

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Jenkins, James E.: Files
Folder Title: International Terrorism Conference
[1 of 2]
Box: OA 10569

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/>

The Jonathan Institute
SECOND CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM
The Four Seasons Hotel, Washington D.C.

SCHEDULE

Sunday, June 24, 1984

8:00-10:00 PM

OPENING SESSION

Chairman: Lord Chalfont
Speakers: Professor B. Netanyahu
Paul Johnson
Yitzhak Rabin, MK
Secretary of State George Shultz

Monday, June 25, 1984

Morning Sessions

9:00-10:30 AM

TERRORISM AND TOTALITARIANISM

Chairman: Professor Burton Leiser
Speakers: Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick
Professor Leszek Kolakowski
Professor Wolfgang-Fikentscher
Senator Daniel P. Moynihan

10:30-10:45 AM

Break

10:45-12:15 PM

TERRORISM AND THE ISLAMIC WORLD

Chairman: Professor Bernard Lewis
Speakers: Professor Elie Kedourie
Professor J.B. Kelly
Professor P.J. Vatikiotis

Afternoon Sessions

3
2:00-3:30 PM

TERRORISM AND THE DEMOCRACIES

Chairman: Julian Amery, M.P.
Speakers: Senator Alan Cranston
Congressman Jack Kemp
Professor Takeshi Muramatsu
Midge Decter
Professor Walter Berns

3:30-3:45 PM

Break

3:45-5:15 PM

THE NETWORK OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Chairman: Michael Ledeen
Speakers: Shintaro Ishihara, Member of Diet
Claire Sterling
Jillian Becker
Arnaud de Borchgrave

Domestic Measures

Louis Guiffard - ✓ Once started, can't be stopped w. manpower alone (N. Ireland)
✓ Can't protect everyone
✓ Experts say T's can't get A Bomb - but could get chemical agents
✓ Chemical & biological weapons the worst threat
✓ only - protection is intelligence

Lochte - Office for Protection of the Constitution
on "RAF" group "NewLeft" in W. Ger.
"RZ" revolutionary cells - many small
Groups Social rev., anti imperialists, anti-Fascist
IRA, PLO lineage
Neo-Nazi Aenoints - pro-Sov., anti-U.S. "Hector-Keville (?) group"
Nazis - Bolshevism.

EM - policy considerations
T. is criminal clear-cut responsibility

SCHEDULE
(Continued)

Tuesday, June 26, 1984

Morning Session

9:00-12:15 PM*

TERRORISM AND THE MEDIA

Chairman: Ted Koppel
Speakers: Alain Besancon
Charles Krauthammer
John O'Sullivan
Norman Podhoretz
Daniel Schorr
George Will
Bob Woodward

(*Break: 10:30-
10:45 AM)

Afternoon Sessions

HOW CAN TERRORISM BE STOPPED?

2:00-3:30 PM

DOMESTIC MEASURES

Chairman: Hon. Louis Giuffrida
Speakers: Hon. Edwin Meese III
Senator Alfonse D'Amato
Dr. Christian Lochte
Judge William Webster

3:30-3:45 PM

Break

3:45-5:15 PM

INTERNATIONAL MEASURES

Chairman: Professor Eugene Rostow
Speakers: Justice Arthur Goldberg
Hon. Carlo Ripa di Meana
Ambassador Yehuda Blum
Senator Paul Laxalt

8:00-10:00 PM

CLOSING SESSION

Chairman: David Brinkley
Speakers: Minister of Defense Moshe Arens
Jean-Francois Revel
Minister Benjamin Netanyahu
Vladimir Bukovsky
Lord Chalfont

DANIEL SCHORR

Terrorism and the Media

Synopsis

Second International Conference

on

International Terrorism,

June 26, 1984

There exists an unfortunate symbiotic relationship between terrorism and television. It was displayed in satiric form in the film, Network, in which a gang of terrorists in effect engaged in paid programming for television, and in the NBC docudrama, Special Bulletin, in which Charleston, S.C., was (fortunately fictitiously) lost in the interplay between a television station and terrorists.

In real life, as we call it, television responds to violence, and that tends to encourage violence.

Anthony Quainton, former head of the State Department's Office for Combating Terrorism, has associated the increase in casualties during hijackings and hostage-takings with the desire of terrorists to insure news media attention.

Deliberate acts of horror--like the tossing out of slain victims--are planned as media events.

Sometimes the aim of terrorists is to hijack television itself. When the radical Baader-Meinhof gang in West Germany kidnapped a politician in 1975 as hostage for the release of five imprisoned comrades, it forced German television to show each prisoner boarding a plane and to broadcast dictated propaganda statements. "For 72 hours we lost control of our medium," said a German television executive.

When Arab terrorists seized the Vienna headquarters of OPEC in 1975, killing three persons and taking oil ministers hostage, the terrorists' plan called for them to occupy the building until TV cameras arrived.

A central feature of the plan of the San Francisco Symbionese Liberation Army, which kidnapped Patricia Hearst, was the exploitation of the media--forcing radio and television to play its tapes and carry its messages.

The Hanafi Muslims' hostage-taking occupation of three locations in Washington in 1976 was a classic case of media-age terrorism. The leader, Hamaas Abdul Khalis, spent much of his time giving interviews by telephone while his wife checked what was being broadcast.

"These crimes are highly contagious," said Dr. Harold Visotsky, head of the department of psychiatry at Northwestern University. "Deranged persons have a passion for keeping up with the news and imitating it."

Television rewards violence with notoriety, conferring a sense of identity on those seeking to validate their existence.

In 1977, in Indianapolis, Anthony George Kiritsis wired a sawed-off shotgun to the neck of a mortgage company officer, led him out in front of the police and TV cameras, and yelled, "Get those goddamn cameras on! I'm a goddamn national hero!"

John Hinckley Jr., who shot President Reagan, told examining psychiatrists that he had deliberately planned an assassination before news cameras to win maximum media attention.

"No crime carries as much publicity as the assassination of the President of the United States," he said. Hinckley's first question to the Secret Service officer who interrogated him was, "Is it on TV?"

As television, again and again, remorselessly, hypnotically, played the video tape of the shooting, the Secret Service recorded an astonishing number of further threats against the President. Hinckley told psychiatrists he knew he would spend the rest of his life in the spotlight. He had gone, he said, from "obscurity to notoriety."

The speech he wrote for his sentencing, which he never got to make because of the finding of innocence by reason of insanity, said, "The entire civilized world knows who I am."

Television offers a perverse incentive to the unstable and the fanatical. Because television goes to town on a hostage crisis, some are encouraged to plot hostage crises.

For example, the Washington Monument siege in December, 1982, was apparently planned as a media event in protest against nuclear arms. Norman Mayer made clear he wanted to negotiate not with the police, but with the media for air time. He apparently spent part of his last day on earth watching, on a TV set in his van, the live coverage of his siege that represented his great triumph. It may have been only a coincidence that it was 7:30 PM, as the network news ended, that his van started towards the White House to stage the next episode--to be met with a hail of police fire. One can only speculate whether he would be alive had there been less live coverage.

Television is reluctant to confront the unintended consequences of the temptations it offers. Television will have to face the question of whether covering the news requires exploitation of the news--whether a terrorist or hostage incident must be turned into a circus of round-the-clock live coverage, complete with ego-satisfying telephone interviews.

Television has come, in some respects, to replace government as a authority figure. It confers prestige and identity. It must learn the responsibility that goes with its influence. That means not encouraging terrorists by giving them the rewards of massive notoriety.

###

EDITORIALS/COLUMNISTS

DRUGS

Who's in charge of drug war? -- Despite claims made on behalf of the highly publicized drug smuggling task force directed by Vice President George Bush, the war on drugs is not being won. Rather, it has been hindered by government confusion, overt politicization and interagency indifference. Drug Enforcement Administration records show that narcotics are flowing into this country at a record pace....A bill that would put government activities in the hands of a centralized authority is in its second incarnation in Congress....Fragmentation hinders government enforcement activities. It is therefore wise to consider appointing a 'drug czar' to coordinate and oversee international efforts...."

(Cleveland Plain Dealer, 6/23)

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

Our Nuclear Posture Is at Stake -- "...If the Administration is willing to make full disclosure of relevant intelligence to the appropriate congressional committees, and if that intelligence indicates that the Chinese are no longer a party to the more questionable aspects of the Pakistan nuclear-power program, Congress should allow the agreement to become final. But in the absence of such information it has no responsible choice but to disapprove it. To act otherwise would be to make a mockery of this country's entire posture against the non-proliferation (sic.) of nuclear weapons."

(Los Angeles Times, 6/25)

CIVIL RIGHTS

Reagan Can Take Lead on Racial Justice -- "...President Reagan and his team could do a great deal to help in clarifying the issues and restoring a sense of national commitment to civil rights....The Administration could begin by sorting out its own ideas about civil rights and having the President set forth a clear, coherent vision. It would show that the Administration's views, while controversial, still have honorable foundations. The central premise is that America ought to be a 'colorblind' society....But if the Administration is going to receive a fair hearing it must do more than set forth its own vision. It must also show more clearly its own commitment to improving the lives of black citizens as a matter of policy. That commitment logically starts with an expanding economy, and as 6 million jobs have been created since the trough of the recession they have a persuasive point. But the commitment cannot stop there. It should also include an array of other initiatives such as 'urban enterprise zones,'...Budget cuts should also be examined with a more rigorous eye toward their effect on the poor...."

(David Gergen, Los Angeles Times, 6/25)

Mississippi summer legacy -- "The memorial services for three young civil rights workers killed in Mississippi 20 years ago this week -- two white, Jewish Northerners and a Southern black -- put into badly needed perspective some of the strains in the 1984 presidential campaign....It was the legacy of that 1964 summer of joint black-white struggle that made possible the stunning Jackson campaign successes in the South and that could give black voters a key role in deciding the November presidential election. "They (the civil rights workers) died so that people could vote," Carolyn Goodman Eisner said, "and I hope people are going to vote this year."

(Philadelphia Inquirer, 6/23)

Robert White's law (quoted by Podhoretz): **Boredom is most underrated force in world.**

O'Sullivan: **Conor Cruise O'Brien** passed strict Reg. rule for TV
No interviews w. T's or TV: makes them a role model for other would-be terrorists. **Blaming them.**

Schor: "Royal road to identity is violence" - because TV loves it.
TV Indust. sets up ^{positive} incentives for violence" (Hanafy Muslim, Martin Luther King, etc. who all guilty conscious)

Chelfort: **Terrorism**: ~~to spread of fear or change policies~~
^{kill, maiming or} ~~to spread of fear or change policies~~
^{purpose + specificity} ~~to spread of fear or change policies~~
Today: state sponsored

Krauthammer: **Class terrorism**: audience's victim
new random attack on civilian audience in the world
Podhoretz: **Media** now **accept** facts of Soviet role in terrorism; for
we rational/culture of aggression. 3) random attack on civilian audience - this can't be interpreted

Claire Sterling: "investigate & inform" on state terrorism
the media's proper response to terrorism; and it is not doing it.

Schor: believes that Claire Sterling ~~is~~ reporter Pope
De Borchgrave: censorship by omission ^{why} double standard;
e.g., **Caspar drug traffic**



The White House NEWS SUMMARY

Stille
Terrorism as theater
T's not invited
to court or T
Interview numbers in advance?
So TV
plan day
see day
program
anti
ten

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1984 -- 6 a.m. Edition

activity
T's... frame calls through
People's Republics +
Unions + Schools
US intelligence program arrested on
will its. viol. of the terrorists

TODAY'S HEADLINES

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Nicaraguan Aid Money Removed from Senate Bill -- A Senate vote to sidetrack President Reagan's request for \$21 million for covert operations in Nicaragua may doom the CIA's operation there, says Speaker O'Neill. (New York Times, Washington Post, Washington Times, Wall Street Journal, Reuter, AP)

Jesse Jackson Arrives in Cuba -- A group of several thousand Cubans, with President Castro as the cheerleader, welcomed Jesse Jackson at Jose Marti International Airport as the Democratic presidential candidate continued his tour south of the border. (Reuter, AP, New York Times, Washington Post, Washington Times)

NATIONAL NEWS

Appeals Court Rules in Debate Papers Case -- A unanimous U.S. Court of Appeals ruled that the attorney general does not have to seek a special counsel to investigate how documents from the Carter White House got to the Reagan campaign in 1980. (New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Washington Post, Washington Times)

NETWORK NEWS SUMMARY (Monday Evening)

INTEREST RATES -- President Reagan thinks interest rates should be coming down, but economists think the worst is yet to come.

CIVIL RIGHTS -- The President again was defending his Administration's civil rights record.

AIR POLLUTION -- One of the Reagan Administration's controversial air pollution control policies won approval from the Supreme Court.

PERSIAN GULF -- Iran confirmed that Iraqi warplanes hit a Greek tanker.

INTERNATIONAL NEWS...A-2
NATIONAL NEWS.....A-7
NETWORK NEWS.....B-1
EDITORIALS.....B-6

THE SPEAKERS

Julian Amery (United Kingdom) is a Conservative Member of Parliament. He has served as Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State and Financial Secretary of the War Office, Minister of Aviation, Minister of Public Works, and Minister of Housing. His books include several volumes on the life and policies of Joseph Chamberlain.

Moshe Arens (Israel) is Israel's Minister of Defense. He served as his country's Ambassador to the United States from 1982 to 1983. A member of the Knesset since 1974, he was Chairman of its Defense and Foreign Relations Committee from 1977 to 1982. Prior to his election to the Knesset, he was Professor of Aeronautical Engineering at the Technion and Vice President of Israel Aircraft Industry.

Jillian Becker (United Kingdom) has been writing about terrorism since 1975. Her most recent book, "The PLO: The Rise and Fall of the Palestinian Liberation Organization," was published in Britain in April 1984, and this month in the United States. She has also edited "The Soviet Union and Terrorism," scheduled for publication next fall.

Walter Berns (USA) has taught Constitutional law at Yale, Cornell, the University of Toronto and the University of Chicago. His books include "The First Amendment," "The Future of American Democracy," and "For Capital Punishment." He is John M. Olin Distinguished Scholar in Constitutional and Legal Studies at the American Enterprise Institute and Professorial Lecturer and Georgetown University.

Alain Besancon (France) is Professor of the History of Russian Culture at the Ecole de Hautes Etudes in Paris and columnist for L'Express. Last year he was Visiting Scholar at the Hoover Institution, Stanford. Two of his 12 books were translated into English: "The Intellectual Origins of Lenin" and "The Soviet Syndrome."

David Brinkley (USA) is the host of "This Week with David Brinkley" on ABC-TV, and has anchored "World News Tonight." Prior to joining ABC News in 1981 he was with NBC for 37 years. As anchorman, reporter and political analyst he has covered every presidential campaign since 1952 and, with Peter Jennings, is ABC's political analyst for the current campaign.

Vladimir Bukovsky (USSR, USA) is a Russian dissident and author. Prior to his expulsion from Russia in 1976, he campaigned for human rights in the USSR and exposed the Soviet use of psychiatry against political dissenters. He was arrested several times, placed in a "psychiatric ward," and in 1972 was sentenced to a term of 12 years on a charge of anti-Soviet activities. He is the author of "To build a Castle," an autobiography, and "The Piercing Pain of Freedom."

Lord Chalfont (United Kingdom) is a writer and journalist and former Cabinet Minister in the British government. He is the author of several works, including a biography of Field Marshall Montgomery and an analysis of American military power "The Sword and the Spirit." He is a frequent contributor of articles and reviews to The Times and professional journals.

Alan Cranston (USA) is the Senior Senator from California, and Democratic Whip. He is a member of the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee and of the Foreign Relations Committee. He is the ranking Democrat on the Arms Control Subcommittee, and is a member of the Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Subcommittee and the East Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee.

Alfonse D'Amato (USA) is the Junior Senator from New York. He is a member of the Committees on Appropriations and Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, and sits on the Defense and Transportation Subcommittees.

Arnaud de Borchgrave (USA) is an author, journalist and lecturer. He was Newsweek's chief foreign correspondent from 1964 to 1980 and in the past 33 years has covered most of the world's major news events from some 90 countries. A recipient of many journalistic awards, he has co-authored "The Spike" and the recently published "Monimbo."

Midge Decter (USA) is an editor, writer and Executive Director of the Committee for the Free World. Her works include "The Liberated Woman and Other Americans," "The New Chastity," and "Liberal Parents, Radical Children," and numerous articles on political and social issues.

Carlo Ripa di Meana (Italy) is a member of the Socialist Party and representative to the European Parliament, where he has been a leading proponent of international action against terror. He has visited Afghanistan three times since 1980, touring battle zones and rebel outposts, and has lectured extensively on developments there.

Wolfgang Fikentscher (West Germany) has been professor of Law at the University of Munich Faculty Law since 1971, and has held positions on the faculties of several European and American universities including Munster, Tübingen, Ann Arbor (Mich.) and Berkeley (Cal.). He has published books and articles on legal theory, anarchy and the New Left, and international economic relations. In his book "Blocke und Monopole in der Weltpolitik" (1979), he proposed the establishment of a Free Nations Organization and an instrument of cooperation in matters of common concern, among them terrorism.

Jeane J. Kirkpatrick (USA) is the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations. She also serves as a member of President Reagan's Cabinet. Prior to joining government she was professor of government at Georgetown University. Her books include "The Reagan Phenomenon--and Other Speeches on Foreign Policy," "Dictatorship and Double Standards: Rationalism and Reason in Politics" and "The New Presidential Elite."

Leszek Kolakowski (Poland, USA) was for many years Professor of the History of Philosophy at the University of Warsaw. Since his expulsion from the university in 1968 he has taught mostly in England and the United States; he now divides his time between All Souls College, Oxford, and the Committee on Social Thought at the University of Chicago. Mr. Kolakowski's books include the three-volume "Main Currents of Marxism," "Religion," and an essay "Totalitarianism and the Lie" in "1984 Revisited."

Ted Koppel (USA) is anchorman for ABC News "Nightline" and "Viewpoint." From 1971 to 1980 he was ABC's Chief Diplomatic Correspondent, and from 1975 to 1977 the anchorman for the "ABC Saturday Night News." After joining ABC News in 1963, he served in posts around the world, including Japan and Hong Kong, where he served as Bureau Chief. He has received many awards for outstanding journalism and won national and international recognition for his nightly coverage of the Iranian hostage crisis.

Charles Krauthammer (USA) is senior editor at the New Republic magazine. A contributing essayist to Time since 1983, he recently won the National Magazine Award for essays and criticism. He was Commonwealth Scholar in politics at Oxford and a speechwriter for Vice President Mondale.

Paul Laxalt (USA) is the Senior Senator from Nevada. He also served as Nevada's Lieutenant Governor and Governor. He is a member of the Appropriations and Judiciary committees and is Chairman of the Judiciary Criminal Law Subcommittee and of the Appropriations' State, Justice, Commerce Subcommittee. In January he became General Chairman of the Republican Party.

Michael Ledeen (USA) is a senior fellow at the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies and the former executive editor of "The Washington Quarterly." A former professor at Washington University in St. Louis and at the University of Rome, he is the author of books on Italian fascism, West European communism and, with William Lewis, of "Debacle: The American Failure in Iran." In 1981-82 he served as special adviser to Secretary of State Alexander Haig. He is now completing a book on the superpowers.

*with
Pascoe*

Burton Leiser (USA) is Edward J. Mortola Professor of Philosophy in the Dyson College of Arts and Sciences of Pace University, and Adjunct Professor of Law at the College of Law of Pace University. He has also taught at the State University of New York College at Buffalo, Sir George Williams University in Montreal, and Drake University in Des Moines, Iowa. His books include "Custom, Law and Morality," "Liberty, Justice and Morals: Contemporary Value Conflicts," and "Values in Conflict: Life, Liberty, and the Rules of Law."

Bernard Lewis (USA) is Cleveland E. Dodge Professor of Near Eastern studies, Princeton University, and Long Term Member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton. His numerous books include "The Origins of Ismailism," "The Arabs in History," "The Middle East and the West," "The Assassins," and "The Muslim Discovery of Europe." He is co-editor of "The Cambridge History of Islam" and "The Encyclopaedia of Islam" (in progress). His books and articles have been translated into 18 languages.

Christian Lochte (West Germany) is a Director of the Hamburg Senate and the Chief of the Office for the Protection of the Constitution, West Germany's agency responsible for combatting terrorism.

Edwin Meese III (USA) is Counsellor to the President. As the President's chief policy advisor, he is a member of the Cabinet and the National Security Council. From 1977 to 1981, he was Professor of Law at the University of San Diego, where he was also Director of the Center for Criminal Justice Policy and Management. Before joining Governor Reagan's staff as Legal Affairs Secretary and Executive Assistant, he served as Deputy District Attorney of Alameda County.

Daniel Patrick Moynihan (USA) is the senior Senator from New York. He is Vice Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and is a member of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee. He was the US Ambassador to India and US Ambassador to the United Nations. He served as a member of the Cabinet and sub-Cabinet to Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon and Ford. From 1972 to 1976 he was Professor of Government at Harvard University. His most recent book is "Loyalties".

Takeshi Muramatsu (Japan) is the dean of the College of Comparative Culture at Tsukuba University. A writer, columnist, literary critic and French scholar, he has written on a great variety of subjects. His books include "Charles de Gaulle," "International Terrorism," and "Blood, Sand and Prayer--History of the Contemporary Middle East."

Benjamin Netanyahu (Israel) is Deputy Chief of the Israeli Mission in Washington. From 1967-1972 he served as a soldier and officer in a special paratroop unit of the Israeli Army. He is the editor of "International Terrorism: Challenge and Response," co-editor of "The Letters of Jonathan Netanyahu," and author of articles on the Middle East in leading American newspapers.

Benzion Netanyahu (Israel) is Professor Emeritus of Judaic Studies at Cornell University and author of numerous books and studies on Medieval and Modern Jewish History. Architect and first General Editor of the "World History of the Jewish People", he was also for many years Editor-in-Chief of the "Encyclopedia Hebraica". His works include "The Maranos of Spain" and "The Origins of the Inquisition", to be published next year in the US. He was chairman of the Founding Executive Committee of the Jonatnan Institute.

John O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) is a journalist who was formerly editor of "Policy Review" and a fellow of the Institute of Politics at Harvard. He has recently joined the editorial staff of the London "Daily Telegraph."

Norman Podhoretz (USA) is the Editor-in-Chief of Commentary magazine, a position he has held since 1960. His books include "Why We Were in Vietnam", "The Present Danger" and "Breaking Ranks: A Political Memoir". He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and a member of the Boards of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, the Committee on the Present Danger and the Committee for the Free World. He is Chairman of the New Directions Advisory Committee of the USIA.

Yitzhak Rabin (Israel) was Prime Minister of Israel from 1974 to 1977. He served as Israel's Ambassador to the United States from 1968 to 1973. His military career began in Israel's War of Independence in 1948 and culminated in his role as Chief of Staff during the Six-Day War. During his period as Premier, his Cabinet authorized the rescue mission to Entebbe.

Jean-Francois Revel (France) is an author, editor and journalist. His most recent book, "How Democracies Perish" will be published in the U.S. in November, 1984. His writings include seventeen books, among them "The Totalitarian Temptation," "Without Marx or Jesus," two volumes of selected articles, and a "History of Western Philosophy." Professor Revel taught at the French Institute in Mexico City, Florence, Lille, and Paris. From 1978 to 1981 he was editor of L'Express.

Eugene Rostow (USA) is Stirling Professor of Law, Yale University, and former Dean of the Yale Law School. He held several senior posts in the U.S. government, including Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in the Reagan Administration and Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs under President Johnson. He was also the president of the Atlantic Treaty Organization and has been the chairman of the Executive Committee on the Present Danger since 1976. He has written numerous works on international law and political affairs.

Daniel Schorr (USA) is senior foreign correspondent of CNN. He was CBS correspondent in the United States and abroad for many years prior to his present assignment and headed the CBS bureau in Moscow at its opening in 1955. He is author of "Clearing the Air," which includes a chapter on TV and terrorism, and of "Don't Get Sick in America." He has received many journalistic awards here and abroad and is known for his activist involvement in the defense of the First Amendment.

George P. Shultz (USA) is the 60th U.S. Secretary of State. He served in President Nixon's Administration as Secretary of Labor, Director of Office of Management and Budget, Secretary of the Treasury, and Chairman of the Council on Economic Policy. He taught at MIT and the University of Chicago, where he was Professor of Industrial Relations and Dean of the Graduate School of Business. He has published numerous works on Economics, Business and Labor-Management issues.

Claire Sterling (USA) is an American foreign correspondent based in Italy for over 30 years. She was foreign correspondent for The Reporter throughout its existence and has reported on European, African, Middle Eastern and South-East Asian for The Atlantic, The New York Times Magazine, the Reader's Digest, Harper's and the New Republic. Since 1970 she has been writing columns of political analysis for the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, and the International Herald Tribune. She has written three books: "The Masaryk Case," "The Terror Network," and the recently published "The Time of the Assassins."

P.J. Vatikiotis (United Kingdom) is Professor of Politics with Reference to the Near and Middle East at the University of London. His most recent books are "Egypt from Muhammad Ali to Sadat," "Arab and Regional Politics in the Middle East," and "Nasser and His Generation."

William H. Webster (USA) has been the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigations since 1978. He has served as U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, a member of the Missouri Board of Law Examiners, Judge of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri and the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

George Will (USA) is a Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist whose articles appear in Newsweek, The Washington Post and more than 300 other newspapers in the United States. His books include "The Pursuit of Happiness and Other Sobering Thoughts" and the recently published "Statecraft as Soulcraft."

Bob Woodward (USA) is Assistant Managing Editor at the Washington Post. He is co-author of "All the President's Men," "The Final Days," "The Brethren" and author of the recently published "Wired." His six part series, "The Terror Factor" was published in the Washington Post last February.

MAIN POINTS OF FORMER PRIME MINISTER YITZHAK RABIN
AT THE JONATHAN INSTITUTES'S SECOND CONFERENCE
ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM
SUNDAY, JUNE 24, 1984
WASHINGTON, D.C.

-- Eight years have passed since Operation Jonathan was successfully and brilliantly carried out. It served as a landmark in the struggle against international terrorism. Israel was confronted by an act of international terrorism. The terrorists who hijacked Air France flight 139 from Tel Aviv to Paris comprised PLO terrorists of the Wadia Hadad faction and German terrorists of the Baader Meinhof group. They were provided with passports by an Arab country. They brought the plane and the hostages to Entebbe. The government of Uganda and its armed forces helped and protected them..

The Government and people of Israel were determined to do their utmost not to give in to the terrorists' blackmail.

The rescue operation -- Operation Jonathan -- was assisted by information supplied by France and other countries and carried out on the assumption that the government of Kenya would allow the use of its facilities, including the Nairobi airport as a refueling station on the way back, without which the operation could not be carried out. It was an example of how vital international cooperation is vital in such a mission.

Israel paid heavily for its decision. Jonathan Netanyahu, the commander of the elite unit of the IDF was wounded and later died. With him, 4 Israeli hostages lost their lives.

The Jonathan Institute was established as a tribute to a unique man and a leader of men in battle. Yoni, as he was called by his friends, was an example of all the best that we can expect and hope in our young generation. A man of the book that did not hesitate to use the sword for the defense of his country and the values in which he believed.

-- The free world faces today 3 types of threats of war:

Nuclear war that carries the horrible threat of world destruction. Therefore, there is a hope that it can be prevented.

Conventional war, the only type of all-out war between nations since the end of the Second World War, which breaks out from time to time in our world. It is costly and therefore nations try to refrain from it. In the case of Israel we have had in the last 36 years one war every 6 - 8 years.

* Terrorism, that has become in many countries the kind of warfare that inflicts fear and interrupts the daily normal way of life of society, and has become a daily scourge that many of the governments of the world have to cope with.

* Modern terrorism has been internationalized in two ways. First full cooperation exists between most of the terror organizations. For example, today 11 terror organizations outside the Middle East cooperate with the PLO terror groups.

And second, sovereign states initiate and support terrorism and terror organizations. It is done by allowing them to use their territory for training and refuge. They supply them with diplomatic assistance and arms. For example, over 95% of the arms of the PLO were produced in the Soviet Union. Till the beginning of the war in Lebanon the arms were supplied to the PLO directly by Bulgaria.`

The only way the free world can cope effectively with international terror is by cooperating internationally against it. International terror must be thwarted by an internationally organized effort.

* Today there is no international organization of any kind that acts against terror. There are effective bilateral arrangements between various states, but there is nowhere headquarters that direct the fight against international terrorism.

The United Nations cannot present the framework within which such an organization can be created, because of the membership of the Communist bloc and other countries that encourage and support terrorism.

PROPOSAL

Therefore I believe that there is an urgent need for the creation of a voluntary international organization of sovereign states that choose to work together against international terror and against states that promote and assist it. This will be in addition to the existing bilateral arrangements.

Only the United States, the leader of the most powerful country in the free world, can take the lead in initiating the establishment of such an organization and in guiding the organization's operation, and the cooperation and coordination of the activities of the state members.

The functions of this organization will be:

- Intelligence and counter-intelligence
- The creation of effective defenses and preventive measures against terrorism.
- Operational assistance against acts of terror.
- Coordinated political activity against countries that initiate or assist terror.

The structure of the organization will include governments which accept the principle of fighting terrorism and that choose to become members of the organization.

The center of the organization will be located in Washington, D.C. and be headed by a senior representative of the United States.

There will be no military or security forces under the command of this organization.

Every member state will operate and cope with acts of terrorism by its own force. It does not exclude the possibility of a combined operation by the member states involved.

A limited permanent machinery will be created to deal with the subjects defined.

Each member state will have permanent representation in the Organization.

Financing of the Organization will be shared by the member states.

STATEMENT OF
PROFESSOR BENZION NETANYAHU
TO THE JONATHAN INSTITUTE:
SECOND CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM
SUNDAY, JUNE 24, 1984
THE FOUR SEASONS HOTEL
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Secretary, Lord Chalfont, Mr. Rabin, Mr. Johnson, honored guests:

This is the second time that I have been asked by the Jonathan Institute to represent it in a conference devoted to the issue of international terrorism. I have accepted this assignment as a matter of duty, with due humility, and with the full awareness of the responsibility that must rest on anyone who takes any part, however small, however marginal, in this hard and crucial struggle. I have called this struggle crucial not only because it touches such vital issues as our current security, but also because its outcome, we believe, will determine the basic conditions of our future life. Indeed, as we see it, what is involved is nothing less than the survival of free society itself.

Five years ago, when our first conference on terrorism was held, there were only few in the West who fully realized all the implications of this phenomenon. Today there are many in the free societies who recognize its essence and what it entails. Today we see leaders of the free world -- primarily the leading statesmen of this country -- approaching the front lines of this battle, and seeking, with great courage and determination, means and devices to put a halt to the blight. This is certainly a heartening development, whose importance cannot be overassessed. Yet, on the other hand, we see leaders in the West, and many in the press and

others to bend toward the terrorists, stem in part from lack of conviction concerning the true nature of terrorism, and in part from a belief that the terrorists have a case, perhaps a just case, that they can be reasoned with, and finally won over by a number of adequate concessions. The Real Politik is, of course, there; but behind it there is a moral consideration which is based on a misconception of terrorism and what the terrorists are after.

We must clear up this misconception if we wish to make real headway in our effort; and in doing so we must bear in mind that we deal here with a crafty, most potent enemy who operates not only with physical, but also with psychological weapons, with persuasive arguments and captivating slogans. Thus, to delude the peoples of the free world, the terrorist appears as the bearer of their ideals, as the champion of the oppressed, as the critic of social ills, and, more specifically, as a fighter for freedom. The last claim especially is the sure catch which closes the trap laid for the credulous. Since freedom fighters have also used violence in their struggles, and since freedom is so dear to free men, many in the democracies are almost automatically filled with sympathy for the terrorists and their causes, and some of our youth -- our idealistic youth -- are even moved to join their ranks. Others, more observant, more critical, but unconvinced, ask with bewilderment: Who are these men? Are they really

freedom fighters as they claim to be, or are they merely using a pretence, a ruse, a guise, under which they hide their real face -- the face of quite another kind of fighter and another type of man?

Our first conference sought to answer this question by offering a summary definition of the terrorist, a definition based not on his claims, but on his deeds, on his actual conduct. Terrorism, it said, is "the deliberate, systematic murder, maiming and menacing of the innocent to inspire fear in order to gain political ends." This, we maintain, is a perfect definition. But what definition, however perfect, cannot be submerged, evaded or distorted by a campaign of shrewd demagogues proclaiming gross untruths from all the major forums of the world? The distinction we have made seems to have been drowned in the noise of their tumultuous agitation. In any case, it had not gone far enough. We must, therefore, launch it here again.

But now we should sharpen our definition. We should put more stress on the word "innocent" which, when fully understood, cannot fail to expose the sham of the terrorist claims. For in contrast to the terrorist, no freedom fighter has ever deliberately attacked the innocents. He has never deliberately killed small children, or passers-by in the street, or foreign visitors, or other civilians who happen to reside in the area of the conflict. This was not just a matter of tactics, but one that related to his basic aim. His aim was to secure all our freedoms, and therefore

he could not trample under foot the rights of men, which constitute these freedoms. The terrorist, on the other hand, treats these rights as dust, which means that to him our freedoms are worthless. By no stretch of logic, therefore, can he be regarded as a fighter for freedom. But, then, what is he? What is he fighting for?

It may be argued that he fights for the liberation of his own people, without caring about the rest of the world at all. The idea may be proven absurd from many standpoints, but we shall not go into this here. We shall just take a look at the promise of free life that the terrorist carries for his own people. There are countries where this promise was already materialized, and thus we can judge it by their examples. Look at Angola, at Ethiopia, at Nicaragua! Look at Vietnam, look at Cambodia! Do you have freedom there or a despotic rule, which employs all forms of oppression? The subjugated populations of these countries are so terrified that they do not even utter a whisper of protest against any of the abuses of their rights. Yet some advocates of the terrorists still argue that it is better for a group to be subjugated by its own members than by members of a foreign people. But when was this proven to be the rule? Oppression is oppression from whichever side it comes, and intolerable oppression remains intolerable even when practiced by your own kind. In fact, it is often far worse. When Mazzini, after Italy's liberation, was asked for his view about the establishment of a

Marxist regime in Italy, he answered: "I would rather see the Austrians return to Italy than see the Italians slaves to themselves."

But we must also consider a third factor which shows clearly what the terrorist is. I refer to his patrons, promoters and overlords, all of which are states with repressive regimes in which freedom as we know it has no place. Known are his connections with countries of the Middle East such as Syria, Libya, Iraq and Iran, which earned the title of terrorist states because they habitually use terror to further their aims. But not so well-known, and often obscure, are the ties of the terrorists with the Soviet Union; and these are by far more important, more decisive, and more crucial for the future of the free world. The Soviets, as we know, have repeatedly disclaimed their responsibility for the rise of terrorism in the world, but their deeds indisputably refute their denials. It is sufficient to note their treatment of the PLO, which was rightly labeled as the "core of world terror." They support them politically on an unprecedented scale, as the whole world has repeatedly seen; they support them militarily as was revealed in our first conference by offering them training in numerous bases within and outside the Soviet Union; and they support them legally by preventing the attainment of an international convention that will provide for the terrorists' extradition. And, just as there can be no question about these facts, there can be no doubt about their

motives. Terrorism is the first general attack upon a free society which the enemies of freedom plan to take over. When they take it over, and the country falls prey to the terrorist assailants, it becomes a satellite of Soviet Russia and another jumping ground for its political expansion.

The conclusion we must draw from all this is quite evident. Far from being a bearer of freedom, the terrorist is the carrier of oppression and enslavement to any society in which he has his way. The three distinctive signs we have just mentioned -- his method of warfare which includes murder of children, his oppressive rule over his own people, and his alliances with tyrannical regimes -- indicate this unmistakably. If we point out these signs repeatedly, we should be able to destroy, as we must, the myth of the terrorist as a freedom fighter. But this is not enough. We should not only indicate what the terrorist is not, we must also show clearly what he is -- and this brings me to my final remarks.

The terrorist represents a new breed of men which takes man back to prehistoric times, to the times when morality was not yet born. Divested of any moral principle, he has no moral sense, no moral controls, and therefore is capable of committing any crime, like a

killing machine, without shame or remorse. But he is also a cunning, consummate liar, and therefore, much more dangerous than the Nazis, who used to proclaim their aims openly. In fact, he is the perfect Nihilist.

I must add that the harbingers of this type of man have appeared already a century ago, and then too they portrayed themselves as champions of "progress" and "true liberty", as the new wave of the approaching future. Then, of course, it was difficult to see where all this would lead. But a few great men did. One of these was Dostoyevsky, another was Max Nordau. Alarmed by the sight of these terrible humans, and seeking to unmask them, Nordau issued his famous warnings. "They are not the future," he shouted with indignation, "but an immeasurably remote past. They are not progress, but the most appalling reaction. They are not liberty, but the most disgraceful slavery." Were their influence not destroyed, he added, the future would not bring the hoped-for brightness of day, but "the dusk of the nations, in which all suns and all stars gradually wane, and mankind with all its institutions and creations perishes in the midst of a dying world."

Ladies and gentlemen, this is no longer an apocalyptic vision, but a forecast of a stark reality. Nordau did not speak of the death of mankind by nuclear destruction. The atomic bomb was then not yet envisioned; but civilizations may be subject to moral diseases which may kill them as surely as any bomb can. Our attitude

toward terrorism and the way we treat it, the way we are getting conditioned to its horrors, and above all our reactions to the dangers of enslavement represented by the terrorists and their masters, indicate that we are struck with a serious moral sickness that debilitates our capacities to act as free men. And yet we feel within ourselves the power of recovery and the ability to emerge triumphant. May God grant us the wisdom to cure ourselves before the dusk of the nations is upon us.

"TERRORISM AND THE MEDIA"

STATEMENT OF JOHN O'SULLIVAN

TO THE JONATHAN INSTITUTE

SECOND CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1984

FOUR SEASONS HOTEL

WASHINGTON, DC

We already have too many definitions of terrorism and terrorists, but a definition worth considering is that a terrorist is a criminal who seeks publicity. This sets him far apart from what British officials in Northern Ireland have taken to calling the ODC, or ordinary decent criminal who understandably shuns the limelight. Indeed, it is an understatement to say that terrorists seek publicity. They require publicity. It is their lifeblood. If the media were not there to report terrorist acts and to explain their political and social significance (the motives inspiring them and so forth), then terrorism as such would cease to exist. Each terrorist act would then be seen merely as an isolated criminal event. It would not be interpreted as an integral part of a pattern of political violence, the likely prelude to other bombings and shootings, something to be seriously discussed by politicians, bureaucrats and television sociologists. As Walter Lacquer put it: "The media are the terrorist's best friend. The terrorist's act by itself is nothing; publicity is all." One might say that terrorists are simply another type of media parasite, but famous for being infamous.

There is, of course, an element of parasitism on the other side. The media find terrorism a sensational news story and are therefore inclined at first to over-report it, to write admiringly of the terrorists' "daring" even while morally condemning them, and to exaggerate their significance. But the media exploit terrorism as a good story rather than depending upon it. If it were not there, other equally newsworthy topics would be to hand -- wars, demonstrations, elections, congressional battles, the marriages of pop stars and, of course, decent ordinary crime.

What benefits does the terrorist seek from media publicity? In what ways does he hope to make the media his accomplices? There are, I think, three types of unwitting media assistance. They help the terrorist to spread an atmosphere of fear and anxiety in society; they provide him with an opportunity to argue his case to the wider public; and they bestow an undeserved legitimacy on him.

Let us take the first: the spreading of fear and anxiety through society. This seems to be achieved principally through the media simply reporting the terrorist's act -- bombings, shootings, and so on. Such reports naturally arouse public concern; it would be alarming if they did not. In a free society, however, nothing is to be done about this. A regime like that in the Soviet Union can suppress all news of its occasional hi-jackings, as it does news of airline crashes and major industrial disasters. And if events do not become known, plainly they cannot influence public opinion. (Even this argument cannot be pushed too far, however. If terrorist acts were sufficiently frequent, they would become known through gossip and hearsay in the most effectively censored society.) Is panic contrived by terrorists then, simply an unavoidable price of living in a society with a free press? I don't think so.

For it is not the simple succession of terrorist acts which, when reported, arouse profound public anxiety. Statistically, these are usually a very trivial threat to the lives and limbs of anyone in particular. No, the media heighten tension much more dramatically by reporting not just terrorist acts, but their threats of future acts, by describing in often lurid colours the campaign

of terror that will ensue if the Government does not yield to their demands and in general by giving the impression that a prospect of endless violence and upheaval lies ahead.

This spreads panic and anxiety in two ways. First, directly, it increases the ordinary citizen's fear that he may fall victim to a bomb in a restaurant or a supermarket. But also, more subtly, it conveys the message that society is a moral chaos, that the laws, rules, standards and securities we have taken for granted no longer provide any protection against random violence and that, in the words of the Rumanian refugee in Casablanca, "the Devil has the people by the throat". There is an instructive comparison from the world of crime. People are murdered all the time without arousing any public feeling more profound than a prurient curiosity. But when a killer like the Yorkshire Ripper not merely kills people, but also mutilates them and then jeers at society for its inability to stop him, mocking the police for their incompetence, then a genuine fear based on moral uncertainty does grip the public. In short, the media magnify terrorist violence so that its impact on public opinion is disproportionate to the actual physical harm it does.

In these circumstances pressures grow for the Government to take action to restore public order. Awkwardly from the terrorist's point of view, this is more likely to be pressure for repressive measures than for government concessions. To take account of this, philosophers of terrorism produced a theory whereby terror would produce a repressive government which in turn would alienate the people by its repression, which would at last usher in a revolutionary government to the terrorists' taste. This has turned to be wishful

thinking. Democratic governments in Britain, Italy and West Germany have been able to reduce or eliminate terrorism without abandoning democratic institutions. And even in countries like Argentina, where a military government did take over and institute counter-terror, it has been replaced by a conventional democratic government not very different from that originally attacked by the Montoneros. Meanwhile the country has endured all the trauma of civil war.

I turn now to the second point: that the media provide the terrorist with an opportunity to broadcast his views to the wider public. This is an opportunity which he would not generally enjoy if he were to use the conventional channels of democratic politics because his support would not warrant that kind of media attention. But the use of terror gives him a platform. The reason is, once again, straightforward journalistic curiosity. Who are these people blowing up restaurants and shooting policemen? Why are they doing it? What are their aims, intentions, philosophies? And what are their demands? We assume that the public is clamouring to know the answers to such questions and seek to provide them. The terrorists themselves so arrange their affairs as to make life relatively easy for the media. They arrange press conferences, publish communiques and statements of ultimate aims, and give exclusive interviews. In Northern Ireland, indeed, the so-called Republican Movement is divided into a terrorist wing which murders people, the IRA, and a political wing, Sinn Fein, which is available to the media to explain why these murders were regrettable necessities.

We can judge the importance placed on this media platform by terrorists from the fact that, when such attention is lacking, they force the media to present their case by threatening to kill hostages, etc. In his classic essay on this topic, Professor Yonah Alexander cites a number of cases in which terrorists have secured statements of their views in the press through such tactics. In 1975, for instance, the Montoneros terrorists in Buenos Aires released a Mercedes Benz director after his company had published advertisements in Western newspapers denouncing the "economic imperialism" of multi-national corporations in the Third World.

This presents a problem for both press and politicians in a democratic society. It is our natural instinct to publish some incomprehensible verbiage which few will read and by which no-one will be influenced, in return for saving identifiable lives. We can assure ourselves what is perfectly true in another context -- that the terrorists on such occasions are falling victim to their own delusions about the power of advertising to condition people's social and political attitudes. That being so, the only effect of such advertisements will be to swell the revenues of newspapers and the salaries of journalists. But such bien-pensant reasoning ignores the long-term effects of the terrorist being seen to bargain with governments and to dictate to the media. Not only does he thereby raise his political status dramatically, but he also obtains the "Robin Hood" glamour of having triumphed, however trivially, from a position of relative weakness. Governments and media, on the other hand, by cooperating in their own denunciation, come off as somehow corrupt, certainly impotent. One answer is for

governments to announce in advance, as Edward Heath's government did in 1973, that they will not bargain if one of their number is abducted. Such a declaration strengthens their moral authority when they urge private bodies to resist a similar blackmail.

More generally, however, concentration by the media on the terrorists' "case" gives rise to the third problem: the unwitting bestowal of respectability upon terrorist groups. Talking about the aims and philosophies of terrorists inevitably conveys the impression that they are a species of politician rather than a species of criminal. We begin to think of the terrorist in relation to economic or foreign policy rather in relation to knee-capping and amputations. Yet it is what the terrorist does rather than what he thinks (or says he thinks) that makes him a legitimate object of media attention. After all, some people like killing, hurting — and frightening others. That insight might be a far more reliable guide to the terrorist's "motivation" than some parroted guff about social justice and institutionalized violence. It might therefore also be a better guide to his future actions.

Television presents this problem of legitimacy in a particularly acute form. For it conveys a sort of respectability upon the terrorist simply by interviewing him. Television is a levelling and homogenizing medium by its very nature, and the process of critically interviewing someone, whether he is a terrorist or a foreign diplomat or an administration nominee in trouble before the Senate, is essentially the same process. Of course, the producer and interviewer will go to considerable lengths to show the terrorist in a

bad light. No matter how aggressive the questioner is, however, he could hardly be more aggressive than, say, Sir Robin Day interrogating Mrs. Thatcher or Mr. Dan Rather grilling Mr. Nixon. Even if the terrorist comes off badly, therefore, he will have his aim by being treated as someone whose contribution to public debate is worthy of attention. He becomes by degrees a politician.

Is there some compensating advantage that justifies such interviews? I don't believe that there is. The blunt truth is that a terrorist is an advocate of murder and that the advocacy of murder is, or should be, beyond the acceptable boundaries of public discussion. The justification commonly advanced is that "we need to know what these people think". But that is poppycock. To begin with, we invariably know what they think long before they appear on television to tell us. Is anyone here unaware of the aims and beliefs of the PLO, or of the IRA, or of the Red Brigade? Secondly, what they say on television is not necessarily what they think (which, as I have argued above, is much more accurately conveyed by what they do). It is sugared propaganda. Finally, even if we needed to know what the terrorist thought and could rely on his honesty, a straightforward journalistic report and analysis by the journalist himself would be a more efficient and reliable method of conveying such information without the side effect of conferring legitimate respectability upon murderers.

Thus far we have considered rather general examples of the media's influence in relation to terrorism. But there have also been a number of occasions on which newspaper and television reporting of specific terrorist incidents has actually hampered the

authorities. Professor Alexander gives what is unfortunately quite a long list in his essay. For instance, in the 1977 hijacking of the Lufthansa jet, the terrorist heard over public radio that the German captain was passing information to the ground authorities over his normal radio transmissions. They subsequently killed him. A similar incident which, fortunately did not have so tragic a result, occurred during the London siege of the Iranian embassy. BBC television viewers suddenly found an old movie interrupted -- appropriately enough, it was a John Wayne movie -- by live coverage of the start of the SAS operation to lift the siege. Fortunately, it seems that the terrorists were not John Wayne fans and did not therefore receive this inadvertant tip-off. If they had, some of the hostages might have perished.

Are there any attitudes in the media which contribute to both the general and specific problems I have outlined? It seems to me that there are, or at least until recently have been, three such attitudes. The first is an exaggeration of the reasonable view that press and government are necessarily antagonistic, the press bent upon exposure, defending the public's right to know, the government insisting upon its executive privacy. Whatever virtue this may have in the ordinary political rough-and-tumble, it is not an appropriate attitude when the authorities are coping with a campaign of murder. "Leaks" of government plans and ignoring official requests for a news blackout when lives are at stake represent a professional distortion of proper human priorities. Fortunately, this is changing. In the Manns-Martin Schleyer kidnapping, the media generally observed an official request for strict silence on official actions.

The second attitude is what Conor Cruise O'Brien calls "unilateral liberalism" which is quite common in the media as it is in the new professional classes in general. This is the "kind of liberalism which is sensitive exclusively to threats to liberty seen as emanating from the democratic state itself, and is curiously phlegmatic about threats to liberty from the enemies of that state." It is this attitude, surely, that is the basis of the belief that, in some sense, the terrorists have a right to have their case presented as if murder were a sort of opinion which the state should respect.

The third is the dynamic of commercial and professional competition which allows no self-restraint in pursuing a dramatic story.

Quite clearly, the most important contribution that the media could make to defeating terrorism would be changing such attitudes. All sorts of other aspects of media coverage would then change automatically. In the absence of that, however, I offer a few arbitrary and random suggestions:

1. Editors should consider very carefully the extent to which their treatment either exaggerates or minimizes the dangers of terrorism. It is my impression -- and no more than that -- that at present Western media coverage exaggerates the domestic dangers and minimizes the threat of international terrorist cooperation except when, fortuitously, the two are linked as in the London siege of the Libyan embassy. This probably reflects nothing more sinister than the usual priority for home over foreign news. But one effect is that public support has not been built up in the

Western democracies for joint action against the terrorist states and the international terror network. Once this goes beyond platitudes, there is an outcry.

2. The media should not allow itself to be used by terrorist groups. It should not seek interviews, or publish communiques, or employ terrorist vocabulary like 'execute' for murder, or the ludicrous titles that terrorists give themselves like "Chief of Staff" of the IRA. Such matters may appear trivial, but they are an important part of establishing the moral climate in which terrorism operates. Geoffrey Jackson, the British Ambassador to Uruguay, told me once that he believed he had significantly unsettled his captors by refusing to accept that he was in a "Peoples' Prison" and insisting that his presence made it the British Embassy. This challenged their version of reality.

3. In an ideal world, journalists would cooperate fully with the law enforcement authorities. They would not protect terrorist sources and they would inform the police of the time and place of any terrorist press conference. But this would mean a joint agreement among different newspapers and television stations to prevent one newspaper or television station gaining an unfair competitive advantage. I do not see the dynamic of competition allowing this at present. But there should be discussion between major news organizations and journalists' trade unions to establish guidelines for self-restraint in dealing with terrorist organizations. To object to such guidelines on the grounds that they might subsequently be used as the basis of a more general censorship is frivolous.



Office of the Director
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Washington, D.C. 20472

HOW CAN TERRORISM BE STOPPED: THE DOMESTIC FRONT

Remarks by
The Honorable Louis O. Giuffrida
Director
Federal Emergency Management Agency

before the
Second Conference on International Terrorism
Washington, DC

June 26, 1984

Ladies and Gentlemen:

First, some comments on which we can all agree: 1) Once terrorism starts, there is no guarantee that it can be satisfactorily stopped, even with massive use of security forces; e.g., Northern Ireland; and 2) It is impossible to protect everyone and everything from a terrorist attack.

Historically, every society has viewed force--which in this context is synonymous with violence--in relative terms; i.e., from its own peculiar perspective. Some use of violence is decreed as necessary to preserve that society and is ipso facto "legitimate." All other violence is declared "illegitimate." The society then assumes a monopoly on the use of violence and creates instrumentalities such as armies and police to apply that violence. Historically, too, societies have longed for an environment totally free of any illegitimate violence. The harsh reality is that we cannot have it both ways! The only way a society can attempt to totally eliminate illegitimate violence by its own definition of "illegitimate" is to raise the level of legitimate violence to such a point that it completely obviates any semblance of individual freedom. Hitler's attempt to eliminate illegitimate violence, by his definition of "illegitimate," brought forth the Gestapo which wielded its weapons of terror against non-Germans and Germans with equal vigor and brutality.

It seems to me we should stop trying to achieve the impossible and put our combined efforts into trying to define the maximum

level of illegitimate violence we can tolerate and still remain a free society, even though there is no universal definition of when peaceful dissent ceases and unacceptable, deliberate violation of the law commences.

In planning a defense for society against terror of various kinds, it is important to get at least a consensus definition of what we are trying to combat. There must be points of common agreement and a common vocabulary.

I accept for this purpose that terrorism can be generally and usefully defined as organized, illegitimate violence aimed to achieve some specific change; for example, a political change. I agree that the intended target is not necessarily the victim of the violence. This definition includes the "deliberate and systematic" elements of the definition used by Senator Scoop Jackson in Jerusalem in 1979.

It seems to me that we in the United States have suffered more uncertainty and lack of direction than some other countries, primarily because we have been unable to build a common vocabulary so that the terminology of terrorism is clearly understood throughout the entire country. Additionally, the United States seems to have been surprised and even disillusioned by the growing frequency of terrorist acts in the United States. For some years prior to 1974, one could sense throughout the United States a general attitude that "terrorism only happens in backward countries or in Europe or in Latin America, but certainly not here in the United States."

What I am saying is that the general population was under the illusion that we Americans are immune from this problem.

Within the context of our freedoms, then, we must come up with a more specific definition of terrorism based on our laws and traditions. For example, we can agree that dissenters are not necessarily terrorists. Free people have the right to peaceful dissent, and we must all jealously guard that right. I believe that if any group is deprived of the right of lawful, peaceful dissent, then we are all deprived of that right. Social mechanisms for peaceful change must be preserved. This is one of our strengths. It makes terrorism less likely.

In arriving at this difficult balance, it is imperative that we understand what a terrorist is--and is not! The ability of the media to be both informed and objective will be a key factor in educating the public so that legal and acceptable governmental and societal actions can be carried out. I regret to say I have some reservations about the objectivity and depth of knowledge of some of the media, particularly when it comes to terrorists. For example, there were two Sybionese Liberation Armies (SLA's): one created by the media and the other, the real SLA. The media version was an actual army with a nationwide infrastructure, led by social and military experts who seemed to materialize from thin air! The entire world was inundated with almost hourly accounts of this so-called army. They were too frequently portrayed as an

essentially benevolent group of humanists presumably driven to violent and desperate measures by an insensitive and oppressive government. They were portrayed as the "good guys" in far too many accounts. Then, there was the real SLA: a group of criminal misfits totally devoid of any semblance of legitimacy. They were bank robbers, car thieves, and shoplifters who "deliberately and systematically" set about menacing the innocent to gain their ill-defined political ends. Even today there are those who eulogize the SLA as "folk heroes!"

Though some say that domestically the United States appears relatively free of the international upward trend in terrorist acts so far, it is not because we have had organized programs to prevent it. There has, however, been an increase in the awareness of domestic terrorist incidents.

The recent terrorist events here in Wasington--the bombings of the Capitol building and at the Navy Yard--are typical of those which the United States has experienced so far. They were isolated, primarily attention-getting, and made use of conventional technology. We cannot, and should not, count on the current essentially uncoordinated terror methodology in the United States continuing into the future.

Realistically, the United States is extremely vulnerable to the conventional weapons and tactics of terrorism. Our highly interconnected infrastructure systems--power supply networks,

natural gas and petroleum pipelines, nuclear power plants, water supply systems, the telephone network, and others--contain choke points which cannot all be defended simultaneously against site attacks by highly motivated and well armed terrorists. The increasing reliance on high technology systems, designed more for efficiency than for protective characteristics, simply increases America's vulnerability to economic, political, and social disruptions. This is clearly shown even by the frequent unintentional damaging of parts of these systems by peacetime disasters.

It is obvious that terrorism is not new; it has been with us all the time, and only the degrees of severity and of public awareness have varied. It is only inevitable that more and more terrorism will be State supported because it is the cheapest and the least hazardous way to fight an undeclared war. How else could a sponsor nation provide money, training, and other support within the mantle of "normal diplomatic relations" almost totally free of the risk of military or economic reprisals from the target nation? For a variety of reasons, the United States has not yet had to face at home highly organized, highly trained, State-supported terrorists. I would suggest that until now this could be explained at least in part by the existence of relatively easy targets in Europe and other parts of the world.

This situation, however, is changing. Target countries like France, Italy, West Germany, and England have become tougher and

better at dealing with terrorism; they can no longer be called "easy." It stands to reason, then, that terrorists will look for new targets that are not as well prepared to deal with them. The United States, unfortunately, automatically becomes a very attractive target.

The modern world has been fortunate that it has experienced no nuclear, biological, or chemical terrorist incident. Experts disagree on the extent to which a third world country or private terrorist group might be able to construct a nuclear device which could be used convincingly to make demands. As a practical matter, however, responsible government officials have to assume a worst case situation in their planning.

The experts do agree that chemical or biological weapons are well within the technical capability of third world countries or private terrorist groups. To give an idea of these threats, let me compare the weight of various agents needed to produce heavy casualties in a square mile area under idealized conditions. To produce about the same number of deaths in that square mile, it would take about 32 million grams of fragmentation cluster bomb material; 3,200,000 grams of mustard gas; 800,000 grams of nerve gas; 5,000 grams of material in a crude nuclear fission weapon; 80 grams of Botulinal Toxin Type A; and, only 8 grams of Anthrax spores.

A government facing a terrorist threat must find a solution which is not only effective, but also acceptable. We in the United States are "instant problem--instant solution" oriented. This national characteristic has always made us more inclined to be reactive rather than proactive. Virtually everything our government does is conceived and debated in conformance with "Sunshine Laws." When one factors in political opposition and fiercely protected domain, the development of a long-term, federally directed anti-terrorism strategic plan which is both effective and acceptable becomes difficult indeed!

It is possible to identify the necessary components of a counterterrorism program.

The strategic plan must deal with every facet of combatting terrorism: legal, operational, budgetary, and administrative. It must consider not only government at every level, but also the public, the private sector, the media, and the academic community. Furthermore, the government cannot be perceived as dramatically changing its normal emergency response functions in order to deal with terrorism, else the terrorists' claimed ability to disrupt government will be given undeserved credibility.

The goals of counterterrorism must be:

1. To secure continuous intelligence on terrorists groups;
2. To identify and isolate terrorist groups and prevent terrorist actions by denying them food, money, shelter, weapons, medical treatment, etc.; and
3. To capture and bring to trial the terrorist leaders. Without leaders, terrorist groups are more likely to splinter and become less effective.

No counterterrorism program can hope to succeed without detailed, coordinated planning. The brunt of counteraction must fall on law enforcement and on the military, but many other agencies will also be involved; e.g., the Border Patrol, the Coast Guard, etc. There must be one boss with the power to impose an appropriate plan on all the agencies concerned. At the very minimum, there must be a common strategy and a clear delineation of agency responsibilities. There has to be a continuous, true dialogue among the agencies involved.

Our biggest deficiency has been the lack of intelligence. There is no question in my mind that we have the men, the materials, the skills, and the courage to assemble a special response force.

I do not minimize the dangers implicit in re-assessing traditional legal safeguards or in restricting liberties. I am also very much aware of the difficulty in trying to get less glamorous or politicized reporting of terrorist acts. But, fundamental to any chance for success is the necessity for us to recognize that all of our planning and all of our potential for anti-terrorism response which will be both effective and acceptable is totally dependent upon a continuum of intelligence information that can be clearly utilized by all the agencies which have the responsibility to plan for and to respond to acts of terrorism. Intelligence gathered by separate agencies must be centrally evaluated and must include a retrieval system so that the intelligence can be made readily available to those who need it in the performance of their duties. Intelligence has to include detailed knowledge of active terrorists and their supporters. The security forces must have valid intelligence to be able to identify command structures of terrorists groups. The computer sciences can greatly enhance the intelligence process and, properly and legally managed, can be utilized without flagrant disregard for personal liberties.

I am confident that we can handle acts of conventional terrorism such as bombs or disruptions of communications or power systems. I am not confident about our ability to deal with chemical or biological agents. It seems to me our best defense against this

type of assault is the ability of our intelligence agencies to identify those terrorists who could and would use such techniques and to keep fully informed as to their whereabouts, intentions, affiliations, etc. Knowing who our potential enemies are and what they are doing is fundamental to our survival. Acquiring and utilizing this essential intelligence and maintaining our free society need not be mutually exclusive.

No special reaction force or memorandum of understanding between agencies can replace reliable intelligence. In fact, the lack of good intelligence is what causes reliance on such things as baggage checks, roadblocks, body searches, etc. Any objective analysis would show that removing some of the restrictions on intelligence operations would be far more effective in terms of identifying terrorists. Not only is intelligence essential for any preventive measures, it is also required for successful rescue attempts or hostage situations.

At some point, we need to decide what concessions we would be prepared to make, if for no other reason than to measure what kind of emergency services we would need to survive the results of a terrorist action. This type of decision absolutely requires an understanding of the resources available to the government (and, incidentally, also to the terrorist) and a defensible, unemotional analysis of the physical results of a terrorist act. This is true whether we are considering conventional weapons or whether we're

considering mass terrorism through the use of nuclear, biological, or chemical devices. The damage caused by terrorist weapons is directly related to the terrorist's selection of targets. For example, a heat-seeking rocket would do relatively little damage to a government building; but, the same rocket could completely destroy a loaded 747 aircraft.

We could do much better at controlling explosives and other death-dealing items. We do not require users of explosives to be careful enough in their storage of the items; they can be too easily stolen. We need to critically examine how far the government is entitled to go in lifting legal safeguards such as searches, detentions, etc.

Since the police will inevitably be involved, we should be looking hard at their readiness for counterterrorism actions. Is it appropriate to suggest that the specialized training, both technical and academic, that police have received might be more critical than the number of policemen who respond to terrorist incidents?

I think everyone will agree that there is a clearly identifiable ratio between the capabilities of terrorists and government's power to respond.

The list could go on, but really what I am saying is that we need to look hard at ourselves as nations. In the past at the

national and international levels our problem has been a "turf" problem with a completely unacceptable level of parochial bickering between and among the various agencies which should have been and could have been productively involved in addressing this type of crime. Terrorism and so-called terrorism technology have become a major international growth industry! There is an enormous amount of money being spent on redundant research to produce endless pages of "analytical reports." "Terrorism experts" are hawking their wares to both the public and private sector. I do not mean to impugn the legitimate efforts being made, but confess serious reservations about the validity of some of these "experts" and their products, especially those who package "panacea solutions."

Where are we now? Because terrorism is a criminal act, in the United States the Federal Bureau of Investigation has the primary role in dealing with the law enforcement aspects of terrorist incidents. Likewise, the U.S. Department of Justice has the lead coordinating role within the Federal Government in marshalling a direct response to a specific domestic terrorist threat.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has a responsibility to coordinate Federal responses to any emergency, irrespective of cause. In the United States, we had traditionally addressed emergencies by type rather than generically. The Congress would write a specific law to address, for example,

earthquakes or floods, and then give the responsibility to separate agencies of the U.S. Government for implementation. It was inevitable that this approach would be costly and less than fully effective. Finally, 4 years ago, FEMA was created essentially by lumping into one agency all of these previously autonomous or semi-autonomous functions and responsibilities..

Since governments have always had the responsibility of protecting their citizens, it follows that the citizens should have the right to demand from their government a predictable, effective, coordinated, and acceptable response to whatever imperils the population. If one were to list all of the dangers, natural or manmade, facing the United States on a continuing basis and then go on to list what the government needs to have in place in order to fulfill its responsibility of protecting the citizens, he would list for each type of emergency--including war and terrorism--precisely the same requirements. The differences are not dynamic but only order of magnitude. An Integrated Emergency Management System (IEMS) to address the entire spectrum is what we have been building for the past 3-1/2 years. Its development and implementation have involved the expenditure of millions of dollars to provide better communications systems, Emergency Operating Centers (EOC's), training programs, etc. We now have for the first time a National Emergency Management System (NEMS) in which we have been careful to include State and local governments in both the design and the execution of training programs, exercises, and conferences. At FEMA Headquarters, we have a state-of-the-art Emergency Information and Coordination Center (EICC) which is

connected with all other agencies of the Federal Government and with State and local governments.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency is not an intelligence gathering agency and maintains no intelligence files. We depend upon those agencies which have a legal charter to collect and disseminate intelligence. FEMA does have the responsibility to plan for and coordinate the Federal response to the consequences of terrorists incidents. If a terrorist act had major effects on the populace anywhere in the United States, FEMA would exercise its regular day-to-day channels to State and local emergency managers, and to other Federal agencies, to assure a consistent and effective multi-jurisdictional response to the consequences of the incident.

It is important to note that FEMA's method of dealing with the consequences of terrorism is basically the same as the way it deals with any major emergency. It makes use of existing channels of communication to governments and existing emergency managers, which it has helped support and train on the best ways to manage any large emergency. When necessary, FEMA Headquarters is prepared to send out trained coordinating teams to assist in the response at the scene. The same doctrine underlies our recent publication of a "National Contingency Plan for Responding to Consequences of an Extraordinary Situation at Special Events." The most immediate special events are, of course, the Olympics, the World's Fair, and the political conventions; but, the plan sets forth coordinating

arrangements for any kind of major emergency, not just a terrorist incident.

I believe that the way in which the United States, through FEMA's National Emergency Training Center (NETC), is handling this problem is the most logical way for this nation to approach our role in terrorism. Through training programs, we are elevating the level of consciousness, imparting factual and theoretical knowledge to those whose responsibility it will be to deal practically with emergency situations once they arise. Properly implemented, this training will enable the various levels of government to exercise their authority, if required, with considerably less parochial opposition.

It has been our experience that programs and training which fit logically into our Integrated Emergency Management System are not likely to be criticized either by Congress or by the general public.

After years of studying this problem, I am encouraged by the progress that free nations are now making to combat this insidious common enemy. I urge that we do more of the same; for in the words of an early American patriot, "We must hang together or we will most certainly hang individually."

available

Clare - Sterling
to white home luncheon
Thurs. - afternoon
Fri. - all
Mon. - all

My.
(212)

254-1173
tel 9 + after 6

Ed Pot - State
Set - back Mon.
Ron Schlee
3046

1) S. Horn
Clare Sterling lunch Carroll (?)
Rayma
J. Richman
J. Harris
Tommy Blawie
Leta - list of spec of state
Fru. schedule - Gr N Gr

Rayma
724 =
2351
Wouter