

Jorge Dezcallar

Ambassador of Spain

The terrorist threat is evolving in a world in rapid evolution from a multilateral to a multipolar system, while the geopolitical system born after WWII and based on the so-called Washington consensus is coming to an end. We now confront two major terrorist threats in the form of Islamist terrorism and cyberterrorism, which demand new combat methods and techniques on our part in a permanent cat-and-mouse game in which security forces and Intelligence agencies, on the one hand, and terrorists, on the other, are constantly learning from each other. In open societies where total security simply does not exist, it is important to respond with a cool head and avoiding over-reactions that might endanger our civil liberties and freedoms.

A first decisive characteristic of our world is the acceleration of the "*tempo historico*" to the point where -as Toynbee pointed out- the dust raised by the hooves of the galloping horses of History prevents us from seeing what it is actually happening around us. The rate of discoveries in science, medicine, technology, biology... is simply so vast and fast that it is almost impossible to keep abreast of them all.

Probably there has never been such a thing as a World Order but there were at least some enduring political-diplomatic architectures, even if they had progressively shorter spans of life: In 1815 the Vienna Congress imposed a conservative order in Europe which lasted until the First World War in 1914, when four empires bit the dust. Then the conferences of Tehran, Postdam, Bretton Woods, San Francisco etc. established another geopolitical house of cards which lasted just 45 years, until 1989, when the Berlin Wall fell down taking with it Communism, Bipolarity, MAD, the USSR and the Cold War. But only ten years later, 9/11 shook American confidence in hegemony laying its vulnerability bare before the world. And then the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan showed the limits of American power for all to see.

We now witness the dismantling of the geopolitical system laboriously set up in 1945, while we enter a complicated time in which standing rules are doubted and debated, and the power void translates into uncertainty and insecurity, something aggravated by the personality of the new tenant in the White House. This is the boiling pot in which terrorism is born.

The three main elements marking the geopolitics of the world in 2017 are the withdrawal of the USA, the crisis in Europe and the emergence of new actors in a context of globalisation (macroeconomic gains but microeconomic injustices), global problems (climate change, poverty, pandemics, terrorism and cyberterrorism, proliferation...) and local crises in central Europe, the Middle East, Southeast Asia, the Sahel and the heart of Africa.

For some time the Americans have been showing signs of fatigue in the face of wars that are difficult to understand, impossible to win and terribly expensive in both human lives and money. These wars were not making the USA or the world a safer place. President Barack Obama read the mood and reached the White House with a clear programme to repatriate the troops and concentrate on revamping the economy and providing with social security to 30 million Americans who did not have it. This created a void. Then President Trump arrived "without baggage" (according to Kissinger) and with the belief that the present international and economic order of the world is both unfair and contrary to the interests of the USA. His ideas are both simple and few: America First, which entails a redefinition of American interests in narrower terms, relinquishing collective leadership and showing no interest in preserving the statu-quo; protectionism; and rejection of both international alliances and international organisations. But if the USA withdraws from international organisations the world will be less safe. And setting up walls of protectionism, is a recipe for poverty. On the other hand, President Trump's line of action may reduce the international presence of the USA but in no way diminishes its national standing. The US will continue to play a major role, even if no longer as the "indispensable" leader.

The second element is the decadence of Europe. With 9% of the population, the European Union (EU) represents 21% of the world's GDP, 15% of its trade ... and 50% of its social spending! This will be difficult to maintain given cheaper energy in the US and the Middle East, and cheaper manpower in Africa and Asia. Our welfare system is the envy of the world and elicits accusations of hedonism or comparisons between Mars (the US) and Venus (Europe). The truth is that the EU is in an "existential crisis" (President Juncker) with institutional, political, economic and social problems, prompting fractures between North and South because of different economic interests, and between East and West for different values on Human Rights or refugees. The European Union lacks necessary common policies on Foreign Affairs, Energy, Defense, Economy and Fiscal policies - you name it! And its predicament is aggravated by the current refugee crisis in a context of slow growth, low inflation, high unemployment, little investment and in desperate need for growth oriented stimuli.

As a result, the global influence of Europe diminishes because either the EU is an "ever closer union among the peoples of Europe" (article 1, TEU) or we shall disappear as a relevant actor. The combined effect of the election of Donald Trump in the USA and Brexit should become the impulse we need to revitalise our Union.

This is, finally, a world in which new actors are emerging, both at state and non-state level. And power is changing hands. In 1960 the USA + Europe + Japan represented 70% of the world's GDP. Now just they add up to a little more than 50%. Asia alone has 34% of world GDP. And this massive transfer of wealth from North to South and from East to West has made it necessary to create the G-20 which accounts for 85% of global GDP.

These emerging countries (China, India, South Africa etc) have different values as a result of a differing cultural evolutions, and demand more participation and a different sharing of the wealth of the world. No matter how much insistence there is on harmony, it is inevitable not to create ripples when a new country enters Calderon's Great Theater of the World with prima donna ambitions. It is the so called Thucydides Trap and its best example is the emergence of Prussia in the heart of Europe in mid XIX Century. These countries accuse of lack of democracy and lack of transparency the institutions we have inherited from the end of the Second World War of lacking democracy and transparency, all adopted without their input. Why should France hold a veto power on the United Nations Security Council and not India?. The consequence is that either we reform these institutions together or they will become unaccepted and irrelevant.

Be that as it may, it seems evident that we are witnessing the end of four hundred years of Western domination of the world in favor of the area Asia-Pacific, as the new economic epicentre of Planet Earth. And this massive transfer of wealth and influence coincides with the passing from a multilateral world to a multipolar world. Multilateralism is based on the "Washington consensus", i.e., market economy, liberal democracy, security guaranteed by the USA, international cooperation and strong international institutions for the resolution of conflicts. A combination that Francis Fukuyama considered definitive. On the other hand, multipolarism means permanent competition among countries and/or clusters of countries, in an environment of protectionism and weak international conflict resolution instances. If this is true, we are heading for an epoch of insecurity and uncertainty, at least for as long as it takes for the new model to assert itself.

This is the background on which a new wave of terrorism is taking place. For the purposes of this paper I understand terrorism to be an act of violence on civilians or non-combatants in order to create an state of fear to intimidate a population, or to force a government to do something or to abstain from doing it through fear. Having ended in Europe with our own home grown anarchist, leftist or ethno-nationalist brands of terrorism (ETA, IRA, Baader-Meinhoff etc), we must confront a new Islamist terrorism coming from the Middle East and North Africa. Islamist terrorism has different objectives and uses different tactics, methods and weapons to the ones we had got used to and were familiar with. It is a new challenge and demands a different preparation on our part. And we learn with each passing day. There is no doubt that in the end we will prevail, but in the meantime we have to make sure we reduce the suffering to the minimum. And it is not easy.

The Middle East is nowadays by far the most conflictive area on Earth. The reasons for this are many and go back to the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire and the carving up of the region between the French and the British, disregarding the lofty views of President Wilson in his Fourteen Points which aimed, among other things, to put an end to colonial rule. The Sykes-Picot agreements drew a line from the "e" of Acre to the "k" of Kirkuk and gave the North to France (the Greater Syria) and the South to the United Kingdom (Jordan, Iraq, Transjordan, Saudi Arabia..). The new borders did not respect ethnic, religious or language differences and created artificial new states: Lebanon was segregated from Syria to give a home to Maronite Christians, Israel was given to the Jews, and Iraq was

formed out of three different Turkish wilayats or governorships (one for the Kurds and one each for the sSunni and the Shia Arabs), and then Kuwait was carved out to separate Iraq from the sea. And so on and so forth. Not only did these policies betray the longing for freedom of the Arabs (remember the broken promises of Lawrence of Arabia), but the resulting countries were artificial copies of Western models, giving way to political corruption and economic inefficiency. They utterly lacked legitimacy both of origin and of exercise. The Palestinian poet Tamin al-Barghouti has said that they got independence in exchange for dependence because the West then gave its support to dictators from Tunisia to Persia, from Ben Ali, Mubarak, the Shah etc... to al-Sisi in today's Egypt. And what is still more serious, we have also given our short-sighted support to radical Islamist forces: Israel discreetly helped Hamas in order to weaken Arafat's Fatah years ago, while the USA armed the mujahideen in Afghanistan to fight and expel the Soviet invaders. Turkey and Qatar are now openly supporting the Muslim Brotherhood and Saudi Arabia finances the radicalisation of Sunnis all over the world. Zbigniew Brzezinski told me that once that a strong feeling of injustice unites Muslims against the West because of these misguided options.

The Arab Spring channelled the appetite for freedom and the demand for dignity of peoples subjected to post-colonial rule, and put an end to many corrupt dictatorships. At the same time a number of old, unsolved ethnic, tribal and linguistic problems came to the surface, together with others related to the role of religion in public life, the Sufis' longing for an idealised and no longer existent past, etc. Then, the failure of the Arab Spring has brought about a burning feeling of frustration, giving way to what Avi Shlaim calls "post-Ottoman syndrome", characterised by disorders, unstableness and an strong deficit of both legitimacy for the states and in the human rights of their peoples. After vainly looking for solutions to their problems in socialism, Pan-Arabism and nationalism, Arab peoples have turned to Islamism trying to find in past idealised glories an answer to their present predicaments and frustrations, which are many.

If that were not enough, we must confront the danger posed by failed states from Somalia to Afghanistan and Libya, Eritrea, Mali etc, unable to control their own national territory and open to organisations which use terrorism and all sorts of illegal trafficking and which would not reject the use of weapons of mass destruction if they had the chance. Other risks are born in the prevailing unjust distribution of wealth in a world where 45 million people starve to death every year, one billion have no access to drinking water and two billion have no electricity, and these are just a few examples. Hunger, war and despair feed vast migrations which result in other threats to our comfortable way of life. We confront both threats and risks, which are more elusive and difficult to cope with.

This is the boiling pot which gives birth to the main two terrorist Islamist (in the sense that they resort to a distorted version of Islam for their political aims) organisations of our days: Al -Qaeda and the Islamic State. They are separated by differences that are ideological, doctrinal, tactical and personal at the same time, in spite of rumours of unconfirmed recent contacts between al-Zawahiri and al-Baghdadi. Were they to be true, they would mean very bad news for the world at large. On the other hand, Russian sources pretend to have killed al-Baghdadi near Raqqa on May 28th, a still unproven assertion.

After a peak in 2004 (Madrid) and 2005 (London), there has been a resurgence of terrorist crimes since 2015 for a number of reasons: the need to show resilience against the setbacks ISIS faces in Syria and Iraq, motives of vengeance, to boost the morale of their troops, to keep recruiting volunteers, and to strike back in this asymmetric war. The recent use of cheap, humble instruments as weapons (knives, hammers) and locally born terrorists is a lethal combination and ISIS is taking advantage of it when calls for the weaponisation of daily life to strike in “the land of infidels”. And we should not forget in this respect that Spain, dominated by the Arabs for 700 hundred years and cradle of a glorious moment in Arab culture (Al Andalus), is considered a retrievable land for some of today’s radical Islamists! Crazy as that may sound.

We must confront terrorist threats and, at the same time, we have to reduce our vulnerability. Our security grows when we control our borders, introduce biometric data on our passports and protect our vital networks in energy, transports etc. But also when we strive for a better integration of migrants, something that is not easy, as experience demonstrates. But difficulties should not deter our efforts.

Also very worrisome is the exponential development of Cyberterrorism, a great threat in our times, which benefits from the security offered by distance, opacity and the difficulty of tracing back CT attacks. Cyberterrorism can put a country literally on its knees by attacking critical networks or modifying viruses to create pandemics. The possibilities are enormous. And they are growing: from 64 major attacks registered in the world in 2015 to 479 last year alone. Spain suffered a total of 115.000 cyberattacks in 2016, double the figure in 2015. In this respect the Centro Criptológico Nacional, created in 2002 when I headed CNI, is doing a great job of protecting our networks and infrastructure.

The greater risk is nowadays the possibility of terrorist groups using CT or, still worse, WMD, something that has not yet happened (with some exceptions with sarin gas and anthrax) due to the complication inherent in weaponising these substances, or just because of self-restraint on the part of terrorists themselves because of the difficulties controlling their consequences. The WannaCry ransomware attack may also offer new ideas to terrorists groups or individuals. Recent unconfirmed information suggests that the Islamic State is producing chemical weapons to use against Iraqi forces, and that part of this material is currently being transferred from Iraq to Syria, where a new “chemical weapons cell” is being created. Were this information to be true, there is no need to insist on the extreme gravity of this development needs no extra emphasis.

Intelligence is a fundamental instrument in combatting terrorism, something already predicted by Sun Tzu in the 5th century BC when he said something as obvious as that it was easier to defeat an enemy if you were aware of its intentions. And it was in Spain, under Phillip II, that the first autonomous, administrative and professional network of spies was ever set up (Walsingham’s being more just a personal counterintelligence agency which died with his own life). Intelligence aims not just to gather information, something that is easy in the internet era, but to select that which is correct about terrorist networks (strategy, internal structure, financing sources etc) and other threats to the security of the state. This information must be certain, concise, contrasted, politically neutral, not biased and

with added value. And it should be addressed in real time to the right person in government to facilitate the decision-making process at the adequate level. To gather this vital material, Intelligence services use human (Humint), signal (Sigint), and image (Imint) sources, among other methods.

In Spain we have trained forces that are well trained in combatting terrorism due to our decades long tough fight against ETA. Experience is always very important in this field. But it is never enough, as this is a different kind of combat in which terrorists not only are not afraid to die, but actually long for death itself. And in this game of cat and mouse, where we constantly learn from each other, they keep the advantage of always choosing the what, how, when and where of any attack. And terrorist attacks are never the same, as their objectives, methods, victims and even the terrorists themselves vary from one attack to the next, their only permanent element being their aim to create terror and fear. It is true that many terrorist plots are frustrated and that even the fact that terrorists resort to cars or knives is a success, in the sense that it can lead us to believe that they experience growing difficulties in obtaining deadlier weapons. But a single successful terrorist attack is enough to obliterate the success of many frustrated ones.

We have to learn to live with the knowledge that zero security simply does not exist in our world and get used to it and be very clear about it. If we protect the parliament they will mow down pedestrians, and if we separate cars from sidewalks with barriers they will turn their attention to softer targets like public markets, a crowd attending a sports event, or whatever isolated rural parish they may fancy. And for this very reason we should avoid over-reacting, because more measures do not automatically amount to more efficiency, in the same way that more restrictions do not necessarily provide more security, or that more meetings do not perforce result in better cooperation.

In my own experience we have to search out terrorists, because if we just wait for them we will certainly be too late. That is why prevention and early detection are essential weapons in our struggle. That also means public awareness and support along the American lines of "neighbors watching" and "if you see something, you say something". And then, global threats demand shared security, as we need the full picture of a number of isolated minor crimes, difficult to prosecute in themselves and that only together allow us to detect a terrorist plot. There is no longer any difference between domestic and international terrorism and that is why the name of the game nowadays calls for better domestic coordination and more international cooperation, knowing full well the difficulties inherent in sharing sensitive information or sources. We must be more efficient in the integration of migrants and more vigilant about the spreading of radical ideas on the social networks. This is something no country can do alone. We have to learn from our mistakes and pull together our resources in the name of efficiency, and the European Union offers an ideal framework to do it. Change laws if we have to, but only after careful consideration and never under the impact of a murderous massive terrorist attack, remembering that any restrictions to our freedoms should only be imposed with a prior crystal clear definition in order to avoid abuses; with a restrictive character; only if they are absolutely necessary; at the lowest possible level; with pre-established temporal limits; and under adequate parliamentary and judicial control.

And, please, stop thinking of higher and higher barriers to stop terrorists at the borders, making travel more and more uncomfortable. After all, in the recent terrorist attack at London Bridge, the victims were three French, two Australians, one Spaniard, one Canadian and just one British citizen, whereas all three terrorists were British. Or maybe the border walls are intended to prevent more victims from coming in, as Fernando Savater has ironically suggested?

In the end we will prevail and that is just another reason why we have to protect our system of rights and civil liberties, paying attention to the fact that the growing demands of an impossible total security are encroaching into them and that we do not want to give terrorists a victory over our values and freedoms.

