

**Mr. Martin Scheinin statement**

m

**Friday 9 September 2022  
10:10-10:50**

Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, colleagues

Much of my work as Special Rapporteur on human rights and counter-terrorism was related to definitions of terrorism. The requirement of legality demands that such definitions are clear, precise and public. Central to a human rights law scrutiny of national definitions of terrorism is insistence on the exhaustive nature of aims of terrorism, as spelled out for instance in the 1999 Terrorism Financing Convention or in Security Council Resolution 1566 (2004). Both of the two alternative aims that the international community accepts as defining elements of terrorism are victim

ET00.000008 0 595.2 81.92 reW hBT/F4 14.04 Tf1 0 0 1 161

The mandate of the Special Rapporteur on human rights and counterterrorism was created in the long aftermath of 9/11, the dreadful day of 11 September 2001. Twenty years later, In an essay published last year in Global Governance I criticized the best international definitions of terrorism – those that as Special Rapporteur I had sought to enforce – for not capturing the essence of terrorism. The two alternative aims of terrorism, mentioned before, are casuistic, often impossible to prove in a criminal trial, and sometimes counterintuitive in respect of real-life incidents of terrorism.

What I proposed as the better alternative, is what call a Kantian definition of terrorism. It focuses on the instrumentalization of another human being, the victim, to a mere means, denying her value as an