

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: North, Oliver L.: Files
Folder Title: Terrorism – Public Diplomacy
(1984)
Box: 106

To see more digitized collections visit:
<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:
<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name NORTH, OLIVER: FILES

Withdrawer

CAS 5/21/2012

File Folder TERRORISM - PUBLIC DIPLOMACY (1984)

FOIA

M11-442

Box Number ~~FBI-101~~ Box 106

HAENNI

9

ID	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
137079	PAPER	RE PROPOSAL	2	1/12/1984	B1
137081	PAPER	RE COUNTERTERRORISM	1	ND	B1

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

NORTH, OLIVER: FILES

Withdrawer

CAS 5/21/2012

File Folder

TERRORISM - PUBLIC DIPLOMACY (1984)

FOIA

M11-442

HAENNI

Box Number

FBI-101

9

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
137079 PAPER	RE PROPOSAL	2	1/12/1984	B1

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]

B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]

B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]

B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]

B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]

B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]

B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]

B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

am transmitting ~~today~~

to which this
legislation is
being sent

During the past year, international terrorism has taken a terrifying toll in human life. It is becoming an increasing danger to democratic society, posing a threat to our way of life and that of our friends and allies. ~~This~~ very chamber has been damaged by those who would deny Americans their most fundamental freedoms. In the year ahead, we must improve our ability to thwart the brutality and senseless violence of terrorism. To that end, I ~~will be sending~~ ^{today} to the Congress a package of five bills designed to implement a more effective program against terrorism. Two of these bills will enable us to fully adhere to the provisions of the Montreal Convention against aircraft sabotage and the United Nations Convention against taking hostages. Another would make it a crime anywhere in United States jurisdiction to conspire to assist or to commit terrorist acts. The United States cannot be permitted to become a place where terrorism can be mounted against people of our country or of other countries. A fourth bill provides authority to pay rewards for information on international terrorist activities. The fifth bill allows the prosecution of those who help states or groups which engage in terrorism. I will also be asking our similarly threatened European and Japanese allies to address this matter on an urgent basis during our Summit this June. We must improve the cooperation among democracies if we are to persevere against this dreadful threat. I ask for bipartisan support for these initiatives in protecting our people and helping to rid the world of this affront to humanity.

DRAFT STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY ON TERRORISM

As I announced in my State of the Union Message, I sent to the Congress today a package of five bills designed to systematize and strengthen our country's response to terrorism, and to help protect our people and facilities from terrorist attack. I want to take this occasion to state categorically that the United States cannot and does not condone the practice of terrorism by anyone in any cause, and this Administration intends to resist it by every legal means available. As I have stated before, terrorism is a problem for all nations, and I intend to have this Government work as closely as possible with other governments to put an end to it.

We have cause for deep concern about the states that now practice or support terrorism, but our policy is directed against terrorism of any sort. The states and groups that practice terrorism or actively support it cannot be allowed to do so without consequence. We will use every channel of communication that is available to us to persuade the states now practicing or supporting terrorism to stop. If that fails, whenever we have the evidence that a state or a group is mounting or intends to mount an act of terrorism against us, we have the right to take steps to protect our people and facilities.

We will make a major effort ourselves and work closely

with other governments to obtain the information we need about the states and groups involved in terrorist activities to be able to prevent attacks, warn our people, our friends and allies, and lower the risk to them. We will do everything that we can to see that acts of state supported terrorism are publicized and condemned in every appropriate forum.

SPEECH BY AMBASSADOR ROBERT M. SAYRE

TO THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMISSION

OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

AT THEIR MID-WINTER CONVENTION

CAPITAL HILTON HOTEL

FEBRUARY 29, 1984

MR. CHAIRMAN:

MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMISSION OF THE
AMERICAN LEGION:

SOME FORTY YEARS AGO I WAS IN TENNESSEE AS A MOTOR OFFICER IN AN ARMY TRUCK COMPANY ENGAGED IN MANUEVERS. IN A FEW MONTHS I WOULD BE IN EUROPE. I HAD SEEN ALL OF THE ARMY MOVIES ON "KNOW YOUR ENEMY" AND WHY WE FIGHT" OR AT LEAST I HAD SEEN SO MANY THAT I THOUGHT THAT I HAD SEEN THEM ALL. WE HAD BEEN TAUGHT ABOUT THE RULES OF LAND WARFARE AND HAD BEEN WARNED IF CAPTURED TO GIVE NOTHING BUT NAME, RANK AND SERIAL NUMBER. I HAD STUDIED ALL THE UNIFORMS AND INSIGNIA OF THE ENEMY. WE BECAME ACQUAINTED WITH HIS EQUIPMENT AND HIS AIRCRAFT. ONE COULD READ IN THE PRESS ABOUT THE FRONTLINES IN ITALY AND IN A FEW MONTHS WE WOULD KNOW EXACTLY WHERE THESE LINES WERE IN WESTERN EUROPE.

I HAD NOT EXPECTED THEN AS AN ARMY OFFICER TO BECOME A DIPLOMAT. A FEW YEARS AGO AS A DIPLOMAT I WOULD NOT HAVE THOUGHT OF BEING IN CHARGE OF THE "WARROOM" OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AS WE TRY TO COMBAT TERRORISM--THE NEW KIND OF WARFARE DIRECTED AGAINST US.

IN THIS NEW KIND OF WARFARE, THERE ARE NO FRONTLINES AND OUR "SOLDIERS" ARE THE CIVIL POLICE FORCE. THE ENEMY PLAYS BY NO RULES EXCEPT HIS OWN, HAS NO UNIFORM OR INSIGNIA TO

STUDY. IS ELUSIVE AND THE REASONS FOR ATTACKING US AND OUR ALLIES ARE MORE OFTEN THAN NOT MURKY. THE TERRORIST IS AS LIKELY TO BE A WOMAN AS A MAN. THE VICTIM IS MUCH MORE LIKELY TO BE A CIVILIAN OFFICIAL THAN MILITARY.

IT IS INDEED A NEW BALL GAME.

IN THE ALMOST PROPHETIC WORDS OF A FORMER PRESIDENT SOME 20 YEARS AGO, WE HAVE BEEN CALLED "TO BEAR THE BURDEN OF A LONG TWILIGHT STRUGGLE, YEAR IN AND YEAR OUT, "REJOICING IN HOPE, PATIENT IN TRIBULATION."

YOUR LETTER TO ME EXPRESSED YOUR CONCERN ABOUT THE INCREASE IN INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM AND YOU INVITED ME TO MEET WITH YOU AND TO DISCUSS WHAT THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IS DOING TO COMBAT THE PROBLEM.

WE ARE IN A TRIBULATION PHASE OF THE LONG TWILIGHT STRUGGLE.

THERE WAS A SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM IN 1983. THERE WERE ALMOST 900 INCIDENTS IN 1983 AS OPPOSED TO 791 IN 1982; APPROXIMATELY A 13% INCREASE. THE MOST DRAMATIC INCIDENTS WERE THE BOMBING OF THE AMERICAN EMBASSIES IN BEIRUT AND KUWAIT AND OF THE MARINE BARRACKS IN

BEIRUT. MORE AMERICANS LOST THEIR LIVES TO TERRORIST INCIDENTS IN 1983 THAN IN ALL OTHER INCIDENTS SINCE WE BEGAN KEEPING STATISTICS IN 1968. THE CONCERN YOU EXPRESS IS ENTIRELY JUSTIFIED.

BUT IF WE ARE TO HAVE AN EFFECTIVE STRATEGY IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO DISCUSS THE PATTERN OF TERRORISM AND HOW THE PROBLEM AFFECTS US WORLDWIDE, AND NOT JUST THE EVENTS OF THE PAST FEW MONTHS.

FOR SEVERAL YEARS NOW, THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF TERRORIST INCIDENTS HAS BEEN IN WESTERN EUROPE. THIS WAS ALSO TRUE IN 1983. THE INCIDENTS HAVE NOT BEEN AS DRAMATIC AS THOSE IN THE MIDDLE EAST, BUT THERE HAVE BEEN MORE OF THEM. THE SECOND HIGHEST LEVEL OF INCIDENTS IS IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE MIDDLE EAST IS A CLOSE THIRD. THERE IS TERRORISM IN OTHER AREAS, BUT THE LEVEL IS MUCH LOWER THAN IN THESE THREE MAJOR AREAS.

THE TYPES OF INCIDENTS IN 1983 FOLLOWED THE PATTERN OF PREVIOUS YEARS, BUT WE BELIEVE THAT THE TACTICS OF THE TERRORIST HAVE CHANGED. THEIR OBJECTIVE, OF COURSE, IS TO GET PUBLICITY AND CALL ATTENTION TO THEIR CAUSE. PREVIOUSLY THEY HAVE EMPHASIZED SEIZING OF AIRCRAFT AND BUILDINGS AND THE KIDNAPPING OF PROMINENT PERSONS. THE MORE RECENT

INCIDENTS ARE MORE HIT-AND-RUN IN NATURE. THE TERRORISTS ARE MORE PRONE TO KILL; AND THE KILLING HAS BECOME MORE INDISCRIMINATE. THE RISK TO THE TERRORIST--EXCEPT THE DRIVER OF A SUICIDE VEHICLE--IS MUCH REDUCED WITH SUCH TACTICS; THE CONSEQUENCES FOR THE VICTIM IS MUCH MORE SEVERE. THE PUBLICITY FOR THE CAUSE IS JUST AS GREAT--INDEED IT MAY EVEN BE MORE EFFECTIVE AS WE HAVE SEEN IN THE CASE OF THE BOMBINGS OF THE MARINE BARRACKS IN BEIRUT. THE POLICY IMPACT MAY ALSO BE GREATER.

DIPLOMATS WERE THE TARGET OF THE TERRORISTS IN OVER HALF THE INCIDENTS. BY NATIONALITY, AMERICANS HAVE NORMALLY BEEN THE VICTIMS IN ONE-THIRD OF THE CASES. BUT IN 1983 THAT CLIMBED TO ALMOST ONE-HALF THE CASES. OTHERS INCLUDED ISRAEL, FRANCE, TURKEY, AND POLITICALLY MODERATE ARAB COUNTRIES.

THE EVENTS OF 1983 ARE ALSO SIGNIFICANT BECAUSE THEY HIGHLIGHTED THE EXTENT TO WHICH SOVEREIGN STATES ARE ENGAGED IN TERRORISM AND USING IT AS AN INSTRUMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY. THE MOST UNEQUIVOCAL CASE WAS THE ATTEMPT OF THE NORTH KOREAN GOVERNMENT IN BURMA TO ASSASSINATE THE PRESIDENT OF SOUTH KOREA. SEVERAL MEMBERS OF THE SOUTH KOREAN CABINET LOST THEIR LIVES. THE TERRORISTS WERE MEMBERS OF THE NORTH KOREAN ARMY.

EVIDENCE HAS BEEN LESS CLEAR IN OTHER CASES, BUT THE INTELLIGENCE ON IRANIAN AND SYRIAN INVOLVEMENT IN ACTS OF TERRORISM IN THE MIDDLE EAST IS PERSUASIVE. THE UNITED STATES DECIDED TO ADD IRAN TO THE LIST OF STATES SUPPORTING TERRORISM WHICH ALREADY INCLUDED SYRIA, LIBYA, SOUTH YEMEN AND CUBA.

WE NOT ONLY HAVE TO LOOK AT THE STATES THAT USE TERRORISM AS AN INSTRUMENT OF STATE POLICY, BUT THOSE COUNTRIES WHICH PROVIDE SUPPORT AND ASSISTANCE TO SUCH COUNTRIES. THE SOVIET UNION IS THE BEST EXAMPLE OF THIS TYPE OF ACTIVITY. AS WE HAVE POINTED OUT IN OUR PUBLICATIONS ON TERRORISM, THE SOVIET UNION AND ITS ALLIES HAVE PROVIDED TRAINING, ARMS, AND OTHER DIRECT AND INDIRECT SUPPORT TO A VARIETY OF NATIONAL INSURGENT AND SEPARATIST GROUPS. MANY OF THESE GROUPS COMMIT INTERNATIONAL TERRORIST ATTACKS AS PART OF THEIR PROGRAM OF REVOLUTIONARY VIOLENCE. MOREOVER, SOME OF THE INDIVIDUALS TRAINED AND EQUIPPED BY THE SOVIETS MAKE THEIR WAY INTO STRICTLY TERRORIST GROUPS WITH LITTLE REVOLUTIONARY HISTORY OR POTENTIAL.

MOSCOW CONTINUES TO MAINTAIN CLOSE RELATIONS WITH AND TO FURNISH AID TO GOVERNMENTS AND ORGANIZATIONS THAT DIRECTLY SUPPORT TERRORIST GROUPS. IN THE MIDDLE EAST, FOR EXAMPLE, THE SOVIETS SELL LARGE QUANTITIES OF ARMS TO LIBYA. THE

SOVIETS SUPPORT PALESTINIAN GROUPS THAT CONDUCT TERRORIST OPERATIONS. IN LATIN AMERICA, THE SOVIET UNION AND CUBA APPEAR TO BE PURSUING A LONG-TERM COORDINATED CAMPAIGN TO ESTABLISH SYMPATHETIC LATIN AMERICAN REGIMES. PART OF THIS CAMPAIGN INVOLVES NURTURING ORGANIZATIONS AND GROUPS THAT USE TERRORISM IN THEIR EFFORTS TO UNDERMINE EXISTING REGIMES. IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD, ESPECIALLY AFRICA, THE SOVIETS HAVE SUPPORTED GUERRILLA MOVEMENTS AND NATIONAL LIBERATION ORGANIZATIONS, SUCH AS THE AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS (ANC), THAT ENGAGE IN TERRORISM.

WE CONSIDER INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM A THREAT TO OUR SECURITY INTERESTS WHETHER IT IS PRACTICED BY STATES OR NATIONAL GROUPS. WE HAVE RESISTED IT BY ALL LEGAL MEANS AVAILABLE TO US. WE HAVE CONSISTENTLY STATED THAT WE WILL NOT MAKE CONCESSIONS OR GIVE IN TO BLACKMAIL. AT THE SAME TIME, THAT DOES NOT MEAN THAT WE DO NOT ENGAGE IN DIALOGUE; INDEED IN MANY CASES THAT IS THE ONLY WAY WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO END AN AIRCRAFT HIJACKING, RECOVER A KIDNAP VICTIM, OR END OTHER TYPES OF INCIDENTS. WE WORK CLOSELY WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTS THAT IN MANY CASES ARE MORE AFFLICTED BY THIS MENACE THAN WE AS I INDICATED ABOVE IN DISCUSSING THE GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF TERRORIST ACTIVITY. IN THE CASE OF STATE SUPPORTED TERRORISM, WE HAVE USED WHATEVER SANCTIONS ARE AVAILABLE TO US SUCH AS TRADE RESTRICTIONS AND DIPLOMATIC REPRISALS.

OUR COOPERATION WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTS AGAINST TERRORISM IS EXTENSIVE. WE ARE ACTIVE ON A DAILY BASIS WITH A BROAD RANGE OF FRIENDLY GOVERNMENTS IN SHARING INTELLIGENCE ON TERRORIST ACTIVITY. INTELLIGENCE IS THE KEY TO ANY EFFECTIVE PROGRAM TO COMBAT TERRORISM.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY HAS PROBABLY BEEN MOST SUCCESSFUL IN DEALING WITH AIRCRAFT HIJACKING. THE UNITED NATIONS, THROUGH VARIOUS CONVENTIONS, HAS PROVIDED THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR DEALING WITH THIS PROBLEM. WE HAVE WORKED VERY CLOSELY WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTS IN DEALING WITH ANY SPECIFIC CASE THAT ARISES. SANCTIONS HAVE BEEN LEVIED AGAINST GOVERNMENTS THAT HAVE GIVEN SANCTUARY TO TERRORISTS WHO ENGAGE IN HIJACKINGS. AIRLINES AND GOVERNMENTS HAVE ALSO TAKEN EXTENSIVE SECURITY MEASURES TO PROTECT THE TRAVELING PUBLIC. THE OVERALL RESULTS OF THIS CONCERTED EFFORT HAVE BEEN GOOD.

WE HAVE ALSO BEEN WORKING CLOSELY WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTS IN THE PROTECTION OF DIPLOMATIC PERSONNEL. WE HAVE COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS WITH SEVERAL GOVERNMENTS IN CASE OF TERRORIST ATTACKS. WE HAVE UNDERTAKEN A MAJOR PROGRAM TO IMPROVE THE SECURITY OF OUR EMBASSIES. WE WILL BE SPENDING SOME \$115 MILLION DOLLARS ON SECURITY MEASURES THIS FISCAL YEAR, ABOUT 9% OF OUR OPERATING BUDGET.

LAST NOVEMBER THE CONGRESS APPROVED A PROPOSAL WHICH THE ADMINISTRATION HAD MADE IN 1982 TO PROVIDE TRAINING TO FOREIGN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS ON COMBATTING TERRORISM. THIS IS A RECOGNITION THAT THE FRONTLINE "SOLDIER" IN COMBATTING TERRORISM IS THE CIVIL POLICEMAN AND THAT HIS TRAINING NEEDS TO BE IMPROVED; THAT HE NEEDS NEW TECHNIQUES AND BETTER EQUIPMENT IF HE IS TO COPE EFFECTIVELY WITH THE TERRORIST AND HIS SOVIET MADE KALASHNIKOV. WE HAVE MOVED AHEAD AS RAPIDLY AS POSSIBLE TO DISCUSS THIS PROGRAM WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTS. WE EXPECT THAT WE WILL BE ABLE TO INITIATE ACTIVE TRAINING HERE IN THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE NEXT FEW MONTHS. WE HAVE ALREADY BEEN CONSULTING WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTS THAT PROVIDE SIMILAR TRAINING. WE BELIEVE THAT WELL-TRAINED LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS WILL MAKE A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO DEALING WITH TERRORISM. WE ALSO BELIEVE THAT THIS TRAINING PROGRAM WILL STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AMONG LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS IN COMBATTING TERRORISM.

WE ARE ACTIVELY CONSIDERING ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION AS THE PRESIDENT INDICATED IN HIS STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE. THE UNITED STATES, FOR EXAMPLE, HAS APPROVED UN CONVENTIONS ON AIRCRAFT SABOTAGE AND THE TAKING OF HOSTAGES BUT WE HAVE NOT PASSED IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION. WE ARE ALSO CONCERNED ABOUT PERSONS SUBJECT TO US JURISDICTION WHO ARE TRAINING

AND EQUIPPING TERRORISTS ABROAD. WE COULD USE MORE EFFECTIVE LAWS TO DEAL WITH THAT PROBLEM. WE ALSO BELIEVE THAT IT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO HAVE A MORE EFFECTIVE SYSTEM OF REWARDS TO OBTAIN INFORMATION THAT WOULD HELP US RESOLVE TERRORISM CASES AND THAT MIGHT ALSO LEAD TO THE ARREST AND CONVICTION OF THE TERRORISTS.

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM IS A THREAT TO OUR SECURITY. IT IS VERY BROAD IN SCOPE AND EXCEEDINGLY DIFFICULT TO CONFRONT. WHILE WE HAVE BEEN FAIRLY SUCCESSFUL DOMESTICALLY, ON THE INTERNATIONAL SCENE WE ARE LARGELY DEPENDENT ON OTHER GOVERNMENTS TO DEAL WITH THESE THREATS AGAINST US AND THEM. WE HAVE GREATLY EXPANDED OUR INTELLIGENCE EFFORT AND OTHER FORMS OF COOPERATION WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTS TO COPE WITH THE PROBLEM. WE ARE ADDRESSING THE INCREASING USE OF TERRORISM AS AN INSTRUMENT OF STATE POLICY. WE HAVE DEVOTED MAJOR RESOURCES TO COMBAT TERRORISM AND WE WILL BE INCREASING THAT EFFORT IN THE MONTHS AHEAD AS WE EXPAND COOPERATION WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTS, CARRY OUT NEW PROGRAMS RECENTLY APPROVED, AND OBTAIN APPROVAL OF ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION WE WILL BE SEEKING.

AT THE SAME TIME, WE KNOW IT WILL BE A LONG TWILIGHT STRUGGLE AND WE SEEK YOUR WISE COUNSEL AND GUIDANCE. IT WILL BE WITH YOUR HELP, AND OTHERS LIKE YOU THAT WE SHALL SUCCEED AGAINST THIS THREAT TO DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT.

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

NORTH, OLIVER: FILES

Withdrawer

CAS 5/21/2012

File Folder

TERRORISM - PUBLIC DIPLOMACY (1984)

FOIA

M11-442

HAENNI

Box Number

FBI-101

9

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
137081 PAPER	RE COUNTERTERRORISM	1	ND	B1

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]

B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]

B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]

B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]

B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]

B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]

B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]

B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

APRIL 14
1330

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FOR PRESS SPOKESMEN

I. DIPLOMATIC

II. INTELLIGENCE

III. MILITARY

DIPLOMATIC

CLOSING LIBYAN PEOPLE'S BUREAUS

Q: What have our allies done to cooperate with us in countering Libyan terrorism? Why haven't the Germans, French, and Italians closed down Libyan People's Bureaus for example?

A: We have been working closely with our allies to counter international terrorism. Some have taken measures and we applaud their efforts. Much still remains to be done and our consultations continue.

OVERTHROWING QADHAFI

Q: Is the U.S. trying to kill Qadhafi or to replace him with a friendly regime?

A: No, the United States is neither trying to kill Qadhafi nor replace his regime with a government more friendly to the United States. What we are trying to do is stop Qadhafi's direction of and support for international terrorism.

Our forces struck at the nerve centers of Libyan-backed terrorism. [If Qadhafi is dead, then this is a fortuitous by-product of our act of self-defense.]

MESSAGE FROM QADHAFI

Q: There are reports that Colonel Qadhafi has sent a message to President Reagan to negotiate an end to the crisis. Is this true and how will the President respond?

A: We have not received a formal message from Colonel Qadhafi as of now. Belgium represents the United States' interests with Libya since we have no formal diplomatic relations. If Colonel Qadhafi has a message for the President, it can be conveyed through appropriate channels with the Belgian Embassy.

The best message that Qadhafi can send is by his actions. If he truly wished to seek an end to our differences, he could call off his planned attacks on American tourists, servicemen, and diplomats. We have sought through peaceful means to convince Qadhafi that his policies and actions of international terrorism are unacceptable and cannot be tolerated in the world community.

EMISSARY

Q: Would you comment on press reports that the President sent a special emissary to Europe to discuss the strike with our allies? Where did he go?

A: Yes, Ambassador Walters travelled to several countries in Europe as a special Presidential emissary prior to the strikes. I will not go into further detail on which countries were consulted or what the substance of those consultations might have been.

ALLIED COOPERATION

Q: Would you comment on press reports that some of our friends and allies (Egypt, UK, Italy) refused to let us use their air facilities and NATO bases for the operation.

A: I will not comment on any discussions concerning contingency and military planning with allies and friends. However, I can state categorically that we were acting in accordance with all agreements with our Allies.

Q: Were any allied facilities used?

A: I would refer any questions on the military operation to the Department of Defense.

Q: (If any allied facilities were used after the operation.) Did you have host nation permission to use.....?

A: Because of (casualties/problems with planes/etc.), we did land at..... Obviously, we had no way of knowing in advance and could not possibly have consulted on this issue. Moreover, it is not common practice to have to consult regarding emergency occurrences such as these.

Q: Which of our allies did you consult with before launching the attack?

A: We obviously were in touch with a number of friends and allies. I will not comment on the particulars of any consultations.

ARAB REACTION

Q: Are you not just building up Qadhafi further in the Arab world by attacking him? Is it not true that no Arab government can afford to be seen supporting the U.S. against Qadhafi at this time?

A: With respect to specific Arab reaction, I (have not seen any yet) (cannot comment on the motives behind those reactions). But I will say that a number of Arab countries have previously said privately that they appreciated our willingness to stand up to Qadhafi. I dare say we will have similar reactions this time.

SOVIETS

Q: Did you inform the Soviets?

A: Yes, as with the Freedom of Navigation exercise, we talked with the Soviets as events were underway to avoid a miscalculation on their part.

Q: Doesn't this U.S. strike risk direct hostilities or confrontation with Soviet forces? Won't they support their Allie, Qadhafi?

A: We have made clear to the Soviets that our actions are not directed at them. The Soviet Union does not have a Treaty of Friendship and Assistance with Libya and we do not expect the Soviets to provide active military support to Qadhafi.

WAR WITH LIBYA

Q: Is the U.S. going to war with Libya?

A: No, the U.S. has neither declared nor conducted war against Libya. What we have done is conducted a proportional military response to prevent intended acts of international terrorist acts by Libya. Such a proportional response is allowed under international law according to the doctrine of self-defense.

WAR POWERS

Q: Did you consult with Congressional leaders before the strike as required under the War Powers Resolution?

A: The President consulted with the Congressional leadership of the House and Senate prior to commencement of the strikes and intends to make a full report to the Congress within 48 hours.

INTELLIGENCE

PLANNING

Q: When did the Administration decide to retaliate?

A: No comment.

EVIDENCE

Q: What evidence do you have linking Libya with the Berlin bombing?

A: We learned in late March that Qadhafi had sent orders to a number of so-called People's Bureaus, including East Berlin, to attack U.S. citizens and facilities. Subsequently, members of the LPB, with records of previous terrorist activity, were seen and identified in West Berlin by U.S. and West Berlin security personnel who were on alert. On the evening of April 4, Berlin time, we learned that the LPB in East Berlin told Tripoli, Libya, that an attack would take place on April 5. Subsequently, the LPB in East Berlin told Tripoli that the "operation" had been successful and that it could not be traced to the LPB. The same pattern of Libyan planning to attack Americans and others has been identified elsewhere, but for various reasons there have as yet been no other "successes." This is due to good security and intelligence by the U.S. and to good cooperation from friendly governments. However, we can not afford to sit back and wait passively for Qadhafi's murderers to try again and again.

WARNINGS

Q: What warnings did you issue as a result of the advanced indications of an attack?

A: We sent warnings to our diplomatic and military posts abroad and they were asked to warn private Americans. On March 27, our representative met separately with officials from the GDR and USSR to apprise them of the threat of Americans in West Berlin from the LPB in East Berlin and called upon them to prevent any terrorist acts.

Upon receiving more immediate warnings of an attack, U.S. security personnel in West Berlin began to warn our military personnel to vacate bars and night clubs. Unfortunately, they had not yet gotten to La Belle discotheque when the bomb went off at 1:30 a.m. on April 5.

QADHAFI'S TERRORISM

Q: What other terrorist attacks has Qadhafi been behind?

A: Our policy has always been to not answer questions that involve sensitive intelligence. The public record Qadhafi's involvement in many acts of aggression is clear and extends back many years. A British policewoman was murdered in front of the Libyan People's Bureau (LPB) in London in May 1984. The British closed the LPB as a result.

He has sent assassination squads all around the world, including the U.S., to kill Libyan dissidents living in exile.

Libya has been convincingly linked to the brutal attacks at Rome and Vienna airports last December 27.

Qadhafi routinely gives material support to Palestinian terrorists like Abu Nidal.

In March, Qadhafi hosted what amounted to an international terrorist convention in Tripoli, with hundreds of terrorists from groups around the world attending.

FUTURE ATTACKS

Q: What evidence do you have of additional Libyan terrorist operations now in planning or underway?

A: We have highly reliable intelligence that Qadhafi and his key lieutenants are planning more attacks on U.S. citizens and facilities in Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America.

-- In Africa, Libyans have been planning attacks and conducting surveillance of U.S. facilities in 10 countries. Last week, three Libyan agents arrived in one African state to set up the bombing of our Embassy Chancellery and the kidnapping of our Ambassador.

-- In the Middle East, the Libyans have planned several attacks against U.S. embassies and have encouraged other terrorist groups there to conduct similar attacks.

-- In Latin America, Libyan diplomats have American diplomats and dependents.

-- Libya has also directed its agents to strike U.S. commercial interests, including U.S. international air carriers.

SYRIA/IRAN

Q: Aren't Syria and Iran just as responsible as Libya for state supported terrorism? Why doesn't the U.S. treat them similar to Libya?

A: We are equally concerned about Syrian and Iranian support for terrorist activities. Both states are on our "terrorism list," which affects commercial and trade controls. We have said that, when we have proof, we will hold accountable those responsible. In this case, the evidence points to Libya.

MILITARY

U.S. ACTION AGAINST LIBYAN TERRORISM

Q: You say this U.S. attack on Libya is in response to Qadhafi's terrorism campaign, but that our last strike was to defend our ships during a Freedom of Navigation operation. Wasn't the real objective of the Freedom of Navigation exercise all along to retaliate for the Rome/Vienna attack?

A: The United States cannot and will not tolerate state-sponsored terrorism. This has been our longstanding policy. Following the Rome/Vienna massacres we took a number of political and economic measures aimed at persuading Qadhafi to abandon his support for terrorists. We made it clear that if he continued sponsoring terrorist, and our other incremental steps did not deter him, we would be forced to take military measures. We kept our word.

As we said at the time of the Freedom of Navigation operation, we responded in self-defense only after Qadhafi ordered and carried out attacks on our forces while they were operating in international waters.

OBJECTIVE OF STRIKE

Q: What did you hope to achieve militarily in launching this attack? What did you hope to accomplish politically?

A: Our objective was to inflict damage to Qadhafi's capability to direct and control the export of international terrorism. The United States, and for that matter, all freedom loving peoples of the world, cannot tolerate terrorism. When we can clearly identify those responsible for terrorist acts, we will hold them accountable. The military goal, therefore, was to strike targets in a way that would damage Qadhafi's ability to perpetrate terrorist acts. The political goal was to show that such attacks are a consequence of undertaking terrorist actions -- that terrorism cannot be supported without incurring a heavy price. We have successfully accomplished both objectives.

We do not contend this will end Qadhafi's support for and export of terrorism. We may even face escalating attacks from him in the near future. Yet the purpose of our response was not to force a definitive end to his terrorist tactics. Rather, it was to send a clear message that we will no longer tolerate the death of innocent Americans and others. We are confident the message was heard and understood.

EXCUSE TO ATTACK

Q: Wasn't your real motive from the beginning to provoke Qadhafi so that you would have the excuse to strike Libya directly and more strongly as you have just done?

A: No. Colonel Qadhafi bears full responsibility for this turn of events. We know that his terrorist campaign was planned and underway long before the Gulf of Sidra operations. He is simply using the Gulf of Sidra operation as a convenient excuse for his unprovoked attacks. He has long supported terrorists who commit heinous crimes indiscriminately against innocent people of all nationalities. The irrefutable evidence that Qadhafi ordered the brutal Berlin bombing proves his cowardice to the world.

TARGETS

Q: Why did you choose the targets that you did?

A: Five targets were carefully studied and selected on the basis of their relation to Qadhafi's direction and support of terrorism. These five targets were:

1. Al Azziziyah barracks in Tripoli -- the main headquarters of Libyan planning and direction of its terrorist attacks overseas.
2. The Al Jumahiriya barracks in Benghazi -- an alternate command post to the Al Azziziyah barracks.
3. The Sidi Bilal port facility -- training base for Libyan commandos.
4. The military side of the Tripoli airport -- IL-76 aircraft transport military and subversive materiel around the world.
5. The Benina military airfield -- military suppression target, home base for Libyan fighter and bomber aircraft. It also supports the resupply of military and subversive materiel in the war against Chad.

Also evaluated very carefully was the possibility of collateral damage and casualties among innocent civilians. The targets and the means of attack were selected to prevent such damage and casualties as much as possible.

SA-5 SITES

Q: The Libyans, with Soviet aid, repaired the SA-5 sites quickly after we took them out and these were operational during this last strike. Why didn't the Sixth Fleet inflict more permanent damage at that time?

A: Our response at the time of the Libyan attacks against U.S. forces conducting a peaceful exercise in the Gulf of Sidra was considered appropriate. Our purpose was not to do disproportionate damage, rather it was to protect our assets and to send a clear message that we will respond if attacked.

THREE CARRIERS

Q: You used three carrier battle groups to conduct a Freedom of Navigation exercise last month. Why did you believe it sufficient to strike Libya with only two CVBGs this time?

A: The Freedom of Navigation exercise was a long-planned event for which we were able to bring together three CVBGs, the assets which seemed optimal for all possible contingencies. The response to Libyan terrorism needed to be immediate in order to prevent the additional Libyan-directed terrorist acts that were being planned in several other countries.

I would refer you to the Pentagon for any specific answer. You can be assured that the President would not have agreed to conduct such an operation if the military planners were not satisfied there were adequate resources to safely complete this mission.

AMERICAN CITIZENS IN LIBYA

Q: How many American citizens remain in Libya? Doesn't the strike put their lives in danger?

A: We do not have an exact number, but we use several hundred as an estimate. Our attack should not endanger, either directly or indirectly, remaining American citizens, some of whom are there as spouses of Libyan citizens. We continue to hold the Government of Libya fully responsible for the safety and welfare of any American citizens who remain in Libya. I should note, however, that those Americans still residing in Libya are doing so in violation of U.S. law and policy.

STRIKE RESULTS/CASUALTIES

Q: What were the results of the strikes? Did U.S. forces sustain any casualties?

A: The U.S. operations have only just concluded. We have no firm word on either the results of the strikes or U.S. losses. You should direct requests for additional details to the Department of Defense.

CHAIN REACTION OF VIOLENCE

Q: Surely you realized when you planned the Freedom of Navigation exercise that it would provoke Qadhafi to attack and retaliate with terrorism thusly leading to a chain reaction and terrorist acts?

A: Our exercise was a part of our longstanding and global policy to assert freedom of navigation and presence in international waters. We had previously conducted such exercises seven times in the Gulf of Sidra over the past five years. In undertaking the exercise, we hoped it would be a discrete event. Certainly, we considered the possibility that Qadhafi might respond as he did and our forces were prepared when they were attacked by Libya. However, and I cannot emphasize this strongly enough, we cannot cease to act in ways that uphold our principles because we believe that a consequence of such action may be a terrorist reprisal.

Also, Qadhafi's use of terrorism is not a recent event. He has, for a number of years, not hesitated to use terrorism to advance his own goals. What we saw in Berlin and elsewhere was not a new phenomenon, it was only Qadhafi acting in his usual way.

NEXT STEPS

Q: What do you expect to happen next?

A: That is really up to Colonel Qadhafi. Our position is very clear. He cannot carry out terrorist acts with impunity. If he decides to stop his direction and support of international terrorism, he has nothing to fear from the United States. If, however, he decides to continue or even increase such direction and support, the U.S. is prepared to sustain counter-terrorist operations against Libya as long as it takes to stop Libyan-sponsored terrorism.

MEMORANDUM

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~SYSTEM II
90480

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ACTION

April 16, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT C. MCFARLANE

FROM: OLIVER L. NORTH

SUBJECT: Statement on Terrorism

Bob Sims has called, asking what we can say about terrorism given the articles that have appeared in today's Post, L.A. Times, and Washington Times (Tab A). Please note the only name mentioned is at Defense. White House office of Legislative Affairs has also called asking for a copy of the NSDD. These calls have been referred to Bob Sims.

At this point it would appear that if we have to brief at all on the Hill, we should limit the brief to key Hill members, not staff. Candidates for such a briefing would be: Jeremiah Denton (Senate Subcommittee on Terrorism), Senators Tower (SASC), Percy (SFRC), Goldwater (SSCI) and, on the House side, Price (HASC), Fascell (HFAC), and Boland (HPSCI), along with their respective minority leaders.

The attached statement is designed to respond to the most immediate queries. We have asked State to develop additional contingency Qs and As and to coordinate these with State and Defense. In the interim, the attached is designed to be used in responding to press and Congressional queries. We need to staunch the hemorrhage of information about "pre-emptive attacks" or we will be inviting one upon ourselves.

Recommendation

1. That you approve the attached statement for use by B. Oglesby and Larry Speakes.

Approve _____

Disapprove _____

2. That you discuss w/B. Oglesby a possible Congressional briefing (Room 208?) for the parties indicated above.

Approve _____

Disapprove _____

Attachments

Tab A Washington Post, L.A. Times, and Washington Times articles

Tab B Proposed statement

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Declassify OADR

CONFIDENTIAL

White House Security & Supp. 11, 2015
BY NARA C-11 DATE 5/21/12



CURRENT NEWS

PART I - EARLY BIRD EDITION - 0730



Monday, April 16, 1984

THIS PUBLICATION IS PREPARED BY THE AIR FORCE AS EXECUTIVE AGENT FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO BRING TO THE ATTENTION OF KEY DOD PERSONNEL NEWS ITEMS OF INTEREST TO THEM IN THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITIES; IT IS NOT INTENDED TO SUBSTITUTE FOR NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS AS A MEANS OF KEEPING INFORMED ABOUT THE NATURE, MEANING AND IMPACT OF NEWS DEVELOPMENTS. USE OF THESE ARTICLES HERE, OF COURSE, DOES NOT REFLECT OFFICIAL ENDORSEMENT. FURTHER REPRODUCTION FOR PRIVATE USE OR GAIN IS SUBJECT TO THE ORIGINAL COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS.

WASHINGTON TIMES

16 April 1984 Pg.1

Move on terrorism ordered by Reagan

By Stephanie L. Nail
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

President Reagan has ordered U.S. military and government agencies to track terrorist groups actively into any corner of the world, administration officials said yesterday.

The president also endorsed the principle of pre-emptive attacks abroad, they said.

A senior administration official yesterday said Mr. Reagan signed National Security Decision Directive 138, which endorses the principles of both pre-emptive strikes and reprisal raids.

The new policy allows the U.S. to use force against terrorists before an incident such as a hijacking or bombing occurs rather than wait and react defensively. The key element of the plan is a dramatic increase in intelligence gathering so that the U.S. learns in advance of terrorists' plans and can stop them.

As part of the directive, Mr. Reagan ordered 26 government agencies to suggest ways to deal with terrorism. Mr. Reagan also asked the agencies to "find ways to cooperate better with other countries to track down and identify terrorists," an administration official said.

The decision to seek out and stop terrorists was prompted by the truck-bomb massacre of 241 Marines in Beirut last October. The directive, signed April 3 by Mr. Reagan, followed months of inter-agency meetings and dozens of proposals on how to counter terrorism.

"It seems to me to be a straightforward and modest directive that sets forth our objectives but does not order direct action," an official said. "The president is asking the agencies involved how should we respond to terrorism — which is a modern fact of life."

Under the pre-emptive strike
REAGAN...Pg.2

WASHINGTON POST
16 April 1984 Pg.19

Preemptive Anti-Terrorist Raids Allowed

By Robert C. Toth
Los Angeles Times

In a major shift to counter terrorism, President Reagan has signed a policy directive that endorses the principle of preemptive strikes as well as reprisal raids against terrorists abroad, the Los Angeles Times has learned.

The new, get-tough policy, months in the making, was triggered by the truck-bomb slaughter of 241 Marines in Beirut in October. Secretary of State George P. Shultz has been most outspoken among administration leaders in pushing what he

RAIDS...Pg.2

WASHINGTON POST
16 April 1984 Pg.1

Covert Aid Salvage Try Under Way

By Charles R. Babcock
and Bob Woodward
Washington Post Staff Writers

The Reagan administration is trying to salvage faltering congressional and public support for its secret war against Nicaragua by attempting to focus new attention on the size of the Soviet and Cuban military buildup in Central America and playing down the controversy over U.S.-directed mining of Nicaraguan harbors.

In an effort to rescue \$21 million in funding for the co-

AID...Pg.2

NEW YORK TIMES 16 April 1984 Pg.3

Soviet Says Arms Study Is Fiction by Pentagon

MOSCOW, April 15 (AP) — A Pentagon report on Soviet military might is a "hackneyed invention" aimed at misleading the public, the Communist Party newspaper Pravda said in an editorial distributed today.

The editorial, which is to be published on Monday but was carried in advance by the official Soviet press agency Tass, said the Defense Department's "Soviet Military Power" book-

let is a White House attempt to frighten allies of the United States into supporting American military policies.

The Pentagon annually publishes the survey of Soviet military power, and the Soviet press usually says the statistics are inflated and misrepresented. The latest report was made public Tuesday.

"In the election year, the Administration would very much like to convince Americans that its policy of building up tensions and of the arms race, of shameless plunder of taxpayers for the benefit of the military-industrial complex is allegedly justified," Pravda said.

Helen Young, Chief, Current News Branch, 697-8765

For special research services or distribution call Harry Zubkoff, Chief, News Clipping & Analysis Service, 695-2884

Daniel Friedman, Assistant Chief

AID...Continued

vert operations, CIA Director William J. Casey told the Senate last week that the controversial CIA-directed mining of Nicaraguan harbors was not an integral part of the program. President Reagan and intelligence officials also began giving stronger emphasis to specific figures about the scope of the threat they see in the region.

CIA officials have said that their intelligence collection shows:

- The Soviet Union is spending between \$4 billion and \$4.5 billion each year in Cuba and \$250 million to \$300 million elsewhere in Central America.

- The Soviets have about 10,000 personnel in Cuba; 8,000 of these are technicians and 2,000 are military. About 100 Soviets are in Nicaragua.

- The Cubans have between 7,000 and 10,000 personnel in Nicaragua, of whom between 2,500 and 3,500 are military. Casey has said that the Cuban military personnel in Nicaragua have shaved their Castro-style beards, discarded their Cuban uniforms and been integrated into many units of the regular Sandinista army.

The president cited similar, but slightly lower, figures on the Soviet-Cuban presence in Nicaragua in a radio address Saturday in which he said, "We cannot turn our backs on this crisis at our doorstep."

Others in and out of the administration are skeptical of the CIA figures. One congressional source familiar with the intelligence estimates said yesterday, "My fear is that in the effort to save the program they will overstate their case and undermine the truth, which is that there has been a very substantial buildup" by Soviets and Cubans.

This source noted that the Soviets have sent new generations of air defense missiles, planes and maritime equipment to Cuba.

Sen. David F. Durenberger (R-Minn.), a member of the Senate intelligence committee who has supported the administration's requests for covert funding, said yesterday

RAIDS...Continued

calls an "active defense against terrorism," the use of offensive as well as defensive measures.

Despite the emphasis on preempting terrorist activity, the presidential directive reportedly stops short of authorizing assassinations of suspected terrorists. But it permits the use of force in other forms, such as by FBI and CIA paramilitary teams and Pentagon military squads.

As part of its program, U.S. officials say, the White House will ask Congress for new anti-terrorism laws, including one to permit payment of huge awards—\$500,000 has been proposed—for information on terrorism abroad or at home.

The FBI is permitted to pay informers in criminal cases, but far smaller amounts have been involved.

Noel C. Koch, the deputy assistant defense secretary in charge of Pentagon policy on terrorism, said in an interview last week that the new administration doctrine "represents a quantum leap in countering terrorism, from the reactive mode to recognition that pro-active steps are needed."

The National Security Decision Directive 138, which Reagan signed April 3, also orders 26 agencies and offices of the U.S. government to provide him with options on how to implement the new policy.

One State Department official said, "In this country, we have never had a doctrine for dealing with low-level conflict where force is required What we're trying to grapple with is how to use little amounts of force on little problems in distant places and how to convince the American public it's necessary."

U.S. officials from the State and Defense departments and other key agencies said the new directive seeks to make formal and to coordinate new steps the United States is taking, including:

- Intensified intelligence collection at home by the FBI and abroad by the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency.

- Creation and training of FBI and CIA paramilitary teams and Pentagon military squads.

that he questioned the Soviet-Cuban troop numbers being used by administration officials.

"The Sandinistas are supposed to be moving Cubans out," he said. "There are probably substantially

REAGAN...Continued

plan, military units or government agencies could be authorized to make raids in foreign countries and kill would-be terrorists before they can carry out scheduled attacks.

That policy could be contrary to earlier presidential directives — and illegal — if the government forces were given a "blank check" to make strikes abroad. A presidential directive signed by former President Ford, and reaffirmed by former President Carter and Mr. Reagan, prohibits government employees or agents from participating in any assassination attempt.

In March Mr. Reagan rejected a proposal to relax his ban against assassinations as a tool against terrorism. One official said the new directive does not "contemplate any assassination conspiracies."

The official said an important distinction is that pre-emptive action is based on a specific planned event, but an assassination is based on general opposition to a group or person thought to be engaged in terrorism.

Under the guidelines of the directive, a pre-emptive strike could be made only after complete information about a terrorist plan is gathered.

Another official said that the directive says only that "as a matter of principle we must keep prepared to act when necessary to deal with terrorism. Authorizations [for pre-emptive strikes] will come later, if we have all the answers" on a planned attack.

One official said the directive makes no mention of the creation of para-military teams by intelligence agencies such as the CIA. The FBI and Army already have trained anti-terrorist squads.

White House aides said last month the administration is putting the final details on a legislative proposal to assist in the anti-terrorist drive.

fewer there than there were six months ago."

Durenberger also criticized the administration for making no real attempt "to sell" Congress or the public on the Kissinger commission's recommendations to fund long-term economic growth in the region.

"The really frustrating thing is the president has got to lift this out of mining and covert operations, and lift it into the larger context and get it out to the American people," he said.

Sen. Patrick J. Leahy (D-Vt.), an

AID...Pg. 4

Preemptive Anti-Terrorist Raids Allowed

By Robert C. Toth
Los Angeles Times

In a major shift to counter terrorism, President Reagan has signed a policy directive that endorses the principle of preemptive strikes as well as reprisal raids against terrorists abroad, the Los Angeles Times has learned.

The new, get-tough policy, months in the making, was triggered by the truck-bomb slaughter of 241 Marines in Beirut in October. Secretary of State George P. Shultz has been most outspoken among administration leaders in pushing what he calls an "active defense against terrorism," the use of offensive as well as defensive measures.

Despite the emphasis on preempting terrorist activity, the presidential directive reportedly stops short of authorizing assassinations of suspected terrorists. But it permits the use of force in other forms, such as by FBI and CIA paramilitary teams and Pentagon military squads.

As part of its program, U.S. officials say, the White House will ask Congress for new anti-terrorism laws, including one to permit payment of huge awards—\$500,000 has been proposed—for information on terrorism abroad or at home.

The FBI is permitted to pay informers in criminal cases, but far smaller amounts have been involved.

Noel C. Koch, the deputy assistant defense secretary in charge of Pentagon policy on terrorism, said in an interview last week that the new administration doctrine "represents a quantum leap in countering terrorism, from the reactive mode to recognition that pro-active steps are needed."

The National Security Decision Directive 138, which Reagan signed April 3, also orders 26 agencies and offices of the U.S. government to provide him with options on how to implement the new policy.

One State Department official said, "In this country, we have never had a doctrine for dealing with low-level conflict where force is required What we're trying to grapple with is how to use little amounts of force on little problems in distant places and how to convince the American public it's necessary."

U.S. officials from the State and Defense departments and other key agencies said the new directive seeks to make formal and to coordinate new steps the United States is taking, including:

- Intensified intelligence collection at home by the FBI and abroad by the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency.

- Creation and training of FBI and CIA paramilitary teams and Pentagon military squads.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY ON TERRORISM

Acts of terrorism continue to plague us and our friends and allies. The toll of bombings, assassinations and kidnappings bears terrible witness to the indiscriminate attacks and lawlessness that rules the behavior of terrorist groups. It is also apparent that selected states have adopted these lawless acts as instruments of state policy. While we diligently seek the means to control this scourge, we must also take the steps that are necessary to protect our citizens, our institutions and our friends and allies.

We have, in the course of a detailed review, reached some conclusions on what we must do to protect ourselves, and to assist others in protecting themselves, from this growing threat. Our actions will be guided by the following principles: first, no nation can condone international terrorism. Second, it is the right of every legitimate government to resist the use of terrorism against its people, institutions or property by all legal means available. Third, terrorism is a problem for all nations, and this Government will work as closely as possible with other governments -- particularly other similarly threatened democracies -- to deal with it.

While we have cause for deep concern about the states that now practice or support terrorism, our policies are directed against all forms of international terrorism. We will increase our efforts with other governments to obtain and exchange the information needed about states and groups involved in terrorist activities in order to prevent attacks, warn our people, our friends and allies, and reduce the risk. We will also do everything we can to see that acts of state-supported terrorism are publicized and condemned in every appropriate forum. When these efforts fail, however, it must be understood that when we are victimized by acts of terrorism we have the right to defend ourselves -- and the right to help others do the same.

Finally, it should be noted that our paramount interest is in foreknowledge and prevention. We believe we can best achieve these results through a combination of improved information and better security and protection. This does not represent any change in U.S. policy -- rather, a refocused emphasis.

[IF ASKED]

- Q. Isn't this inconsistent with mining the Nicaraguan ports or supporting the Contras?
- A. First, the Democratic opposition forces are Nicaraguans fighting in Nicaragua for the rights that have been denied them by the communists in Managua. That they have taken up arms should not be surprising under the circumstances. I would not refer to their civil war against the Sandinistas as terrorism. Unlike terrorists, who strike indiscriminately and without warning, regardless of the consequences, the Nicaraguan freedom fighters duly proclaimed that Nicaraguan territorial waters and ports were a war zone and announced the mining to prevent casualties. This is substantively different from blowing up an airliner, sending bomb-laden trucks to destroy an embassy, or brutally murdering third country diplomats in another country. Second, the fact that the U.S. supports democratic movements is appropriate and well-founded in history. If we fail to do so, the communists will eventually, through subversion, terrorism and polarization, deny democracy the chance it needs to flourish.
- Q. Does this NSDD 138 which has been reported in the press call for pre-emptive attacks on terrorist groups?
- A. In keeping with established practice, we will not comment on our specific National Security Decision Directives or classified documents. I can say, however, that our policy is primarily designed to improve protection and security. We also will take no actions that are in any way contrary to U.S. statutes, agreements, laws, or executive orders.

4966
5466

MEMORANDUM

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

June 21, 1984

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT M. KIMMITT

FROM: OLIVER L. NORTH

SUBJECT: Shultz Speech on Terrorism at Jonathan Conference

Don Fortier and I have reviewed the Shultz speech (Tab I) and called our comments back directly to Policy Planning and M/CT (State). Bob Sayre and North have coordinated a final version.

RECOMMENDATION

That you call Charlie Hill and advise him of our approval. No further action is required.

Action _____

Disapprove _____

Attachment

Tab I - Hill Memo to Kimmitt of June 20, 1984 w/attachment

Changes that were telephonically passed to State are marked on the draft at Tab I on pages 11, 12, and 17. Please note that this speech was originally drafted by North and Arnold (State/MCT) and revised/added to by Policy Planning at State.

North 6/25/84

Thanks, Ollie.

Bob

System #

Package #

I

49666

	SEQUENCE TO	HAS SEEN	DISPOSITION
Dep. Exec. Sec'y			
Bob Kimmitt	1	K	
John Poindexter			
Tom Shull			
Wilma Hall			
Bud McFarlane			
Bob Kimmitt			
NSC Secretariat			
Situation Room			
North	2		A

I = Information

A = Action

R = Retain

D = Dispatch

N = No further Action

cc: VP Meese Baker Deaver Other

COMMENTS

Should be seen by:

(Date/Time)

For the record, and Bud's info, could you please indicate changes you and Don suggested?

Please see note at bottom of cover memo.
June 25, 1984 (Hall)



United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520

84 JUN 21 P 2: 33

June 20, 1984

~~LIMITED OFFICIAL USE~~ *USS/ah/2*

TO: NSC - Mr. Robert Kimmitt (S/S 8417914)
Defense - COL R.J. Affourtit (S/S 8417915)

SUBJECT: Draft of Secretary Shultz's Terrorism Speech

Attached is the draft text of Secretary Shultz's speech scheduled for delivery at the Jonathan Institute conference on terrorism in Washington, D.C. on June 24.

I invite your comments and suggestions. They should be directed to Robert Kagan of the Policy Planning Staff at 632-2755. It would be helpful if they could arrive before 4 p.m., June 21.

BMet in by
Charles Hill
Executive Secretary

Attachment:

Draft Speech

~~LIMITED OFFICIAL USE~~

N/A

Five years have passed since the Jonathan Institute held its first conference on terrorism, and in that time the world has seen two major developments: one a cause for great distress; the other a reason for hope.

The distressing fact is that over these past five years terrorism has increased. More people were killed or injured by international terrorists last year than in any year since governments began keeping records. In 1983 there were more than 500 such attacks, of which more than 200 were against the United States. For Americans the worst tragedies were the destruction of our Embassy and then the Marine barracks in Beirut. But around the world, many of our close friends and allies were also victims. The bombing of Harrods in London, the bombing at Orly Airport in Paris, the destruction of a Gulf Air flight in the UAE are just a few examples -- not to mention the brutal attack on a West Jerusalem shopping mall this past April.

Even more alarming has been the rise of state-sponsored terrorism. In the past five years more states have joined the ranks of what we might call the "League of Terror" as full-fledged sponsors and supporters of indiscriminate murder.

Terrorist attacks supported by Libya, Syria, Iran, North Korea, and others, have taken a heavy toll of innocent lives. Seventy or more such attacks in 1983 probably involved significant state support or participation.

As a result, more of the world's people must today live in fear of sudden and unprovoked violence at the hands of terrorists. After five years, the epidemic is spreading and the civilized world is still groping for remedies.

Nevertheless, these past five years have also given us cause for hope. Thanks in large measure to the efforts of concerned governments, citizens, and groups like the Jonathan Institute, the peoples of the free world have finally begun to grapple with the problem of terrorism, both intellectually and in practical terms. I say intellectually because the first step toward a solution to any problem is to understand that there is a problem, and then to understand its nature. In recent years we have learned a great deal about terrorism, though our education has been painful and costly. We know what kind of threat terrorism poses to our free society. We have learned much about the terrorists themselves, their supporters, their targets, their diverse methods, their underlying motives, and their eventual goals.

Armed with this knowledge we can now focus our energies on the practical means for reducing and eventually eliminating the threat. We can all share the hope that, when the next conference of this Institute is convened, we will look back and say that 1984 was the turning point in our struggle against terrorism, that having come to grips with the problem we were able to deal with it effectively and responsibly.

The Challenge to Our Interests and Values

What we have learned about terrorism, first of all, is that it is not random, undirected, purposeless violence. It is not, like an earthquake or a hurricane, an act of nature before which we are helpless. Terrorists and those who support them have definite goals; terrorist violence is the means of attaining those goals. Our response must be twofold: We must deny them the means, but above all we must deny them their goals.

But what are the goals of terrorism? We know that the phenomenon of terrorism is actually a matrix that covers a diverse array of methods, resources, instruments, and immediate aims.

It appears in many shapes and sizes -- from the lone individual who plants a homemade explosive in a shopping center, to the small clandestine group that plans kidnappings and assassinations of public figures, to the well-equipped and well-financed organization that uses force to terrorize an entire population. Its stated goals may range from separatist causes to revenge for ethnic grievances to social and political revolution. Even international drug smugglers use terrorism to blackmail and intimidate government officials. It is clear that the elements of our response will have to fit the precise character and circumstances of the specific threats.

But we must understand that the overarching goal of all terrorists is the same: With rare exceptions, they are attempting to impose their will by force -- a special kind of force designed to create an atmosphere of fear. And their efforts are directed at destroying what all of us here are seeking to build.

The United States and its democratic allies are morally committed to certain values and to a humane vision of the future. In our foreign policies, we have always tried to foster the kind of world that makes human progress possible. Our vision is of a world that promotes peaceful settlement of disputes, one that welcomes change without violent conflict.

We seek a world in which human rights are respected by all governments, a world based on the rule of law. We seek these goals out of enlightened self-interest. We know that in a world community where all nations share these blessings, our own democracy will flourish, our own nation will prosper, and our own people will continue to enjoy freedom.

Nor has ours been a fruitless search. In our lifetime, we have seen the world progress, though perhaps too slowly, toward this goal. Civilized norms of conduct have evolved, even governing relations between adversaries. Conflict persists, but with some notorious exceptions, even wars have been conducted within certain restraints: Indiscriminate slaughter of innocents is widely condemned; the use of certain kinds of weapons has been proscribed, and most nations have heeded those proscriptions.

We all know that the world as it exists is still far from our ideal vision. And today, even the progress that mankind has already made is endangered by those who do not share that vision, who seek instead to impose tyranny through intimidation.

For we must understand, above all, that terrorism is a form of political violence. Wherever it takes place, it is directed in an important sense against us, the democracies -- against our most basic values and often our fundamental strategic interests.

The values upon which democracy is based -- protection of individual rights, equality under the law, freedom of thought and expression, and freedom of religion -- all stand in the way of those who seek to impose their ideologies or their religious beliefs by force. A terrorist is a zealot who has no patience and no respect for the orderly processes of democratic society and, therefore, he considers himself its enemy.

And it is an unfortunate irony that the very qualities that make democracies so hateful to the terrorists also make them so vulnerable. Precisely because we maintain the most open societies, terrorists have unparalleled opportunity to strike.

The antagonism between democracy and terrorism seems so basic that it is hard to understand why so much intellectual confusion still exists on the subject. We have all heard the insidious claim that "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter." Let me read to you the powerful rebuttal that was stated before your 1979 conference by a great American, Senator Henry Jackson:

"The idea that one person's 'terrorist' is another's 'freedom fighter' cannot be sanctioned. Freedom fighters or revolutionaries don't blow up buses containing non-combatants; terrorist murderers do. Freedom fighters don't set out to capture and slaughter school children; terrorist murderers do. Freedom fighters don't assassinate innocent businessmen, or hijack and hold hostage innocent men, women, and children; terrorist murderers do. It is a disgrace that democracies would allow the treasured word 'freedom' to be associated with acts of terrorists."

Where democracy is struggling to take root, the terrorist is, again, its enemy. He seeks to spread chaos and disorder, to paralyze a society with fear of indiscriminate violence. In doing so he wins no converts to his cause. His deeds inspire hatred and fear, not allegiance. The terrorist seeks to undermine institutions, to destroy popular faith in government and society, and to shake the people's belief in the very idea of democracy. In Lebanon, for example, state-sponsored terrorism attempted to shatter that nation's democratic aspirations and to plunge that tragic country into anarchy.

Where the terrorist cannot bring about anarchy, he may try to force the government to overreact, or impose tyrannical measures of control, and hence lose the allegiance of the people.

Turkey faced such a challenge, but succeeded in overcoming it. Martial law was imposed; the terrorist threat was drastically reduced, and today we see democracy returning to that country. In Argentina, the widely deplored "disappearances" of the 1970s were in fact part of a response -- a deliberately provoked response -- to a massive campaign of terrorism. We are pleased that Argentina, too, has returned to the path of democracy. Other countries around the world face similar challenges, and they too must steer their course carefully between anarchy and tyranny. The lesson for civilized nations is that we must respond to the terrorist threat within the rule of law, lest we become unwitting accomplices in the terrorist's scheme to undermine civilized society.

Once we understand terrorism's goals and methods, it is not hard to tell, as we look around the world, who are the terrorists and who are the freedom fighters. The resistance fighters in Afghanistan do not destroy villages or murder women and children. The Contras in Nicaragua do not blow up school buses or execute civilians.

How tragic it would be if democratic societies so lost confidence in their own moral legitimacy that they lost sight of the obvious: that violence directed against democracy or the hopes for democracy lacks fundamental justification.

Democracy offers mechanisms for peaceful change, legitimate political competition, and redress of grievances. But resort to arms in behalf of democracy against repressive regimes or movements may indeed be a fight for freedom, since there may be no other way that freedom can be achieved.

The free nations cannot afford to let the Orwellian corruption of language hamper our efforts to defend ourselves, our interests, or our friends. We know the difference between terrorists and freedom fighters and our policies reflect that distinction. The United States will support those who fight for freedom and democracy. We will oppose guerrilla wars when they threaten to spread totalitarian rule or to deny the rights of national independence and self determination. But we will oppose terrorists no matter what banner they may fly. For terrorism in any cause is the enemy of freedom.

If freedom and democracy are the targets of terrorism, it is clear that totalitarianism is its ally. The number of terrorist incidents in or against totalitarian states is negligible. States that support and sponsor terrorist actions have managed in recent years to co-opt and manipulate the phenomenon in pursuit of their own strategic goals. It is not a coincidence that most acts of terrorism occur in areas of importance to the West.

More than 80 percent of the world's terrorist attacks in 1983 occurred in Western Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East. The recent Posture Statement of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff put it this way: "Terrorists may or may not be centrally controlled by their patrons. Regardless, the instability they create in the industrialized West and Third World nations undermines the security interests of the United States and its allies."

States that sponsor terrorism are using it as another instrument of warfare, to gain strategic advantage where they cannot use conventional means. When Iran, Syria, and their allies sent terrorists to bomb Western personnel in Beirut, they hoped to weaken the West's commitment to defending its interests in the Middle East. When North Korea sponsored the murder of South Korean government officials, it hoped to weaken the non-Communist stronghold on the mainland of East Asia. When the Soviet Union and its clients provide financial, logistic, and training support for terrorists worldwide -- when the Red Brigades in Italy and the Red Army Faction in Germany assault free countries in the name of Communist ideology -- they hope to shake the West's self-confidence and sap its will to resist aggression and intimidation. In a few months' time we may learn the answer to one of the great questions of our time: the allegations of Soviet-bloc involvement in the attempt to assassinate the Pope.

We should understand the Soviet role in international terrorism without exaggeration or distortion: The Soviet Union officially denounces the use of terrorism as an instrument of state policy. Yet, one does not have to believe that the Soviets are puppeteers and the terrorists marionettes in order to ascribe to the Kremlin a large share of the responsibility for the scale and success of international terrorism. Violent or fanatic individuals and groups are indigenous to every society; but in many countries, terrorism would long since have passed away had it not been for significant support from outside.

States that sponsor terrorism need not even share the immediate goals of those who receive their support. ^{These states} ~~The Soviet~~ Union may or may not care about the cause of Basque separatists, or the Irish Republican Army, or Armenian grievances, or a Palestinian homeland. They use terrorist groups for their own purposes, and their goal is always the same: to weaken liberal democracy and undermine world stability.

A Counterstrategy Against Terrorism

Having identified the challenge, we must now consider the best strategy to counter it. Our strategy must combine many diverse elements. No single measure will suffice.

deleted because we
cannot confirm Sov. support
to the Basque terrorists or

And we must keep in mind, as we devise our strategy, that our ultimate aim is to preserve what the terrorists seek to destroy: democracy, freedom, and the hope for a world at peace.

The essential component, therefore, must be greater cooperation among the democratic nations of the world and all others who share our hopes for the future. Just as there is increasing collaboration among the states that engage in terrorism, so there must be increasing cooperation among the states that are the actual and potential targets of terrorism. For years, this country has sought greater international cooperation -- and the world community has achieved some successes. But too often, countries are inhibited by fear of losing commercial opportunities or fear of provoking the bully. The time has come for the nations that truly seek an end to terrorism to join together, ~~in whatever forums,~~ to take the necessary steps. The declaration on terrorism that was agreed upon at the London Economic Summit two weeks ago was a welcome sign that the industrial democracies share a common view of the terrorist threat. We must build on that foundation.

Greater international cooperation offers many advantages. If, for instance, we can collectively improve our gathering and sharing of intelligence, we can better detect the movements of terrorists, anticipate their actions, and bring them to justice.

We can also help provide training and share knowledge of terrorist tactics. To that end, the Reagan Administration has acted promptly on the program that Congress approved last year to train foreign law enforcement officers in anti-terrorist techniques.

We must also make a collective effort to address the special problem of state-sponsored terrorism. States that support terror offer safe havens, funds, training, and logistical support. We must do some hard thinking about how to pressure members of the League of Terror to cease their support. Such pressure will have to be international, for no one country can exert sufficient influence alone. Economic sanctions and other forms of pressure impose costs on the nation that applies them, but some sacrifices will be necessary if we are to solve the problem. In the long run, I believe, it will have been a small price to pay.

We must also discourage nations from paying blackmail to terrorist organizations. Although we recognize that some nations are particularly vulnerable to the terrorist threat, we must convince them that paying blackmail is counterproductive and inimical to the interests of all.

Finally, the nations of the free world must stand together against terrorism to demonstrate our enduring commitment to our shared vision. The terrorists may be looking for signs of weakness, for evidence of disunity. We must show them that we are unbending. Let the terrorists despair of ever achieving their goals. Together, we will not despair.

These international efforts are essential, but individual nations must also take steps on their own to protect their citizens both within their borders and abroad. For our part, the United States is continuing efforts to strengthen security at our embassies around the world to prevent a recurrence of the Beirut and Kuwait Embassy bombings, and our Federal Bureau of Investigation is improving our ability to detect and prevent terrorist acts within our own borders. In addition, President Reagan has submitted four draft bills to the Congress to help us combat terrorist activities. Two of the bills would implement two international conventions to which the United States is a signatory: the International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages, and the Montreal Convention to protect against sabotage of civilian aircraft. We are also working with the Congress on legislation that would help us obtain more information about terrorists through the payment of rewards to informants, and would permit prosecution of those who support states that use or sponsor terrorism.

All the measures I have described so far, international and domestic, are important elements in a comprehensive strategy. But are they enough? Is the purely passive defense that these measures entail sufficient to cope with the problem? Can we as a country -- can the community of free nations -- stand in a solely defensive posture and absorb the blows dealt by terrorists?

I believe the answer is no. From a practical standpoint, a purely passive defense does not provide enough of a deterrent to terrorism and the states that sponsor it. It is time to think long, hard, and seriously about more active means of defense. Experience has taught us over the years that one of the best deterrents to terrorism is the certainty that swift and sure measures will be taken against those who engage in it.

Clearly there are complicated moral issues here. But there should be no doubt of the democracies' moral right, indeed duty, to defend themselves.

And there should be no doubt of the profound issue at stake. The democracies seek a world order that is based on the principles of justice. When innocents are victimized and the guilty go unpunished, the terrorists have succeeded in undermining the very foundation of civilized society, for they have created a world where there is no justice.

This would represent a defeat for our most fundamental moral values and a dark cloud over the future of humanity. We can do better than this.

No matter what strategy we pursue, we must accept the fact that the terrorist threat will not disappear overnight. This is not the last conference that will be held on this subject. We must understand this and be prepared to live with the fact that despite all our best efforts the world is still a dangerous place. Further sacrifices, as in the past, may be the price for preserving our freedom.

It is essential, therefore, that we not allow the actions of terrorists to affect our policies or deflect us from our goals. When terrorism succeeds in intimidating governments into altering their foreign policies, it only opens the door to more terrorism. It shows that terrorism works; it emboldens those who resort to it and it encourages others to join their ranks.

The Future

With all that we have learned over these past years, there is reason to have hope for the future. If we remain firm, we can look forward to a time when terrorism will cease to be a major factor in world affairs.

Not so long ago we faced a rash of political kidnappings and embassy takeovers. These problems seemed insurmountable. Yet, through increased security, the willingness of governments to resist terrorist demands and to use force when appropriate, these acts of terrorism have declined. In recent years, we have also seen a decline in the number of airline hijackings -- once a problem that seemed to fill our newspapers daily. Today, tougher security measures and greater international cooperation have clearly had their effect.

We can achieve the same success in combatting all other forms of terrorism if only we have the will to come together and act decisively and boldly. I have great faith that we do have the will, and the capability. It is really up to us, the nations of the free world. We must set ourselves to the task of making terrorism a thing of the past, not of our future.

we noted that this
conclusion was
inconsistent with
the introduction (par 2, p. 1)
and that it should be
modified to reflect the
small amount of terrorist activities.