2019

Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees' Influence on Terrorism and Human Rights Atrocities

Janice Marie Gravely
Walden University

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Janice Marie Gravely

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Joseph Pascarella, Committee Chairperson,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. George Larkin, Committee Member,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Victoria Landu-Adams, University Reviewer,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2019

Abstract

Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees' Influence on Terrorism and Human

Rights Atrocities

by

Janice Marie Gravely

BA, University of Central Florida, 2015

MEd, McNeese State University, 1997

BA, Southern University, 1987

Dissertation Submitted Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

November 2019

Abstract

The United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees' current collaborative practices have failed to reduce global terrorists' activities and human rights abuses associated with counterterrorism activities. The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore and compare collaborative processes between the committees in combatting terrorism and human rights violations associated with counterterrorism. The researched was centered around two key questions: The similarities and differences with information sharing processes and the impacts of the committees' collaborative processes on terrorists' activities and human rights violations. For this study, the pragmatic paradigm theoretical framework was used, focusing on the descriptive exploratory design. Secondary data was used as a source. Additionally, face-to-face and telephonic interviews with subject matter experts were conducted. Eclectic coding was used as the primary coding methodology to integrate other coding methodologies in the analysis process. The research concluded that the current multidisciplinary collaborative process used by the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and Human Rights Committee creates inefficiencies that enable terrorists' activities to adapt while reinforcing their terrorist message. Strategically integrating the interdisciplinary process within both committees could expand each committee's awareness and efficiency in specified areas while positively reducing terrorist activities and human rights violations. Developing an appreciation and understanding beyond one's individual expertise while melding expert considerations is the basis of the interdisciplinary process that can positively effect social change for a more stable international forum.

Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees' Influence on Terrorism and Human

Rights Atrocities

by

Janice Marie Gravely

BA, University of Central Florida, 2015

MEd, McNeese State University, 1997

BA, Southern University, 1987

Dissertation Submitted Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

November 2019

Dedication

      I would like to dedicate my dissertation to my recently deceased mother Barbara Jean Middleton Gravely. Barbara was a God-fearing woman who made education a priority in my life. She was also my biggest cheerleader and staunchest supporter. I praise God for blessing me to have her as a mother and her for instilling an attitude of excellence in my life.

      .

Acknowledgments

First, I would like to give honor to God who blessed me with the strength and perseverance to see this through. Special thanks to my committee beginning with the Chair Dr. Joseph Pascarella, Second Committee Member Dr. George Richard Larkin, and URRs Dr. Meena Clowes and Dr. Victoria Landu-Adams. Your guidance and support were instrumental in my completing this process. Additionally, I would like to thank Dr. William Barkley for providing the foundation and focus for my dissertation topic. I appreciate your willingness to continue to share in this journey.

I am grateful to Clifton S. and Benton F. for reading my initial papers and giving input that focused my writing style for an external audience. I am eternally grateful to my interviewees who provided the insight and foresight to make this research possible. Your willingness to give your time, perspective, and expertise will be eternally appreciated. Also, I would like to thank Ricky Allen, my NSLS counterpart who motivated me to never quit. The weekly team accountability meetings were a principal reason that I completed this in a timely fashion.

Finally, I would like to thank my daughter Angelique. In my lowest times, you were there to force me to continue to write, to continue to push, to not give up or make excuses. Even though you were also in college, you took the time to read my papers when I asked, to participate in areas when I needed a partner, to listen when I needed to vent. As a mother, I could not have been blessed with a better Angel than you. Thank-you for being a rock in my storm. I love you – eomma.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

The United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees in their

international capacity play a significant role in shaping counterterrorist efforts and

containing human rights violations associated with counterterrorism. In this research, I

demonstrated that these United Nations committees tend to focus on their specific area of

responsibilities and expertise without integrating an interdisciplinary approach, which

may decrease terrorist activities and human rights violations associated with

counterterrorist activities. The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) is a key

influencer in addressing international counterterrorism issues (Ali, 2013), and in this

research, I reinforced how the current collaborative practices of these two committees

have adversely impacted multiple areas within the global international communities,

culminating in increased global terrorists' activities and human rights violations

associated with counterterrorist activities. This practice has generated gaps and seams in

abating the terrorist challenge and human rights violations. This research demonstrates

that various reported documented concerns from nongovernmental agencies, affected

nation states, and other groups that do not fall directly in either committee's area of

responsibility seem to fall into a gap where neither committee acts to mitigate the noted

concerns. Furthermore, the literature that directly addressed the relationship between the

United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees highlighted that there

are no enforceable processes to integrate collaborative efforts that would address these

noted gaps. The shortfalls in their collaborative process in areas that overlap may

potentially bolster the increase in terrorist activities and human rights violations, which represents a principal gap in the current literature.

In this chapter, I provide background information for the foundation of this research topic. I reinforce the problem statement and the purpose of the study. This section addresses the specific design, theory, and framework used from an interdisciplinary perspective to address the research questions. My overarching intent of this chapter was to ensure the reader understood the implications explored because the United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees' current processes used for sharing information do not adequately support requirements needed to reduce terrorist activities or humanitarian rights abuses associated with counterterrorism.

Background

Over 12,700 peer-reviewed and 200 nonpeer-reviewed articles were originally considered for this topic. After reviewing abstracts, ruling out some articles, and prioritizing the literature, 103 documents were used as the foundation for the research. Terrorism is expanding exponentially on a global scale. Most nation states have discrepant definitions of what constitutes terrorism and what appropriate actions are to alleviate terrorism in their countries. This discrepancy has created a quagmire for the United Nations to identify what nation state humanitarian abuses are in the name of terrorism and what actual terroristic threats are to the international community. Furthermore, I used the literature to reflect on the relationship between the United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees, which highlighted that there are no enforceable processes to integrate collaborative efforts that would address these

noted gaps. The shortfalls in their collaborative process in areas that overlap may potentially bolster the increase in terrorist activities and humanitarian rights violation and represented a principal gap in the current literature,

An example included a paradoxical situation in Syria in 2016 (Nissenbaum, 2016). There were three major countries, the United States, Russia, and Turkey, who were fighting against ISIS, but each had determined that other involved supporting sects were terrorist organizations according to each respective nation's definition. The result was a barrage of killings to one of the three prescribed country's allies who were also involved in the war against ISIS. Preliminary research on the United Nations committees demonstrated that there are independently associated actions from both the counterterrorism and human rights committees that may directly and indirectly affect each other's committees as it relates to terrorism and human rights. Even so, documentation has illustrated that committees do not have coordinated processes to interchange information and collectively work to formulate viable solutions (Flynn, 2007). There is nominal research that identifies information sharing and collaboration to develop a more precise approach to abate the terrorist and humanitarian abuses.

Over a 10-year period, many scholars have continued to identify nominal changes in collaboration procedures between the United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees. Additionally, terrorist activities and human rights violations continue to increase. This analysis reemphasizes the significance of these two vital committees considering integrating their processes for collaboration in an interdisciplinary versus multidisciplinary perspective to yield more favorable results in

decreasing terrorists' activities and humanitarian rights violations. Feinberg (2015) opined about the conflicts between counterterrorism efforts and human rights concerns and established a foundational baseline for this interdisciplinary approach. Feinberg identified the shuffling of responsibility within the United Nations (UN) because specific committees have definitive designated responsibilities. Similarly, Foot (2007) addressed the conflicts between counterterrorism efforts and human rights concerns. Understanding that the dynamics addressed by Foot and Feinberg are still relatively the same after 8 years helps to reinforce how an interdisciplinary approach can move considerations forward. Frank (2015) addressed the fluidity and uncertainty associated with terrorism and counterterrorism. The information Frank highlighted demonstrated additional gaps created by the multidisciplinary siloed approach to this issue.

Each of the UN readings demonstrated the siloed approach that the committees are currently using. In this study, I highlight the discrepancies and made recommendations for more integrative collaborative efforts. There is a gap in the literature in recommending considerations to mitigate the current multidisciplinary collaborative challenges between the two committees. The concept of tackling an interdisciplinary approach to combatting terrorism and human rights violations is somewhat nebulous and unchartered. The research topic of counterterrorism and humanitarian rights violations has increased over the years after 9/11, but the implications associated with the intricacies of synchronizing efforts in the global organizational communities has not been adequately addressed even though collaboration and synchronization are relative and important in counterterrorism and human rights

considerations. In this dissertation, I highlight discrepancies and make recommendations for more integrative collaborative efforts because there is a gap in the literature in recommending considerations to mitigate the current collaborative challenges between the two committees.

The concept of tackling an interdisciplinary approach to combatting terrorism is somewhat nebulous and unchartered. Before continuing further in this document, it was practical to differentiate between an interdisciplinary process versus a multidisciplinary process. Repko (2013) provided two simplistic metaphors that help to understand the differences between the two disciplines: The multidisciplinary process was compared to a fruit salad, which consisted of assorted fruits very close to each other but still separate and distinct both in appearance and taste; conversely, the interdisciplinary process was like a smoothie, the fruits are amalgamated to create a unified yet distinct mix of fruits, which creates a different flavor and appearance. My research underscored the impact of prevalent collaborative processes used by these two committees.

The research topic of terrorism and counterterrorism has increased over the years after 9/11, but the implications associated with the intricacies of synchronizing efforts in the global organizational communities has not been extensively explored. Discovering viable collaborative solutions is relative and important to reducing the terrorist threat and human rights violations associated with counterterrorist activities.

Problem Statement

The United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees' current collaborative practices have failed to reduce global terrorists' activities and human rights

abuses associated with counterterrorism activities. Despite the United Nations'

counterterrorism focus, terrorism is a universal problem that continues to expand

globally. The correlation between the increased worldwide human rights violations seem

to coincide with the increase in terrorist activities. After September 11, 2001, the United

Nations unanimously declared terrorism an international crisis (Braber, 2016). However,

most nation states have discrepant definitions of what constitutes terrorism and what are

the appropriate actions to alleviate terrorism in their countries. This discrepancy has

created a quagmire for the United Nations to identify abuses of power by nation states in

the name of terrorism and what are actual terroristic threats to the international

community. An example of the noted discrepancies is depicted in Nigeria's human rights

abuses and violations, which have been thoroughly documented in the 2016/17 Amnesty

International Report (Amnesty International, 2017) and in the United States Department

of State 2015 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices (United States Department of

State, 2016). Nigeria has a prolonged history of arbitrary abductions, killings without

due process, unlawful confinement, and detainee maltreatment in their defined terrorist

fight against Boko Haram. However, as of August 26, 2017, the United Nations Security

Council has only implemented sanctions against Boko Haram and specific Boko Haram

leaders (United Nations Security Council, 2017). The sanction of Boko Haram and not

the Nigerian military and government agencies that have documented human rights

violations provide conflicting opinions that enable countries like Nigeria to continue to

violate human rights to fight terrorist activities. This unresolved dilemma is apparent as

the terrorist threat continues to expand exponentially.

According to the Institute for Economics and Peace (2015) *Global Terrorism Index 2015,* between 2000 and 2015, there has been a steady increase in terrorist incidents and associated terrorist deaths. In 2000, the study attributed 3,329 deaths to terrorism, and by 2014, the death tolls had increased nine times the initial count for a total of 32,685 (Institute for Economics and Peace, 2015). The Institute for Economics and Peace calculated over 140,000 deaths associated with over 61,000 terrorist incidents between this same period. Even though there is an increased international emphasis related to counterterrorist efforts, the increase of incidences and deaths are diametrically in opposition to the international goals to reduce or eliminate terrorist acts. In 2013, there were 18,111 terrorist associated deaths, but in 2014, the numbers expanded by 55% with 32,685 deaths (Institute for Economics and Peace, 2015).

Furthermore, as the United Nations is attempting to grapple with this seemingly untenable challenge, there is increased concern of discerning what constitutes a terrorist act versus a nation state's right to declare their political or citizen oppositions as terrorists to justify government abuses of power. A prime example is the current situation in Syria. Specifically, in 2015/16, there were three major countries, the United States, Russia, and Turkey, who were fighting against the Islamic States of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) and Iraq and the Levant   The United States collaborated with the Kurds to assist in the conflict, but Turkey accused the Kurds of being a terrorist organization. Even though the United States backed the Kurd fighters' support, Turkey continued to target the Kurds' locations while targeting the Islamic State militants because the Kurds were allegedly taking over territory from supporters backed by Turkey (Nissenbaum, 2016). Additionally, there

were continuous conflicting opinions regarding Russia's support of Syria's president Bashar al-Assad. The United States and Turkey regarded Assad as a principal facilitator in the Islamic States' stronghold within Syria (Landis & Simon, 2016). Each country had determined that other supporting allies represented terrorist organizations according to each respective state's definition; the result was a barrage of killings of one of the three prescribed country's allies who were also involved in the war against the Islamic States. Expert contributors to the Institute for Economics and Peace (2015) *Global Terrorism Index 2015* highlighted human rights concerns varying from citizen/political opponents being targeted by governments to neutralize independent thought to the increase of refugees and displaced citizens where inhumane living conditions affected their livelihood. These human rights concerns accentuate the human rights atrocities directly and indirectly associated with counterterrorist activities. I researched the degree of collaborative efforts between the United Nations Counterterrorism committee and the United Nations Human Rights committee because there seemed to be a correlation between counterterrorist actions and human rights abuses. The current perceived stove-piped procedures between these two committees may be a key indicator why terrorism continues to expand, terrorists associated deaths continue to increase, and counterterrorism associated human rights violations continue to surge.

The concept of an interdisciplinary approach to combatting terrorism is somewhat nebulous and unchartered. Even though the research on terrorism and counterterrorism has expanded over the years since 9/11, the challenges associated with multidisciplinary collaborative efforts between the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the

Human Rights Committee remains a gap in the literature. Both Foot (2007) and Feinberg (2015) emphasized the challenges associated with addressing how the siloed approach between the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee has exacerbated the terrorist threat. Furthermore, there is a gap in explaining these committees' collaborative processes (or the effectiveness of their collaborative processes) when the conflicts between counterterrorism efforts and human rights concerns overlap.

The 9/11 commission report summarized the events associated with the September 11, 2001 tragedy (Kean & Hamilton, 2004). These events evolved around the challenges related to siloed organizations. This disaster accentuated the gaps and seams created because there were no formal processes or policies in place to communicate, interact, or share information across the various law enforcement agencies and emergency response agencies. The initial results highlighted delayed responses, mass confusion, misinformation, and ultimately the largest catastrophe on U.S. soil. Many studies and documentaries emphasized how various agencies had pieces of information that could have prevented this event if agencies were cross talking and sharing information for cross agency integration on a routine basis (Kean & Hamilton, 2004). There is evidence of similar situations between the United Nations Counterterrorism and the Human Rights Committees as terrorist activities and human rights violations continue to expand. In this research, I aimed to determine if these two committees' collaborative practices could create consequences on a global scale, and if so, provide recommendations to mitigate those identified challenges. The research topic of

counterterrorism and human rights violations has increased over the years after 9/11, but the implications associated with the intricacies of synchronizing efforts in the global organizational communities has not been extensively explored. Discovering viable collaborative solutions is relative and important to reducing the terrorist threat and human rights violations associated with counterterrorist activities.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore and compare the current gaps and seams associated with the perceived siloed processes between the United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees in efforts associated with combatting terrorism and human rights violations associated with counterterrorism efforts. I investigated to determine if these two committees' collaborative practices impacted consequences on a global scale and, if so, to provide recommendations to boost positive results. The long-term effects (which could be assessed in subsequent studies) could be a pronounced drop in global terrorist activities and human rights violations associated with counterterrorist activities. This research was a qualitative case study using pragmatic paradigm theoretical framework to provide considerations associated with implementing an interdisciplinary approach. The pragmatic paradigm has been closely associated with the mixed method research ideology (Cameron, 2011), which uses both quantitative and qualitative research to yield a solution because of its eclectic nature. However, the genesis of this research and the multiple considerations involved with approaching the United Nations problem set afforded me the opportunity to consider different designs and still focus on the research from a qualitative perspective. The case

study design afforded me the flexibility to address the complexities associated with analyzing the two committees' current collaborative practices as a single case with multiple variables (see Yin, 1999). Despite the correlation between counterterrorist actions and human rights disparities, I researched current collaborative efforts between the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee and ascertained the viability of implementing an interdisciplinary collaborative approach. The current perceived stove-piped approach between these two committees may be a key indicator of why terrorism continues to expand and why human rights abuses associated with counterterrorism activities continue to increase.

Research Questions

Research Question (RQ)1: How do the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee collaborate and share information received to aid in the reduction of terrorists' activities and humanitarian rights violations associated with counterterrorist activities?

Research Question (RQ)2: How are their respective communication and collaboration processes similar/different?

Theoretical Foundation

I employed a qualitative case study based on the pragmatic paradigm theoretical framework by using the descriptive exploratory design approach. This theory was selected because Bertalanffy's (1967) concept allowed me to define my research processes based on real world issues versus applying a methodologically pure process. Bertalanffy (1967) made the comparison between the scientific method that relies on

predictability and is associated with the "if this happens then this will be the result" and the systems concept that addresses the complexity of the social problem that may have different results based on the associated variables. Based on these considerations, the systems approach provided me flexibility in identifying the best methodology(ies) to address the research questions. The dynamics associated between the two UN committees has multiple variables based on the committee members involved, the nation states involved, and the particular situation addressed. Using the systems approach provided flexibility to develop a credible position to defend. I used the pragmatic paradigm theoretical framework approach because it allowed me to define my research process based on my research questions and real world issues versus applying a methodologically pure process (see Creswell, 2014). Additionally, by not being confined to a singular design or theory, multiple positions could be integrated to address the problem from an interdisciplinary perspective (see Creswell, 2014). Chapter 2 provides an in-depth literature review and analysis that further justifies my theories and assumptions. The exploratory design enabled me to go beyond the scope of the descriptive literature, which continued to highlight the deficiencies between the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee and delve to provide interdisciplinary considerations that move beyond just identifying the problem (see Akhtar, 2016).

Nature of the Study

This qualitative case study was based on the pragmatic paradigm theoretical framework with a focus on Bertalanffy's (1967) systems theory and Easton's political

theory. Bertalanffy introduced the general systems theory (which evolved into the systems theory) in the 1930s (Bertalanffy, 1967). Bertalanffy initially took the approach through his work in biology that systems did not just function based on finite processes, but they had an interdependency based on the various interactions and the outcomes that occurred from the varied levels of interactions. Easton addressed the intricacies of political theory by applying the use of systems theory beginning in the 1940s (as cited in Miller, 1971). Easton identified how decisions evolved through political negotiations. This was important because each nation state has a distinct means of recognizing their leadership, which affects how the political decision making is influenced (Miller, 1971). I used the case study design to define the phenomenon(s) that was best suited to satisfy the research (see Vennesson, 2008). My use of the descriptive exploratory design provided the venue to explore an unknown area nominally researched area while attempting to understand associations within the organization that influence its collaborative policies and procedures (see Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2009).

Despite the correlation between counterterrorist actions and human rights disparities, I researched current collaborative efforts between the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee and ascertained the viability of implementing an interdisciplinary collaborative approach. The current perceived stove-piped approach between these two committees may be a key indicator of why terrorism continues to expand, and terrorist associated deaths continue to increase. The concept of tackling an interdisciplinary approach to combatting terrorism is somewhat nebulous and unchartered. The research topic of terrorism and

counterterrorism has increased over the years after 9/11, but the implications associated

with the intricacies of synchronizing efforts in the global organizational communities

have not been extensively explored. Discovering viable collaborative solutions is relative

and important to reducing the terrorist threat and humanitarian violations associated with

counterterrorist activities.

I used three distinct methodological techniques to satisfy my research

requirements: First, I reviewed primary and secondary research addressing

counterterrorist actions and humanitarian rights; second, I explored professional venues

that focused on the United Nations approach towards balancing counterterrorist efforts

and human rights concerns; finally, I conducted face-to-face and telephonic interviews

from a United Nations member and subject matter experts.

I incorporated a thematic content analysis (see Ravitch & Carl, 2016) for coding.

When coding the information, the thematic content analysis process ensured that the

information was consistent with the questions presented and the information was

defendable. I used pattern matching and cross-case synthesis to support this analysis (see

Baxter & Jack, 2008). Both the face-to-face and telephonic interviews consisted of open-

ended thought-provoking fact-finding questions that supported my principle research

questions. I used the interview protocol refinement (IPR) framework associated with

qualitative interviewing (see Castillo-Montoya, 2016) because it provided a "continuous,

flexible, adaptive design" that supported obtaining a trustworthy assessment and analysis

pertaining to the two identified United Nations committees. This process enabled me to

establish a rapport with the interviewees. The interviews were free flowing versus being

scripted or perceived as confrontational.

Definitions

Case study: Qualitative research allows the researcher to implement various

methods and data sources that support the chosen research paradigm. The case study

selected determines the level of flexibility the researcher has in their analysis process but

still reinforces the rigor and credibility required for an effective research document

(Baxter & Jack, 2008)*.* According to Yin (1994), "Case studies are research situations

where the number of variables of interest far outstrips the number of data points (p.

1211)." Additionally, Yin noted that a case study has flexibility to adjust to the

application of competing phenomena within a research based on the complexity of the

topic.

Descriptive exploratory design: This design is associated with both the pragmatic

paradigm and the qualitative case study. This design allows the researcher to describe an

issue so the reader can understand the problem and provides a method to delve into the

problem that may not have a clearly defined solution or application (Baxter & Jack, 2008;

Collier, 1993). The nuances associated with such a complex subject as the specified UN

committee collaborative processes warranted using this design versus some others which

I considered.

Expert sampling: Expert sampling is a subset of purposive sampling that targets

experts with requisite United Nations background and expertise to provide empirical

evidence that explains processes and effects associated with the United Nations' actions.

Experts were required to ensure the research was credible based on experiences and knowledge versus unverifiable speculation from laypeople (Laerd Dissertation, n.d.)

Interdisciplinary studies/research: Repko (2013) identified five distinct approved definitions for interdisciplinary studies/research. For purposes of this research, interdisciplinary studies/research is defined as the melding of unique aspects of approved theories and methodologies as an application to solve a unique problem set. The spirit of interdisciplinary studies is to take critical aspects of a discipline and meld them into a new model where the separate disciplines are not uniquely highlighted (thus differentiating it from a multidisciplinary approach).

Pragmatic paradigm: Rossman and Wilson's (1985) identified how the pragmatic approach enables the researcher to focus on the problem versus establishing a structured methodology to answer the problem. The pragmatic paradigm has been closely associated with the mixed method research ideology (Cameron, 2011), which uses both quantitative and qualitative research to yield a solution because of its eclectic nature. I incorporated the pragmatic paradigm for similar reasons that I used the descriptive exploratory design – it gave me flexibility in my approach in analyzing such a complex subject.

Purposive sampling: Selecting participants based on predetermined criteria. For the purposes of this study, the participants had to be directly affiliated with the United Nations, Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs), or experts who report on the United Nations activities in relation to counterterrorism actions and humanitarian rights violations associated with counterterrorism or scholars who have researched United Nations policies associated with counterterrorism actions and humanitarian rights

violations associated with counterterrorism (see Mack, Woodsong, Macqueen, Guest, & Namey, 2005).

Snowball sampling: When selected interviewees refer additional individuals who have the required background and/or expertise to support the interview process and research (a referral; Mack et al., 2005).

Assumptions

I assumed that the United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees do not have an effective interdisciplinary collaborative process to jointly tackle the challenges associated with the increased terrorist activities globally and the increased human rights abuses associated with counterterrorism activities. The concept of tackling an interdisciplinary approach to combatting terrorism is somewhat nebulous and unchartered. The research topic of terrorism and counterterrorism has increased over the years after 9/11, but the implications associated with the intricacies of synchronizing efforts in the global organizational communities have not been extensively explored. Discovering viable collaborative solutions is relative and important to reducing the terrorist threat and human rights violations associated with counterterrorist activities.

Scope and Delimitations

In this research, I focused specifically on the current collaborative processes between the United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees while providing detailed correlations on their impact to terrorist activities and human rights abuses associated with counterterrorist activities. I briefly discuss some other areas that may be impacted by the current collaborative processes, such as international legal

implications, in the literature review. These areas could serve in future research

considerations.

The United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees' current

collaborative practices have failed to reduce global terrorist activities and human rights

abuses associated with counterterrorism activities. Despite the United Nations'

counterterrorism focus, terrorism is a universal problem that continues to expand

globally. The correlation between the increased worldwide state sponsored human rights

violations such as extrajudicial killings, prolonged detentions with no charges, no legal

representation, and isolation from family seem to coincide with increased terrorist

activities.

My research interview population pool for consideration consisted of United

Nations members, NGOs with concentrations within terrorist issues and humanitarian

rights issues associated with terrorism, think tanks, and peer rated scholars who focused

on terrorist issues and humanitarian rights issues associated with terrorism. This

population supported my ability to triangulate the responses to determine if there are

overlapping patterns that may influence how to address my research questions.

Additionally, there were documented experts in their areas of concentration, which

reinforced the study's validity, trustworthiness, and transferability.

Other phenomenon considered and discarded were postpositivism, constructivism,

and transformative. Postpositivism (see Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006) did not support this

research because postpositivism represented structured methodologies associated with

traditional applications. Postpositivism is typically well defined and more closely

associated with a quantitative research use. It is based on a well-defined theory that the researcher can prove or disprove with their documented findings. The pure methodological quantitative approach would create additional gaps and seams and potentially adversely affect the reliability of the research because the topic would either have to be narrowed even further to be able to apply effective quantitative measures or it would be so broad as to preclude answering the base questions developed for this research topic.

Constructivism (see Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006) is more closely associated with qualitative research, but the theory is developed based on observations or interactions associated with participants integrated into the study. The social interactions served as the basis to support the developed theory. This research is not designed to observe the interactions of United Nations members or the committees but to identify if the committee interactions are effective in addressing their respective interdisciplinary collaboration challenges that support reducing terrorism and human rights abuses associated with counterterrorist activities.

Finally, the transformative (see Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006) considerations expanded the constructivists theory by highlighting the underrepresented vulnerable populations who typically do not have a strong voice or representations to support their needs socially, politically, or economically. Even though issues associated with some oppressed populations are discussed in this research, they are not the principal focal point; therefore, this would not have been the best phenomenon to address the underlying problems or associated questions undertaken in my research.

Limitations

My initial greatest perceived limitation was if there would be an imbalance in the type of participant response: For example, bias may be reflected if there is a preponderance of NGO participants and researchers versus actual United Nations members or vice versa. It was important to understand the internal workings of the United Nations policies while understanding their impact on external elements that support communities adversely effected by UN actions or lack thereof. I had a projected goal of 20 participants to reach saturation. Even though I read over 40 current applicable writings that included 56 named authors and 14 distinct department and organizations, I could not obtain substantial support for interviews from the authors. I conducted three personal interviews and used an additional 15 secondary sources to complete the study.

The three interviews conducted provided saturation for the questions presented. Additionally, the secondary data reinforced the interview responses. Concern about the delicate nature related to the United Nations activities associated with counterterrorism and human rights actions was an area that could have potentially influenced responses. I addressed this potential concern (bias) by assuring participants would have complete anonymity throughout the process and they would have access to the material used.

Even though I attained adequate saturation with three interviews to support the current thesis, I did not achieve my respondent pool goal of 20 participants. Additionally, I conducted a content analysis on the current policies, discussions, and relevant United Nations press releases and NGO reports and think tanks as an alternative approach to demonstrate additional rigor and reliable results.

Significance

The long-term effects (which could be assessed in subsequent studies) would be a pronounced drop in global terrorist activities and human rights violations associated with counterterrorist activities. Discovering viable collaborative solutions is relative and important to reducing the terrorist threat and human rights violations associated with counterterrorist activities. Additionally, this research can serve as a foundation for follow-up research in the areas associated with establishing a unified definition for terrorism and resolving some of the international legal concerns to address what punishable offenses are based on state's abuses in name of self-defense.

The fight against terrorism is a global event. The fluidity and challenges related to attacking this problem set from a multidisciplinary siloed position have not remediated the terrorist threat. Frank (2015) identified concerns associated with these challenges that focused on the fluidity and uncertainty linked to terrorism and counterterrorism.

The United Nations in its international capacity plays a significant role in shaping counterterrorist efforts. The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) is a key influencer in addressing international counterterrorism issues (Ali, 2013). For over more than 8 years, these two United Nation's committees tend to focus on their area of responsibilities without integrating an interdisciplinary approach to solving contiguous, overlapping problems (Feinberg, 2015; Foot, 2007). This practice has generated gaps and seams in the terrorist threat because NGOs and other external agencies concerns are not adequately addressed when they provide documented shortfalls that potentially bolster terrorist activities. Both Feinberg (2015) and Foot (2007) opined that the issues are not addressed

because the documented concerns do not fall directly in either committee's area of responsibility. Feinberg and Foot also emphasized the continuing human rights violations in various countries that have occurred in the name of counterterrorism. When addressed, the counterterrorism committee has identified these concerns as a human rights committee action, and the human rights committee refers these measures as a sovereign nation's approach to eliminating terrorism. No one was willing to address the underlying effects these inactions may have in generating a new generation of terrorists who feel targeted, oppressed, and alienated. The committees' ambiguous approach has generated a cycle that permeates distrust in international organizations while providing gaps for terrorist organizations to flourish. Failure to use an interdisciplinary approach leaves a venue for terrorists' organizations to stay under the radar. Furthermore, the United Nations fully supports the rights of a sovereign states to govern and defend the sanctity of its jurisdiction authority. Failure to have some level of overlap continues to yield fertile grounds for terrorist organizations to cultivate, motivate, and indoctrinate new members. It also enables sovereign states to encourage humanitarian rights abuses under the guise of supporting counterterrorism efforts.

Another unique challenge when encountering terrorist organizations is that they ignore the same rules that govern countries throughout the world. ISIS has booby trapped hospitals and specifically targeted civilian noncombatants as targets (Jasper & Moreland, 2016). ISIS's nonconventional techniques, tactics, and procedures have made them more elusive and has created a new paradigm for United Nations countries battling an adversary who incorporates all perceived infidels as enemy combatants and therefore

disregards the traditionally accepted Laws of War prescribed in the Geneva Convention (see Jasper & Moreland, 2016).

A principal challenge associated with the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee is that there does not seem to be a venue where they can review information together to help shape international public policy, which currently seems to influence an increase in terrorist activities and humanitarian rights violations associated with counterterrorism activities.

Summary and Conclusions

In conclusion, the United Nations has established numerous independent resolutions that have focused on humanitarian rights and counterterrorism actions. Even though there is much literature associated with these topics, the literature has addressed counterterrorism or humanitarian abuses but not both. Even when counterterrorism and humanitarian rights are discussed together, the emphasis tends to be on the humanitarian abuses versus the counterterrorism actions used to fight terrorist activities that may generate humanitarian abuses.

A principal challenge associated with the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee is that there does not seem to be a venue where they can review information together to help shape international law regarding nonstate actors and their roles in terrorism. Because there is a shortage of United Nations recommendations to establish a universal definition of terrorism or define what should be the minimum standards to justify use of force, various member states and member organizations are establishing their own definitions. This has created avenues

for member states to redefine Article 51, which justifies the use of force; to independently declare opposition countries (and/or citizens) as terrorists and use that as an excuse to take military actions against such countries (and/or citizens); and to establish independent rules of law that are not consistent with the International Court of Justice.

The literature has suggested that there are many initiatives occurring in both the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee, but the committees are not working together from an interdisciplinary perspective to solve the increased terrorist activities and humanitarian rights violations. It appears that the committees are talking past each other versus to each other to construct a viable resolution. It is evident that the efforts of these two committees are not effective because both the terrorist activities and the humanitarian abuses are rising. Understanding current processes and providing considerations for adjusting the committees' approach may be critical to not only finally establishing an acceptable definition for terrorism but ultimately creating an atmosphere where both terrorist activities and humanitarian abuses are significantly reduced.

Chapter 2 is the literature review. In this chapter, I provide an array of information from the United Nations, NGOs, and subject matter experts. This information provides an essential foundation for future chapters.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees' current collaborative practices have failed to reduce global terrorist activities and human rights abuses associated with counterterrorism activities. Despite the United Nations' counterterrorism focus, terrorism is a universal problem that continues to expand globally. The correlation between the increased worldwide state sponsored human rights violations seem to coincide with the increase in terrorist activities.

Multiple United Nations' charters, resolutions, and plenary session meetings were used to establish a foundational understanding between the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee. After reviewing abstracts, ruling out articles, and prioritizing the selected literature, this research includes 12,926 literature articles. My research in the Ulrich's Periodicals Directory yielded 12,791 peer-reviewed articles.

Terrorism is still a growing phenomenon globally, particularly after the September 11, 2001 attacks, when the United Nations subsequently and unanimously declared terrorism an international crisis (Braber, 2016). However, there has been no unified resolution defining what constitutes terrorism or what contributes to state sponsored human rights violations. This discrepancy has created a quagmire for the United Nations to identify what nation-state abuses are in the name of terrorism and what actual terroristic threats are to the international community, both of which adversely affect humanitarian rights and applications associated with humanitarian rights like due

process and acquiescence of human rights protection (Feinberg, 2015). The United

Nations' inactions have also created a philosophical shift in which countries are pursuing

the right to take preventive aggressive actions against nonstate actors in sovereign states

under the premise of self-defense (Sofaer, 2014). The literature I reviewed revealed

established patterns that highlight disparities in how nation-states are defining terrorism

and how nation-states are justifying human rights abuses in the name of their respective

war on terrorism. The United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United

Nations Human Rights Committee collaborative efforts lack a federated message to unite

member states' actions on what specifically should constitute a terrorist act from the

United Nations' perspective and what are appropriate parameters to defend against

terrorism without violating human rights.

Furthermore, as the United Nations continues to grapple with this seemingly

untenable challenge, the literature I read also supported the current perceived stove-piped

approach between two principal committees: The United Nations Counterterrorism

Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee. In this section, I highlight

the literature used to identify the gaps in the interdisciplinary efforts between these two

committees and the adverse effects that the current committee processes are having in the

fight to eliminate global terrorism. This section includes the literature search strategy.

The literature research strategy section enables the reader to replicate the research process

to verify, validate, or repeat the research if there is a concern pertaining to the report's

credibility. The next section is the theoretical foundation. This section provides the

readers with the foundational scholars' theories used to support the research process. In

this section, I provide a rationale for the theoretical foundation selected and the rationale to rule out other theories. Next, I provide salient points and counterpoints that various scholars have used in their discussions pertaining to the United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees' collaborative processes. I wrap up Chapter 2with a summary of the literature process.

Literature Search Strategy

I used a thematic structured format for the literature review. Google Scholar was the driver used to generate initial literature considerations. Additionally, the Thoreau multidatabase search was the baseline used to conduct research for pertinent peer-reviewed literature. The preponderance of the literature scrutinized ranged from 2015 to present. Even with narrowing the focus to this time frame, there were still thousands of research articles available to review. After reviewing abstracts, ruling out articles, and prioritizing the selected literature, this research included 12,926 literature articles. My research in the Ulrich's Periodicals Directory yielded 12,791 peer-reviewed articles. The initial key words yielded the following results: *United Nations + terrorism + hybrid threats* (7 between 2012 -2013 only, 3 peer-reviewed), *counterterrorism* (4,901 peer-reviewed since 2015), *terrorism prevention* (2,359 peer-reviewed since 2015), *United Nations + human rights* (3,935 peer-reviewed since 2015),

United Nations + counterterrorism (161 peer-reviewed since 2015), *United Nations Counterterrorism Committee* (0 peer-reviewed since 2015, 1 nonpeer-reviewed since 2015), *United Nations Human Rights Committee* (86 peer-reviewed since 2015), *United Nations Human Rights Council* (231 peer-reviewed since 2015), *Counter-Terrorism*

Committee Executive Directorate (0 peer-reviewed since 2015, 8 nonpeer-reviewed since

2015), *International law + terrorism* (1,113 peer-reviewed since 2015), *anti-terrorism*

bills (3 peer-reviewed since 2015, 119 nonpeer-reviewed since 2015), and *anti-terrorism*

and humanitarian rights (2 peer-reviewed since 2015). Appendix A provides specifics

pertinent to the search process.

      I used multiple United Nations' charters, resolutions, and plenary session

meetings to establish a foundational understanding between the United Nations

Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee.

Understanding the nuances of the United Nations committees helped to refute some of

the literature initially used as a baseline, but it also highlighted a critical gap that supports

establishing a defined interdisciplinary model.

      Many of the articles made references to other articles and information that could

easily cause one to expand the scope into numerous variants associated with

counterterrorism and humanitarian rights. With the increased global terrorists' activities,

there are countless literary offshoots that could easily cause one to venture into an

expanded path if given the opportunity.

Theoretical Foundation

      I based this qualitative case study on the pragmatic paradigm theoretical

framework with a focus on Bertalanffy's (1967) systems theory and Easton's (1957)

political theory, specifically focusing on the descriptive exploratory design. The

descriptive exploratory design provided the means to resolve my research questions:

RQ1: How do the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee collaborate and share information received to aid in the reduction of terrorists' activities and humanitarian rights violations associated with counterterrorist activities?

RQ2: How are their respective communication and collaboration processes similar/different?

I used the pragmatic paradigm theoretical framework approach to define my research process based on real world issues versus applying a methodologically pure process (see Creswell, 2014). Additionally, by not being confined to a singular design or theory, multiple positions were integrated to address the problem from an interdisciplinary perspective. The pragmatic paradigm has been closely associated with the mixed method research ideology (Cameron, 2011) which uses both quantitative and qualitative research to yield a solution because of its eclectic nature. However, the genesis of this research and the multiple considerations involved with approaching the United Nations problem set afforded me the opportunity to consider different designs and still focus the research from a qualitative perspective. One of the unique considerations in writing this research is the fact that there are thousands of articles, books, research, and comments addressing the United Nations and its stance on humanitarian issues and more so after 9/11 on counterterrorism issues. Nonetheless, there are not many documents that addressed the challenges these committees encounter by not adequately synthesizing their unified efforts towards counterterrorism measures and humanitarian rights. Furthermore, this standstill has created an international judicial predicament because violations

involving counterterrorism and humanitarian rights violations associated with

counterterrorism are not as clear cut or universally accepted amongst many member

states. The descriptive exploratory design enabled me to go beyond the scope of the

descriptive literature that continued to highlight the deficiencies between the United

Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee

and delve to provide interdisciplinary considerations that move beyond just identifying

the problem (see Surbhi, 2019). Furthermore, the exploratory design supported the fact

that research into the annals of the United Nations' policies and procedures is an

untapped arena with nominal research addressing the inner working and nuances of

United Nation policy.

      Von Bertalanffy's actions associated with the systems theory (1967) and Easton's

political theory (see Miller, 1971) enabled me to approach this topic in an

interdisciplinary manner, which encompassed melding a combination of frameworks and

theories versus relying on one specific genre or approach (see Gray & Rizzo, 1967) while

considering the required interactions within the political mecca of the United Nations to

assess how these two committees comprised of multiple nations and ideologies can reach

a consensus to support greater world order (Miller, 1971). Bertalanffy introduced the

general systems theory (which evolved into the systems theory) in the 1930s (Bertalanffy,

1967). Bertalanffy (1967) initially took the approach through his work in biology that

systems did not just function based on finite processes, but they had an interdependency

based on the various interactions and the outcomes that occurred from the varied levels of

interactions. Bertalanffy's philosophy continued to expand throughout the other

disciplines and is now prominent in how researchers and decision makers approach

global scale political, social, and international considerations (Valentinov & Chatalova,

2016). Easton addressed the intricacies of political theory by applying the use of systems

theory beginning in the 1940s. His focus was identifying how decisions evolved through

political negotiations. This was important because each nation state has a distinct means

of recognizing their leadership, which affects how the political decision making is

influenced (Miller, 1971).

Tseng and Seidman (2007) used the systems theory as a tool to broach the social

challenges encountered with today's youth. They postulated that the current positional

approach in factoring a specific theoretical framework hindered their ability to effect

dynamic social settings (Tseng & Seidman, 2007). This premise is more prevalent in a

dynamic global microcosm associated with something as fluid as the United Nations.

Using the three focal points that Tseng and Seidman applied in their research was one

means to keep this research focused on my principle questions. Tseng and Seidman's

focal points are social processes that focused on interactions between two or more people.

For my research, the social processes were the interactions between the United Nations

Humanitarian Committee and the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and their

respective interactions with member states; the latter two focal points were resources that

Tseng and Seidman defined as what is required to positively affect the social process and

organization of resources that focused on how resources are apportioned. From my

paper, the resources and organization of the members associated with the respective

committees and the tools they used to influence the social settings and decisions

associated with their actions were critical in approaching this dynamic problem set from a different lens.

Paul Freire based his research on the originating pragmatists William James who wrote the book *Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking* in 1907 and John Dewey who wrote the book, *Experience and Nature* in 1925 (Rocha, 2015). Rocha highlighted that both James and Dewey emphasized that within the scheme of most disciplines, there were metaphysical disputes that would not be resolved. The nexus of this philosophy was how could a researcher take what appeared to be an unresolvable concept and through a non-descript approach develop a solution that gets one closer to a result than previously thought possible. Rocha also discussed how Paulo Freire focused his research using James and Dewey as the basis of his political theory approach. This was an important consideration because in 1972, the General Assembly adopted resolution 3034 to establish an ad hoc committee to create a unified definition for terrorism (Kfir, 2009). As of September 2019, no approved definition has been determined. The United Nations' Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations' Human Rights Committee's respective roles are to develop systems to mitigate the increase in terrorist activities and humanitarian rights violations. The information gathered from both committees should serve as the foundation to resolve conflicts for establishing a universal definition for terrorism.

Freire highlighted how at some point the oppressed became the oppressor to attain the goal of liberation. Freire's position is that dialogue is essential and should involve all parties (Smith, 2012). Even within the annals of The United Nations' Counterterrorism

Committee and the United Nations' Human Rights Committee, it seemed apparent with

the documents reviewed that dialogue is principally applied in specified venues in the

form of briefings. There appeared to be a lack of interdisciplinary dialogue between the

two key parties - The United Nations' Counterterrorism Committee and the United

Nations' Human Rights Committee. Both have the monumental role of shaping policy

and procedures to reduce both terrorist activities and humanitarian violations - which are

still extremely high (Institute For Economics and Peace, 2015).

Creswell (2014) postulated how the descriptive design could also be used to

establish the moral compass of the organization or the member states that are charged

with executing the mandates addressed in the multiple United Nation resolutions. This is

an important consideration because the effects of the global terrorist movement after 9/11

created an emotionally charged United States and a global realization that terrorism was

not the isolated activity focused only in a few less prominent countries in the world. The

actions taken by the United States and other countries and the responses generated from

the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights

Committee helped set the stage for what became the accepted moral standard as it

pertains to counterterrorism actions and human rights.

Literature Review Related to Key Variables

The previous section highlighted previous scholars, their methodologies, and how

I applied their processes in this research application. The word search criteria yielded

thousands of literatures that was applicable to this problem set. After an exhaustive

review of key abstracts and initial scans of a few hundred articles, principle titles selected

conveyed the overarching themes that were applicable for this research. The

preponderance of the research ranged from 2015 to present. However, a few articles

from earlier periods were used because they provided the foundational basis for the

current research and they demonstrated how the United Nation's approach towards

countering terrorism does not indicate an adequate evolution to keep pace with the

changing tactics associated with terrorist activities.

This literature research began with the foundational readings that highlighted the

current United Nations' construct developed to support humanitarian abuse actions with

its connection to the United Nations' counterterrorism initiatives. Most of the references

in this section originated from the United Nations website. I briefly touched on

significant resolutions that many of the subsequent scholars highlighted in their literature

considerations to set the stage for my selecting the specified literatures to support my

research premise (See Appendix B for complete summary). After the September 11,

2001 terrorists attacks in the United States, the United Nations unanimously adopted

Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) on 28 September 2001 (United Nations Security

Council, 2001). This resolution charged Nation-states with implementing policies that

would counter terrorist activities by sharing information, restricting money transactions

of known terrorists' groups, and criminalizing individuals, groups, or organizations who

assisted terrorists overtly or covertly. One of the challenges associated with terrorism is

that many terrorists do not govern their actions by the international approved rules of law

or the Geneva Convention (Lapkin, 2004). Also, many terrorists are non-state actors

which some sovereign countries surmised excluded these non-state actors from receiving

the same humanitarian rights and privileges as prisoners of war or other enemy combatants would under the international rule of law and Geneva Convention (Lapkin, 2004). Some member states based their position that some terrorists actions constituted public emergencies which afforded states the right to defer some citizen human rights based on Vienna Conventions for the Law of Treaties (Feinberg, 2015). These same states took the position that the Vienna Conventions for the Law of Treaties gave them the authority to treat non-state actor terrorists differently because the security of one's nation trumps individual rights as a whole (Feinberg, 2015).

On March 26, 2004, the United Nations Security Council adopted resolution 1535(2004) which established the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) (United Nations Security Council, 2004). The Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) was designed to serve as a liaison between the counter-terrorist committee and the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner Human Rights (OHCHR) (which will be discussed further in the subsequent paragraph) (United Nations Security Council, 2004). As terrorist activity continued to expand, the United Nations Security Council adopted resolution 1624(2005) on 14 September 2005 (United Nations Security Council, 2005). Despite resolution 1373, terrorist activities continued to flourish (United Nations, 2017) Resolution 1624 discouraged member states from allowing terrorists to take refuge in their countries and it continued to promote international dialogue to better understand how each nation-state defined terrorism and implemented counterterrorist preventative measures (United Nations Security Council, 2005).

Human rights considerations have been a part of the United Nations' foundation since its inception in 1945 (United Nations Human Rights Committee, 2017). During its initial meeting, the United Nations established a human rights programme in Geneva Switzerland which focused on fair and humane treatment both at peace and war. The General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on 10 December 1948 (United Nations, 2015) which formalized the committees' obligation to uphold the tenants of Articles 55 (which highlighted the fundamental human rights freedoms that are intrinsic to all citizens worldwide) and Article 56 (which focused on international cooperation to uphold the tenants of Article 55) (United Nations Human Rights Committee, 2017). These two articles are a part of the United Nations Charter signed on 26 June 1945. This charter contains 111 articles established during the United Nations Conference on International Organization in San Francisco, California (United Nations, 2015). This declaration established the universal minimal acceptable inherent rights that every citizen should have. Some of the key inherent rights are life, liberty, and security of person. The declaration also highlighted that individuals should not be tortured, they had a right to a fair and public trial, and they should not be indiscriminately detained (United Nations, 2015). As human rights issues have evolved, the United Nations has attempted to develop internal changes to focus on the changing scenarios. During the 1980's, the Human Rights Programme became the Centre for Human Rights. During the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna on 25 June 1993, 171 of the participating states voted to enact the Vienna Declaration and Programme of action that established the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner Human Rights (OHCHR) (Office of the

United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), 1993). This

commission became responsible for taking a more aggressive approach to identify and

reduce human rights violations globally. The United Nations Office of the High

Commissioner Human Rights also made earnest efforts in incorporating

nongovernmental offices (NGOs) reports of human rights violations to develop

recommendations that influence change with the violating member states. Finally, during

the plenary session on 15 March 2006, the General Assembly voted to establish a Human

Rights Council that replaced the day to day duties of the United Nations Office of the

High Commissioner Human Rights. This enabled the United Nations Office of the High

Commissioner Human Rights to work more with the Secretariat and Nongovernmental

Offices while the Human Rights Council devoted more attention and efforts with the 193

nation-states (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

(OHCHR), 2017). The Human Rights Council consists of 47-member states that rotate

on staggered rotations every three years. After 9/11, member states had varying

interpretations of what constituted "terrorists' acts". These interpretations further led to

varying perceptions addressing treatment of terrorists versus the universal standards of

treatments to Prisoners of War/enemy combatants under the Geneva Convention. Many

member states did not presume that terrorists (or sometimes suspected terrorists) should

have the same liberties associated with the Law of War because terrorists did not

prescribe to the conventional tenants associated with combat (Office of the United

Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), 2017). In June 2007, the

Human Rights Council established the Universal Periodic Review. The Universal

Periodic Review enabled the Human Rights Council to audit member states human rights activities by requiring member states to submit reports addressing state human rights initiatives and actions each state is taking to mitigate any perceived human rights violations every four years. All 193 member states have participated since the Universal Periodic Review's implementation. The audits occur every 4.5 years and the third round of audits began in 2017 (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), 2017). Even though The United Nations General Assembly established The United Nations Human Rights Council to develop a different approach towards humanitarian concerns and issues from the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner Human Rights, Hug (2016) highlighted that there was not a significant difference in the voting records, types of resolutions, or the approach used to temper humanitarian violations by member states.

The foundation of the literature review began with the overview of how these resolutions currently influence key member states and the impact the United Nations has had on globally synchronizing efforts against terrorism while maintaining humanitarian rights throughout countries (in particular, those who have a large terrorist population within their borders). Before 9/11 most member states considered terrorism as a concentrated problem focused in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Nigeria, and Libya (United States Department of State, 2017). After 9/11, it became apparent that terrorism was now an international event that was solely limited by the imaginations of the perpetrators involved. The United States as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council and a founding member of NATO requested assistance under Article 51(Use of

Force in Self Defense) under the United Nations Charter and Article 5 of the Washington

Treaty (Bracknell, 2016) with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Additionally, the

United States submitted a formal request identifying 40 actions the United States wanted

the European Union to implement to support the United States' war on terrorism

(Statewatch, 2002). Even though the United States is not a European Union signatory,

the European Union opted to support many of the United States requests to include

information sharing of known terrorists or their affiliates and revenue restrictions on

suspected terrorists and their affiliates. The European Union in its response aligned its

support based on resolutions approved through the United Nations (Statewatch, 2002).

Both the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization used the

United Nations' charter and resolutions as the framework for their respective

counterterrorism strategies (Monar, 2015). However, since the United Nations'

resolutions abdicated a clearly defined interpretation of what constitutes terrorist

activities, which organizations/groups are terrorist cells versus freedom fighters, what

constitutes an act of war versus a law enforcement issue, etcetera, it has left the door open

for diverse interpretations by NATO member states , the European Union, and the

international community (Bird, 2015). When reviewing both the European Union and the

North Atlantic Treaty Organization's charters, they took a law enforcement posture

towards terrorists and terrorists' acts based on their interpretations of the various United

Nations Resolutions and the International Court of Justice decisions (Monar, 2015). The

United States took the approach that terrorist activities are acts of war and not mere

criminal activities. The United States used their position that terrorists acts on American

soil constituted a declaration of war against the United States to establish the Patriot Act and to pursue terrorists as enemy combatants with limited rights because the terrorists groups were not signatories to any agreements associated with humanitarian rights (Monar, 2015). Hamid and Sein (2015) highlighted that there is a disparity between the United States interpretations of article 51 after 9/11 versus the international legal community's position. Sofaer (2014) emphasized that after 9/11, the United States submitted a proposal to take a more aggressive and preemptive stance against terrorists and against the countries who harbor terrorists. Additionally, the United Nation's language used in resolutions 1373 and 1624 has created a gap by recognizing a sovereign nation's interpretation of what warrants its right to self-defense even though in some cases the states interpretation is counter to other resolutions and long-standing international laws that addressed when a sovereign country had the right to attack another sovereign country.

Resolutions 1373 and 1624 is the cornerstone that has created multiple interpretations of what defines terrorism and what measures a sovereign country could take to defend themselves against these acts. The International Court of Justice held in their opinion that under Article 51 of the UN Charter, an armed attacked must be executed by a sovereign state against another sovereign state in order for the affected state to take any form of military actions (Braber, 2016). The uniqueness that occurred after 9/11 is that Al Qaeda is not a state nor were its actions overtly supported by a state (Hamid & Sein, 2015). However, former president George W. Bush attributed that Afghanistan and Iraq served as safe havens for these groups amongst other allegations

against these countries and declared under article 51 that as a sovereign country he had

the right to pursue the non-state actors who were endorsed (or not endorsed but allowed

to have a safe haven) by those respective state governments. The Bush Administration

notified the United Nations of the United States' intent to pursue actions in Afghanistan

and shortly thereafter Iraq even without the United Nations support. In similar events

with other countries, the International Court of Justice highlighted a limited scope of

when article 51 was justified by International charter (Hamid & Sein, 2015). The

International Court of Justice had established this precedence with other member states

such as the United Kingdom and Nicaragua that restricted their ability to attack a

sovereign country based on the perception that the country was aiding terrorists' groups

by serving as a sanctuary. The United States did not feel those two decisions were

applicable to its situation. Furthermore, the United Nations Security Council nor the

United Nations Counterterrorism Committee has taken any actions to define what

constitutes an armed attack and how terrorist acts should be applied in relation to article

51, because the premise of Article 51 was based on conventional war considerations that

involved state actors who violated another state actors' sovereignty. Non-state actors

previously did not have the global influence that warranted specific attention on how to

address their actions which involved violating a sovereign country with violent acts while

sequestering its' base in another country who may or may not support the terrorist

activity executed. The divergence of philosophies between the international legal

community and affected sovereign states has significantly influenced member states

interpretations of whether actions towards these terrorists "enemy combatants" who do

not prescribe to the international law of war, are not signatories of Geneva Convention, and are not state sanctioned should be afforded the same humanitarian rights as defined in the aforementioned documents. Additionally, (Lapkin, 2004) made a good point that still holds true today - The Law of War and Geneva Convention are considered in the simplest terms as contracts between signatories. Since terrorist groups have not signed the agreement, it is presumed that nation states like the United States, Israel, or Nigeria are not obligated to extend writs of habeas corpus to those individuals captured or detained.

Sweeny (2014) postulated that once the United States instituted the Patriot Act which was approved by Congress and sanctioned with specified review procedures from the Supreme Court, the humanitarian rights considerations for extended detention of suspected terrorist was not a principle consideration in comparison to the protection of a sovereign nation. Bachmann & Kemp (2012) opined that the aggressive posture of the United States threatened the Nuremberg legacy by enabling member states to singularly determine when it was acceptable to invade another sovereign country to pursue terrorists without provocation of the ruling country. Additionally, Bachman and Kemp inferred that various member state actions that have occurred since 9/11 may have damaged the international legal communities' ability to identify and prosecute war crimes as acts of aggression versus acts of self-defense. This is yet another example of how the United Nations' inability to synchronize efforts to define terrorism has created challenges that promote terrorists' growth. Furthermore, the lack of interdisciplinary coordination between The United Nations' Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations' Human Rights Committee stymies the international legal communities' ability to enforce

universal law and order. Bachman and Kemp also highlighted that current policies may be outdated based on the rise of influence by non-state actors and the increased use of hybrid warfare. Neither the international law community nor the United Nations have been able to keep up with the fluid global conflict changes.

Sofaer (2014) provided additional consideration to counter Hamid and Sein's position. The United States has taken the posture of preemptive self-defense: Instead of waiting for an armed attack to occur, the United States is proactively seeking the terrorists and aggressively seeking military remedies as a preventative action versus allowing another event like 9/11 to occur on US soil. Although, the precedence regarding the applicability of the writs of habeas corpus has been longstanding. Sofaer highlighted that other member states have used over 100 unauthorized preemptive military self-defensive measures since the United Nations charter was signed in 1945. He highlighted Vietnam's invasion of Cambodia to remove the Khmer Rouge from power and Tanzania's preemptive removal of Idi Amin in Uganda before his attempt to capture Tanzania. Even though affected parties filed official complaints with the United Nations, no actions were taken against the violating countries. Within the international community, typically, the violating country's responses for their aggressive actions merited more credibility and legitimacy than the arbitrating state's complaint. Also, states who have successfully defended and rationalized their actions have sometimes received praise from both the United Nations and the international community even though they violated the tenants of the United Nations Charter and The International Court of Justice.

Numerous resolutions highlighted earlier reflected on the United Nations' commitment to promoting that member states implement humanitarian considerations while pursuing methods to eliminate terrorist activities. Member states have provided requested information to both the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Humanitarian Committee independent of each other. These two committees report to the General Assembly, but there is little evidence that demonstrated that these two committees have established venues to share information other than through the General Assembly and the briefings provided to the Counterterrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED).

In 2004, The United Nations Security Council established its subsidiary policy branch, the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED). The Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate charter is to serve as a liaison between the counter-terrorist committee and the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner Human Rights (OHCHR). The Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate serves as the policy arm of the United Nations Security Council on matters effecting human rights. The Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) also reports to the United Nations General Assembly. The Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) depicted its involvement with obtaining the member state reports from the United Nations Human Rights Council that addressed what efforts the member states were making to support predominately domestic humanitarian rights concerns (United Nations Security Council, 2017). The Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) has received two iterations of reports from all 193-

member states. The Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) also receives reports from the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner Human Rights (OHCHR) and the Special Rapporteur of the United Nations Human Rights Council (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), 2017). The Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) reported these findings from the aforementioned committees to The United Nations' Counterterrorism Committee. Even though multiple reports are briefed in multiple forums, there was no evidence that any of the committees were working as an interdisciplinary body to shape the international scene by defining what constitutes terrorism, identifying when military force should be used, or highlighting what should be appropriate penalties associated with human rights violators. There is no evidence in the reports that I read that the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate had taken advantage of the voluntary human rights inspection process to obtain feedback from the member states to establish a baseline definition of terrorism and to further define more prescriptive considerations when it comes to member states using indefinite and ill-defined emergency declarations to justify prolonged detentions and human rights violations. There is also no indication that The Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) has established any type of interdisciplinary dialogue between The United Nations' Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations' Human Rights Committee to codify better defined international guidance for terrorism concerns and the associated humanitarian rights offenses.

In the absence of a guided effort from the United Nations, various member states are filling the gaps with their own interpretations which the United Nation has not challenged or clarified. Some examples are as follows: The United States continues to use its post-9/11 "Authorization for the Use of Military Force" (Laub, 2016) to justify its support and participation in its fights against terrorism in Afghanistan, Syria, Iraq, Libya, and Nigeria to name a few countries. The United States also continues to use its Patriot Act and other countries have similar acts to justify indefinite detentions as preemptive measures against individuals who may be affiliated with known terrorists' organizations or activities (Sweeny, 2014). Varhola and Sheperd, (2013) discussed that the United States had developed a greater interest in Africa as an area that could help in the protections of its National interest. The United States has become more involved in supporting African countries in their battle with terrorists' organizations like Boko Haram.

Amnesty International expressed some concern that the United States was violating the Leahy Law by selling weapons to Nigeria to fight against Boko Haram (McKinney, 2016). The Leahy Law requires that the United States fully vet countries for human right violations prior to providing foreign military assistance or funding support from the United States' foreign military sales programs which provides venues for the United States to offset weapons, ammunitions, and supply costs to countries who request assistance in support of mutual military efforts (McNerney, Blank, Wasser, Boback, & Stephenson, 2017). However, the Leahy Law does not prevent the United States from selling weapons to a country with human rights violations if the country is using its own

funds to purchase the weapons, ammunition, or supplies (McKinney, 2016). Despite the fact that the United States Department of State listed Nigeria as a principal human rights violator (United States Department of State, 2016) and the International Court of Justice was investigating the Nigerian government, the United States executed a military sale worth $593 million in August 2017 (Stone, Zargham, & Maler, 2017). Nigeria continues to use the fight against Boko Haram to reinforce extrajudicial killings, disappearances, and questionable detentions to name a few.

The United Nations highlighted the fact that all 193 countries provided reports on their efforts to maintain humanitarian conditions while fighting terrorism, but there is no evidence that either committee is putting more stringent guidelines in place to discourage some of the more aggressive actions which clearly violate human rights. Furthermore, there have been no joint resolutions from The United Nations' Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations' Human Rights Committee to admonish countries who engage in a pattern of human rights violations in their quest against terrorist organizations or those countries who support the violators. Another interesting consideration is that The Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights (OHCHR) cited twenty-nine countries that violated human rights efforts that were sanctioned by the United Nations in 2017. Nine of the twenty-nine countries were current members of the Human Rights Council (Sampathkumar, 2017) (Appendix C). The 47 Members of the Human Rights Council are selected by secret ballot for three-year terms. There are no penalties associated with council members who violate the tenants of what they are charged to represent.

The CTED emphasized its 100% Universal Periodic Review of the 193-member states. I reviewed the United States and Nigeria to get an idea of how this report would support establishing an interdisciplinary approach to dealing with counterterrorism and humanitarian issues. Both reports focused principally on domestic human rights concerns, not the implications associated with the member states counterterrorism decisions.

The United States Universal Periodic Review placed considerable emphasis on racial injustices and police brutality. There was a small section addressing Guantanamo Bay and a generalized section that addressed procedures for considering the use of force when civilians are involved (United Nations Human Rights Council, 2015). The United States highlighted how military members who were caught violating human rights were punished, but they also addressed civilian members accused of similar offenses were not punished due to insufficient evidence. There was no discussion of the detentions associated with the Patriot Act by the United States (United Nations Human Rights Council, 2015). Finally, Vitiello (2015) underscored that many Human Rights groups lambasted the results of the most recent findings because the United States had not taken any corrective actions associated with the United Nations recommendations to the findings identified during the 2010 Universal Periodic Review of the United States.

The Nigerian Universal Periodic Review highlighted that Nigeria is not a current signatory to the United Nations human rights instruments and protocols. Technically, this means that Nigeria is under no obligation to adhere to any of the United Nations' recommendations concerning human rights (United Nations Human Rights Council,

2013). The Universal Periodic Review report also broached the humanitarian concerns from a domestic position with one small section that highlighted abuses associated with Nigeria's counterterrorism efforts. Nigeria's responses emphasized its approach to provide greater opportunities for people with disabilities. When Nigeria addressed the security concerns linked to human rights violators in their military and security forces, the approach was strikingly similar to the United States approach with police abuse (United Nations Human Rights Council, 2013). Additionally, Nigeria cited that they promoted the tenants of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights by conducting trials for law enforcement officials accused of participating in extrajudicial killings, kidnappings, and torture (to name a few). Nigeria cited that security officers who were charged with murdering the Boko Haram Sect leader Mohammed Yusef would face "the full weight of the law" (United Nations Human Rights Council, 2013). However, by 2015, all accused security officials had been exonerated due to lack of substantial evidence or credible witnesses (Bamgboye, 2015). There was no noted feedback from the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate, The United Nations' Counterterrorism Committee, or the United Nations' Human Rights Committee. However, Amnesty International continued to highlight concerns about these atrocities in their recurring reports (2017).

These two reports highlighted that neither country identified measures they were using to counter terrorism that would minimize the cited human rights abuses. Furthermore, there were no discussions of the effectiveness of each country's counterterrorist's efforts and if there were any indications that the current approach was

helping or hurting the counterterrorist efforts. Also, even though each country acknowledged concerns outlined in the report, they did not give projected timelines when they planned to remedy the areas, they concurred were issues. From an interdisciplinary approach, the effectiveness of counterterrorism measures and the effectiveness of preventing human rights violations in the fight against terrorism could serve as a critical benchmark for the designated committees to adequately define terrorism and while implementing adverse actions such as sanctions for countries who abused their sovereignty rights against their indigenous citizens.

On the other hand, the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) took a different approach and interpretation on how they define and approach terrorism. The European Union currently consists of 28-member states within Europe. After 9/11, the European Union through its treaty processes opted to treat terrorism as a criminal activity that is managed through the judicial system instead of associating terrorism with war like activities (Martins, 2016). The EU has a Terrorism Framework that they adopted on 13 June 2002. They criminalized terrorists' activities into three categories as follows: (a) terrorist offences - some key activities associated with terrorists' offenses involve situations that result in a person's demise, extreme property damage, or seizures involving aircraft or kidnapping; (b) Offenses related to terrorist groups. Terrorist groups consist of two or more people intent on executing terrorist events; and (c) offenses linked to terrorist activities. These offenses are linked to money generating activities through criminal means such as extortion, theft, or using altered documents. Martins also emphasized that the EU has implemented more than 200

counter-terrorism measures since 9/11. They have also been instrumental in shaping United Nation resolutions associated with terrorism. Even under the EU's criminal considerations associated with terrorism, the act associated with terrorism must be intentional, it must be a criminal offense under international law, and it must have some intended consequences to the people affected by the act.

Martins (2016) compared the European Union's approach with the Norm diffusion theory. The norm diffusion theory is a process characterized by three stages norm emergence, norm acceptance, and norm internalization. Martin used this theory to demonstrate how the European Union took the basis of the United Nations Security Council's resolutions associated with counterterrorism and internalized those resolutions into legal actions within their 28-member nations.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) consists of 29 countries including the United States (North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 2017) Even though the United States is a founding member of NATO, NATO currently does not promote the same position as the United States in relation to its definition of terrorism and actions it should take against terrorism. NATO's key philosophy is that every member state has an obligation to defend its own borders; however, if a member country encountered an attack beyond its capability to support, it can seek NATO assistance under Article V of the Washington Treaty (Bird, 2015) known as the collective defence agreement. In the day to day efforts in the War on terrorism, NATO continues to monitor and makes decisions on the best methods it can support. Currently, NATO's posture of increased information sharing and working with some countries with potential terrorist cells to

provide training to counter terrorism are the main efforts that they are using. Just like the European Union's position, until the United Nations establishes a unified direction, NATO has reserved the level of aggressive actions it would take towards terrorist activities.

Terrorist activities have occurred throughout the global communities since biblical times (Samuel, 2017). 9/11 affected the United Nations' approach to terrorism. The dynamics associated with events following 9/11 is continually evolving in its implementations on how member states approach actions towards countering terrorism. Murphy (2015) opined that there is now a constant struggle between what constitutes criminal versus civil law versus a war crime. This struggle is consistent because of the United Nation's inability to establish a consensus definition for terrorism or penalties for violating current sanctioned United Nations resolutions. The recurring position upheld in each United Nations Counterterrorism Resolution is that each member state's sovereignty is sacred above everything else. This position gives the states the leverage to declare certain revolutionary actions within their country as legitimate whereas other actions are declared as terrorist activities. The criminal law considerations continues to take a more pronounced approach as terrorists organizations implement criminal tactics to support fund raising and other nefarious options to build their ability to act (Braber, 2016).

Another consideration within each states policy, is the fact that they can waive some humanitarian considerations for the greater good of "protecting their citizens". However, this waiver was designed to have an end state. Since 9/11 there are some cases where countries have detained suspected terrorists for inordinate amounts of time without

the right of due process such as talking to an attorney, their embassy, or other National Governmental Organizations. Murphy (2015) opined that the United Nations' by continuously emphasizing the member states' right to sovereignty sanctions how nations determine what are appropriate actions for self-defense. These sanctioned efforts have created a major dilemma – each member state has almost exclusive rights to determine what is a terrorist activity within its country versus civil disobedience. This impasse has resulted in cited human rights violations that are highlighted through various agencies, with no actions taken by the United Nations or its designated committees against those offending countries. Also, as highlighted earlier, there are even violating countries serving as members of the United Nations Human Rights Committee.

Braber (2016) examined how the United Nations' quandary in promoting an approved definition for terrorism effects the international legal council's ability to adequately identify what constitutes violation of international law since there is no prescribed legal basis to clearly delineate terrorist activities that may have international implications versus domestic activities that involve high crimes that could be considered acts of international terrorism. Braber also opined that proportionally terrorism received more attention even though its actual effect on human casualties and intimidation are significantly less than the deaths and destruction caused in wars. However, a distinction that Braber missed in his assertions is that wars are conducted amongst specific military arms within a combative country. Terrorism involves actions against innocent civilian populations who typically have no direct or indirect affiliations with the cause the terrorist is promoting. The victims serve as a tool to bring attention to its perpetrators

(Jasper & Moreland, 2016). Also, countries like the United States and India have so refined their definitions of terrorism to incorporate many domestic crimes that use violence to intimidate people based on ethnicity, political affiliation, or religious values to name a few. Other member states may associate these same actions with freedom fighters who have been oppressed in their respective majority countries and are seeking a voice through some levels of violence.

Another interdisciplinary challenge that The United Nations' Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations' Human Rights Committee should examine is defining terrorists' activities versus freedom fighters who have been oppressed by their government. Some of our current military actions highlight how this lack of distinction has created inconsistencies even amongst countries who are supposedly fighting against the same terrorist organization. For example, the United States as a founding member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has declared that ISIL has committed genocide against minority groups like Shia Muslims, Christians, and Yazidis, but there is no verbiage in any United Nations' resolutions that have identified specific ISIL atrocities as genocide (Bracknell, 2016). Also, Kfir (2009) identified that neither the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate, The United Nations' Counterterrorism Committee, or the United Nations' Human Rights Committee have addressed Syria's endorsement of Hamas, Hezbollah, and the Islamic Jihad in Damascus. The United Nations have declared all three of these groups as terrorists' organizations, but the United Nations has failed to take any punitive actions against Syria. This has created some unique challenges as Syria has joined in the fight against the Islamic State of Iraq and the

Levant in Syria. Syria's counterterrorism situation has illuminated the contrast of opinions when there are no unified definitions. In this section, four principle players (Syria, United States, Russia, and Turkey) conflicts were highlighted to illustrate how each is justifying the old adage, "One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter:" Syria under the leadership of Bashar al Assad is fighting for its survival against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and the Sunni majority who wants the Syrian government replaced with different leadership. The United States has used the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant occupation within Syria as a justification to pursue actions that support its war on terrorism. The United States has also attempted to influence the change of government leadership in Syria proclaiming that Assad's government is exacerbating terrorists' activities in the region. Russia is supporting the Assad's government's request for support in fighting the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and preventing other factions from taking over the government. Since the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant occupies areas on the Syrian / Turkish border, Turkey has a vested interest in eliminating the terrorist group before they attempt to expand into Turkey (Blanchard, Humud, & Nikitin, 2015).

Williams (2016) exemplified the challenges associated with these four countries and the countries who continue to support their efforts against counterterrorism. A few examples include the United States has incorporated assistance from the Kurdish PYD/YPG forces to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in Eastern Syria. However, Turkey has declared the Kurds as a terrorist organization and have initiated numerous attacks against this United States backed coalition even though the Kurds have

effectively neutralized terrorist activities in eastern Syria. Syria continues to support and is supported by known terrorist groups such as Hezbollah. The United States has declared Hezbollah as a terrorist agent that must be eliminated in the war against terrorism. Turkey is an opponent of the Assad regime. Russia has taken advantage of the request for support from the Assad government to not only support efforts to eliminate the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, but to also have taken advantage of the situation to bomb Assad opponents. Consequently, there were multiple incidences where Russia bombed Turkish military which subsequently resulted in Turkey shooting down a Russian plane (Szénási, 2016). In spite of all this internal infighting and cross coalition fratricide, the United Nations has still not made a concerted effort to clarify policy so there would be clear penalties for violations. Hamid & Sein (2015) postulated that if the United Nations does not step up to define terrorism and elucidate what are acceptable conditions to repudiate humanitarian considerations, then more countries could use the excuse to invade other sovereign countries based on actions taken by non-state actors who are resident in a specific sovereign country. This has the potential for global instability based on a few countries misaligned interpretation of the ultimate sovereign country's rights for self-defense.

A key consideration that Braber (2016) concluded was that until the United Nations ratifies a formal definition for terrorism, the ability to properly sanction countries who use terrorism as an excuse to neglect humanitarian rights is limited. Sivakumaran (2017) discussed that the United Nations in its role as a state empowered entity could influence international law. Sivakumaran posited that international law traditionally

consisted of state actors and non-state actors. State actors influence what are acceptable

guidelines for enforceable violations under the guidance of the International Judicial

Council or the International Law Commission. Sivakumaran surmised that states ability

to reject international law can be damaging to international law enforcements if enough

states reject the recommendations. Additionally, Sivakumaran identified the challenges

that the United Nations Human Rights council may encounter if member states reject the

recommendations or if some member states reject the recommendations because it does

not support the states' agenda. This is evident in the various state interpretations of what

are adequate humanitarian actions related to counterterrorism. Sivakumaran also opined

that United Nations resolutions and recommendations are sent to all member states for

comment. It is assumed that if member states do not provide comments that the states are

accepting the United Nation recommendations as written. Sivakumaran noted that the

United Nations Human Rights Committee typically does not receive many comments.

However, not providing comments may serve as a venue to continue to violate some

aspects of international law or specific aspects of a resolutions because even though

member states did not provide any comment, they also did not provide any concurrence.

As previously mentioned, member states have taken over 100 preemptive attacks counter

to United Nations resolutions and international laws. These preemptive actions have

created humanitarian violations that were previously addressed. In the Nigeria example

included in this paper, Sivakumaran (2017) did not address how international law

considerations are integrated into counterterrorism actions. This is a significant factor

that not only influences how states approach non-state actor violations, but it also effects

what states feel are acceptable practices in dealing with alleged non-state actor terrorists. Also, Sivakumaran addressed the influence of state actors and state-sponsored entities on international law. However, he did not highlight how the international legal community is working with key state-sponsored entities like The United Nations to establish acceptable and enforceable laws for non-state actors who are not recognized as legitimate organizations within any community. Non-state actors serve as the core of the terrorist community. It has been an ongoing challenge to actively approach this unconventional threat within the international legal community. This area is still influenced more by the states in which the non-state actors exist. Therefore, violations encountered by the nonstate actors' actions are governed by the state actors of that effected country. This is yet another article that demonstrated the lack of a cohesive strategy between the United Nations' human rights committee and the United Nations' counterterrorism committee.

Summary and Conclusions

In conclusion, the United Nations has established numerous independent resolutions that focus on human rights and counterterrorism actions. Even though there are thousands of literatures associated with these topics, the literature tends to focus on counterterrorism or human rights abuses not both. Even when counterterrorism and human rights are discussed together, the emphasis tends to be on the human rights abuses versus the counterterrorism actions used to fight terrorist activities that may generate human rights abuses.

A principal challenge associated with The United Nations' Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations' Human Rights Committee is that there does not seem

to be a venue where they review information together to help shape international law regarding non-state actors and their roles in terrorism. Since these committees have not established a universal definition of terrorism or defined what should be the minimum standards to justify use of force (in particular, as it relates to non-state actors), various member states and member organizations are establishing their own definitions. This has created avenues for member states to redefine Article 51 which justifies the use of force; to independently declare opposition countries (and/or citizens) as terrorists while using that as an excuse to take military actions against such countries (and/or citizens); and to establish independent rules of law that are not consistent with the International Court of Justice.

The literature suggested that there were many initiatives occurring in both The United Nations' Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations' Human Rights Committee, but the committees are not working together from an interdisciplinary perspective to solve the increased terrorist activities and human rights violations. It appears that the committees are talking past each other versus to each other to construct a viable resolution. It is evident that the efforts of these two committees are not effective because both the terrorist activities and the humanitarian abuses are rising. Understanding current processes and redesigning the committees' approach may be critical to not only finally establishing an acceptable definition for terrorism, but ultimately creating the atmosphere where both terrorist activities and humanitarian abuses are significantly reduced.

Chapter 3 will address the research method used to understand the problem associated with the global expansion of terrorism and human rights abuses associated with counterterrorist activities. It highlights the research applications used, the participants involved, and considerations associated with these efforts. The literature review served as a principle driver to determine the best methodology to approach this problem.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore and compare the current

gaps and seams associated with the current siloed processes between the United Nations

Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees in efforts associated with combatting

terrorism and human rights violations associated with counterterrorism efforts. I

investigated to determine if these two committees' collaborative practices could create

consequences on a global scale, and if so, provide recommendations to mitigate those

identified challenges. The United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights

Committees in their international capacity should play a significant role in shaping

counterterrorist efforts and containing human rights violations associated with

counterterrorism. Through this research, I demonstrated that these United Nations

committees tend to focus on their specific area of responsibilities without integrating an

interdisciplinary approach to decrease terrorist activities and human rights violations

associated with counterterrorist activities. The UNSC is a key influencer in addressing

international counterterrorism issues (Ali 2013), and in this research, I reinforced how the

current collaborative practices of these two committees have adversely affected multiple

areas within the global international communities culminating in increased global

terrorists' activities and human rights violations associated with state sponsored

counterterrorist activities. This practice has generated inadequacies in abating the

terrorist challenge and human rights violations. Through this research, I demonstrated

that various reported documented concerns from nongovernmental agencies, effected

nation states, and other groups that do not fall directly in either committee's area of

responsibility seem to fall into a gap where neither committee acts to mitigate the noted

concerns. Furthermore, the literature that directly addresses the relationship between the

United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees highlighted that there

were no enforceable processes to integrate collaborative efforts that would address these

noted gaps. The shortfalls in the United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights

Committees collaborative process in areas that overlap may potentially bolster the

increase in terrorist activities and human rights violations associated with state sponsored

counterterrorist activities.

In this chapter, I provide background information that supports the foundation for

this research topic. I reinforce the problem statement and the purpose of the study. This

section addresses the specific design, theory, and framework that were used from an

interdisciplinary perspective to answer the research questions. The overarching intent of

this chapter is to ensure the reader understands the processes explored because the United

Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees' current processes used for

sharing information do not adequately support requirements needed to reduce terrorist

activities or human rights abuses associated with counterterrorism.

Chapter 3 is comprised of three key sections. First, I address the research design

and rationale to provide the reader a better understanding of why the design was selected

to support this research. In the role of the researcher section, I reemphasize the

importance of developing a thorough credible research process. I detail my

responsibilities to maintain the appropriate procedures throughout the research. The

methodology section provides the tools and techniques that can be replicated for others who may have an interest in verifying the research, or it can serve as a foundation for another research study to branch into complimentary areas that have been impacted by current practices used by the committees. The next section addresses issues of trustworthiness. This section helps to reinforce the rigor applied to identifying the problem, justifying the gap in the literature and the potential implications if the research does not meet the expected threshold for scholarly excellence. Finally, I end this chapter with a summary that encapsulates the critical points within this chapter.

Research Design and Rationale

This section begins with the key questions that must be satisfied to support the research as follows:

RQ1: How do the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee collaborate and share information received to aid in the reduction of terrorists' activities and humanitarian rights violations associated with counterterrorist activities?

RQ2: How are their respective communication and collaboration processes similar/different?

This was a qualitative case study based on the descriptive exploratory design approach within the pragmatic paradigm theoretical framework. The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore and compare the current gaps and seams associated with the current siloed processes between the United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees in efforts associated with combatting terrorism and human

rights violations associated with counterterrorism efforts. Case studies provided me the flexibility to adjust to the application of competing phenomena within the research based on the complexity of the topic (see Yin, 1999).

Kohlbacher (2006)addressed the challenges associated with qualitative research and singularly using an exploratory design. Kohlbacher recounted that in some research, the researcher appears as a reporter of information gathered with no methodology or process for theoretical applications. Azarian (2011) also highlighted the potential trap of conducting a study without the required scientific rigor to meet the scholarly parameters to ensure the research is accurate with verifiable methodologies. Azarian asserted how some researchers in the past have had works invalidated by using comparisons without any design or framework. Combining descriptive and exploratory design aids in approaching this unchartered research area in a defined and defendable manner. Qualitative research still struggles to attain the respect and acceptance of a defined quantitative methodology (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). Conducting qualitative research without an accepted framework jeopardizes the research studies credibility (Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson, & Spiers 2002). The scholar community wants to see familiar academic processes that are supportable and repeatable. Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) favored the pragmatic paradigm theoretical framework as the unconventional mixed methods approach to support their theories without being confined to a specific defined disciplinary methodology. I selected this theory because it allowed me to define my research processes based on real world issues from a qualitative perspective versus applying a methodologically pure process. In essence, it provided flexibility to develop a

credible position to defend using an interdisciplinary consideration that yielded credible results.

Applying an interdisciplinary approach to the United Nations problem set is both unique and principally unchartered. Newell (2008) highlighted how academia considered interdisciplinary studies an experimental discipline in the 1960s, which evolved into what many still considered a fad in the early 2000s. In 2008, Newell emphasized the importance of main stream academia's acceptance of interdisciplinary studies and its application to a more diverse research dogma. Currently, various academic institutions use Repko's (2012) book, *Interdisciplinary Research: Process and Theory*, as the foundation for interdisciplinary studies. As this discipline becomes more accepted into mainstream academia, its applications become more relevant in addressing many modern-day problem-sets.

Repko (2012) also highlighted the two prevalent forms of interdisciplinarity: Critical interdisciplinarity, which is society driven, and instrumental interdisciplinarity, which is problem driven. Repko emphasized that "instrumental interdisciplinarity is a pragmatic approach that focuses on research, borrowing, and practical problem solving in response to the external demands of society (location 1273)." The instrumental interdisciplinary philosophy supports considerations required to answer my research questions.

Creswell (2014) emphasized the diverse considerations and applications that the pragmatist approach enables the researcher to incorporate. Rossman and Wilson (1985) identified how the pragmatic approach enables the research to address the problem versus

establishing a structured methodology to answer the problem. The aforementioned analysis served as the basis for this research method. Other phenomenon considered and discarded were postpositivism, constructivism, and transformative.

Postpositivism (Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006) did not support this research because postpositivism represents structured methodologies associated with traditional applications. Postpositivism is typically well defined and more closely associated with quantitative research. It is based on a well-defined theory that the researcher can prove or disprove with their documented findings. The pure methodological quantitative approach could create additional gaps and seams and potentially adversely affect the reliability of the research because the topic would either have to be narrowed even further to be able to apply effective quantitative measures or it would be so broad as to preclude answering the base questions developed for this research topic.

Constructivism (Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006) is more closely associated with qualitative research, but the theory is developed based on observations or interactions associated with participants integrated into the study. The social interactions serve as the basis to support the developed theory. This research was not designed to observe the interactions of United Nations members or the committees but to identify if the committee interactions are effective in addressing their respective collaboration challenges that support reducing terrorism and human rights abuses.

Finally, the transformative (Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006) considerations expanded the constructivists theory by highlighting the underrepresented vulnerable populations who typically do not have a strong voice or representations to support their needs

socially, politically, or economically. Even though issues associated with some oppressed populations are discussed in this research, they are not the principal focal point; therefore, this would not be the best phenomenon to address the underlying problems or associated questions undertaken in my research.

As stated previously, first, I used previous discovered secondary data collected to serve as a base line to develop fact-finding thought-provoking questions for the selected participants. The documentary analysis consisted of anything written such as peer-reviewed articles, newspapers, and blogs that provide credible background to the current topic (see Rubin & Rubin, 2012). The interdisciplinary process is key because, as identified earlier, there is limited peer reviewed or other source documents that address both the increased terrorist activities and human rights violations and their interdependencies on each other.

Next, I elicited interviews from United Nations representatives to ask them key questions that answered my principle research questions. The United Nations, Non-Governmental Organizations, Think Tanks, and peer rated scholars each had distinct criteria to elicit interviews from members of their organization. Each were provided a preliminary request for requirements to request interviews with the caveat that specifics would follow after IRB approval (Appendix D). Most stated that they would consider the request once the specifics were provided. Additionally, no interviewing/data collection occurred until Walden University approved the submitted Institutional Review Board (Walden University, 2018). Walden's Institutional Review Board provided an optional preliminary review to ascertain if there were any potential complications or conflicts

pertaining to the interviewees. The initial feedback highlighted that the interview

population was non-vulnerable, and the data was non-sensitive. Once the designated

paperwork was submitted and approved, the next request was to submit participant

requests to the appropriate organizations previously identified.

There were multiple avenues for approving officials to review the request and

authorize the solicitation of participants for a face to face or telephonic interview. The

preliminary venues I used was email, telephone, and word of mouth inquiries. Once the

Walden IRB Committee officially approved the request, I asked the various organizations

(via email, face-to-face, and telephonically) to forward my request to specific individuals

or departments which I provided (from secondary data source research) which culminated

at 56 members who would be potentially amenable to participating in these interviews.

The reason for this number would be to account for people who initially committed but

could not meet the requirement due to scheduling or other conflicts and to validate the

saturation is not biased based on a single organizational point of view. As identified

earlier, based on the unique experience, exposure, and expertise these participants had, I

anticipated that at N=20 the responses would be consistently similar. Rubin and Rubin

(2012) identified that repetitive themes and responses are essential to reaching a

saturation point. Until the saturation point is attained, the research questions cannot be

satisfied. Attempting to complete research without reaching the saturation point,

adversely effects the research's credibility and reduces the researcher's trustworthiness in

their current and future research recommendations and results.

I used three distinct methodological techniques to satisfy my research requirements: First, I reviewed primary and secondary research pertaining to the perception of the influence of counterterrorist actions and humanitarian rights. Additionally, I explored professional venues that may provide considerations on the United Nations and its approach towards balancing counterterrorist efforts and human rights. I applied this research to understand the general perceptions and considerations towards counterterrorist actions and its impact on human rights. With this information, I conducted a comparative analysis (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2007) to determine if there was a correlation between the public opinion and perceptions and how the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee work together to mitigate contradictions between sovereign states counterterrorists actions and their human rights abuses. The cross-comparative analysis with a parallel sampling design (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2007) supported my ability to conduct a case analysis of the two committees to ascertain if their implemented collaboratives processes were interdisciplinary and effective in the war against terrorism and human rights violations associated with counterterrorism activities.

I used expert sampling which is a subset of the purposive sampling process (Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching, 2008) to obtain the initial participant pool sampling to conduct interviews. I discussed the process of obtaining the pool in the methodology section. I anticipated the potential of using snowball sampling (Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching, 2008) to obtain additional referrals who would

have the requisite United Nations' background and expertise. I conducted the same

process for identifying bloggers and authors identified in the methodology section.

Role of the Researcher

I had a participatory role as a researcher. As a researcher, I used secondary

literature to serve as the foundational tool that highlighted the interdisciplinary gaps

between the United Nations' Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations'

Human Rights Committee collaboration and execution of complimentary actions that

support their respective committees. Additionally, I planned to conduct face-to-face

interviews with United Nations members who could provide insight on how they interpret

the effectiveness of the relationships between the United Nations' Counterterrorism

Committee and the United Nations' Human Rights Committee. Furthermore, I pursued

telephonic interviews with current bloggers, researchers, and other subject matter experts

who could provide specific background information pertaining to their research (and

writings) and their respective positions as it applied to my research questions.

Furthermore, their considerations for a recommended way ahead was an essential

interdisciplinary consideration for suggested organizational social changes. These

individuals were selected based on their publications and noted expertise from their

public biographies. Rubin & Rubin (2012) emphasized the significance of establishing a

strong trusting relationship with individuals interviewed. It was vital that they

understood my role as a researcher throughout this process and that they trusted that any

information shared would be kept confidential and that their interests remained protected.

Having previously participated in international dialogues, the nuances, and delicacies of promoting and maintaining diplomatic ties and dialogue with multiple countries and committees within each country is essential for continued collaboration. With this basic understanding, I did not have any perceived biases pertaining to the United Nations' Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations' Human Rights Committee collaboration and working relationship in the fight against terrorism and defense against human rights violations. However, I stayed attuned to the perceptions or biases that an interviewee may have based on their respective experiences. This research served as a fact-finding process to determine if there is truly a valid gap in the communication processes between the United Nations' Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations' Human Rights Committee or is their methodology based on additional diplomatic socio-political considerations that are not apparent to an outsider. This validation of either consideration enabled me to provide additional discussion points for better collaboration as required while establishing better external understanding of the two United Nations committees' processes that influence their current communication/collaborative processes.

As discussed earlier, the sensitivities associated with diplomatic socio-political ideologies can have a profound impact on ethical considerations when conducting face-to-face and telephonic interviews. I presented my recommendation through the Institutional Review Board to ensure that the appropriate ethical release forms are reviewed and signed by the interviewees or recorded verbal consent was given in cases where concern was addressed for providing written signatures (Walden University,

2018). Members associated with the United Nations may have opinions counter to the

United Nations' party line. They may also share information that could be

counterproductive to the diplomatic process. Those who volunteered to participate in this

research were assured and felt comfortable that their anonymity would remain intact. I

assigned a coded designation for each participant that will be secured in a separate

location from the recorded interviews. Written notes only included the code designation

which ensured the utmost level of confidentiality is maintained. My biggest role as a

researcher is to protect the sanctity of the interview by preserving the integrity and

confidentiality of all participants without jeopardizing their standing within their

respective organizations or jeopardizing diplomatic processes (Walden University, 2018).

Methodology

Participant Selection Logic

There were multiple avenues for approving officials to review the request and

authorize the solicitation of participants for a face-to-face or telephonic interview. Once

the Walden IRB Committee officially approved the request (IRB # 12-04-18-0602601), I

asked the various organizations (via email, face-to-face, and telephonically) to provide a

sample pool (I provided specific names and departments, so the requests could be

forwarded through the respective agency) which would potentially culminate at 30 – 50

members who would be amenable to participating in these interviews. The reason for

this number would be to account for people who initially committed but could not meet

the requirement due to scheduling or other conflicts and to validate the saturation was not

biased based on a single organizational point of view. The United Nations, Non-

Governmental Organizations, Think Tanks, and peer rated scholars each had distinct

qualifications that I used to elicit interviews from members of their organization. As

identified earlier, based on the unique experience, exposure, and expertise these

participants would have, I anticipated that at N=20 the responses would be consistently

similar. Rubin and Rubin (2012) identified that repetitive themes and responses were

essential to reaching a saturation point. Until the saturation point was attained, the

research questions could not be satisfied. Attempting to complete research without

reaching the saturation point, adversely effects the research's credibility and reduces the

researcher's trustworthiness in their current and future research recommendations and

results.

Instrumentation

My interview questions complemented my research questions and helped provide

a repeatable interview process for future researchers. Interviews were digitally recorded

then transcribed for analysis and accuracy by using the digital transcription software

Otter. Participants were interviewed individually. Throughout the interviews and upon

multiple reviews of the interviews and documents, I incorporated a thematic content

analysis (Saldana, 2016). When coding the information, the thematic content analysis

process ensured that the information was consistent with the questions presented and the

information was defendable. I used pattern matching and cross-case synthesis to support

this analysis (Baxter & Jack, 2008). Both the face-to-face and telephonic interviews

consisted of open ended thought-provoking fact-finding questions that support my

principle research questions. I used the IPR framework associated with qualitative

interviewing (Castillo-Montoya, 2016), because it provided a "continuous, flexible, adaptive design" that supported obtaining a trustworthy assessment and analysis pertaining to the two identified United Nations' committees. The IPR framework process enabled me to establish a rapport with the interviewees, so the interview was free flowing versus scripted or perceived as confrontational. Furthermore, this process was essential to ensure that the proper alignment of the interview questions was consistent with the research questions and the process supports feedback to maintain the credibility and reliability of the analysis and subsequent results.

Baseline proposed interview questions were as follows:

1. Briefly describe your professional background and how it ties into expert knowledge pertaining to the United Nations?

2. Briefly describe your professional understanding of The United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees?

3. How many years have you been affiliated, worked with, or conducted research on matters involving the United Nations? Please explain.

4. What are your professional thoughts on the current relationship between The United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees and their ability to decrease global terrorist activities and humanitarian rights violations associated with terrorist/counterterrorist actions?

   a. From your professional expertise, please provide examples of effective collaborative venues The United Nations Counterterrorism and Human

Rights Committees have used to counter terrorism and humanitarian rights violations.

b. From your professional expertise, please provide examples of collaborative venues The United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees have used to counter terrorism and humanitarian rights violations that can be improved.

c. If you are not sure of the current collaborative efforts between the United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees, what would you like to see?

5. Do you think an interdisciplinary approach would help mitigate some of the current challenges between The United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees?

6. How do you think this approach would help / hinder committee actions and activities? (Will have information explaining the interdisciplinary approach that will be provided when soliciting participation and can be discussed further if there are questions).

7. Please provide any additional comments / considerations you have pertaining to collaborative efforts between The United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees that could influence terrorist activities and humanitarian rights violations.

8. Is there anyone you would like to recommend that I contact to participate in this process?

The first few questions were designed to establish the interviewee's credibility and experience associated with the United Nations and the respective committees influenced by the UN committees. The questions underscored if the interviewee's experience was because they are United Nations' members, Nongovernmental agencies effected by United Nations' activities, or they have done extensive research that qualified them as a subject matter expert to discuss particulars associated with the United Nations. The other questions were open-ended to provide the best venue to establish clear themes that would not be apparent with closed-ended questions. Additionally, the potential for follow-up questions provided venues to expound on an answer or clarify any questionable responses. It was also essential to provide the interviewee a complete summary of their interview and responses to ensure that nothing was misinterpreted since English may be many of the interviewees' second language. Finally, question eight was designed to promote snowball sampling because the initial interviewees could promote the research based on their interview experience.

Any secondary research that I used was peer reviewed, obtained from a reputable source (official news transcripts, resolutions, formal documents) or the author had some level of credentials that supported their expertise to answer any questions based on previous analysis and research versus purporting personal opinions.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

I conducted telephonic, email, and face-to face interview requests with agencies and individuals who best supported the expertise required for this research. Both the telephonic and face-to-face interviews were digitally recorded then transcribed for

analysis and accuracy using Otter software. I interviewed participants individually. Throughout the interviews and upon multiple reviews of the interviews and documents, I incorporated a thematic content analysis (Nowell, Norris, White, & Moules, 2017). Each interview consisted of seven open-ended questions which took less than an hour to answer. Additionally, all parties agreed to participate in follow-up questions if required to ensure that there was a clear understanding of the responses. This was essential because different countries may have a different interpretation of their responses even though the questions were asked and answered in English.

Potential participants were provided information addressing the proposed research, my role as a researcher, the objectives associated with the research, and the target audience desired. Because these participants understood the underpinnings associated with the United Nations, their responses weighed heavily on my assessment and conclusions. The participants also received the objectives associated with the research, my role as a researcher, the confidentiality agreement, and their rights as a participant. I used digital recordings and written notes to capture the information for accuracy. Finally, I pursued telephonic interviews with some of the current authors cited in my literature review to obtain additional information that addressed their respective positions addressing the collaboration opportunities/challenges between United Nations' counterterrorism and human rights committees in efforts associated with combatting terrorism. I solicited authors who have provided peer reviewed research within the past three years. These authors had email addresses, phone numbers, or blogs that enabled me to request an interview and provide them additional information pertaining to my

research project. No interviews or data collection occurred until Walden University

approved the IRB (Walden University, 2018). I used digital recordings and written notes

to capture the information for accuracy. Both the face-to-face interviews and telephonic

interviews consisted of scripts designed to be simple and straightforward to prevent

misinterpretations of the questions (Knupfer & McLellan, 2001). This was extremely

important to maintain the reliability and credibility of the information obtained. Using

these three methodologies provided an array of expertise and research knowledge which

created a greater validation and reliability process.

     The United Nations provided multiple esubscriptions from committee reports that

addressed policy issues pertaining to counterterrorism and human rights violations

affected by terrorists and counter terrorist activities. Nongovernmental organizations web

pages contained current trends and assessments that they have encountered in their focal

areas of interest. Even though the respondent pool of three (original goal was N=20) did

establish adequate saturation to support the current thesis, I conducted a content analysis

on the current policies, discussions, and relevant United Nations Press releases and NGO

reports and think tanks as an alternative approach to reinforce the research problem. The

purpose of this analysis was to identify patterns and challenges that prevented the two

committees from reducing terrorist activities or humanitarian rights violations. A

thorough review of recommendations, policy decisions, and voting practices based on a

three-year review of the committee reports and papers from NGO reports and think tanks

provided additional resources to answer the current research questions.

Participant transcripts were provided to each interviewee for validation and accuracy prior to implementing the findings in any formal analysis and final report   It was essential to provide the interviewee a complete summary of their interview and responses to ensure that nothing was misinterpreted since English may be many of the interviewees' second language. Avenues to recontact the interviewee were established to clarify information if required and to ensure that the interviewee was comfortable with the information captured during the interview.

Data Analysis Plan

I collected the data during telephonic or face-to-face interviews. I used eclectic coding as my primary coding methodology because it enabled me to integrate other coding methodologies in the analysis process. Initially, I translated the data as a thematic and exploratory (Saldana, 2016) tool while ensuring the information was credible to support the analytical aspects of the coding process. Finding the recurring themes when coding the information provided the foundation to conduct the in-depth analysis to develop credible results. Other coding methodologies that I considered integrating into my paper included descriptive coding which enabled the reader to visualize the problem set while following the process for clarity and reliability. Additionally, I used elaborative coding to build my research from previously developed sources. This coding process was validated once the formal interview occurred (Saldana, 2016) because the information remained consistent between the secondary information and the individuals interviewed. If any responses were not consistent with the recurring themes, it would have been highlighted in the final analysis to note that the aberration was considered.

Issues of Trustworthiness

The listed scholars throughout this section all credit Lincoln and Guba (1986) as the foundational leaders who highlighted four principle areas that are nonnegotiable in promoting trustworthiness in research. The four principle areas that I expounded on include credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. If any one element is missing in the research, it would put into question the legitimacy of the problem and analysis. If a researcher cannot obtain the respect of fellow scholars because of poor foundational practices, then future research becomes inconsequential in the scholar community (Lincoln & Guba, 1986).

Credibility

Credibility is the foundational core of this research paper. A key element supporting credibility is the transparency (reflexivity) used in the methodologies and data collected even when the data is not consisted with the anticipated outcome (Korstjens & Moser, 2018). The secondary data used was peer rated to ensure that additional experts had reviewed and supported the postulations highlighted. Peer reviewed data has already been accepted as credible; therefore, it added credence to establishing a compelling foundation. Interviewed United Nations members had clear United Nations procedural and process background to ensure that their responses can be replicated even if another researcher selected a different pool of United Nations participants. Any secondary research that I used was peer reviewed, obtained from a reputable source (official news transcripts, resolutions, formal documents) or the author had some level of credentials that supported their expertise to answer any questions based on previous analysis and

research versus purporting personal opinions. One of the survey questions was designed

to ensure that the interviewee expertise was captured and included in the final analysis.

Using these three data sources ensured that relevancy was preserved, rigor was

demonstrated, and saturation was obtained which validated and reinforced the research

credibility (Levitt, Bamberg, Crewell, Frost, Josselson, & Suarez-Orozco, 2018). I also

used the transformational approach (Ravitch & Carl, 2016) to support the research's

validity. This approach ensured that I maintained the research focus on the research

questions and supported recommendations for institutional changes if required. Again,

since the interdisciplinary aspects of this research are relatively unchartered, this

approach continued to support the interdisciplinary opportunities available for the United

Nations' counterterrorism and human rights committees. To maintain credibility in this

study the potential participants were directly or indirectly affiliated with the United

Nations, NGOs or experts who report on the United Nations activities in relation to

counterterrorism actions and human rights violations associated with counterterrorism, or

scholars who have researched United Nations policies associated with counterterrorism

actions and human rights violations associated with counterterrorism.

Triangulation (Billups, 2014) supported ensuring dependability and credibility

because I integrated multiple strategies, methodologies, and documentation to ensure that

there were no unnecessary gaps in the final analysis and considerations. Yin (2018)

highlighted six considerations that could be applied to triangulation: Documentation,

archival records, interviews, direct observation, physical observation, and physical

artifacts. This research focused on three of the six considerations: Documentation,

archival records, and interviews. The analysis of these three distinct sources provided repetitive and complementary evidence to support the questions identified.

Transferability

The selection process of archived materials used coupled with the process submitted during the Institutional Review Board process to interview people ensured that the process was transferable to comparable research versus a process that solely focused on replicating the current research (Nowell et al., 2017). Based on the unique population that I used for the research, it did not require many additional requirements because the population entailed actual United Nation Members or credible researchers who have extensive United Nations exposure. This is consistent with Lincoln and Guba's (1986) definition of thick description by validating the patterns of interview information to attain similar outcomes and responses. Detailed descriptions of United Nations methodologies used and steps they have taken to mitigate the challenges associated with their current collaborative processes provided supplementary areas for the reader to consider for complimentary research as well (UNICEF, 2014). The current selected participant pool were experts in terrorism and/or humanitarian rights. However, they were selected because they each had a unique perspective of how they envisioned the United Nations' counterterrorism and human rights committees' effectiveness in abating terrorists' activities or human rights abuses associated with counterterrorist activities. Their professional experiences provide venues for other researchers to broach more specific considerations in subsequent studies.

Dependability

Dependability ensured that the information that was gathered, correlated, coded and interpreted remained consistent with the research questions that served as the foundation of my paper:

A verifiable research methodology reinforced dependability because it served as the core tool to replicate, authenticate, and substantiate previous research (Billups, 2014).

Triangulation (Billups, 2014) supported ensuring dependability and credibility because I integrated multiple strategies, methodologies, and documentation to ensure that there were no unnecessary gaps in the final analysis and considerations. Yin (1999) highlighted six considerations that can be applied to triangulation: Documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observation, physical observation, and physical artifacts. This research focused on three of the six considerations: Documentation, archival records, and interviews. The analysis of these three distinct sources provided repetitive and complementary evidence to support the questions identified.

Confirmability

The process using competing resources and interviewing people who can approach the topic from varying viewpoints and perspectives negated a one-sided analysis. Using these competing resources demonstrated how triangulation enabled me to verify the researched information from multiple resources (Shenton, 2004). It provided the requisite checks and balance to demonstrate neutrality and accuracy (Shenton, 2004). Ravitch and Carl (2016) postulated that there could be biases associated with qualitative research regardless of one's intention to be neutral. Triangulation offset the biases that

the researcher or the interviewees may have injected in their responses because I had multiple sources supporting or disproving my premise.

Ethical Procedures

Preliminary IRB reviews indicated that this research is low risk based on the topic and the selected population identified for the interview process. Appendix E highlighted the forms submitted to the Institutional Review Board for approval to conduct interviews. Appendix E is the Ethics Self-Check which ensures that I understood my responsibility and remained compliant with the 40 ethical standards required for research studies.

As stated previously, ethical procedures were consistent with the institutional review board application. Critical ethical considerations for this paper included: ensuring all input remains anonymous; ensuring that information provided did not jeopardize anyone's livelihood; ensuring that information disclosed did not jeopardize diplomatic agreements or relationships; and ensuring that interviewee biases did not adversely influence the analysis and results (Castillo-Montoya, 2016).

Interviews were digitally recorded to maintain the information's accuracy. All digital recordings were transcribed with a computer transcription application, Otter and physically reviewed and validated for accuracy. All persons interviewed had the ability to withdraw from the process and have their information removed. Once I completed the formal analysis, I provided a draft of what I planned to publish to each participant to ensure that what I interpreted and wrote was consistent with the participant's comments. Adjustments were made as required. There was a code word process associated with participants names to maintain anonymity. All recordings and documentation will be

preserved in separate secure lock boxes as an independent resource for at least five years.

No information retained can be shared or distributed to other researchers without the

express written consent of the individuals' interviewed (Walden University, 2018). After

the mandated five-year period all information will be destroyed. Any paper documents

will be shredded, digital recordings erased, and any digital storage devices will be erased.

Summary

This chapter highlighted the research methodologies used to support this

qualitative case study which was designed to explore and compare the current gaps and

seams associated with the current siloed processes between the United Nations'

counterterrorism and human rights committees in efforts associated with combatting

terrorism and human rights violations associated with counterterrorism efforts. It also

addressed the key questions discussed at the beginning of this chapter.

This was a single case study that focused on the above questions. The case study

was researched from multiple viewpoints (Harrison, Birks, Franklin, and Mills, 2017).

Additionally, this chapter reemphasized the importance of ensuring the research was

credible, transferable, dependable, and confirmable. I implemented many strategies to

ensure the research was trustworthy and could be replicated under similar circumstances.

Appropriate coding techniques and considerations were essential in supporting results

that can be replicated and substantiated.

Finally, protecting the confidentiality of individuals interviewed was key.

Preserving the integrity of the research while protecting the individuals who agree to

support the research was paramount to a successful study. Preliminary IRB reviews

indicated that this research is low risk based on the select population identified for the interview process. Continuous involvement with the institutional review board was essential for a successful project. This ensured that the results can help influence future policy considerations within the United Nations.

Chapter 4 consists of a detailed descriptive report pertaining to the selected interviewees. Chapter 4 highlighted the interviewee background, provided a synopsis of their responses to the questions, and addressed any perceived biases the interviewees may have demonstrated. Next a thorough coding analysis process enabled me to determine the critical applications for this topic. Finally, I summarized the data and provided recommendations based on the in-depth analysis.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore and compare the current gaps and seams associated with the current siloed processes between the United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees in efforts associated with combatting terrorism and humanitarian rights violations associated with counterterrorism efforts. The principle questions that I researched were as follows:

RQ1: How do the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee collaborate and share information received to aid in the reduction of terrorists' activities and humanitarian rights violations associated with counterterrorist activities?

RQ2: How are their respective communication and collaboration processes similar/different?

Setting

There were no noted personal or organizational conditions that influenced participants or the interpretation of the results. After receiving approval from the Walden Institution Review Board, I submitted requests for interviews to eight departments within the United Nations, four NGOs, two think tanks, and 56 individuals whose writings and biographies seemed consistent with my research theme. I received three affirmative responses, 11 no responses, and the remaining organizations and individuals did not comment or respond at all even after follow-up attempts.

Even though the individuals I approached had written articles that indicated a keen awareness of the United Nations' influence in counterterrorism or human rights concerns, the people who responded no did not feel that they had the requisite expertise to support the interview. Because I was not getting feedback from emails and attempted phone calls, I went to New York City to attempt to conduct face-to-face meetings or obtain commitments for interviews from organizations who had New York City addresses on their websites. I subsequently discovered two primary NGOs with New York City addresses did not really exist in New York City except for a representative in an office space. The other NGO required permission to access and did not grant the permission.

Demographics

I ended up with three individuals who committed to an interview and used additional in-depth reference materials provided by the United Nations Library. The average experience level of the three interviewees working directly or indirectly with the United Nations was 18 years. To preserve the sanctity of their privacy, nominal information is provided regarding their specific occupation, assigned organization, sex, and affiliated countries. Interviewee 1 (1902516C) worked directly for the United Nations and supported committee requirements as necessary. They also served in their country's military prior to becoming a permanent United Nations member. They had an opportunity to support the United Nations in their military capacity as well. Their expertise provided unique insight about the nuances associated with collaboration and policy processes within the United Nations. The second interviewee (803516G) served

as a United Nation's military observer and at other times as a military member supporting

the United Nations in various capacities. The second interviewee also participated in

hostage negotiations activities involving a terrorist hijacker. They provided peripheral

insight of United Nations relationships, some implications of the processes used to

stabilize a hostage type situation, and the impact on different entities involved. The third

interviewee (0703516L) was a member of a prominent NGO that works closely with the

United Nations on human rights issues. The NGO interviewee had previously worked

directly with the United Nations. The third interviewee attended conferences and

meetings with committee members affiliated with human rights issues and was able to

provide experience from being on the outside as an NGO and on the inside as a UN staff

member. All three had a different perspective based on their experiences, but their

answers were consistent in their observations pertaining to collaborative processes.

Additionally, the secondary data offset/complemented the interviewees' observations

provided. The secondary data provided additional clarity but required extensive research

to understand the nuances associated with collaborative processes. I used 15 recent

secondary data sources from sources as follows: The Human Rights World Report, The

Institute for Economics and Peace, media releases from the United Nations Security

Council, General Assembly, Human Rights Council, and Couterterrorism Committee.

Additionally, the secondary data consisted of separate reports, briefs, and articles released

from the same United Nations entitities listed above.

Data Collection

I conducted one face-to-face interview with the United Nation representative, and I conducted two telephonic interviews with the remaining interviewees. I digitally recorded the interviews and used the transcription software Otter to transcribe the information. Each interview averaged approximately 30 minutes. Each participant was asked the same seven questions that addressed their experience, their involvement (direct and indirect with the United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees), and their observations pertaining to current collaborative processes within the annals of the United Nations. Each participant was provided a copy of their transcript for review so they could adjust as they deemed necessary. Additionally, they received a draft summary of Chapter 4, which afforded them the opportunity to see how their responses influenced the study. Once the complete study has been approved by Walden University, they will receive a complete copy of the study for their situational awareness.

Data Analysis

In order to conduct a thorough data analysis, I used the software Otter to record the three interviews. Otter has an artificial intelligence feature that enables it to transcribe information while recording. The interviews are private and not resourced to a third party. After the interviews, I manually listened to the recordings multiples times to correct any errors made because the system did not understand the conversation. I incorporated a thematic content analysis (see Ravitch & Carl, 2016) for coding. When coding the information, the thematic content analysis process ensured that the information was consistent with the questions presented and the information was

defendable. I used pattern matching and cross-case synthesis to support this analysis (see

Baxter & Jack, 2008) to establish common threads based on the interviewees' diverse

backgrounds and experiences that each participant addressed. Both the face-to-face and

telephonic interviews consisted of open ended thought-provoking fact-finding questions

that supported my principle research questions. I used the IPR framework associated

with qualitative interviewing (see Castillo-Montoya, 2016), because it provided a

continuous, flexible, adaptive design that supported obtaining a trustworthy assessment

and analysis pertaining to the two identified United Nations' committees. This process

enabled me to establish a rapport with the interviewees. The interviews were free flowing

versus being scripted or perceived as confrontational.

The use of the eclectic coding process as highlighted in Chapter 3 enabled me to

identify common patterns to develop themes. The similarities in the interviewees'

responses and the ability to support the themes through the secondary data resources

provided a means to triangulate the data, thus validating its credibility and transferability

for additional research. The charts in Appendix F highlight key comments and recurring

themes from both the interviews and the secondary data.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

As indicated earlier, the individuals interviewed averaged approximately 18 years

of experience either supporting the United Nations committees, working with members of

the United Nations Counterterrorism or Human Rights Committees to support specific

agendas, or supporting a nongovernmental agency who was affected by actions

influenced by the United Nations Counterterrorism and/or Human Rights committees.

Additionally, I used secondary data in the form of additional documented resolutions, committee meeting summaries, media reviews, information from the United Nations Journal, and other esubscriptions. Even though the three individuals came from different backgrounds and perspectives, their responses demonstrated that other researchers should be able to obtain similar results regardless of the affiliated organization(s) involved. Furthermore, the consistency of information reviewed from the additional secondary data reinforced the research questions, thus maintaining dependability and confirmability. The diversity of the interviewees backgrounds and the secondary data provided the requisite checks and balances to support the study's trustworthiness.

Results

The interviews and secondary data yielded three consistent themes as follows:

Theme 1: The Collaborative Process Is Multidisciplinary

The first theme highlighted that United Nations committees' network with multiple organizations and agencies: They tend to function in similar fashion, a multidisciplinary process. One interviewee summed UN committee interactions best when they noted, "The UN is good in networking inside its own organization, with a different unit, another department, but also with other NGOs… They have everywhere, somewhere, somebody, they know, they can discuss with..." The UN member stated,

> So, when I go to meeting and everyone's represented, right. So, anyone is able to be in that room and be participating in the process. However, at the member state levels they are very much seen as separate, because again, there are different constituencies and there's different mandates (190251C).

The NGO interviewee highlighted,

> There is obvious information exchange between the various governments, the UN,
> and the counterterrorism committee or the Security Council…there is a lot of
> overlap in terms of mandate …but I don't see how they are complementing or
> working in parallel with other like coordinating agencies. (0703516L)

One of two key examples from my secondary data review is represented by the process of information sharing adopted by the Counterterrorism Committee on March 11, 2013:

> Every two weeks, the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive
> Directorate (CTED) will transmit to the Chair of the Counter-Terrorism
> Committee the Overview of Implementation Assessment (OIA); Detailed
> Implementation Survey (DIS); cover letter; and follow-up table of visit
> recommendations table (if applicable). The Vice-Chair of the relevant
> subcommittee will circulate the aforementioned documents to sub-
> Committee members via the Committee's internal document tracker. The
> Vice-Chair will initiate a five-day silence procedure for approval of the
> OIA. (United Nations Security Council, 2013)

The second example from my secondary data related to my United Nations esubscription: After registering to receive information, I averaged three separate emails daily, which provided the calendar to all committee meetings, media briefings, and committee reviews and summaries. I was only receiving the unclassified information open to the public. Both the Human Rights Committee and Counterterrorism Committee

would receive additional classified or confidential information that they would be

responsible for reviewing daily. Even though there is a 5-day window to respond, there

is not a formal forum that allows face-to-face cross-talk or a venue to understand

alternative considerations that could have an impact on adverse activities in both arenas.

Additionally, other secondary sources documented highlighted leaders identifying

challenges with current collaborative processes and the need to integrate more

information and communication techniques (Appendix F).

Theme 2: Committee Members Are Talented and Experts in Their Areas of
Responsibility

The second consistent theme is that the individuals serving on these committees

are talented and experts in their areas of responsibility. This has direct implications on

my research questions. The analysis continued to support a multidisciplinary process

which is not effective in addressing and remedying the challenges within the two

committees. The members are experts in their area of expertise, but have difficulty

integrating information and ideas from different experts into their strategic considerations

for day to day operations. Furthermore, there is a protective climate where varying

experts are sensitive about the information shared with outside departments and experts

in different arenas (See Appendix F).

Theme 3: Limited Cross Talks and Tensions

The third consistent theme is there is limited cross talk and tensions between

different organizations. In some instances, they talk past each other versus appreciating

different perspectives used to address the same issue. An example shared by 0703516L

was, "I was attending an interesting conference…so they were trying to connect people

from UN and NGO headquarters on day one and people from the field on day two…two

completely different talks…it was like people did not understand each other."

These themes serve as the foundation that there is not an interdisciplinary process

that provides efficiencies that could potentially enable these two committees' alternative

venues to circumvent additional terrorist initiatives and reduce the member state abuses.

The 2019 Human Rights Watch World Report emphasized that even though the official

caliphate stronghold has been destroyed, terrorists' acts are fluid and spreading because

of technological communications successes. The report also highlighted an increase in

Member states governmental human rights abuses under the guise of counterterrorist

actions. Nongovernmental agencies are increasingly frustrated because they continue to

identify the disparities with government actions with no decrease in regional terrorist

activities or human rights abuses. Even recently in current world news (As of August

2019), there is consistent acknowledgment that terrorists' actions are indicating a

potential resurgence (see Appendix F).

This section addressed some potential reasons why the multidisciplinary process

has been the method employed versus an interdisciplinary process.   One of the

interviewees highlighted many internal nuances that have shaped the committees'

approach towards information sharing and the lack of appreciation for understanding

external considerations in their actions. A key distinction is that even though they are

called the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee, they are actually a peacekeeping

entity that can provide operational support to member states as requested (1902516C).

Member states execute counterterrorist activities while the United Nations supports from

a peacekeeping perspective. The United Nations Counterterrorism branch is restricted

from engaging in armed conflicts unless it is for self-defense (1902516C). Also, the

Human Rights Committee is governed by member states who have varied agendas and

positions derived from their independently defined definitions of terrorism (1902516C).

There seems to be an uneasiness to cross talk because the designated lanes of

responsibility require a delicate balance so external sources don't perceive that there is a

conflict of interest or a threat to a member states sovereignty. As indicated earlier, both

803516G and 0703516L highlighted the noted tensions they have seen directly and

indirectly. It seems that the culture of organizations and groups accept talking past each

other in an effort to stay in their designated lane. The consternation of crossing that

delicate line of responsibility has provided an opening that the terrorists continue to

exploit.

 As identified previously, even though there are numerous conferences and

meetings, different areas tend to talk past each other and there are noted tensions and

unrest amongst different factions. There is a hesitancy to share institutional knowledge

when a crisis does not exist. Also, there are cultural differences of opinion (based on the

organization or agency one is affiliated with) and sensitivities that also generates a

reluctance to share beyond the perceived "Need to know." Nevertheless, in times of

crisis, 803516G identified how varied organizations come to the table and they work

through their differences to mitigate the crisis in the shortest amount of time. This

analysis highlights that there is potential to cross lines of information, but currently the emphasis appears to be only if there is a crisis. Otherwise, different organizational bodies prefer to "protect" their activities and keep the information within their groups.

Many United Nations committees, nongovernmental organizations, and agencies have highlighted the need for better collaborative efforts amongst the organizations. However, the intrinsic desire to protect one's "brand" results in an impasse where little is accomplished. 0703516L shared that some departments display a level of arrogancy that generates resentment. In particular, resentment was apparent among those organizations and agencies who are in the field where they are seeing firsthand the impacts associated with the decisions or lack thereof by the United Nations. As mentioned earlier in this review, the atmosphere of talking past each other can create an environment where ideas are repressed, and solutions are missed.

I thought it was important to address some nuances and considerations that indirectly impact this research but can serve as a tool to provide remedies to improve the current collaborative processes between the United Nations Counterterrorism committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee. The specific insights of the interviewees helped to identify the current collaborative challenges from differing perspectives, situations, and exposure. The interviews also delved into the underpinnings that impact the cultures associated with these committees. The previous research, I explored highlighted the problems, but I did not find any sources that attempted to understand the internal considerations that influence their activities.

The interviews and secondary data reviewed were executed to answer two questions. A summary of the results accompanied each question. The first research question, "How do the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee collaborate and share information received to aid in the reduction of terrorists' activities and humanitarian rights violations associated with counterterrorist activities?" is mainly addressed in Theme 1. Data are shared in a multidisciplinary or coextensive process across multiple disciplines, agencies, and nongovernmental organizations. "Information is sent out through multiple designated communications channels with a five-day response period. If no one responds, the recommendations are considered accepted and the resolution passes (United Nations Human Rights Council, 2013)". There were nominal indicators that recommendations and correspondence are routinely challenged or defeated once presented. Also, there is a nuance associated with The United Nations Human Rights Committee which are governed by designated member states and the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee which is the operational arm managed through the Secretariat (19021516C).

The second research question was: How are their respective communication and collaboration processes similar /different?

Themes 2 and 3 demonstrate current communications and collaborative processes. Both the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and The United Nations Human Rights Committee use a multidisciplinary process where the information is disbursed to members and organizations as required, but there is nominal face-to-face interaction or cross-talk. The face-to-face forums consists of key members briefing the body with

limited opportunities for working groups. During the General Assembly 2019 International Day Event Maria Fernanda-Espinosa-Garces, General Assembly President highlighted the need for increased multilateralism to help resolve global challenges and contribute to mankind. She highlighted sharing ideas and working together was not a threat to any country's sovereignty (United Nations, 2019). Additionally, establishing a willingness to integrate external experts' information in department strategic analysis could streamline and provide multiple venues to mitigate current challenges associated with minimizing global terrorist threats.

Summary

In summary, my research validated that there is a parallel multidisciplinary collaborative process between the two committees. There does not appear to be an appreciation or understanding of the implications associated with not integrating a blended recommendation when resolutions are developed by either committee. Also, as identified earlier, there is an undercurrent that acquiescence to certain policies may threaten a member state's sovereign rights which could affect how they govern their respective country. Chapter five will address any perceived implications associated with this study, limitations of the research, and provide recommendations for future interdisciplinary collaborative processes.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to determine if the current collaborative practices between the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee have adversely impacted multiple areas within the global international communities, culminating in increased global terrorists' activities and human rights violations associated with counterterrorist activities.

Secondary data reports still emphasize the continued increase and expansion of terrorist activity even with the downfall of the caliphate and reduction in deaths associated with the caliphate. The data also revealed an expansion of government sponsored human rights violations based on member states independent definitions for terrorism. Even though these committees continue to highlight challenges and generate resolutions, there are no apparent venues to coalesce viewpoints and positions, so the resolutions could have a greater impact in these areas.

Interpretation of the Findings

I used the pragmatic paradigm theoretical framework with a focus on Bertalanffy's (1967) systems theory and Easton's (1957) political theory, specifically focusing on the descriptive exploratory design. Bertalanffy addressed the causal actions of a systems from a psychological angle – if this occurs then this should happen. However, when there are multiple variables that may influence the actions, then it becomes more difficult to predict the outcome. Bertalanffy broke down his system theory in two broad trends: the mechanismic and organismic trend. The mechanismic

trend is not applicable to this research as it pertains to the technological, industrial, and social considerations (1967). The organismic trend focuses on "multivariable interactions, organizations, wholeness, and growth to name a few" (1967). The objective is to develop a harmonized element that functions for the good of the whole. The United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee represent an organization with multivariable interactions. The challenge becomes establishing a formula within the organization that synchronizes efforts across each committee to generate results that positively influence the international community. Easton addressed from a political perspective that the that "each part of the political canvas does not stand alone but is related to each other part" (p. 383). From a political perspective Easton highlighted five essential elements that impacted the political system: (a) distinguish them from external areas, (b) establish boundaries for each area to understand, (c) the systems provides inputs and outputs that influence a society, (d) the system must have continuous inputs to function properly, and (e) the outputs enable the system (political organization) to assess its effectiveness in bettering society. When comparing this analysis to the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee, even though they have a foundation similar to Easton's philosophy, the complications and implications are as follows: Both committees have distinguished roles, they have designated boundaries, they provide inputs that have global influence, and they provide outputs and assessments. My research revealed that the committee boundaries seem to stymy the input, which affects the impact within the international communities. There are areas where the committees' boundaries must

overlap for effective integration and more impactful inputs and outputs. This research confirmed that there are collaboration disparities between the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and the United Nations Human Rights Committee. These disparities have a direct and indirect impact on global terrorist activities, human rights abuses associated with counterterrorist activities, and support activities led by NGOs, other agencies, and member states counterterrorist efforts. This analysis went beyond the peer reviewed literature used to support the research in that I attempted to identify some of the organizational background information that currently influences their multidisciplinary approach to collaboration.

Limitations of the Study

Even though I read over 40 current applicable writings that included 56 named authors and 14 distinct department and organizations, I could not obtain substantial support for interviews. The common thread was the organization, or the author did not feel they had the expertise to participate in an interview even though their writings supported my requirements. There was also an indicated concern about the delicate nature related to the United Nations activities associated with counterterrorism and human rights actions. Even though the three interviews conducted provided saturation for the questions presented, the impact associated with the collaboration challenges was unique. Other responses could have reinforced the current impact not only on the increased terrorist activities and humanitarian rights organizations but the impact on the organizations and individuals who are charged with supporting the United Nations efforts

to influence a positive change in countering terrorism and supporting human rights while countering terrorism.

Recommendations

Sharing this study with United Nations Departments, NGOs, and think tanks may influence readers to be willing to participate in future research to support policy changes that create a fluid environment where agencies understand more nuances within each other's organizations and integrate melded Subject Matter Expert (SME) considerations in future UN resolutions and recommendations. This may help integrate better awareness to support increased information sharing that could reduce the terrorist's ability to slip through the cracks. It could also create better member state accountability associated with human rights abuses related to state sponsored counterterrorist efforts. Additionally, an emerging framework that could be applied to future research is the complex adaptive system framework (see Innes & Booher, 1999). The complex adaptive system framework is an interdisciplinary process that focuses on consensus building, on empathy, on better appreciation for external experts' concerns (which decreases suppressed recommendations), and on a fluidity that reduces current bureaucracies as they attempt to tackle the uncertainties and challenges associated with global terrorism (Innes & Booher, 1999).

Implications

All three interviewees agreed independently that some levels of interdisciplinary incorporation could not only increase efficiencies but could serve as a venue to enhance options that could be implemented to positively reduce terrorism and human rights

violations by the member states. As one of the interviewees highlighted, "You need to be able to consider the interdisciplinary approach to be a card you play by judiciously…You basically work out where it's going to work - you use it there" Also, as I indicated in the recommendations section, if the United Nations as a whole would consider adjusting their model to a complex adaptive system framework in some areas -- where policy is developed by interactive consensus building versus accepting no response as an approval, then it would promote more enforceable actions for member states who currently take advantage of the loopholes in the system. Consensus building requires more interactions and responses, which creates a venue where member states are more accountable in the process and the resolution enforcements.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the current multidisciplinary collaborative process used by the United Nations Counterterrorism Committee and Human Rights Committee has potentially created unforeseen inefficiencies that enable terrorist activities to continue to adapt while reinforcing their terrorist message. Strategically integrating an interdisciplinary collaborative process within both committees could expand each committee's awareness and efficiency in specified areas while positively reducing terrorist activities and human rights violations. Developing an appreciation, understanding beyond one's individual expertise and melding expert considerations is the basis of the interdisciplinary process that can positively effect social change for a more stable international forum.

References

Akhtar, D. M. I. (2016). Research design. *Research in Social Science: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. New Delhi, India. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2862445.

Ali, N. (2013). Between a rock and a hard place: Treaty-based settlement of terrorism - related disputes in the era of active United Nations Security Council involvement. *Erasmus Law Review*, *6*(2), 79-92.

Amnesty International. (2017). *Amnesty International Report 2016/17, Nigeria*. Retrieved from https://www.amnesty.org/en/africa/nigeria.

Azarian, R. (2011). Potentials and limitations of comparative method in social science. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *1*(4), 113-125.

Bachmann, S.-D., & Kemp, G. (2012). Aggression as "organized hypocrisy?" – How the war on terrorism and hybrid threats challenge the Nuremberg legacy. *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice*, *30*(1), 233–252. ADD MISSING DOI

Bamgboye, A. (2015,). Court frees police "killers" of Boko Haram. *Daily Trust*. Retrieved from https://www.dailytrust.com.

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, *13*(4), 544-559

Billups, F. (2014). The quest for rigor in qualitative studies: Strategies for institutional researchers. *The NERA Researcher*, *52*(1), 1–5

Bird, J. (2015). NATO's Role in Counter-Terrorism. *Perspectives on Terrorism, 9*(2), 61-70. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/26297360 Blanchard, C. M., Humud, C. E., & Nikitin, M. B. D. (2015). Armed conflict in Syria: Overview and U.S.

response. *International Journal of Terrorism & Political Hot Spots*, *10*(4), 385–416.

Braber, I. (2016). The thorny nature of a terrorism definition in international law. *IUP Journal of International Relations*, *10*(1), 40–55.

Bracknell, B. (2016). NATO approaches in response to ISIL and international terrorism. *International Lawyer*, *49*(3), 417–426.

Cameron, R. (2011). Mixed methods research: The five Ps framework. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*,*9*(2), 97-106.

Castillo-Montoya, M. (2016). Preparing for interview research: The interview protocol refinement framework. *The Qualitative Report*, *21*(5), 811–831.

Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching. (2008). Qualitative sampling methods - Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching. https://cirt.gcu.edu/research/developmentresources/research_ready/qualitative/sampling

Collier, D. (1993). The comparative method. *Political Science: The State of Discipline II, Ada W. Finifter, ed., American Political Science Association*. 105-117. .

Creswell, J. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Kindle Edition.

Easton, D. (1957). An approach to the analysis of political systems, *World Politics*, *9*(3), 383-400.

Feinberg, M. (2015). International counterterrorism – national security and human rights: conflicts of norms or checks and balances? *International Journal of Human Rights* *19*(4), 388–407. https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2015.1027053

Flynn, E. J. (2007). The Security Council's Counter-Terrorism Committee and Human Rights. *Human Rights Law Review*, *7*(2), 371–384. https://doi.org/10.1093/hrlr/ngm009

Foot, R. (2007). The United Nations, Counter-Terrorism and Human Rights: Institutional adaptation and embedded ideas. *Human Rights Quarterly*, *29*(2) 489-514. https://doi.org/10.1353/hrq.2007.0018

Frank, M. C. (2015). Conjuring up the next attack: The future-orientedness of terror and the counterterrorist imagination. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, *8*(1), 90-109.

Gray, W., Duhl, F., & Rizzo, N. (1969). History and development of general systems theory J&A Churchill Ltd., London

Hamid, A. G., & Sein, K. M. (2015). Combating terrorism and the use of force against a state: A relook at the contemporary world order. *Journal of East Asia and International Law*, *8*, 107 - 131. https://doi.org/10.14330/jeail.2015.8.1.05

Harrison, H., Birks, M., Franklin, R., & Mills, J. (2017). Case study research: Foundations and methodological orientations. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 18*(1), 1-17.. https://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-18.1.2655

Hug, S. (2016). Dealing with human rights in international organizations. *Journal of Human Rights*, *15*(1), 21–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/14754835.2015.1032224

Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. (1999). Consensus building and complex adaptive systems: A framework for evaluating collaborative planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, *65*(4), 412 - 423. doi:10.1080/01944369908976071

Institute For Economics and Peace. (2018). Global-Terrorism-Index-2018. *Measuring the Impact of Terrorism*. Retrieved from http://visionofhumanity.org/app/uploads/2018/12/Global-Terrorism-Index-2018-1.pdf

Institute For Economics and Peace. (2015). Global-Terrorism-Index-2015. *E National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism*, (3). Retrieved from http://economicsandpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Global-Terrorism-Index-2015.pdf

Jasper, S., & Moreland, S. (2016). ISIS: An adaptive hybrid threat in transition. *Small Wars Journal*, *12*(10).

Kean, T., & Hamilton, L. (2004). *The 9/11 Commission Report*. The United States Congress: The United States Congress. Retrieved from https://www.9-11commission.gov/report/

Kfir, I. (2009). The United Nations and the Challenge of Combating International Terrorism. *Legal Aspects of Combating Terrorism*, *47*(1), 23–35.

Knupfer, N., & McLellan, H. (2001). Descriptive Research Methodologies. Retrieved from http://members.aect.org/edtech/ed1/41/index.html

Kohlbacher, F. (2006). The Use of Qualitative Content Analysis in Case Study Research. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *7*(1). Retrieved from http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/75

Korstjens, I., & Moser, A. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 4: Trustworthiness and publishing. *The European Journal of General Practice*, *24*(1), 120–124. https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375092

Laerd Dissertation (n.d.). Purposive Sampling. Retrieved May 6, 2017 from http://dissertation.laerd.com/purposive-sampling.php\

Landis, J., & Simon, S. (2016). Assad Has It His Way. *Foreign Affairs*. Retrieved from https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/syria/2016-01-19/assad-has-it-his-way

Lapkin, T. (2004). Does Human Rights Law Apply to Terrorists? *Middle East Quarterly*. Retrieved from http://www.meforum.org/651/does-human-rights-law-apply-to-terrorists

Laub, Z. (2016). The Islamic State. Retrieved December 2, 2017, from https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/islamic-state

Levitt, H. M., Bamberg, M., Creswell, J. W., Frost, D. M., Josselson, R., & Suárez-Orozco, C. (2018). Journal article reporting standards for qualitative primary, qualitative meta-analytic, and mixed methods research in psychology: The APA Publications and Communications Board task force report. *American Psychologist*, *73*(1), 26–46. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000151

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. E. (1986). Research, Evaluation, And Policy Analysis: Heuristics For Disciplined Inquiry. *Review of Policy Research*, *5*(3), 546–565.

Mack, N., Woodsong, C., Macqueen, K. M., Guest, G., & Namey, E. (2005). *Qualitative Research Methods: A Data Collector's Field Guide*. Family Health International. Retrieved from http://www.fhi.org

Mackenzie, N., & Knipe, S. (2006). Research dilemmas: Paradigms, methods and methodology. *Issues In Educational Research*, *16*(2), 193–205.

Martins, B. (2016). The political-legal nexus in EU counter-terrorism: an assessment of the two-track influences between the EU and the UN. *European Politics and Society*, *17*(2), 181–195. https://doi.org/10.1080/23745118.2016.1120995

McKinney, E. (2016, June 2). Don't Bend the Law to Fight Terror in Nigeria. *The National Interest*, 3.

McNerney, M. J., Blank, J., Wasser, B., Boback, J., & Stephenson, A. (2017). *Improving implementation of the Department of Defense Leahy law*. Santa Monica, Calif: RAND Corporation. Retrieved from https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR1700/RR1737/RAND_RR1737.pdf

Miller, E. (1971). David Easton's Political Theory. *The Political Science Reviewer*, *1*, 184.

Monar, J. (2015). The EU as an International Counter-terrorism Actor: Progress and Constraints. *Intelligence & National Security*, *30*(2/3), 333–356. https://doi.org/10.1080/02684527.2014.988448

Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification Strategies for Establishing Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research.

International Journal of Qualitative Methods, *1*(2). Retrieved from

http://www.ualberta.ca/~ijqm

Murphy, C. (2015). Transnational counter-terrorism law: law, power and legitimacy in

the 'wars on terror.' *Transnational Legal Theory*, *6*(1), 31–54.

https://doi.org/10.1080/20414005.2015.1042229

Newell, W. (2008). The Intertwined History of Interdisciplinary Undergraduate

Education and the Association for Integrative Studies: *Issues In Integrative*

Studies, *26*, 1–59.

Nissenbaum, D. (2016). Turkey's Shelling of Kurds in Syria Will Continue, Erdogan

Says. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from http://www.wsj.com/articles/turkeys-

shelling-of-kurds-in-syria-will-continue-erdogan-says-1455725107

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (2017). What is NATO? Retrieved December 30,

2017, from http://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/index.html

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis:

Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative*

Methods, *16*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). (1993).

World conference of human rights - Vienna, 1993 - OHCHR 20 Years. Retrieved

November 25, 2017, from http://at20.ohchr.org/conference.html

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). (2017).

Human Rights Council. Retrieved from

http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/RegularSessions/Session34/Document s/HRC_booklet_En.pdf

Onwuegbuzie, A., & Leech, N. (2007). Sampling Designs in Qualitative Research: Making the Sampling Process More Public. *The Qualitative Report*, *12*(2). Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol12/iss2/7

Ravitch, S., & Carl, N. (2016). *Qualitative Research: Bridging the Conceptual, Theoretical, and Methodological* (Kindle Edition). Sage Publications.

Repko, A. (2013). *Interdisciplinary Research: Process and Theory*. The University of Texas at Arlington. (Kindle Edition). Sage Publications.

Rocha, S. (2015). *Folk Phenomenology: Education, Study, and the Human Person*. Pickwick Publications.

Rossman, G., & Wilson, B. (1985). Numbers and words: combining quantitative and qualitative methods in a single large-scale evaluation study. Sage Publications, Inc., *9*(5).

Rubin, H., & Rubin, I. (2012). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data Third Edition* (Kindle Edition). Sage Publication, Inc.

Saldana, J. (2016). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers* (Kindle Edition). SAGE Publications Ltd.

Sampathkumar, M. (2017). Nine members of the UN Human Rights Council accused of violating human rights. *Independent*.

Samuel. (2017). Judges 18. In *The Holy Bible, King James Version* (Kindle Edition). The Holy Bible, King James Version.

Schutt, Russell K.. Investigating the Social World (p. 648). (Kindle Edition). Sage
Publications.

Shenton, A. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research
projects. *Education for Information*, *22*, 63–75.

Sivakumaran, S. (2017). Beyond States and Non-State Actors: The Role of State-
Empowered Entities in the Making and Shaping of International Law. *Columbia
Journal of Transnational Law*. Retrieved from http://jtl.columbia.edu/wp-
content/uploads/sites/4/2017/05/Sivakumaran_55-CJTL-343.pdf

Smith, M. K. (2012). Paulo Freire: dialogue, praxis and education. Retrieved December
22, 2017, from http://infed.org/mobi/paulo-freire-dialogue-praxis-and-education/

Sofaer, A. D. (2014). Preventive War Can Be Justified by Adhering to Strict International
Legal Standards. *War*. Retrieved from link.galegroup.com/
apps/doc/EJ3010237271/OVIC?u=minn4020&xid=e9073754.

Statewatch. (2002). US letter from Bush to EU, 16.10.01. *Statewatch*, *4*(2). Retrieved
from http://www.statewatch.org/analyses.htm

Stone, M., Zargham, M., & Maler, S. (2017). Pentagon notified U.S. Congress of $593
million military sale to Nigeria. *Reuters*. Retrieved from
https://www.reuters.com/article/us-nigeria-usa-aircraft/pentagon-notified-u-s-
congress-of-593-million-military-sale-to-nigeria-idUSKCN1BA306

Surbhi, S. (2019). *Difference Between Exploratory and Descriptive Research (with
Comparison Chart) - Key Differences*. Retrieved from:

https://keydifferences.com/difference-between-exploratory-and-descriptive-
research.html

Sutton, J., & Austin, Z. (2015). Qualitative Research: Data Collection, Analysis, and
Management. The Canadian journal of hospital pharmacy, 68(3), 226–231.
doi:10.4212/cjhp.v68i3.1456

Sweeny, J. (2014). Indefinite Detention and Antiterrorism Laws: Balancing Security and
Human Rights. *Pace Law Review*, *34*(3). Retrieved from
http://digitalcommons.pace.edu/plr/vol34/iss3/6

Szénási, L. C. E. (2016) An unnecessary conflict: Turkish downing of Russian military
aircraft. *Defence*, 158.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2009). *Foundations of Mixed Methods Research*. (Kindle
Edition). Sage Publications.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and
Behavioural Research*. Sage.

Tseng, V., & Seidman, E. (2007). *A systems framework for understanding social settings*
(Vol. 39). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-007-9101-8

UNICEF. (2014). Case Study Guidance and Template. *Peacebuilding, Education and
Advocacy*. Retrieved from http://www.dmeforpeace.org/educateforpeace/wp-
content/uploads/2014/06/061714_Case-Studies-Guidance-and-
Template_PBEA.pdf

United Nations. (2015). Charter of the United Nations. Retrieved from
http://www.un.org/en/charter-united-nations/index.html

United Nations. (2015). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Retrieved from

      http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/index.html

United Nations. (2017). United Nations Security Council Resolutions adopted by the

      Security Council since 1946. Retrieved from

      http://www.un.org/en/sc/documents/resolutions/

United Nations. (2019). *Speakers Call for Reinvigorated Multilateralism, Stronger*

      Diplomacy to Address Global Crises, as General Assembly Marks International

      Day | Meetings Coverage and Press Releases. Retrieved from

      https://www.un.org/press/en/2019/ga12140.doc.htm.

United Nations Human Rights Committee. (2017). OHCHR | Brief history. Retrieved

      from http://www.ohchr.org/EN/AboutUs/Pages/BriefHistory.aspx

United Nations Human Rights Council. (2013). *National Report Submitted In*

      Accordance With Paragraph 5 Of The Annex To Human Rights Council

      Resolution 16/21 : [Universal Periodic Review]: Nigeria. United Nations General

      Assembly   Seventeenth Session. Retrieved from https://documents-dds-

      ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G13/160/00/pdf/G1316000.pdf?OpenElement

United Nations Human Rights Council. (2015). *National Report Submitted In*

      Accordance With Paragraph 5 Of The Annex To Human Rights Council

      Resolution 16/21 : [Universal Periodic Review]: United States of America. United

      Nations General Assembly   Twenty-second Session. Retrieved from

      https://documents-dds-

      ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G15/024/66/PDF/G1502466.pdf?OpenElement

United Nations Security Council. (2001). United Nations Security Council Resolution

    1373 (2001) Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts 28

    September 2001. United Nations Security Council. Retrieved from

    http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1373(2001)

United Nations Security Council. (2004). United Nations Resolution Security Council

    1535-2004- Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts.

    Retrieved from

    http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1535(2004)

United Nations Security Council. (2005). United Nations Security Council Resolution

    1624(2005). Retrieved from

    http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1624(2005)

United Nations Security Council. (2013). Revised procedures for the Counter-Terrorism

    Committee's stocktaking of Member States' implementation of Security Council

    resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005). Retrieved from

    https://www.un.org/sc/ctc/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/2013-03-11-

    stocktaking_revised_procedures.pdf

United Nations Security Council. (2017). Human rights. Retrieved from

    https://www.un.org/sc/ctc/focus-areas/human-rights/

United States Department of State. (2016). Country Reports on Human Rights Practices.

    Retrieved from https://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/hrrpt/2015/index.htm

United States Department of State. (2017). Country Reports on Terrorism 2016.

    Retrieved from http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/crt/2016/index.htm

Valentinov, V., & Chatalova, L. (2016). Institutional Economics and Social Dilemmas: a Systems Theory Perspective: Institutional Economics. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, *33*(1), 138–149. https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2327

Varhola, L., & Sheperd, T. (2013). Africa and the United States—A Military Perspective. *American Foreign Policy Interests*, *35*, 325–332. https://doi.org/10.1080/10803920.2013.855546

Vennesson, P. (2008). Case Studies And Process Tracing: Theories And Practices. In D. Della Porta & M. Keating (Eds.), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences* (pp. 223–239). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801938.013

Vitiello, C. (2015). The U.S. Response to the Universal Periodic Review Recommendations. *Human Rights Brief*, *22*(2), 9–10.

Von Bertalanffy, L. (1967). General systems theory and psychiatry an overview. In General Systems Theory and Psychiatry, 32(4), 33-46

Walden University. (2018). Dissertation Guidebook. Walden University.

Williams, I. (2016). Too Little, Too Late? "Responsibility to Protect" In Syria and Iraq. *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, *35*(1), 32–33.

Yin, R. K. (1999). Enhancing The Quality Of Case Studies In Health Services Research. *Health Services Research*, *34*(5 Pt 2), 1209–1224.

Appendix A: Result List Key Phrases

		Journals Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	
S18	anti-terrorism bills by country	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	0
S17	International law AND terrorism	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	1,113
S16	United Nations counterterrorism committee	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	0
S15	United Nations counterterrorism committee	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231 Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	1
S14	Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231 Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	8
S13	Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	0
S12	Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	0
S11	united nations Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	0
S10	united nations human rights council	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen -	231

EBSCO Research
HOST Databases

Search ID#	Search Terms	Search Options	Last Run Via	Results
S27	terrorism prevention	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	2,359
S26	United Nations terrorism prevention	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	0
S25	United Nations terrorism prevention	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	0
S24	United Nations terrorism prevention	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	0
S23	counterterrorism	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	4,901
S22	anti-terrorism AND humanitarian rights	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	2
S21	anti-terrorism AND humanitarian rights	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231 Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	2
S20	anti-terrorism bills	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231 Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects Search modes - Boolean/Phrase	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen - Advanced Search Database - @ Walden University Library	119
S19	anti-terrorism bills	Limiters - Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly	Interface - EBSCO Discovery Service	3

		Expanders – Apply equivalent subjects Search modes – Boolean/Phrase	Advanced Search Database – @ Walden University Library	
S9	United Nations Human rights committee	Limiters – Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders – Apply equivalent subjects Search modes – Boolean/Phrase	Interface – EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen – Advanced Search Database – @ Walden University Library	86
S8	United Nations AND counterterrorism committee	Limiters – Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders – Apply equivalent subjects Search modes – Boolean/Phrase	Interface – EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen – Advanced Search Database – @ Walden University Library	0
S7	United Nations counterterrorism committee	Limiters – Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders – Apply equivalent subjects Search modes – Boolean/Phrase	Interface – EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen – Advanced Search Database – @ Walden University Library	0
S6	United Nations AND counterterrorism	Limiters – Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders – Apply equivalent subjects Search modes – Boolean/Phrase	Interface – EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen – Advanced Search Database – @ Walden University Library	161
S5	United Nations AND Human Rights	Limiters – Full Text; Publication Date: 20150101-20171231; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders – Apply equivalent subjects Search modes – Boolean/Phrase	Interface – EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen – Advanced Search Database – @ Walden University Library	3,935
S4	United Nations AND Human Rights	Limiters – Full Text Expanders – Apply equivalent subjects Search modes – Boolean/Phrase	Interface – EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen – Advanced Search Database – @ Walden University Library	61,290
S3	United Nations AND Human Rights	Limiters – Full Text; Peer Reviewed Scholarly Journals Expanders – Apply equivalent subjects Search modes – Boolean/Phrase	Interface – EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen – Advanced Search Database – @ Walden University Library	22,179
S2	United Nations AND Terrorism AND Hybrid Threat	Limiters – Full Text Expanders – Apply equivalent subjects Search modes – Boolean/Phrase	Interface – EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen – Advanced Search Database – @ Walden University Library	3
S1	United Nations + Terrorism + Hybrid Threats	Limiters – Full Text Expanders – Apply equivalent subjects Search modes – Boolean/Phrase	Interface – EBSCO Discovery Service Search Screen – Advanced Search Database – @ Walden University Library	0

Appendix B: UN Resolutions- Background

KEY UNITED NATIONS' RESOLUTIONS / BACKGROUND INFORMATION

UN RESOLUTION	DATE APPROVED	SUMMARY
General Assembly Resolution 3034(1972)	19721218 1972 DEC 18	Measures to prevent international terrorism which endangers or takes innocent human lives or jeopardizes fundamental freedoms, and study of the underlying causes of those forms of terrorism and acts of violence which lie in misery, frustration, grievance and despair and which cause some people to sacrifice human lives, including their own, in an attempt to effect radical changes
General Assembly Resolution 48/141	19940107 07 JAN 1994	High Commissioner for the promotion and protection of all human rights. Decides that the **High Commissioner for Human Rights shall be the United Nations official with principal responsibility for United Nations human rights activities** under the direction and authority of the Secretary-General; within the framework of the overall competence, authority and decisions of the General Assembly
General Assembly Resolution 60/251	20060315 15 MAR 2006	The **Human Rights Council** is an inter-governmental body within the United Nations system made up of 47 States **responsible for the promotion and protection of all human rights around the globe**. The Council is made up of 47 United Nations Member States which are elected by the UN General Assembly. The Human Rights Council replaced the former United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

UN RESOLUTION	DATE APPROVED	SUMMARY
Security Council Resolution 1535(2004)	20040326 26 MAR 2004	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts. Under resolution 1535 (2004), th**e Security Council established the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED)** to assist the work of the CTC and coordinate the process of monitoring the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). CTED comprises some 40 staff members, about half of whom are legal experts who analyze the reports submitted by States in areas such as legislative drafting, the financing of terrorism, border and customs controls, police and law enforcement, refugee and migration law, arms trafficking and maritime and transportation security. CTED also has a senior human rights officer
Security Council Resolution 2178(2014)	20140924 24 SEP 2014	More recently, the Council has underscored that effective counter-terrorism measures and respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law are complementary and mutually reinforcing and constitute an essential part of successful counter-terrorism efforts. In its resolution 2178 (2014), the Council stated that failure to comply with these and other international obligations, including under the Charter of the United Nations, fosters a sense of impunity and is one of the factors contributing to increased radicalization. Requests **the Counter-Terrorism Committee**, within its existing mandate and with the support of CTED, to **identify principal gaps in Member States' capacities to implement Security Council resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005)**. Expressing concern that international networks have been established by terrorists and terrorist entities among States of origin, transit and destination through which foreign terrorist fighters and the resources to support them have been channeled back and forth,

UN RESOLUTION	DATE APPROVED	SUMMARY
Security Council Resolution 1373(2001)	20010928 28 SEP 2001	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts. Decides that all States shall: (a) **Prevent and suppress the financing of terrorist acts**; (b) Criminalize the willful provision or collection; (c) Freeze without delay funds and other financial assets or economic resources of persons who commit, or attempt to commit, terrorist acts
Security Council Resolution 1455(2003)	20030117 17 JAN 2003	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts. Stresses to all Member States the importance of submitting to the Committee the names and identifying information, to the extent possible, of and about members of the Al-Qaida organization and the Taliban and other individuals, groups, undertakings and entities associated with them so that the Committee can consider adding new names and details to its list, unless to do so would compromise investigations or enforcement actions
Security Council Resolution 1456 (2003)	20030120 20 JAN 2003	Beginning with its adoption of resolution 1456 (2003), {Citation} **the Security Council has consistently affirmed that States must ensure that any measures taken to counter terrorism comply with all their obligations under international law, in international human rights, refugee, and international humanitarian law**. The Counter-Terrorism Committee must intensify its efforts to promote the implementation by Member States of all aspects of resolution 1373 (2001). States should assist each other to improve their capacity to prevent and fight terrorism, and notes that such cooperation will help facilitate the full and timely implementation of resolution 1373 (2001)

UN RESOLUTION	DATE APPROVED	SUMMARY
Security Council Resolution 1624(2005)	20050914 14 SEP 2005	Threats to international peace and security (Security Council Summit 2005). The following year, the Security Council adopted resolution 1624(2005) on 14 September 2005 (Manuel, n.d.-b). Despite the earlier resolution, terrorist activities continued to flourish. This resolution **discouraged member states from allowing terrorists to take refuge in their countries** and it continued to promote international dialogue to better understand how each nation state defined terrorism.
Security Council Resolution 1805(2008)	20080320 20 MAR 2008	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts. The Working Group's main objectives are to **Enhance expertise and develop common approaches by CTED staff on human rights issues**, as well as to consider ways in which the Committee might more effectively encourage Member States to comply with their international obligations in this area.
Security Council Resolution 2129(2013)	20131217 17 DEC 2013	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts. The Council **encourages CTED to further develop its activities in the areas of human rights and rule of law**, "to ensure that all issues relevant to the implementation of resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005) are addressed consistently and even
Security Council Resolution 2249(2015)	20151120 20 NOV 2015	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts. **Urges Member States to intensify their efforts to stem the flow of foreign terrorist fighters** to Iraq and Syria and to prevent and suppress the financing of terrorism and urges all Member States to continue to fully implement the above-mentioned resolutions. Invoking compliance with international law related to international human rights, refugee, and humanitarian law, without spelling out what the law is.

UN RESOLUTION	DATE APPROVED	SUMMARY
Security Council Resolution 2370(2017)	20170802 2 AUG 2017	Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts - Preventing terrorists from acquiring weapons. **Directs the Counter Terrorism Committee (CTC), with the support of the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED) to continue** as appropriate, within their respective mandates, t**o examine Member States efforts to eliminate the supply of weapons to terrorists**, as relevant to the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) with the aim of identifying good practices, gaps and vulnerabilities in this field.
Security Council Resolution 375(2017)	20170428 28 APR 2017	The Counter-Terrorism Committee proposes that the comprehensive international framework to counter terrorist narratives called for in S/PRST/2016/6 consist of three core elements: legal and law enforcement measures in accordance with obligations under international law, including international human rights law, and relevant Security Council resolutions and in furtherance of General Assembly resolutions; public-private partnerships; and the development of counter-narratives.
The Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action (VDPA)	19930625 25 JUN 1993	The World Conference on Human Rights reaffirms the solemn commitment of all States to fulfil their obligations to promote **universal respect for, and observance and protection of, all human rights** and fundamental freedoms for all in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, other instruments relating to human rights, and international law. The universal nature of these rights and freedoms is beyond question.

UN RESOLUTION	DATE APPROVED	SUMMARY
United Nations Commission on Human Rights (UNCHR) Committee		The Council's Universal Periodic Review (hereinafter UPR) is a unique process which involves a review of the human rights records of all 193 UN Member States once every four and a half years. The UPR is one of the most innovative and powerful achievements of the Human Rights Council designed to ensure equal treatment for every country when their human rights situations are assessed. It provides the opportunity for each State to declare what actions they have taken to improve the human rights situation in their countries and to fulfil their human rights obligations, as well as the challenges and constraints they are facing in so doing. Since the UPR began functioning in 2008, there has been 100% participation by all 193 UN Member States who have had their human rights records reviewed twice, with the third UPR cycle commencing in 2017.
UN Charter Chapter VII ART 51	200706	*("Chapter VII," 2015)* ___Article 51Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.___ *Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security ("Charter of the United Nations," 2015)*
UN RESOLUTION	DATE APPROVED	SUMMARY

		Chapter I Article 2
UN Charter VII Article 39		1. The Organization and its Members, in pursuit of the Purposes stated in Article 1, shall act in accordance with the following Principles. 2. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members. 3. All Members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter. 4. All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered. 5. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations. 6. All Members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action. 7. The Organization shall ensure that states which are not Members of the United Nations act in accordance with these Principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security. 8. Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter Vll.
UN RESOLUTION	DATE APPROVED	SUMMARY

United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC)United Nations Commission on Human Rights (UNCHR)		The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.
Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) UNITED Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC)	1993	REMARKS The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.
Special Rapporteur of the United Nations Human Rights Council Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED)	20061993	Works more with secretariat and NGOs REMARKS
CT Implementation Task Force (CTITF) working group on human rights and rule of law the Special Rapporteur of the United Nations Human Rights Council	20042006	Replaced portions of UNCHR. Works with the 193-member states Works more with secretariat and NGOs

as a member of its Working Group on Human Rights and Rule of Law. Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF) as a member of its working group on human rights and rule of law	2004	Policy arm of UNSC replaced portions of UNCHR. Works with the 193-member states
as a member of its Working Group on Human Rights and Rule of Law.		Policy arm of UNSC
NATO ART V https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts _17120.htm	19490404	The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.
NATO ART V https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts _17120.htm	19490404	Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security

UN RESOLUTION	DATE APPROVED	SUMMARY
NATO ART V https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm		Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Appendix C: United Nations Human Rights Council Members

2017 Human Rights Council Members and Notes Highlighting Documented Human Rights Violators in 2017

HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL MEMBERS (2017)   Yellow highlighted members are also on the UN's annual report of Human Rights Violators:

ASIA-PACIFIC STATES
BANGLADESH
CHINA
INDIA
INDONESIA
IRAQ
JAPAN
KYRGYZSTAN
MONGOLIA
PHILIPPINES
QATAR
REPUBLIC OF KOREA
SAUDI ARABIA
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

AFRICAN STATES
BOTSWANA
BURUNDI
CONGO
CÔTE D'IVOIRE
ETHIOPIA
GHANA
KENYA
NIGERIA
RWANDA
SOUTH AFRICA
TUNISIA
EGYPT
TOGO

LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN STATES
BOLIVIA (PLURINATIONAL STATE OF)
BRAZIL
CUBA
ECUADOR
EL SALVADOR
PANAMA

PARAGUAY
VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)
WESTERN EUROPEAN AND OTHER STATES
BELGIUM
GERMANY
NETHERLANDS
PORTUGAL
SWITZERLAND
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
EASTERN EUROPEAN STATES
ALBANIA
CROATIA
GEORGIA
HUNGARY
LATVIA
SLOVENIA
HRC BUREAU (2017) PRESIDENT
AMB. MR. JOAQUÍN ALEXANDER MAZA MARTELLI (EL SALVADOR)
VICE-PRESIDENTS
AMB. MR. MOAYED SALEH (IRAQ)
AMB. MR. VALENTIN ZELLWEGER (SWITZERLAND)
AMB. MR. SHALVA TSISKARASHVILI (GEORGIA)
AMB. MR. AMR AHMED RAMADAN (EGYPT)

The other 20 countries in the report were Algeria, Bahrain, Eritrea, Honduras, Iran, Israel, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Burma, Oman, Pakistan, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan

In previous reports, an average of 15 countries were listed, and never more than 20. This is a record. The Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights (OHCHR) issued the eighth annual report about the condition of the people working with it to identify human rights violations around the world (Sampathkumar, 2017).

Appendix D: Preliminary Request for Information for Interviews Requests

I am a PhD student conducting research on the following topic: Collaboration Between The United Nations Counterterrorism And Human Rights Committees Influence on Terrorism and Human Rights Atrocities. I am seeking members of the United Nations who would be willing to participate in a telephonic recorded interview consisting of approximately 7 questions to assist in my analysis of processes. Specific questions and information is forthcoming in 2 -6 weeks once approved by Walden University for dissemination. The interviews will be confidential and would last for 30 minutes to an hour. If there is a formal process to request participation, please advise.

Thank-you for your consideration.

Formal Request for SME support and interview participation after IRB Approval

Tue, Feb 19, 2:43 PM

to

Dear HRW team,

My name is Janice M. Gravely, I contacted the HRW operator while I was in NYC at XXX and she informed me that the request needed to be faxed. I am including some of the information from previous emailed correspondence.

I am a PhD student conducting research on the following topic: Collaboration Between the United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees Influence on Terrorism and Human Rights Atrocities. I am seeking subject matter experts in United Nations Policy, counterterrorism, and/or humanitarian rights violations associated with counterterrorism who would be willing to participate in a telephonic recorded interview consisting of 7 questions to assist in my analysis. Specific questions and IRB approval are included. The interviews will be confidential and would last for 30 minutes to an hour.

If you or any potential participant have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via email at XXX@waldenu.edu or phone XXX.

Janice M. Gravely, Doctoral Candidate, Walden University

Dear HRW Press:

Attached is my approved IRB consent form to request for interviews and an excerpt from my initial oral defense that provides additional clarity on my research topic. At a minimum, I respectfully request that you forward this material to the following individuals (Names Redacted):

XXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXX

I am fully prepared to come to New York to conduct face to face interviews if it is possible. If you or any potential participant has any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via email at XXX@waldenu.edu or phone XXX.

I look forward to your response.

Janice M. Gravely
Doctoral Candidate
Walden University

to

Dear RAND Corporation:

I am a PhD student conducting research on the following topic: Collaboration Between the United Nations Counterterrorism and Human Rights Committees Influence on Terrorism and Human Rights Atrocities. I am seeking subject matter experts in United Nations Policy, counterterrorism, and/or humanitarian rights violations associated with counterterrorism who would be willing to participate in a telephonic recorded interview consisting of 7 questions to assist in my analysis. Specific questions and IRB approval are included in the fax. The interviews will be confidential and would last for 30 minutes to an hour.

If you or any potential participant have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via email at XXX@waldenu.edu or phone XXX.

Janice M. Gravely, Doctoral Candidate, Walden University

*Note received permission to send to individuals I identified. I emailed each person individually.

Appendix E: Form C- Ethics Self-Check 2016

IRB SELF CHECK

ETHICS SELF-CHECK APPLICATION FOR IRB APPROVAL

INSTRUCTIONS:
Section 1: The researcher must complete the brown column A of the table below to document how the research procedures comply with the university's 40 ethical standards. Mark "Not Applicable" only when there is no possible way to address that ethical issue.
Section 2: Attach enclosures as indicated in section II (yellow section).
Section 3: Provide electronic signature.
Section 4 (students only): Have your faculty supervisor review the entire form and then provide an electronic signature.

IRB approval will be issued when the IRB confirms that there is adequate evidence that the university's ethical standards have been met, based on this form and the attachments listed in Section II of this form. Within 10 business days of receiving a researcher's submission, the IRB will notify the researcher of one of the following outcomes:
(a) that the IRB has provided ethics approval based on the submitted documents; or
(b) that the IRB requires revisions and/or additional documentation (will be specified in Column B).

Questions can be sent to IRB@waldenu.edu. Click here to view IRB policies, forms, samples, and FAQs about conducting research in specialized contexts such as international, educational, or clinical/intervention settings.

SECTION I: RESEARCHER'S CONFIRMATION OF ETHICAL STANDARDS COMPLIANCE	A. In this column, the researcher should confirm compliance with each ethical standard by entering Yes, No, or NA, and defending the response by providing supporting details.	B. Ethics reviewer will confirm compliance with each ethical standard in this column by entering "Confirmed" or provide a request for revisions. The researcher should enter responses/revisions using a font of a different color.
Sample: Will data be stored securely?	*Sample response: Yes. Supporting details: Paper surveys will be stored in a locked file cabinet at the researcher's*	

	home. Electronic files will be stored on the researcher's password-protected computer and backed up on a password-protected hard drive.	
The first 13 questions apply to all studies (even when the researcher is not interacting with participants to collect new data).		
1. Has each recruitment and data collection step been articulated such that risks/burdens can be identified? (Provide a bulleted list of recruitment and data collection steps in the brown column.)		
2. Will the research procedures ensure privacy during data collection? Describe how.		
3. Will data be stored securely? Describe how.		
4. Will the data be stored for at least 5 years? Describe how data disposal will occur.		
5. If participants' names or contact info will be recorded in the research records, are they absolutely necessary? Describe why or clarify that data collection is 100% anonymous (which is preferable).		
6. Do the research procedures and analysis/writeup plans include measures to ensure that participant identities are not directly or indirectly disclosed? Describe how.		
7. Will confidentiality agreements be signed by anyone who may view data that that contains identifiers? (e.g., transcriber, translator) Submit a blank copy.		
8. Is there a specific plan in place for sharing results with the participants and community stakeholders? Describe.		

9. Have all potential psychological, relationship, legal, economic/professional, physical, and other risks been fully acknowledged and described? In the brown column, provide a bulleted list of risks to participants, labeling which ones are minimal versus substantial.		
10. Have the above risks been minimized as much as possible? In other words, are measures in place to provide participants with reasonable protection from loss of privacy, psychological distress, relationship harm, legal risks, economic loss, damage to professional reputation, and physical harm? In the brown column, explain how each risk will be minimized.		
11. Has the researcher proactively managed any potential conflicts of interest? Describe how.		
12. Are the research risks and burdens reasonable, in consideration of the new knowledge that this research design can offer? Describe why.		
13. Is the research site willing to provide a Letter of Cooperation granting permission for all relevant data access, access to participants, facility use, and/or use of personnel time for research purposes? (Note that some research sites will only release data if a more formal Data Use Agreement is in place, often in addition to a Letter of Cooperation.). State whether you will be obtaining written site approval before or after Walden IRB approval.		
The remaining questions only apply to studies that involve recruiting participants to collect new data.		

14. Is participant recruitment coordinated in a manner that is non-coercive? Describe. Coercive elements include: leveraging an existing relationship to "encourage" participation, recruiting in a group setting, extravagant compensation, recruiting individuals in a school/work setting, involving a service/aid provider in the recruitment process, etc. A researcher must disclose here whether/how the researcher may already be known to the participants and explain how perceptions of coerced research participation will be minimized.		
15. If vulnerable individuals will be specifically sought out as participants, is such targeted recruitment justified by a research design that will specifically benefit that vulnerable group at large? Describe why. To specifically recruit vulnerable individuals as participants, the researcher will need to submit Form D for Non-expeditable Studies in addition to this self-check.		
16. If vulnerable adults might happen to be included (without the researcher's knowledge), would their inclusion be justified? Describe why.		
17. If anyone would be excluded from participating, is their exclusion justified? Is their exclusion handled respectfully and without stigma? Describe.		
18. If the research procedures might reveal criminal activity or child/elder abuse that necessitates reporting, are there suitable procedures in place for managing this? Describe.		
19. If the research procedures might reveal or create an acute		

psychological state that necessitates referral, are there suitable procedures in place to manage this? Describe.		
20. If the research design has multiple groups, are measures in place to ensure that all participants can potentially benefit equally from the research? Describe how.		
21. Applicable for student researchers: Will this researcher be appropriately qualified and supervised in all data collection procedures? Describe how.		
22. If an existing survey or other data collection tool will be used, has the researcher appropriately complied with the requirements for legal usage? Describe how.		
Questions 23-40 pertain to the process of ensuring that potential participants make an informed decision about the study, in accordance with the ethical principle of "respect for persons."		
23. Do the informed consent procedures provide adequate time to review the study information and ask questions before giving consent?		
24. Will informed consent be appropriately documented?		
25. Is the consent form written using language that will be understandable to the potential participants?		
26. Does the consent form explain the sample's inclusion criteria in such a way that the participants can understand how/why THEY are being asked to participate?		
27. Does the consent form include an understandable explanation of the research purpose?		
28. Does the consent form include an understandable description of the data collection procedures?		

29. Does the consent form include an estimate of the time commitment for participation?		
30. Does the consent form clearly state that participation is voluntary?		
31. Does the consent form convey that the participant has the right to decline or discontinue participation at any time? When the researcher is already known to the participant, the consent form must include written assurance that declining or discontinuing will not negatively impact the participant's relationship with the researcher or (if applicable) the participant's access to services.		
32. Does the consent form include a description of reasonably foreseeable risks[i] or discomforts?		
33. Does the consent form include a description of anticipated benefits to participants and/or others?		
34. Does the consent form describe any thank you gift(s), compensation, or reimbursement (for travel costs, etc.) or lack thereof?		
35. Does the consent form describe how privacy will be maintained?		
36. Does the consent form disclose all potential conflicts of interest?		
37. Does the consent document preserve the participant's legal rights?		
38. Does the consent form explain how the participant can contact the researcher and the university's Research Participant Advocate? (1-800-925-3368 ext. 312-1210 from within the USA, 001-612-312-1210 from outside the USA, or email address irb@waldenu.edu).	*Yes, used template provided*	
39. Does the consent form include a statement that the participant should	*Yes, used template provided*	

keep/print a copy of the consent form?			
40. If any aspect of the study is experimental (unproven), is that stated in the consent form?	*Not applicable*		

SECTION II: SUBMISSION CHECKLIST
To request ethics approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB), a researcher must submit this completed form to <u>IRB@waldenu.edu</u> along with all of the following that apply. Students must CC their supervising faculty member on all submissions. Please indicate below (by placing an X in the corresponding yellow boxes) which method you are using to send each of your supporting documents:

	Emailed to IRB@ waldenu. edu	Faxed to (626) 605-0472	NA for this study
(a) Human Research Protections training completion certificate (training can be accessed via http://phrp.nihtraining.com and a completion certificate is good for 5 years)			
(b) Blank copy of consent form(s)			
(c) Data collection tools (e.g., surveys, interviews, assessments, observation protocols, etc.)			
(d) If using non-public information released by an organization that requires formally specified terms of data release: Submit a tailored Data Use Agreement (see <u>sample</u>) that has been signed by the appropriate representative from each organization agreeing to share its non-public records.			
(e) If using any organization's facilities, email system, personnel, private records, worktime, or other resources for participant recruitment or data collection: Submit a <u>Letter of Cooperation</u> from each community partner organization. -If a partner organization has an IRB, then documentation of their IRB's approval or exemption of the study will serve as your Letter of Cooperation, along with the application that was submitted to that IRB. -If the organization cannot sign its letter until after Walden's IRB approval, then submit a draft letter and indicate to IRB staff that you are requesting conditional IRB approval at this time by placing an X on this line:____ -Note that a Letter of Cooperation is not required if the organization is simply forwarding research invitations or if a researcher is using <u>public</u> records to identify and contact participants.			
(f) If using one or more <u>existing</u> data collection instruments: Submit one of the following for each instrument:			

-the instrument creator's written/emailed permission to use the instrument (for those measures that are not commercially distributed), or -(if the instrument's creator did not respond to the researcher's attempts to make contact) a copy of your written request to the creator, or -confirmation that the tool is public domain (would be available on the publisher's website or upon request), or -a sales receipt will suffice for commercially distributed assessments-- If the researcher prefers to wait to purchase commercially distributed assessments after conditional IRB approval, then indicate to IRB staff that you are requesting conditional IRB approval at this time by placing an X on this line:___ Note that if a researcher wishes to reproduce the instrument in the final dissertation, explicit written permission must be obtained from the copyright holder and submitted with this ethics application.			
(g) If anyone outside a faculty committee (such as a transcriber or translator) may see raw data with identifiers: Submit blank copy of the <u>Confidentiality Agreement</u> that the individual(s) would be asked to sign.			
(h) If applicable: Submit invitation to participate in research (e.g., letter, flier, phone script, ad, etc.).			

SECTION III: RESEARCHER'S ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE By placing an X next to each of the following boxes and submitting this document from my official Walden email address, I (the researcher) am providing an electronic signature certifying that each of the statements below is true.	
	The information provided in this application form is correct, and was completed after reading all relevant instructions.
	I understand that I am requesting the university's ethics approval to conduct the <u>exact</u> procedures described above. I understand that the IRB does <u>not</u> review the proposal so I am responsible for ensuring that this form fully reflects the <u>final</u> set of procedures.
	I understand that <u>any</u> deviation from the participant recruitment and data collection procedures referenced in this form can result in invalidation of the data and dismissal from the university.
	I will request IRB approval before making any modification to the participant recruitment and data collection procedures or forms, using the Request for Change in Procedures Form found at the <u>Walden IRB Web site</u>.
	I will report any unexpected or otherwise significant adverse events and general problems within one week using the Adverse Event Reporting Form found at the <u>Walden IRB Web site</u>.
	Neither recruitment nor data collection will be initiated until notification of approval to conduct research is received from IRB@waldenu.edu.
	I understand that this research, once approved, is subject to continuing review and approval by the Committee Chair and the IRB.
	I will maintain complete and accurate records of all research activities (including consent forms and collected data) and be prepared to submit them upon request to the IRB.

	I understand that if any of the conditions above are not met, this research could be suspended and/or not recognized by Walden University.
	I understand that my data and research activities are subject to audit at any time by the university's compliance office within the Center for Research Quality.
	I have conducted my own inquiries to ensure that I am aware of any applicable state or international regulations that might apply to my proposed data collection (e.g., mandated reporting, privacy, protection of minors or other vulnerable populations). *Note to researcher: State-level professional organizations and licensing entities for your field are a good source of this information. An international compilation of human subjects policies can be found at this link: http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/international/intlcompilation/intlcompilation.html*

To electronically* sign this document, the researcher must enter his or her official Walden email address below and send the materials from this Walden account:
Please enter the title of the study:
Students must also provide their student number:

SECTION IV: SUPERVISING FACULTY MEMBER ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE
As the faculty member supervising this research, I assume responsibility for ensuring that the student complies with University and US federal regulations regarding the use of human participants in research. By placing an X in each of these boxes and asking the student to CC my official Walden email address when submitting this document, I am providing an electronic signature certifying that each of the statements below is true.

	I affirm that the researcher has met all academic program requirements for review and approval of this research.
	I will ensure that the researcher properly requests any protocol changes using the Request for Change in Procedures Form found at the Walden IRB Web site.
	I will ensure that the student promptly reports any unexpected or otherwise significant adverse events and general problems within 1 week using the Adverse Event Reporting Form found at the Walden IRB Web site.
	I will report any noncompliance on the part of the researcher by emailing notification to IRB@waldenu.edu.

To electronically* sign this document, the supervising faculty member must enter his or her official Walden email address below and then have the student CC this email address when submitting materials from his/her Walden account. A faculty member should notify IRB@waldenu.edu if a student submits any documents that the faculty member has not approved.

*IRB Policy on Electronic Signatures

Electronic signatures are only accepted when the signer is either (a) the sender of the email, or (b) copied on the email containing the signed document. Electronic signatures are

regulated by the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act.

Appendix F: Documented Coded Segments / Themes Associated With Research

Questions

Table F1 Interviews

	Interviews (n=3)		
Themes / interviewees	1902516C	803516G	0703516L
COLLABORATION	The assessments that I would see member states, there's probably more accepting of assistance from the counterterrorism committees, than they are necessarily from the Human Rights side of the house… So, when I go to meeting and everyone's represented, right. So, anyone is able to be in that room and be participating in the process. However, at the member state levels they are very much seen as separate, because again, there are different constituencies	They have a lot of people working directly, indirectly, in different branches peacekeeping, you have UNHCR, you have the World Food Program, so you have a lot the UN is good in networking inside its own organization, with a different unit, another department, but also with other NGOs… That's one of the qualities of the UN they have everywhere, somewhere, somebody	There is obviously, information exchange between the various governments, the UN and, and the counterterrorism committee or the Security Council … There is a lot of like, you know, overlap in terms of mandate and what certain UN agencies are doing… but I don't exactly see like how they are complementing or working in parallel to other like coordination agencies.

(table continues) |

Themes / interviewees	1902516C	803516G	0703516L
	and there's different mandates	they know, they can, they can discuss with the pass message	
EXPERTISE	Being on the outside looking in, it's almost impossible to work out how it works or doesn't work. So, you know, you can read about products, you can read about the industry, you can read about how things have happened, but doesn't necessarily tell you how the sausage is made on the inside or where the inter-relationships are or agreements lie (identifies the nuances associated with the experts involved and the difficulties for outsiders to understand).	What I have seen or lived in the UN expert about terrorists for terrorism, they are experts they have, they have good expertise they are have, they have a lot of background.	I have no doubt that there are very smart people in the thing.
TENSIONS	So, the differentiation between what is the members state lead	…that was kind of more negotiation skill than to use the real	I think the issue here is that there are about 32 or (table continues)

Themes / interviewees	1902516C	803516G	0703516L
	activities, and those things which are done by the organization, the Secretary of itself is quite distinctive as well. So, there's been challenges (Highlights tensions generated because the human rights committee is member state led with many perspectives and the counter-terrorism committee is managed through the Secretariat With a peacekeeping focus). it probably makes where penetrates the media is when certain Member States become members of things like a Human Rights Committee, Saudi Arabia, or Iran, or various countries, which are a lot of member states	element of anti- terrorism rules, procedures, and specialist in now (tensions associated with actual terrorists' negotiations (hijacking) and challenges implementing UN international rules) Now, the downside of UN, they have people from a lot of different countries. And sometimes the people work differently. So, the efficiency of a team sometimes is not as expected.	36 UN organizations that have somehow contest terrorism or countering violent extremism or preventing violent extremism somehow in their mandate (potential reason for some of the tensions) … In practice I don't know you probably are aware as I am of this extreme tension between NGOs and the UN and, and how, NGOs perceive UN versus themselves when it comes to really working in the heart of these issues

(table continues)

Themes / interviewees	1902516C	803516G	0703516L
	don't like their human rights record… So, there's a lot of tensions that are sort of very evident,		

Table F2 *Secondary Data*

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
Human Rights Watch (2019). World Report 2019. Retrieved from https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2019	Although the Afghan government acceded to the United Nations Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture in April 2018, it failed to hold police and National Directorate of Security (NDS) personnel accountable for systematic torture, extrajudicial executions, and enforced disappearances (multidisciplinary collaboration – govt received guidance, but ignored guidance)		The UN Human Rights Council, for example, took important— sometimes unprecedented —steps in the past year to increase pressure on Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, and Venezuela. The opponents of human rights enforcement, such as China, Russia, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia, traditionally carry considerable weight in these settings, so it was impressive to see how often they lost this past year. Given the recent reluctance of many large Western (table continues)

Secondary Data (n=15) appears as the table title above the header row.

152

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
			powers to promote human rights (tensions that affect collaborative processes).
United Nations (2019). General Assembly Terrorism and human rights A/RES/73/174. Seventy-third session Agenda item 74(b). Retrieved from https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/73/174	…while stressing that terrorism can only be defeated by a sustained and comprehensive approach involving the <u>active participation and collaboration of all States</u> and international and regional organizations, *Renews its commitment* to strengthening <u>international cooperation</u> to prevent and counter terrorism (reinforcing the importance of collaboration)	*Recognizing* that countering terrorism requires <u>a comprehensive approach and a multidimensional strategy</u> to tackle the factors underlying terrorism *Reaffirms* its commitment to the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy and a balanced and integrated <u>implementation of its four pillars</u>, as adopted in its resolution 60/288 (highlights expert strategy designed to enhance counterterrorism and human rights)	Recognizing that effective counter-terrorism measures and <u>the protection of human rights are not conflicting goals</u> but are complementary and mutually reinforcing (highlighted tensions based on human rights focus) (table continues)

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
United Nations (2019). Meetings Coverage. Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism |Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force. Speakers Call for Reinvigorated Multilateralism, Stronger Diplomacy to Address Global Crises, as General Assembly Marks International Day. Meetings Coverage and Press Releases Retrieved from https://www.un.org/press/en/2019/ga12140.doc.htm	<u>No country, however powerful, can resolve global challenges alone</u>, she (María Fernanda Espinosa Garcés (Ecuador)), stressed, adding that the International Day will be an opportunity to assess the Organization's contribution to mankind (reinforcing the importance of collaboration).	Maha Yaqoot Juma Yaqoot Harqoos (United Arab Emirates) The United Nations is an embodiment of multilateralism and is the main tool used by Member States to <u>overcome international challenges that are complex and multipronged</u>. It plays an important role in promoting dialogue and understanding among countries, regardless of cultural and religious differences (highlighting the importance of experts)	María Fernanda Espinosa Garcés (Ecuador), President of the General Assembly… Therefore, <u>it is critical to end the false concept that multilateralism undermines the sovereignty of States,</u> when in fact it bolsters sovereignty. Georg Helmut Ernst Sparber (Liechtenstein) "As members of the United Nations, we all have our grievances with this Organization," … <u>The United Nations should do better in listening to the people it represents</u> (table continues)

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
			(acknowledging the tensions effecting collaboration and policy)
United Nations (2019). Security Council. Security Council Unanimously Adopts Resolution Calling upon Member States to Combat, Criminalize Financing of Terrorists, Their Activities Security Council 8496th Meeting. SC/13754. Meetings Coverage and Press Releases. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/press/en/2019/sc13754.doc.htm	They <u>also expressed support for partnership with the private sector</u> and strongly advocated respect for international humanitarian law, VLADIMIR VORONKOV, Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism, The Office, he continued, <u>must expand its focus to include the sharing of intelligence, sectoral risk assessments and public-private partnerships</u> to ensure that financial regulation is responsive, targeted, proportional and effective. (reinforcing the importance of collaboration across all member states, organizations, and agencies)	Vladimir Voronkov, Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism ... called upon Member States to <u>make national experts available to United Nations</u> programmes on countering terrorist financing (highlighted expanding collaborative efforts to experts across nations with UN experts).	Iran's representative said … "Indeed, <u>counter-terrorism activities are effective only when double standards and selective approaches are avoided</u> an all States cooperate fully and responsibly," he noted. (example of tensions some states expressed pertaining to UN Counterterrorism and human rights guidance).
Institute for Economics and Peace (2018). Global Terrorism Index 2018. Retrieved from http://visionofhumanity.org/app/uploads/2018/	<u>Governments should reassess how they might build novel collaborations based on distinct national capacities and shared goals</u>. In 2015, the		(table continues)

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
12/Global-Terrorism-Index-2018-1.pdf	United States, Denmark, and Norway partnered with ISD to launch the Strong Cities Network (SCN) at the United Nations. (reaffirmed from an NGO perspective the need to better collaborative practices).		
United Nations (2018). General Assembly. Promotion and protection of human rights. Seventy-third session **56**th plenary meeting Strategy Review. Agenda item 74. Retrieved from https://undocs.org/en/A /73/PV.56			Mr. Hassani Nejad Pirkouhi (Islamic Republic of Iran): This is another unfortunate instance of the General Assembly being forced into taking a deeply biased and politicized decision, which further erodes the credibility of the United Nations. This is another unfortunate instance of the General Assembly being forced into taking a (table continues)

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
			deeply biased and politicized decision, which further <u>erodes the credibility of the United Nations</u>. **Mr. Kuzmin** (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Our delegation has traditionally refrained from supporting so-called country-specific draft resolutions on human rights, which are often based on unreliable information and have little to do with the real state of affairs. <u>Such openly political initiatives discredit the human rights structures of the United Nations</u>. (example of (table continues)

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
			tensions some states expressed pertaining to UN Counterterrorism and human rights guidance).
United Nations (2018). General Assembly Plenary Seventy-Third Session, 65th Meeting (GA/12117). General Assembly Adopts 16 Texts Recommended by Fifth Committee, Concluding Main Part of Seventy-Third Session. Meetings Coverage and Press Releases. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/press/en/2018/ga12117.doc.htm	By a <u>recorded vote of 65 in favour to 27 against, with 70 abstentions,</u> the Assembly adopted draft resolution… Next, it adopted without a vote the draft resolution contained in the report on the "activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services" (Demonstrates breakdown in collaborative process when more states abstain versus rendering a vote)		The representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea said his delegation opposes <u>country-specific resolutions that clearly show the politicization of human rights and double standards</u>. (example of tensions some states expressed pertaining to UN Counterterrorism and human rights guidance).
United Nations (2018). Security Council. Counter-Terrorism, May 2018 Monthly Forecast: Security		On 21 December 2017, the Council adopted **resolution**	The importance of (table continues)

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
Council Report. Retrieved from https://www.securityco uncilreport.org/monthly -forecast/2018- 05/counterterrorism_1. php?print=true		**2395…** It stresses that assessing the implementation of resolution 1373 and other relevant counter- terrorism resolutions is the <u>core function of CTED</u> (highlights experts' responsibilities)	counter- terrorism efforts enjoy overall unanimity among Council members, notwithstandi ng divergences over the politicisation of the issue in the Middle East. <u>However, frictions on certain issues remain,</u> (acknowledge s tensions)
United Nations (2017). Security Council. Resolution 2354. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/en/ ga/search/view_doc.asp ?symbol=S/RES/2354 %282017%29&referer =/english/&Lang=E	Relevant United Nations entities <u>should ensure greater coordination and coherence</u> with donors and recipients of counter -terrorism capacity-building, taking into account national perspectives, and with a view to strengthening national ownership… <u>To be more effective, counter-narrative measures and programs should be tailored to the specific circumstances of different contexts on all levels;</u> (highlights the	*Urging* Member States and the United Nations system to take measures pursuant to international law, to address all drivers of violent extremism conducive to terrorism, both internal and external, in a balanced manner <u>as set out in the United Nations Global Counter- Terrorism</u>	*Stressing* the importance of the role of the media, civil and religious society, the business community and educational institutions in those efforts to enhance dialogue and broaden understanding , and in promoting (table continues)

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
	importance of collaborative efforts)	Strategy (highlights the expert guidance provided to help states counter terrorism while supporting human rights)	tolerance and coexistence, and in fostering an environment which is not conducive to incitement of terrorism, as well as in countering terrorist narratives (highlights collaborative efforts required to reduce tensions)
United Nations (2016). General Assembly. The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy Review. Agenda item 117. Retrieved from https://undocs.org/a/70/L.55	2. *Reaffirms* the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy and its four pillars, which constitute an ongoing effort, and calls upon Member States, the United Nations and other appropriate international, regional and subregional organizations to step up their efforts to implement the Strategy in an integrated and balanced manner and in all its aspects; (encourages better collaboration)	*Convinced* that the General Assembly is the competent organ, with universal membership, to address the issue of international terrorism, *Mindful* of the need to enhance the role of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, within their mandates, in the implementation of the Strategy,	(table continues)

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
		(acknowledges experts addressing terrorism)	
United Nations (2016). General Assembly. The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy Review. Agenda item 117. Retrieved from https://undocs.org/a/70/L.55	7. *Affirms* the importance of the integrated and balanced implementation of all pillars of the Strategy, recognizing the need to redouble efforts for even attention paid to and even implementation of all the pillars of the Strategy; 17. *Calls for* greater coordination and coherence among the United Nations entities and with donors and recipients of counter -terrorism capacity-building, including in developing and maintaining effective and rule of law-based criminal justice systems, and also calls for dialogue to be enhanced among all stakeholders, with a view to placing national perspectives at the centre of such capacity -building in order to strengthen national ownership, while recognizing that rule of law activities (reinforces the	25. *Welcomes* the efforts of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force to increase its transparency, accountability and effectiveness, and calls upon the Task Force and the United Nations Counter -Terrorism Centre to improve the strategic nature and impact of their programmes and policies; (emphasizing the importance of the CT task force in highlighting its expertise when making policy recommendations).	
			(table continues)

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
	importance of collaboration)		
United Nations (2016). General Assembly Adopts Resolution Affirming Importance of Balanced, Integrated Implementation of Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy Meetings Coverage and Press Releases. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/press/en/2016/ga11800.doc.htm	Abdallah Y. Al-Mouallimi (Saudi Arabia), speaking on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), said… Transparency and coordination of United Nations counter-terrorism entities must ensure that efforts were not duplicated. (highlights how collaboration promotes efficiency)		Michele J. Sison (United States) said the Strategy remained valid and relevant. No country was immune from the plague of terrorism and partnership was needed to counter it. For that reason, the United States had joined consensus around the resolution that would be adopted today, despite several aspects which proved challenging to accept. The key question was how to work together to counter terrorism (Underscored tensions that effected collaboration)
United Nations (2016). General Assembly. The	*Encourages* the Counter-Terrorism		(table continues)

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy Review. Agenda item 117. Retrieved from https://undocs.org/a/70/L.55	<u>Implementation Task Force to work closely with Member States and relevant international, regional and subregional organizations</u> to identify and share best practices to prevent terrorist attacks on potentially vulnerable targets, and recognizes the importance of developing public-private partnerships in this area; (reinforces importance of collaboration)		
United Nations (2016). Human Rights Council. Outcome of the panel discussion on the human rights dimensions of preventing and countering violent extremism. Thirty-third session Agenda items 2 and 3. Retrieved from https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/g16/170/05/pdf/g1617005.pdf?openelement	The moderator then referred to resolution 30/15, in which the Human Rights Council stressed the need to address conditions conducive to violent extremism <u>by engaging with all groups of civil society concerned</u> (reinforcing collaborative efforts required)	Ms. Ghanea recalled that, in its resolution 16/18, <u>the Human Rights Council had laid out a number of helpful actions</u> such as collaborative projects… and respectful debate of ideas (Demonstrates expert efforts from Human Rights Council).	The negative impact of heavy-handed counter-terrorism measures following 11 September 2001 <u>had only widened the rift between communities, deepened distrust and generated a hateful public discourse</u> (emphasized tensions and the implications on communities).
United Nations (2016). Security Council	In its assessments of Member States		(table continues)

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
Counter-terrorism committee. Countering violent extremism. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/sc/ctc/news/category/countering-violent-extremism	implementation of the relevant Council resolutions, the Committee and CTED place considerable emphasis on the steps taken by States to institute programmes and strategies to counter incitement, in <u>promoting social inclusion and cohesion</u>. (		
United Nations (2016) Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED). Global survey of the implementation of Security Council resolution 1624 (2005) by Member States Retrieved from https://www.un.org/sc/ctc/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Global-Implementation-Survey-1624_EN.pdf	On 21 and 22 April 2015, <u>the Secretary-General, in cooperation with the President of the General Assembly and the High Representative of the United Nations Alliance</u> of Civilizations convened a high-level thematic debate on "<u>Promoting tolerance and reconciliation</u>: fostering peaceful, inclusive societies and countering violent extremism", at United Nations Headquarters. (highlights collaborative meetings).	The present version of the survey takes into account the mandate given to the Executive Directorate in Council resolution 2129 (2013) to "identify emerging issues, trends and developments related to resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005), while taking into account the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, as appropriate, at all levels, <u>in</u>	(table continues)

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
		consultation with relevant partners, and to advise the Committee on practical ways for Member States to implement resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005)". (highlighting using experts to assist in countering terrorism and human rights).	
United Nations (2015). General Assembly Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism A/70/674 Agenda items 16 and 117. Retrieved from http://unoy.org/wp-content/uploads/UN-Plan-of-Action-to-Prevent-Violent-Extremism.pdf	Over the last decade, there has been a strong emphasis on the implementation of measures under pillar II of the Global Strategy, while pillars I and IV have often been overlooked… In the past two years, the General Assembly has emphasized the need for united action on violent extremism (highlights the limits of collaborative on enforcing the 4 pillars).	The United Nations, through the 36 entities of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force and an "All United Nations" approach, is ready to support Member States in developing such policies and plans (highlights expertise available to support states).	While, collectively, we have the tools with which to address many of the grievances driving violent extremism, we have to learn to use and resource them effectively… At a time of growing polarization on a number (table continues)

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
			of national, regional and global issues, preventing violent extremism offers a real opportunity for the members of the international community to unite, harmonize their actions and pursue inclusive <u>approaches in the face of division, intolerance and hatred</u> (reinforces promoting harmony versus state tensions in countering terrorism).
United Nations (2013). Counter-terrorism Committee. Revised procedures for the Counter-Terrorism Committee's stocktaking of Member States' implementation of Security Council resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005). Retrieved from https://www.un.org/sc/	Every two weeks, the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) will transmit to the Chair of the Counter-Terrorism Committee the Overview of Implementation Assessment (OIA); Detailed Implementation Survey (DIS); cover letter; and		(table continues)

	Collaboration	Expertise	Tension
ctc/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/2013-03-11-stocktaking_revised_procedures.pdf	follow-up table of visit recommendations table (if applicable). 3. <u>The Vice-Chair of the relevant subcommittee will circulate the aforementioned documents to sub-Committee members</u> via the Committee's internal document tracker. <u>The Vice-Chair will initiate a five-day silence procedure for approval of the OIA</u>… The Chair will then circulate the aforementioned documents to Committee members via the Committee's internal document tracker and initiate a five-day silence procedure for approval of the OIA; the cover letter and the follow-up table of visit recommendations (Highlights collaboration processes).		