory to fourteen international legal instruments against terrorism negotiated under the auspices of the United Nations, as well as to the Inter-American Convention against Terrorism.

Being a country with no history of terrorist acts, Brazil has been attentive to prevention not only domestically, but also at the multilateral, regional and sub-regional levels. We are currently a member of the Advisory Committee of the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Centre (UNCCT).

Mr. Chairman,

Countering international terrorism is a goal that has a galvanizing potential, for two main reasons. First, because no single country is immune to terrorist threats, regardless of its size and resources. Secondly, because we all converge on the need and urgency to combat the scourge of terror. While the ultimate goal potentially brings us together, some of the tools chosen to implement counter-terrorism efforts – particularly those involving use of force – have been clearly counterproductive and of questionable legality.

Brazil is a staunch defender of the centrality of the United Nations in the coordination of global efforts against international terrorism. The UN Charter is both our best ally and our best defense against this phenomenon. It provides us with the legitimacy and tools required to develop and adopt measures for preventing and countering international terrorism.

Mr. Chairman,

The current absence of a universally agreed-upon definition of international terrorism is detrimental to our shared goal of eliminating it. It is also a stark reminder that defining terrorism is a complex and sensitive task, which demands a multilateral effort.

I take this opportunity to reiterate the call made by CELAC [and other speakers before me] regarding the need to overcome the stalemate in the negotiating processes leading to adoption of the Comprehensive Convention against International Terrorism and to the convening of a high-level conference under the auspices of the UN. These initiatives would complement existing instruments, provide a comprehensive legal framework and direct our joint efforts in a more coordinated way.

Filling this unjustifiable legal gap would contribute to reinvigorate the rule of law dimension of counter-terrorism, a precondition for its effectiveness. It would also create adequate conditions for ensuring that measures adopted at regional and national levels respect the due process of law and comply with human rights.

In the context evolving trends of international terrorism, the lack of a universally accepted legal definition can also undermine the proper understanding of the linkages between “terrorism”, “radicalism” and “violent extremism”.

Though these three phenomena may obviously be linked in specific contexts – such as in the recruitment for the so-called “Islamic State” – they are not automatically correlated. Racism, xenophobia and homophobia, for example, can lead to forms of violent extremism which are not correlated to the commission of terrorist acts. It is therefore crucial to preserve this conceptual difference, which is recognized in Security Council Resolution 2178 (2014), when its OP 1 refers specifically to violent extremism “conducive to terrorism”.

Terrorism also does not have universal or intrinsic linkages with transnational organized crime, even though an interrelationship between these two phenomena may obviously arise under specific circumstances. While terrorism is essentially fueled by political and ideological considerations and may represent a threat to international peace and security, transnational organized crime is usually motivated by the expectation of financial gains and remains primarily an issue within the realm of public security. Although international cooperation, upon request, is a valid tool to curb transnational organized crime, we are dealing with different spheres of responsibility, to which different remedies should be applied.

When highlighting the differences between terrorism, on one side, and radicalism, violent extremism and transnational organized crime, on the other, we are essentially preserving the conceptual distinction between “conflict” and “violence”.

I therefore take this opportunity to underscore that we cannot take the risk of jeopardizing the formulation of much-needed strategies to tackle international terrorism due to unnecessary and avoidable confusion and polarization arising from imprecise terminology. A Comprehensive Convention would minimize this risk. I echo CELAC’s call for flexibility of all Member States, so that we can finally resolve outstanding issues and achieve meaningful progress in this endeavor.

Mr. Chairman,

Prevention is always the best policy – including in the context of fighting international terrorism. We are facing a multidimensional threat, which will only be efficiently countered through approaches that take into consideration its underlying causes, in particular those associated with protracted social, political, economic and cultural exclusion. When legitimate grievances are seriously tackled by Governments and international governance structures, one of the many constructive outcomes is that more flexible conditions are created for a unified front against a common enemy.

Counter-terrorism efforts will be effective to the extent that it is consistent with the UN Charter, international refugee and humanitarian laws, human rights, including the freedom of speech and the right to privacy, and other norms of international law. If counter-terrorism takes place at the expense of international legal parameters, it will have defeated its purpose – and maybe contributed to generating additional extremism conducive to terrorism.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman,

Let me reaffirm the Brazilian position, according to which there are no excuses for terrorist acts. We remain convinced that cooperation and dialogue within the United Nations will enhance our capacity to counter this plight – and that concluding the Comprehensive Convention is pivotal in this endeavor.

Thank you.