

This questionnaire supports lectures dedicated to terrorism, counterterrorism, IHL and human rights. It can be copy-pasted in online apps, such as *wooclap*, *socrative* or *polleverywhere* for live use with students.

1. *In a few words, what would you say is the biggest myth related to CT, sanctions and IHL you've come across so far?*

2. *"IHL does not apply to 'terrorism' and 'counterterrorism' legal and practical measures"*

- It's totally a myth!
- It certainly does not!
- Mh, let me think about that one...
- I don't know...
- I prefer not to answer that one. Can you bring me next please?

3. *"Only IHL can be applied to the 'war on terror'"*

- True, as *lex specialis*, it is logical IHL takes precedence over IHRL to regulate the 'war on terror' worldwide.
- It's a myth! IHL would not apply as such to the global 'war on terror', but only to specific situations that can be classified as armed conflicts, based on objective facts on the ground. And IHRL remains applicable at all times in that respect.
- True, because IHL provides a "common grammar" for the coalition of actors fighting terrorism worldwide.

- I don't know...
- I prefer not to answer that one. Can you bring me next please?

4. *"Terrorists' are not afforded any protection under IHL or IHRL, because they target civilians in the first place."*

- It's a myth! Certain guarantees under both IHL and IHRL apply to all individuals, including 'terrorists'.
- True, 'terrorist' act by their very nature are in violation of rules of IHL and IHRL. Accordingly, 'terrorists' do not enjoy any protection.
- True, why should 'terrorists' enjoy the protection from the law and order they're fighting against?
- I don't know...
- I prefer not to answer that one. Can you bring me next please?

5. *"The problem comes from the absence of a universal definition of 'terrorism'".*

- True, 'terrorism' is merely a political label.
- True, there is no clear definition of 'terrorism' in international law.
- It's a myth! There is no 'problem' as long as 'counterterrorism' legislations and measures preserve the integrity of IHL..
- I don't know...
- I prefer not to answer that one. Can you bring me next please?

6. *"Individual behaviors criminalized by CT laws can actually be lawful under IHL."*

- It's a myth! CT laws and IHL ARE harmonized!

- True, you could, say 'blow up an enemy military camp' under IHL, while you would be prosecuted for that under any CT law.
- True, you can go to sleep as a noble humanitarian worker and wake up the next morning in a cell, being accused of supporting 'terrorists' because of the chats you had with them or the food distrib' you set up in their area.
- I don't know...
- I prefer not to answer that one. Can you bring me next please?

7. *"Even training 'terrorists' to make them comply with IHL is criminalized by some CT laws"*

- True, some national 'counterterrorism' laws criminalize any form of training to 'terrorists', regardless of its nature.
- It's a myth! States are aware of the importance of IHL and the need to provide exemptions for the dissemination of IHL.
- I don't know
- I prefer not to answer that one. Can you bring me next please?

8. *"IHL allows you to criminalize 'rogue humanitarians' helping 'terrorists' by preserving the humanitarian space for neutral and impartial humanitarians at the same time".*

- True, IHL is very clear on criminalizing rogue humanitarians providing actual support to 'terrorist' operations.
- It's a myth! IHL does not really regulate this issue.
- Somewhat true, IHL stipulates the guiding principles of humanitarian actions, and states can criminalize actions that are not compatible with those principles.
- I don't know

- I prefer not to answer that one. Can you bring me next please?

9. *"It is legitimate and lawful to restrict in advance the rights of suspected 'terrorist' to avoid bloodsheds".*

- It's a myth! Under IHRL, all individuals enjoy absolute guarantees against interference in their private life and freedoms.
- True, better safe than sorry.
- Limitable rights can always be restricted provided there is a legitimate aim (e.g. public order, national security etc) and provided that the measures taken are necessary and proportionate.
- I don't know
- I prefer not to answer that one. Can you bring me next please?

10. *"Whatever IHRL/IHL says, UN Security Council CT measures, including sanctions against terrorists, prevail."*

- True, exceptional circumstances call for exceptional measure and the UNSC's sanctions against terrorists fit its role and mandate.
- Somewhat true, UNSC sanctions prevail over other international obligations as per art. 103 of the UN Charter.
- It's a myth! The UNSC's sanctions are not above the law and States must harmonize their obligations under the UN Charter with their obligations under IHRL.
- I don't know
- I prefer not to answer that one. Can you bring me next please?

11. *"Counterterrorism' laws and measures can be compatible with both IHL and IHRL".*

- It's a myth! 'Terrorism' is a new phenomenon that IHL and IHRL failed to deal with.
- It's a myth! There is inherent tension between 'terrorism' and IHL / IHRL.
- True, a well drafted CT law can be made compatible with a state's obligations under IHL and IHRL.
- I don't know
- I prefer not to answer that one. Can you bring me next please?

12. *"The best way to remedy 'terrorism' both effectively and lawfully is for States to prevent and counter violent extremism".*

- Somewhat true, but you would need to check that PVE/CVE measures respect IHRL and fulfil their purposes.
- It's a myth! How could States agree on the notion of "violent extremism" and regulate measures against it, if they could not agree on the definition of "terrorism"?
- True, better feel safe than sorry.
- I don't know
- I prefer not to answer that one. Can you bring me next please?

13. *"Since when does the ICRC deal with 'terrorism'? I thought you guys were into armed conflicts!"*

- True, the ICRC has a specific mandate and should abide by it, instead of playing "wannabe world police".
- True, the ICRC should focus on provision of humanitarian aid in armed conflicts. That's what it's aimed for and that's what it does best.
- It's a myth! CT laws and measures incompatible with IHL affect the humanitarian work of the ICRC and its ability to assist the most affected communities.

- I don't know
- I prefer not to answer that one. Can you bring me to the next please?

© International Committee of the Red Cross