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The G-20 is an international economic forum for cooperation and consultation on key issues related to the international financial system. It works by studying, reviewing and promoting dialogue among major industrialized countries, with emerging economies and markets, thereby enhancing the stability of the international financial and monetary system. It works to address the issues and crises that concern each of the Group countries through financial, monetary or economic measures, commensurate with the nature of the challenges and crises, and seeks to develop appropriate solutions to meet them. During the G-20 the major world powers in the group gave priority to make the financial system global "totally hostile to the financing of terrorism". A follower of large-scale financial crime cases addressed in group meetings focused on the terrorist acts that have been exposed to every part of the world as a global scourge that must be fought, and the emphasis on safe environmental elimination for terrorists.
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**Introduction**

The shifts towards a market economy in the post-Cold War world left large parts of the world in a state of economic decline. That facilitated organizations with wide geographical networks to reap the benefits of a market economy, by reproducing and transforming their networks and expanding them beyond legal boundaries. Money and financing in all its methods and motives are for terrorists, as an oxygen for living beings, and what resulted from the developments in the world economy during the last two decades of the twentieth century contributed to the emergence of the term ‘terrorism’ and took its place as a major influence on the international scene. So one of the most important risks to globalization and the most
serious threat to the world's economy are the vacuum zones used by terrorist organizations to finance their networks.

**The importance of research**

The importance of the research lies in highlighting the role of the G-20 in the fight against terrorist financing, as well as clarifying its place in the international system, which has given it a crucial role in the management of some international issues.

**Research problem**

The problem of research lies in the lack of agreement on an inclusive and unified concept of terrorism. What a particular state sees as terrorism, may mean another state's struggle. The concept of terrorism adapts to the interpretation that the state deems appropriate and serves its orientations and interests, so too the treatments and mechanisms used in the face of terrorism and its financing. This made the practices and actions taken by states ineffective in eliminating terrorism once and for all, and in combating its sources of financing. That is the case with the G-20, which has not been able to do so. Thus, the study will try to answer the following questions:

1. What is the G-20 and how has it evolved?
2. What is the position of the G-20 countries in the international system?
3. What is the role of the G-20 in combating terrorist financing?

**Research hypothesis**

The study proceeds from the premise that there is a shift in the global roles of organizations and economic groupings towards security issues. This is a result of international requirements and the emergence of security issues in the agendas of major countries, and their reflection on other countries which gave great importance to the security files in politics and foreign affairs, for most countries of the world.

**Structure of the study**

The study was divided into three attempts. The first axis included the emergence of the G-20 and its place in the international system. The second axis is the development of the work of the G-20. The third axis is the role of the G-20 in the fight against the financing of terrorism.
The first axis/ the emergence of the G-20 and its place in the international system
First: The Genesis of the G-20

Asian financial markets collapsed at the end of the 1990s. Afterwards, countries went through many meetings between the poles of the capitalist system, to counter the immediate and future effects of the crisis. The reactions of major industrialized countries edified the financial crises at the end of the 1990s, particularly after the financial crisis in South Asia and the Mexico crisis of 1995 (Khudair, 2009).

The G7 comprises the United States, Japan, Germany, Britain, Italy, France and Canada. It no longer represents the world's largest economies by the standards it created for itself after its first inception in 1975, transforming it from an economic club exercising consultative roles, to a semi-organized, multi-organization; a forum for coordinating international economic policies (Khalil, 2013).

China is about to lead the world's second economic position, and India, Brazil, South Korea, Spain and Mexico are in the top position as compared to the seven G7 countries. A new group first launched in 1997, according to the Group of 22 which first met in 1998 in Washington in April. The next stop was described as the Group of 33 in the same year. It aimed at involving non-G7 countries to take on global financial crises affecting emerging economies markets. But news from the G-20 before the end of the following year was realistic, through the G7 Finance Ministers' Conference in September 1999. Its conferences continued to be held in succession.

The group serves as a forum for economic cooperation between developed industrialized countries and countries with a range of transition economies, with the aim of studying and following up on the major and common economic and financial issues in the world. It includes the G20 members representing 19 countries and regional blocs. That includes the big seven (USA, Germany, Britain, France, Italy, and Canada), and Russia, China, India, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, South Korea, Turkey and the Union. The country’s annual Group meetings are usually held at the level of finance minister and central bank governor, and the President of the European Central Bank and the President of the International Monetary Fund are invited (Al-Alam).

Unlike other international economic and financial organizations, such as the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) or the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development (BIRD), the G-20 presidency does not have a secretariat or permanent staff. The presidency is periodic among members and selected from its member states.
For example, in 2009 the Presidency of Britain was assisted by the former President of the United States of America and the subsequent President of South Korea. The presidency is administered in accordance with the triangular formula, or troika, i.e. from the current, former and subsequent President. The periodic chair of the group constitutes a temporary secretariat for the management of his work tasks. That coordinates the steps of work and organizes minutes. The troika is limited to ensuring the continued management of the Group continuously over the years.

The creation of the G-20 was important with an international forum that plays a more important role than the G7. It represents emerging markets through periodic discussions on many issues related to the international financial system, and the establishment of a platform for dialogue and mutual understanding on those Issues. That provided an option to bridge the gap between industrialized and emerging economic countries, ensuring that the emerging market group is represented in decisions related to the global economy and the international financial system.

Second: The G-20's place in the international system

There is no doubt that the countries of this group are the strongest economically, financially and politically. Their directives and decisions have repercussions on different countries of the world, with nearly two thirds of the world's population living in the G-20 countries. The G-20 produces almost 80% of global GDP. It is driven by a set of basic objectives as follows: (Federal Statistical Office of Germany, 2017).

1. Coordinating policies among its members to achieve stability and sustainable growth of the global economy.
2. Strengthen financial regulations that reduce risk and prevent future financial crises.
3. Creating a new international financial structure.

In this regard, there are two periods of development of the G-20. The first lasted from December 1999 to November 2008. The group worked at the level of finance ministers only, and witnessed the holding of ten meetings of ministers of those countries with the participation of their deputies as well as the presidents of Central Banks, as well as the President of the Central Bank of the European Union and the Minister of State Finance, who chairs the Development Committee of the World Bank.

The second phase began in November 2008 with the group's shift to work at the level of heads of State. The first summit meeting took place on November 4th and 15th in Washington. The second meeting was on the first and second day of April 2009 in London. The third meeting took place on 24-25 September 2009 in Pittsburgh. Therefore, the shift
towards summit-level meetings indicates the extent of interest from the members of the group to the initiation of more important future roles (Ibid).

The impact of that interest on the development of the organization structure of the G-20 can be seen in the principles adopted by Member States. The principles were based on flexibility and avoidance of reliance on bureaucratic institutions. Through this it can be described as an international forum, more than the possibility of referring to it as an institution or an international organization. This description confirms its attempt to move away from the principle of adherence to treaties, by focusing on modern frameworks that are somewhat similar to the Indian Ocean Community for Regional Cooperation. “IORARC” went towards managing the issues of economic cooperation and trade liberalization without having a device. It established a secretariat that was temporary each year through the country that is responsible for the group's presidency, coordinating the work within the group and organizing its meetings.

The Group does not operate as an institution that alone reduces international issues with an economic dimension. It is limited to developing common positions on many complex issues, and facilitating the formulation of appropriate decisions for other institutions, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

**The second axis / the evolution of the Work of the G-20**

**First: The development of the institutional structure of the group**

Flexible institutionalization is the principle underlying the institutional structure of the group. It is divided into two parts. The first is a simple level of bureaucracy and hierarchy. It avoids the establishment of a secretariat at a broad hierarchical level, and this is compensated by managing its work in accordance with a mechanism consisting of: (Jon, 2010)

1 - The host country of the group meetings shall establish a secretariat to follow up and organize the work of the group for one year (the duration of the presidency of the group), as the presidency and hosting of member states are traded alternately between their countries.
2 - The formation of the "Troika" works to perpetuate the holding of meetings between the countries of the group through the terrace of one of its countries for those meetings as well as the membership of the main country of the group for the past year as well as subsequent.

The second part goes to the non-compulsory and illegal nature. It does not depend on the framework similar to treaties and conventions of a mandatory nature. It relies on alternative mechanisms consisting of a system based on a set of objectives for Member States to take over a specified period of time, while leaving responsibility for the implementation of each Member State in accordance with its own circumstances.
The philosophy of "flexible institutionalism" is based on the accumulation of previous experiences of multilateral international collective action during the 1950s and the mid-1980s. At that time it relied on institutional structures with large bureaucracies and secretariats that, among other factors, were the main causes. The failure of teamwork experiments as a result of the magnitude of the costly requirements that were not available to the Member States of those institutions, in addition to the results that resulted in the adoption of the mandatory legal institution and its failure to achieve its objectives due to the adoption of highly ambitious commitments that exceeded its real capacities, forcing Member States have to express reservations about their conventions, thereby pushing them to empty their content.

On the other hand, the flexible institutional model is the most appropriate alternative in the case of the G-20. That is so given the disparity between the G-7 industrialized countries and the rising market countries, both in population size and GDP. It also relates to the level of economic and social development as well as geographical area, which may precipitate a push for some kind of sensitivity among the relatively medium and small countries as compared to the seven major industrialized countries, and exacerbate their negative feelings about the effects of their obligations.

In the face of this, the flexible mechanism model is most suited to the G-20. A number of emerging markets for members of the Group are part of the APEC Forum, such as China, Mexico, Indonesia and South Korea, as well as the United States, Russia, Japan and Canada. Half the Group's members are part of the APEC Forum, which is the applied model for the state of flexible institutional application. The introduction of such a model relates to the disapproval of the emerging Asian countries that there are economic projects shared with foreign countries and the United States or its allies, for fear of perpetuating U.S. and Western hegemony over the Asia-Pacific region.

In light of this, the flexible institutional model is due to the experience of the larger number of G20 members, which was hoped to be rejected by many countries. In the light of the G-20 countries' achievement in November 2008, they moved to work at the summit level rather than just Finance Ministers. That has increased optimism about the role the group can play in managing the economic problems of the world order, given the broad decision-making powers of the summit level in many areas, and the imperatives of expanding the group's agenda beyond monetary and financial issues. The representative status of the peoples of their countries is also important, compared to the level of finance ministers who act within a range of powers limited by their political authorities mainly to the financial sphere. The importance of considering political representation stems from the importance of the legitimacy of the group to the international community — compared to the Group of Seven industrialized nations, which are not available in many international economic institutions.
Summit levels became an important part of the organizational structure of the group after the summit in Pittsburgh in September 2009, especially after it made a formal decision, making it an essential part of the institutional framework for the group's work.

Second: The development of the group's work at the level of the summits

The most important developments in the work of the G-20 occurred during 2008 and 2009 by introducing summits, and the level of its relationship with regulatory frameworks can be indicated through the agenda of the summits in terms of their importance to the Group as follows:

1 - Washington Summit (November 15-16, 2008): The Group focused on understanding the main causes of the global financial crisis, reviewing the commitment to the open global economy, and working to achieve harmony in the international market, and concluding that the group's commitment to the world market was confirmed. The need was to reform the global financial market, including the pursuit of strengthening transparency, controls on financial markets and risk, including monitoring the functioning of lending institutions, encouraging integration in financial markets by improving the conditions for the protection of consumers and investors alike, and settling Trade disputes, avoidance of monopolies, promotion of information sharing, promotion of international cooperation by seeking consistent and harmonious legislation that promote cross-border cooperation in capital flows, as well as the reform of international financial institutions, such as the Bank and the International Monetary Fund, among others from the international financial institution (Jon Kirton).

2 - London Summit (1-3 April 2009), saw the support of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Gordon Brown, to the direction that called for the need to restructure the current financial system and re-establish a new form of financial system, which reinforced the first step of the trends and positions of the countries of the Group of the problem of change. The role played by the Bretton Woods institutions and the emphasis on the creation of an alternative institution or at least work in parallel, as the G-20 sought to take specific steps in the face of the global financial and economic crisis, including the provision of more loans and financial assistance to countries poor and rising, including nearly $750 million in direct assistance, $300 million in loans to low-income countries, through multilateral development banks and in multiple payments of about $100 million annually. These measures also included easing obligations relating to the collection of loans from the International Fund (Declaration on Delivering, 2009). In addition, the summit reaffirmed the Group's commitment to the principles of the Washington Summit, issuing a report on progress in the implementation of those principles, and the group agreed on a package of reforms, including
changing the FSB and expanding its membership to include all members of the G-20, as the Council's role changes to become broader in international crisis management, by establishing control selections to encourage coordination among national regulators, monitoring risks within the global economy, and making recommendations on various global economic developments and regulatory policies proposed to deal with those developments (Jon Kirton).

3 -Pittsburgh Summit (September 24-25, 2009): Focused on the problem of reform in the current global financial system, as well as fluctuations in macroeconomic indicators. For its part, the United States of America raised the issue of the disparity between countries with huge government budgets and deficits stable trade as it has, and other countries with relatively stable trade surpluses, such as China, Germany and Japan, which is pushing for the stability of one-way financial flows from deficit countries to surplus countries. The summit also focused on the need to adopt appropriate mechanisms for sustainable and balanced growth based on periodic and reciprocal review of the economic policy actions of the Group' countries (Claudia Schumacher, 2009).

4 -South Korea Summit (2010): It stressed the need to refrain from policies of devaluation of its currencies to strengthen its competitive strength, and warned against the application of economic policies "uncontrolled" because it will lead to serious consequences for all by creating the right environment for currency wars (Deutsche Well).

5 -Cannes, France Summit (2011). It brought together G-20 leaders and discussed strengthening financial regulations, particularly in non-bank financial institutions, as well as regulation on financial market integrity and transparency, to combat corruption, for example. To ensure that the anti-corruption action plan adopted at the G20 summit in Seoul will produce tangible results and real progress starting in 2011, it examined international economic cooperation and the Arizona crisis.

6 -Antalya-Turkey Summit. It topped the Syrian crisis and the fight against terrorism and migration agenda, during which Saudi Arabia proposed the need to establish an international centre to fight terrorism under the supervision of the United Nations, and announced national readiness to contribute 115 million dollars to finance it (The King of Saudi Arabia).

7 -Hangzhou, China Summit. It was held on September 4-5, 2016 in Hangzhou, Zhejiang. It was the first summit to be held in China and the second in Asia after the fifth G-20 Summit in Seoul, South Korea. It came to discuss ways to achieve a solid and sustainable global economic growth, and also witnessed differences between Moscow and Washington concerning Syria.
8. -Hamburg Summit (2017): The leaders of the 20 countries issued a joint statement on July 7-8, 2017. It contained several points related to countering terrorism, the most important of which is: "Terrorism is a global scourge that must be fought, and any sanctuary for terrorists around the world must be eliminated." All sources and channels of financing of terrorism, as well as highlighting the importance of supporting religious and political tolerance, economic development, and social cohesion, to prevent violent conflicts."

9 - Buenos Aires Summit (2018): It marked the 12th G20 meeting. This is the first G20 summit to be hosted by South America (Argentina), the most important of which is the emphasis on "the need to strengthen dialogue to reduce risks to the global economy and to strengthen confidence." This followed the U.S. threat to impose more taxes on foreign imports. On the sidelines of the summit, French President Emmanuel Macron and Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman, a spokeswoman for the French presidency confirmed to CNN, that the two leaders met for five minutes on the sidelines of the G20 summit, and discussed the "need to find a political solution in Yemen" and oil prices, specifically the role that can be For Saudi Arabia to practice the volatility of oil prices.(G20 Summit).

10 - Osaka, Japan Summit (2019): It met on June 28-29. where Japan will host its first-ever G20 summit. In conjunction with the summit meeting, a meeting of Finance Ministers, central bank governors, a meeting of foreign ministers, and other ministerial meetings will be held at eight different locations throughout Japan.(Website of the Public Relations).

It is useful to mention that the topic of attention to reducing the risk of financing terrorism was among many issues directly or indirectly related, by emphasizing the need to create a global format that deals with immediate variables quickly without being satisfied with the more formal means of bureaucracy. Although complex, this contributes to the creation of a framework for constructive interaction necessarily linked to the trends of political and economic interests that are now more overlapping in today's world.

The third axis: the role of the G-20 in the fight against terrorist financing

First: The definition of terrorist financing

Terrorism financing is defined through the 1999 UN Convention on the Suppression of Terrorist Financing, which, according to Article II, states:

“1 .Commits the crime of any person who performs any means, directly or indirectly, unlawfully and willingly, to provide or collect funds for use, or to know that it will be used in whole or in part to:

(a) An act that constitutes a crime within the scope of a treaty.
(b) Any act aimed at causing the loss of the life of a civilian or any other person, or serious bodily injury, when the person is not involved in hostilities in the event of an armed conflict, when the purpose of such an act, by its nature or context, is intended to terrorize the population, or to force an international Government or organization to throw or any action or refrain from doing it”.

The Agreement resulted from a French initiative supported by the Group of Eight industrialized nations. In May 1998 their foreign ministers identified the issue of preventing the collection of funds for terrorist spills as a priority area for additional action. In 1998, France began negotiations on the Convention and submitted a proposed text to the United Nations. In September 1998 the General Assembly decided to appoint the Committee for the Special Committee on The Establishment of resolution (210/51) the Agreement (General Assembly Resolution, 108/53). On September 9, 1999, the Assembly adopted the general text of the convention, signed by 132 countries. It came into force in (80) countries as of April 30, 2003 (May, 2012).

The Financial Action Force (FATF) was also not known for its provisions of financial measures on anti-money laundering and terrorist financing; recognized as the standard-setting body for State efforts in the fight against money laundering and terrorist financing. The term terrorist financing was not directly defined, particularly in the recommendations on terrorist financing issued after the events of September 11, 2001. But the FATF discussed and invited countries to conclude the UN International Convention on the Suppression and Financing of Terrorism mentioned above. The definition in the convention referred to is adopted by most countries for the purposes of defining terrorist financing.

"The terrorist financing" meant the money that terrorists receive and collect to finance their activities. The broad concept of these funds and other illicit resources used in these activities," for example, is estimated to be approximately $1,500,000, a small cost relative to the political and economic implications of it (Mahrezi). The financing of terrorism can be defined as an operation by an individual, group or state, whether directly or indirectly, whether in the case of public or secret, by providing or raising funds or contributing funds with the intention of using it, or contributing in part or in whole, to supporting terrorists or values with terrorist acts.

Second: Steps to fight terrorism in the G20

The impact of terrorism on the international economy decreased by 7% compared to 2015, a decrease of 19% compared to 2014. Material losses reached $84 billion in 2016, and in 2017 the amount of material losses was $52 billion, 42% less than in 2016. Iraq suffered the highest rate of economic losses due to terrorism in 2016 and 2017 as a result of the ongoing
government-led military campaign against the Group. The decision to withdraw from the
country's territory is a major concern for the Iraqi Government (Saad Bin Ali al-Shahrani).

1 -The place of the fight against terrorism among the members of the group

The "financing of terrorism" file is an important aspect of the group's attention as the
bombings targeting the Stade de France in the Parisian suburbs and a number of restaurants in
the 10th and 11th circles of Paris represented the worst attacks on France since World War II,
At least 132 people were killed and 400 injured. It is in a sense, 11 September, 2011.

Former French President Hollande said France was in an "open war with terrorism". A state
of emergency was imposed and a three-day mourning order was ordered. These attacks,
planned by The Daesh Organization, are the point of no return in a long battle between ISIS
on the one hand and the French state and the international coalition states (Rachid, 2015) in
general, on the other hand. The incident was a focal point of Europe's interest in the fight
against terrorism in particular and the major countries in a year, especially those in the G20
grouping. "Apart from solidarity and vulnerability after the Paris attacks, France wants
concrete decisions in the fight against terrorist financing," said Saban, who was represented
along with former French President Francois Hollande at the G20 summit.

According to the draft final statement of the G20 summit, the summit condemned what it
described as the heinous attacks in Paris. They called for combating the financing of
"terrorism" and promoting the exchange of information for countries in this regard. The draft
final statement of the summit conveyed the concern of countries about the increasing influx
of foreign "terrorists", and stressed that "terrorism" could not be linked to any religion,
nationality or race. The draft urged the need to enhance security for international borders.

**Third: Develop key steps to combat terrorist financing**

The July 7, 2017 summit, in which Germany hosted the G20 summit in Hamburg, brought
together Canada, the United States, France and Germany, along with Britain, Italy and Japan.
It was a response to the need for cooperation, the first start of the G20 in the fight against
terrorism.

On the other hand, the G-20 reaffirmed its commitment to combating the financing of
terrorism and its propaganda, a rare point of consensus among the summit participants. The
declaration emphasizes the support of the "Financial Working Group", a body established in
1989 and issuing recommendations on a regular basis to its members 37 on ways to combat
financial crime and terrorist financing. "We support the ongoing process of strengthening the
work of the Financial Working Group." “We welcome this group's pursuit of legal cover”, to
increase transparency and beneficial ownership of legal persons and legal arrangements, and to strengthen governance and the institutional foundation of the Financial Working Group. Angela Merkel has announced that the G20 countries want to expand counter-terrorism cooperation and tighten measures against propaganda on the Internet. This push for strengthening the relationship between the countries of the Group and its bilateral relations, as well as with countries outside the group, contributes to deepening international reliability and establishing a culture for world peace.

G-20 leaders issued a detailed statement on counter-terrorism. With regard to the fight against terrorist financing, the statement highlighted a number of financial issues at the summit in Argentina, as follows- : (Ibid.)

1- The G-20 calls on all States to close all alternative sources of terrorist financing, including dismantling potential links between terrorism and organized crime, such as human trafficking. Following the UN call in Security Council Resolution 2331 for regional agencies such as FATF to analyze the links between human trafficking and terrorist financing, the Financial Task Force will update and deepen its understanding of financial flows associated with human trafficking, including those that it ends up in the hands of terrorist organizations.

2- Focus on financial intelligence units and banks in developing new tools and techniques to track terrorist financing.

3- Improving the existing international information structure in the areas of security, travel and migration, including Interpol, to ensure the necessary balance between security and data protection.

4- Increase the use of customs security programmes, including, where appropriate, the Security Programme of the World Customs Organization and counter-terrorism strategy, which focuses on strengthening the ability of customs departments to deal with security.

The group's work on counter-terrorist financing operations has also focused on deradicalization programmes, promoting the strategy of combating propaganda and extremism leading to terrorism and the use of the Internet (social media sites) for terrorist purposes:

1. Counter-terrorism action must remain part of a comprehensive approach, including countering extremism and recruitment, hindering terrorist movements and countering terrorist propaganda.

2. We stress that the fight against terrorism requires a comprehensive treatment of the basic conditions exploited by terrorists. It is therefore important to promote political and religious tolerance, economic development, social cohesion and inclusiveness, to resolve armed conflicts and to facilitate reintegration.

3. We will work with the private sector, particularly telecommunications service providers and administrators for related applications, to combat the exploitation of the Internet and social media for terrorist purposes such as propaganda, financing, planning of terrorist acts, incitement to terrorism, extremism and recruitment. Terrorist, with respect for human rights.
We also stress the importance of the role of the media, civil society, religious groups, the business community and educational institutions in creating an environment conducive to the prevention of extremism and terrorism.

We say that the momentum achieved towards drying up the sources of funding for terrorism, and the international emphasis on the need to deepen cooperation in this regard is beneficial. Terrorism has become a phenomenon affecting states in general. Through penetrating borders, and growing means of communication, they no longer exist only in developing countries. In light of those means, global openness, increased interdependence and the accompanying legal and economic facilities, there is a wide range of support for terrorist operations. It articulates broad concerns not limited to one or a few countries.

Conclusions

The G-20 has developed roles, in terms of both foundation and development at the summit level. It indicates a range of interest in the future of the Group and its role on many global issues, particularly with regard to terrorism and its financing methods. A series of conclusions have been reached:

1. The countries of this group are globally the strongest economically, politically and financially. Its directives and decisions will therefore have positive repercussions on various countries of the world, particularly in the fight against terrorist financing, and its actions will directly impact the movement of the international financing of terrorism.
2. The G-20, at several summits and specifically at the Hamburg Summit, affirmed its commitment to combating the financing of terrorism and its propaganda. That was one of the unanimous points among the summit participants. It indicates the distinctive role of the Group countries in combating the financing of terrorism and contributing to reduce its negatives in the future.
3. Support is needed for the Financial Working Group, a body established in 1989 that regularly issues recommendations to its 37 members on ways to combat financial crime and terrorist financing.
4. Vigilance is needed to uncover any link between terrorism and "other forms of organized crime", from arms trade to theft of antiquities, to drug and human trafficking.
5. The G-20 needs to work with the private sector, especially telecommunications service providers, to improve ways to combat hard-line online advertising.
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