

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  
[2 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](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

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

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

"DEMOCRACY VERSUS TERRORISM"

STATEMENT OF JEAN FRANCOIS REVEL

TO THE JONATHAN INSTITUTE

SECOND CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1984

there was a Castrist attempt to assassinate President Romulo Betancourt. Later we have seen democracy toppled in Argentina and Uruguay by the Montoneros and the Tupamaros respectively. We know by reading numerous theoretical manifestos and books that this is called "the strategy of tension". The idea is that it is much easier to go from fascism to communism than from democracy to communism. So, the "revolutionaries" must first push the democratic governments towards a fascist pattern of behavior in order to be able, in a second phase, to build socialism on the destruction of fascism. Usually the first part of the plan works magnificently; we have seen that in Argentina and Uruguay. Thank God we did not see it in Italy or Spain! But we could have. The same strategy is now being applied to Peru. During eleven years, Peru had a military dictatorship from 1968 to 1979, admittedly a left-wing military dictatorship which achieved the reduction, the collapse of the gross national product by sixty per cent in only ten years. In any event, it was an authoritarian regime, and there was no terrorism during its rule in Peru. As soon as a president, Mr. Belaunde, was again democratically elected in 1980, terrorism spread throughout the country under the label "Sendero Luminoso".

To return to Europe for a moment: We have seen recently in France a kind of terrorism which is completely disconnected from any politically achievable goal: the ASALA killings at Orly, Marseilles and the railroad trains. It is beyond the reach of any

French Government to abolish retrospectively the Armenian genocide of 1915. Moreover, France is the European country where most of the Armenians found a new home and became easily French citizens. It is clear that the ASALA killings aim at pure intimidation and destabilization.

## TWO

We have seen that the main enemy of state-sponsored international terrorism is undoubtedly the democratic world. Moreover, this shows the unbalanced relationship between totalitarianism and democracy. The totalitarian terrorists can mind their business almost freely among us; we cannot even dream of inducing or helping any kind of violent action in a totalitarian country. One might object that if terrorism or pacifism or social unrest or civil wars reach such dimensions in the non-communist world it is because of our shortcomings, failures and injustices. This is both true and not true. Assuming it were true, the question would still remain: they can use our imperfections to destroy us from within. We cannot use theirs.

We are accepting their propaganda when we endorse the idea that we have no rights to go on living unless we reach perfection and sanctity, a duty they have not. So terrorism is like so many other phenomena in East-West relations, aimed at the

annihilation of our political will and making us accept the other side's political will. And even worse, it is designed to make us accept the way they see us. Many of our media describe us as the Soviet propagandists want people to see us. Terrorism, therefore, takes its whole meaning within the context of a global operation in order to demoralize democracies.

### THREE

What are the remedies?

1. To realize that to fight terrorism is a problem of defense and not only a problem of internal law and order. So the question, won't we endanger democracy by fighting international terrorism with appropriate means, is irrelevant.

2. The defense has to be a common and coordinated defense of all democratic countries. France has had a tendency to consider Italian or Spanish terrorists as interesting ideological freedom fighters. Spain, though indignant about France's benign neglect of their national tragedy, has nevertheless invited, last October, Tony Negri--the convicted Italian terrorist ideologue and murderer--to speak at the Universidad Complutense in Madrid about Marx. During the worst hours of the Baader-Meinhof terrorism in the Federal Republic of Germany the radical chic in France supported by Jean Genet and Jean-Paul Sartre, was to explain that

## TERRORISM

### I. Introduction

To the ordinary citizen, terrorism may seem, at least in part, an adventure. Natural repugnance may often combine with a mysterious, virtually involuntary, sense of attraction. Transmitting both the possibility of power, and even the potential for heroism, terrorism appears to prove irresistible to a certain kind of misguided idealist, to varieties of base political opportunists and to ordinary criminals seeking to legitimate their crimes by the buzzword of political beliefs.

We cannot, however, allow ourselves to become victims of Orwellian "newspeak". The notion that "One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter" is patently false. Terrorism is terrorism is terrorism. It can be defined, at least in part, by its victims -- who turn out, these days, far more often than not, to be civilians.

The distinction between revolution and terrorism is sometimes blurred. While revolution becomes, at times, the last and only legitimate recourse to an oppressive regime that cannot be moved by democratic methods, terrorism is a crime against humanity as repugnant to natural and international law as the crimes against humanity defined, identified and condemned on identical

grounds by the tribunals at Nuremberg. In short, terrorism is never an instrument of justice, never condonable, never excusable, and never legitimate. Even 19th century revolutionary leaders like Alexander Herzen understood this profoundly moral point - decrying the senseless violence of the 19th century anarchists such as Bakunin and others.

Terrorism is a method. Its purpose is to create and inspire fear in order to secure political ends. To succeed in inspiring genuine fear, civilian victims are essential. Let us also note here that when we speak of "political" ends or goals, we are mindful of the fact that many contemporary terrorists -- in recent years, the Bader - Meinhoff group in West Germany for example -- seek nothing more precise than pure chaos and eventual anarchy.

The elimination of this scourge should be paramount in the minds of all those responsible for national and international safety. It is, however, the western democracies that are most vulnerable to terrorist activities. For it is where individual freedom flourishes -- protected by the rule of law -- that the terrorist will be most free to strike. Seldom, for example, do we hear of terrorist incidents in, as example, Bulgaria.

Freedom exacts certain costs. Concerned as we may be of the possibility of domestic terrorism - we must remain vigilant in guarding those constitutional protections that are comprised in the Bill of Rights. We must not allow the reality of terrorist

violence to create a counterreaction in democratic societies giving rise to extreme and unnecessary measures for internal security. Our criminal justice system properly resorted to is sufficient to do the job.

Our experiences during the anti-anarchist often xenophobic crusade of the 1890's, and the "Red scare" of the 1920's, should caution us to act deliberately and resolutely to crush the terrorist threat without substituting an even greater evil - officially sanctioned repression. If we fail to plan cautiously, yet wisely, to counter terrorism, the danger to our way of life will simply grow.

We define terrorism as a psychological or physical act of violence directed at civilians or diplomats to intimidate the populace, threaten the government, sow discord, and induce political or economic change to serve the interests of the terrorist or his masters. Thus, however much you try to garb or disguise it terrorism is neither heroism or patriotism. It is pure crime.

Terrorist activity is an unusual kind of criminal activity because it wantonly disregards the identity of its victims. More , importantly, terrorism, organized, inspired, funded, or encouraged by one nation, but carried out in the jurisdiction of another, is no less an act of war than any other classicly belligerent act. And nations must be permitted, by international convention, to act in self defense.

A similar situation occurred historically when seafaring nations were threatened by piracy on the high seas. Piracy was long regarded as the scourge of commerce. Pirates ruled some shipping lanes and extracted protection tolls in others. They created states in territories that they controlled and declared themselves immune from any restraints. They were not deterred by threats of hanging or torture. Only when law-abiding nations agreed that none would shelter pirates or profit from their spoils, and only when they agree to join together to expunge piracy, following pirates -- in hot pursuit -- into their lairs, and only, finally, when piracy was outlawed by international convention was this scourge eradicated. There is a lesson to be learned here: The international community, acting in concert, was able to obliterate a common menace. They did so under the Paris Convention of 1856, which declared piracy a universal crime punishable in any jurisdiction.

Although terrorism claims a political rather than a material motivation, neither in its methods nor in its essence does it differ significantly from piracy. Both are repugnant in the same manner and both are problems that cannot be managed by isolated juridical entities. Any nation, whatever its political or cultural orientation (or its geographical location), which feels comfortably immune from the terrorist threat, fails to perceive the true nature of that threat -- and is victimized by a cruel self-perpetrated hoax, as are, even more so, the inevitable innocent victims.

Terrorists often seek to legitimate their activities by pretending to represent aspirations and purposes beyond ordinary law. We are reminded of Chernishevsky's "New Man" who put revolution above the moral concerns of conventional society, and became, like Dostoyevsky's Raskolnikov in Crime and Punishment a remorseless two dimensional character devoid of human sentiment. The self appointed supremacist philosophers of Nazi Germany advanced kindred claims about their so-called Aryan super-race. Now, in the second half of the twentieth century, this posturing fails all credibility.

Declaring terrorism an affront to humanity at large is, still, only a first step. We must act to rid peaceful societies of the terrorist threat. We can fight on two levels. Each nation has the obligation to take whatever measures are necessary, consistent with its own criminal and penal system, to combat terrorism, whether the terrorism in question emanates from within its borders or without. Each nation also has an obligation to establish and support international measures towards the same end. The challenge is here; we seek the best formula.

On the international front, our starting point must be unanimous condemnation, enforced through severe and binding sanctions, against nations who utilize terrorism as an instrument of foreign policy. We must demonstrate that power and parity cannot be won at the expense of law and morality. Regardless of whether such nations passively acquiesce to terrorist bases on their

territory, whether they provide sanctuary for terrorists in flight, whether they disperse arms along bellicose trade routes, or whether they actively purvey terrorism, such nations must be inhibited by international agreement -- just as if they were engaged in piracy.

Of necessity, this stance may force us, despite our strong reluctance to do so, to review the present rules of diplomatic immunity encompassed in the Vienna Convention. This drastic step is occasioned by the growth of state-sponsored terrorism as evidenced by events in London several weeks ago -- the Libyan embassy metamorphosed into a veritable shooting gallery, and an innocent British policewoman, endeavoring to separate hostile camps of demonstrators, was gunned down by an assailant inside the embassy. All too often embassies have been found to provide safe houses and intelligence for terrorists, and diplomatic pouches have been used to transport weapons. This is a complex, subtle problem. Yet it is one that we cannot blindly ignore. If nation states consistently refuse to adhere to established rules of diplomatic behavior -- rules, I might add, that have worked even between countries at war with one another -- then civilized societies cannot allow the use of the Vienna Convention to create a terrorist infrastructure and "safe zone," -- free from any restraint or even embarrassment. There can be no "cities of sanctuary" for terrorists in a civilized society.

The international arena is the logical locale for combat against self-proclaimed private terrorist armies. We are actively

working to achieve a broader and deeper consensus among nations that terrorism represents uncivilized behavior and must be outlawed. As this international consensus develops and deepens, the terrorists' sources of support, supply and refuge should correspondingly diminish.

Specific international agreements concerning terrorism must be enacted. These must be as detailed and as respected as their historical analogues concerning piracy. We have accordingly urged Congress to act on the convention against taking of hostages, and on the convention on physical protection of nuclear materials. We have also asked for full implementation of the Montreal Convention against aircraft sabotage. Finally, we have reiterated our commitment to support the Hague Convention against hijacking and the New York Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons. These various measures underscore our commitment to fight terrorism through the rule of international law, and they also demonstrate that we are serious about protecting American citizens around the world wherever they happen to be. But there is a great deal more that needs to be done.

One important step which nations might consider is the elimination of the political offense exception to extradition for violent crimes. As it currently stands, the law in this area is counterintuitive and counterproductive. The fact that terrorists claim a political motive for their crimes should be no bar to effective punishment when the lives of innocent civilians or diplomats have been placed in jeopardy -- or have been lost.

International law already recognizes that the political motivation behind an offense against a head of state is no defense to extradition; the heads of state owe their own citizenry and their emissaries an assurance that justice will deal just as harshly with terrorists who commit violent attacks against them.

The idea is not novel. Canada recognizes no political offense exception. Article 2 of the European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism allows state-parties to deny terrorists the political exception offense. While we should always grant a safe haven to those who use the pen or the ballot to advance their cause, we should never grant refuge to those who profess that political motives led them to the Harrod bombing or the Ma'alot massacre.

The second route to the elimination of terrorism must function on the national level. The key to this effort must be prevention. Zealots who have little regard for the lives of others have demonstrated, at times, that they have little regard for their own. Thus deterrence in the form of increasingly severe punishment will itself fail to prevent terrorist activity. Only by rooting out a terrorist infrastructure in advance can we successfully prevent actual crimes. And this is, of course, the rub. For a focus on prevention requires attention to civil liberty concerns -- concerns that cannot be easily ignored by calling criminal acts terrorist in character.

The prevention of terrorism in our constitutional context places a high premium on quality police work. Structures must be developed which allow for the sharing of existing police information and data about terrorists between jurisdictions and between countries. As the crimes of terror shift from the streets of Jerusalem to the boulevards of Paris, to Picadilly in London, and to the Capital Dome, nations owe each other and themselves the duty to coordinate efforts in combatting this scourge. If terrorists are unwilling to recognize national boundaries, effective defense measures must be transnational as well. Administration bill HR 380 with its proposal to establish an international working group to combat terrorism is designed to advance the sharing of such information. Last month at the economic summit in London we took the first steps in securing an international agreement to create such an information-sharing capability.

Intelligence information can be secured by other means as well. The proposed revamping of the reward schedule for information leading to the apprehension or conviction of terrorists or prevention of terrorist acts provides an opportunity to secure vital information -- even perhaps from a "weak link" in the terrorist chain. Legislation now pending before Congress, S. 2625, would authorize the Attorney General to reward any person who provides information leading to the prevention or frustration of an act of terrorism, or to the arrest and conviction of a terrorist.

The reward program is a particularly appropriate tool for the prevention of terrorism in a constitutional system such as that in the United States. We can implement the program, and increase police effectiveness, without even marginally interfering with our basic civil liberties. In fact, the United States Supreme Court ruled just last term, in Illinois v. Gates, that the police may act on tips provided by anonymous informants if the information they receive possesses sufficient indicia of reasonableness and veracity.

Information can also be secured through standard surveillance and intelligence gathering techniques. No new legislation is needed in this area. The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, for example, provides an excellent tool for discovering terrorist activity before it reaches fruition. The mechanism established by the Act is effective and secure against abuses. The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which monitors activities under the Act, comprised of seven federal district court judges, provides a check against overzealous investigators. This is a weapon against terrorism already in place, functioning and successful. We should use the program to the greatest extent possible within the limits of the law.

Prevention not only encompasses the foiling of terrorist acts by the intelligence gathering, it requires, as well, the capacity to preclude potential terrorists from entering the United States for nefarious purposes. Thus, one area of concern must be our visa policy. We must look carefully at applications for

visas to ensure that they do not include persons with terrorist connections. This would not require us to make any change in existing law. Rather it would require full application of present immigration law to ensure that a terrorist infrastructure does not develop in this country.

I must stress that we are not talking here about the visa denials to foreign nationals who wish to speak out on foreign public policy issues -- although Kleindienst v. Mandel makes clear the broad executive authority in denying visas under Sections 27-29 of the McCarran-Walter Act and the statistics show that this administration has used this power no more than previous administrations. We are not interested in inhibiting speech -- however foul. Instead, we are talking about persons who enter this country not to talk about terrorist theory but to engage in terrorist acts. Only last month the FBI arrested a Libyan student leader in Philadelphia in a safe house filled with guns, grenades, and other weapons. As far back as 1978 a suspected member of the Baader-Meinhof gang, Kristina Katerina Bersta, was arrested in Vermont for illegally attempting to enter the US with a false Iranian passport. News reports suggest that three other Baader-Meinhof members attempted to cross the border but were turned back.

The experience of the French underscores the importance of stopping terrorism at a country's borders. During the 1980's, the streets of Paris have become a battleground for terrorist factions of every persuasion. Yet the battles include Frenchmen

only as their victims; in the main, the terrorism in Paris of late has been perpetrated by non-Frenchmen. A nation need not stand idle in the face of such abuse.

We in the United States may also learn a great deal from the experiences of other countries in combatting terrorism, both from their triumphs and occasional failures. Strict scrutiny of foreign practices is necessary to ensure that they fit into our own constitutional framework. Nonetheless, we ought not view our own experience as "writ in stone".

Thus, the British Prevention of Terrorism Act would be inappropriate in the United States because it allows for warrantless detention for up to seven days, without benefit of habeas corpus or other judicial intervention. This would clearly violate the warrants clause of the fourth amendment and the habeas corpus clause of article 2. Similarly, the West Germans responded to allegations that radical attorneys were aiding and abetting their clients' crimes under the guise of representation by passing a statute suspending or limiting the right to counsel in certain cases. The problem, though not unknown in the United States, is less susceptible to such sweeping solutions given the accused's right to counsel under the Sixth amendment. The Israelis, plagued by perhaps the most extensive and anguished terrorist activities, have outlawed any form of expression in favor of terrorist groups. Such a content-based proscription would be singularly inappropriate under our constitutional system.

Every nation must adopt the legislation it deems appropriate in light of its own notions of procedural and criminal justice. Certainly, however, even the most noxious criminal deserves fair treatment. The United States now faces the challenge of adopting effective procedures which will preserve public order and safety, without losing sight of our basic values. Once we lose sight of our basic values in combatting terrorism, the terrorists have won. Again, in meeting this challenge, the wisdom gained from comparative experience is essential.

Germany, for example, has a statute similar in many respects to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, in that, upon probable cause and the approval of an independent commission, the police may intercept postal and tele-communications. The statute has proved invaluable in German hands. In fact, the European Court of Human Rights, in approving the statute, found that "secret surveillance . . . is, under exceptional circumstances, necessary in a democratic society in the interest of national security and/or for the prevention of disorder or crime."

The Germans have a reward system, similar to that now pending before the United States Congress. In 1981 West German authorities arrested Gisela Dutzi, a Red Army Faction leader, after posting notice of a reward for information leading to her arrest. German police annually receive thousands of leads prodded, at least in part, by the reward system.

Finally, the entire European continent has benefitted from mutual assistance, information pooling and technical advice. This is a particularly appropriate program for American action and participation. Let us not be so stubborn or selfish as not to assist each other in this modern-day crusade against the terrorists among us.

Terrorism can only be expunged by regarding the terrorist as an outlaw and eliminating any claim to his romantic heroism. It must be emphasized that terrorism will never be a legitimate way of advancing political ambition. It must be appreciated that terrorism is an international threat, and that those countries that nourish terrorists today will be their unwilling victims tomorrow. It must be understood that terrorism cannot be dismembered with one swift or final blow: it requires constant vigilance and attention.

TERRORISM AS A FUNCTION OF MARXIST PHILOSOPHY  
IN THE SOVIET CONSTITUTION

STATEMENT OF PROFESSOR WOLFGANG FIKENTSCHER  
AT THE JONATHAN INSTITUTE  
SECOND CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM  
MONDAY, JUNE 24, 1984

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

I.

STATE-DIRECTED OR -SUPPORTED TERRORISM HAS ALTERED THE TRADITIONAL PICTURE OF THE TERRORIST. THE CLASSICAL TERRORIST DOES NOT FIGHT IN UNIFORM, THUS AVOIDING THE RISKS OF OPEN BATTLE, AND AT THE SAME TIME FOREGOING THE BENEFITS OF THE GENEVA INTERNATIONAL LAW ON THE TREATMENT OF SOLDIERS. THE CLASSICAL TERRORIST DOES NOT ATTACK MILITARY AND OTHER INSTALLATIONS OF AN ENEMY STATE, BUT INDISCRIMINATELY TARGETS PERSONS NOT CONCERNED WITH THE ISSUE OF THE FIGHT, IN PARTICULAR CIVILIANS.

THE PICTURE CHANGES WHEN A SOVEREIGN STATE RESORTS TO TERRORISM. THE STATE MAY DO SO BECAUSE ITS LEADERS ARE SYMPATHETIC TO THE POLITICAL GOALS OF THE SUPPORTED TERRORIST GROUP, OR BECAUSE ITS RULERS ARE AFRAID OF INTERNATIONAL CENSURE OR INTERNAL UNREST IF THEY CHOOSE OPEN WARFARE, OR SIMPLY BECAUSE TERRORISM IS CHEAPER AND MORE COST-EFFECTIVE THAN MILITARY ACTION.

IF A STATE APPLIES TERRORIST MEANS OF ITS OWN OR OF AN EXISTING TERRORIST GROUP SOME OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF CLASSICAL TERRORISM MAY BE DROPPED. FOR EXAMPLE, KILLER SQUADS SENT OUT TO HUNT UP AND ELIMINATE SELECTED POLITICAL ENEMIES, A PRACTICE APPLIED, FOR INSTANCE, BY LIBYA, IRAN, YUGOSLAVIA AND THE SOVIET UNION, ARE TERRORISTS EVEN THOUGH THEY CANNOT BE CALLED INDISCRIMINATE KILLERS. IN OTHER CASES CLANDESTINITY OF ACTION MAY BE DISPENSED WITH. STATE-SUPPORTED GUERILLAS ARE TERRORISTS EVEN IF THEY WEAR UNIFORMS.

A SPECTACULAR EXAMPLE OF A SOVEREIGN STATE ENGAGING IN WORLD-WIDE TERRORIST ACTIVITIES IS THE SOVIET UNION. WITH ITS ENGAGEMENT IN THE TERRORIST SCENE, EVEN AGAINST SOME MARXIST-LENINIST TRADITIONS, TERRORISM GOT MUCH OF ITS MODERN, INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK.

BUT WHY DOES A STRONG, SOVEREIGN, INDEPENDENT AND PROUD MULTI-NATION STATE LIKE THE SOVIET UNION INCLUDE TERRORIST STRATEGIES INTO ITS FOREIGN POLICY? TO ASCERTAIN THIS, ONE NEED NOT TAKE REFUGE TO THE SO-CALLED KREMLIN-ASTROLOGY. ONE SHOULD KNOW THE BASICS OF MARX, AND READ THE NEW SOVIET CONSTITUTION OF 1977, BEGINNING WITH ITS PREAMBLE--WHICH IN ITSELF IS A POMPOUS, BELLIGERENT MARCH INTO NON-HISTORY AND TIME SUSPENSION, AND THE IMPORTANT ARTICLES 28 TO 30 OF THIS CONSTITUTION.

THE THEORETICAL CENTER OF MARXISM IS THE LABOR VALUE THEORY, DEVELOPED BY MARX AND STILL ACCEPTED BY ALL RAMIFICATIONS OF MARXISM. ACCORDING TO THIS THEORY EVERY AMOUNT OF LABOR OR MERCHANDISE CAN BE DETERMINED BY THE EXCHANGE VALUE OR BY THE USE VALUE. THE EXCHANGE VALUE IS FORMED IN THE MARKET-PLACE, IT IS THE INSTRUMENT BY WHICH THE LABORER IS "EXPLOITED." BEING THE DEFINING ELEMENT OF "EXPLOITATION," THE EXCHANGE VALUE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR: THE FORMING OF THE TWO CLASSES, ALIENATION, DIVISION OF LABOR, CLASS STRUGGLE, CAPITAL ACCUMULATION, CRISES, IMPERIALISM. THE TRUE VALUE OF LABOR AND OF MERCHANDISE PRODUCED BY LABOR IN THE ABSENCE OF EXPLOITATION IS THE USE VALUE OF (ABSTRACT) LABOR. THE USE VALUE INDICATES THE VALUES OF LIFE IN TERMS OF NECESSITY, NOT OF UTILITY. THE MAIN POINT IS, HOWEVER,

THAT THE USE VALUE CANNOT BE MEASURED IN THE MARKET-PLACE, IT CANNOT BE TESTED, DEBATED, ARGUED ABOUT, IT CANNOT FORM THE SUBSTANCE OF A DIALOGUE. IT IS AN "IDEAL" ENTITY WHICH CAN ONLY BE DETERMINED "SCIENTIFICALLY." THIS SCIENCE AGAIN IS NOT OPEN TO DEBATE AND ARGUMENTATION. THEREFORE MARXISTS PLAN. THE POWER OF THE PLANNING AUTHORITIES IS DERIVED FROM THE POLIT BUREAU. IN LAST RESORT, THE VALUES ARE DETERMINED BY THE POLIT BUREAU THE OF WHICH ARE "SCIENTIFICALLY" BEYOND DISPUTE. SOCIALISM IS WHAT THE KREMLIN POLIT BUREAU SAYS IT IS. APPLIED TO WORLD DIMENSIONS, THIS IS THE "WORLD SOCIALISM" IN THE MEANING OF ART. 28 OF THE USSR CONSTITUTION.

ACCORDING TO THIS ARTICLE, THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE SOVIET UNION IS (QUOTE) "DIRECTED...TOWARDS...THE STRENGTHENING OF THE POSITIONS OF THE WORLD SOCIALISM, THE ASSISTANCE OF THE PEOPLES IN THEIR FIGHT FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION AND SOCIAL PROGRESS..." (UNQUOTE).

THIS ASSISTANCE INCLUDES, UNDER ARTICLE 31, THE USE OF THE RED ARMY AND THE RED NAVY FOR THE "DEFENSE OF SOCIALIST ACHIEVEMENTS," THE DEFINITIONS OF SUCH ACHIEVEMENTS TO BE DETERMINED AGAIN BY THE POLIT BUREAU.

SUCH DEFENSE CAN ALSO INCLUDE, AS WILL BE SHOWN, STATE-DIRECTED OR -SUPPORTED TERRORISM, AN INSTRUMENT THAT IS FAR CHEAPER AND LESS RISKY THAN THE MILITARY. THE MARXIST ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF TERROR AS AN INSTRUMENT OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE IS A SUBJECT IN ITSELF. A CERTAIN AMBIGUITY CAN ALSO BE FOUND ALREADY

WITH MARX HIMSELF, AND WITH LENIN AND OTHERS OF HIS FOLLOWERS. FROM MY OWN EXPERIENCE DURING THE '68 STUDENT REVOLT--GERMAN TYPE (WHICH MEANS THE MARXIST TYPE)--I MAY SAY THAT THE RELATION OF MARXISM AND TERROR IS A MATTER OF HINDSIGHT: ANY TERROR OF WHICH HAS POSITIVE RESULTS FOR THE AIMS OF THE MARXIST CADRES, IS CONSIDERED A SUCCESSFUL AND NECESSARY REVOLUTIONARY ACTION. ANY TERROR WHICH SHOWS --ON BALANCE--NEGATIVE RESULTS STRATEGICALLY, TACTICALLY, PSYCHOLOGICALLY OR OTHERWISE, IS BRANDED "INDIVIDUAL", "BOURGEOIS", "ISOLATED" OR "COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY," AND IS THEREFORE (A POSTERIORI) REJECTED. IN THE END, THIS BALANCE IS MADE BY THE LEADING CADRES ON GROUNDS OF "SCIENTIFIC" VALUE JUDGMENTS: RIGHT OR WRONG ARE DETERMINED INTERNALLY, WITHIN THE PARTY, AND THE VALUES ARE MADE POLITICALLY BINDING EX CATHEDRA, ON THE BASIS OF THE USE VALUE THEORY.

I HAVE NO DOUBT THAT A MARXIST GOVERNMENT ACTS NOT DIFFERENTLY FROM ANY MARXIST GROUP, SO-CALLED "PARTY", OR SELF-STYLED AVANT-GARDE. BUT A GOVERNMENT NEEDS A RATIONALE FOR ITS CONDUCT, AND THIS IS TO BE FOUND IN ART. 28-30 OF THE SOVIET CONSTITUTION, WHICH CONTAIN THE SO-CALLED "LENIN'S PEACE POLICY," SHAPED IN 1977 INTO A LEGAL TEXT. ACCORDING TO THIS "PEACE POLICY" THE PRESENT STATE OF THE WORLD IS CHARACTERIZED, UNDER THE LAWS OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM, BY THE CHANGE FROM THE CAPITALIST TO THE SOCIALIST-COMMUNIST FORM OF SOCIETY. THIS CHANGE ALSO DEFINES THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS BETWEEN STATES. THERE ARE THREE SUB-SYSTEMS OF THE STATE SYSTEMS, THE "WORLD-WIDE CLASS STRUGGLE" TAKES PLACE. IT SHIFTS THE SUPREMACY, STEADILY, TO THE SOCIALIST WORLD SYSTEM. SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY IS THEREFORE PART OF THE "WORLD-WIDE CLASS STRUGGLE." ACCORDING TO THIS "LENIN'S

PEACE POLICY," THE PRESENTLY VALID "SPECIFIC FORM OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE" IS NOT THE "REVOLUTIONARY WAR" OF THE EARLY TWENTIES, BUT THE "PRINCIPLE OF PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE," WHICH FAVORS THE FIGHT OF THE WORKING CLASS IN CAPITALISTIC COUNTRIES, AND THE FREEDOM FIGHT OF THE COLONIAL AND DEPENDENT PEOPLES.

A LEADING WESTERN COMMENTARY ON THE SOVIET CONSTITUTION FROM WHICH I BORROWED THIS SUMMARY OF "LENIN'S PEACE POLICY" CONTAINS THIS SOBER EVALUATION: (QUOTE) "THE PROBLEM OF THE SOVIET PRINCIPLE OF CO-EXISTENCE IS, THAT IS DOES NOT IMPLY COMPLETE RENUNCIATION OF VIOLENT SOLUTION OF THE CONFLICT OF THE SYSTEMS. ASSISTANCE GIVEN TO "NATIONAL LIBERATION WARS" DOES NOT ONLY INSTIGATE VIOLENCE WITHIN THE THIRD WORLD, BUT IT HAS ALSO NEGATIVE INFLUENCE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF PEACEFUL RELATIONS BETWEEN SOCIALIST AND CAPITALIST STATES; IT THEREFORE INCREASES THE CHANCES OF CONFLICT WITHIN THE COMPLETE SYSTEM OF STATES. THE PRINCIPLE OF PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE DOES NOT TOLERATE THE POSITION OF THE ADVERSARY, IT ONLY ACCEPTS IT AS INEVITABLE FOR A LIMITED TIME. "WHY THEN THE SEMANTIC CHANGE FROM REVOLUTIONARY WAR?" THE DEFEAT OF THE RED ARMY IN ITS "REVOLUTIONARY WAR" AGAINST POLAND IN 1920 CAUSED LENIN TO REFORMULATE THE SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY GOALS: RECONSTRUCTION OF THE USSR IN THE INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK OF CAPITALIST STATES, EVEN AT THE PRICE OF A POSTPONED WORLD REVOLUTION. IN 1977, THE SPECTRE OF NUCLEAR WAR ADDED TO INDUCING THE SOVIET RULERS TO ADOPT LENIN'S PEACE POLICY AS A "CONTINUED STRATEGIC GUIDELINE" OF SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY. IN 1977, IT COULD NOT BE OVERLOOKED THAT THE NUCLEAR STALEMATE IS A SERIOUS STUMBLING BLOCK TO THE HOLISTIC THEORY OF LIFE, REVOLUTION, WAR AND PEACE DRAFTED BY LENIN IN MARXIST TERMS AND LEFT TO HIS HEIRS.

SINCE THE REVOLUTIONARY PEOPLE'S WAR IS A GOOD WAR, WAGING WAR IS NOT BAD AS SUCH, AND THEREFORE WAGING NUCLEAR WAR CANNOT, IN THEORY, BE BAD AS SUCH FOR THE SOVIET UNION. BUT THE UNPRECEDENTED DANGERS OF A NUCLEAR WAR AND THE RESULTING STALEMATE AFFECT THE PROSPECTS OF VICTORY IN THAT PART OF LENIN'S "PEACE POLICY" THAT REMAINED DEVOTED TO THE REVOLUTIONARY CONQUEST OF THE WORLD. SO WHAT HAS TO BE DONE TO ADJUST THIS "PEACE POLICY," WHICH BASICALLY CONTINUES TO BE A THEORY OF WAR AGAINST THE REST OF THE WORLD, TO THE CONDITIONS OF THE NUCLEAR AGE? IT HAS TO BE REDUCED TO THE WAGING OF WARS BELOW THE LEVEL OF THE NUCLEAR RISK. WHAT KIND OF WAR IS THIS? TERRORIST WAR. IT IS THIS NECESSITY OF STAYING BELOW THE THRESHOLD OF THE NUCLEAR RISK, IN COMBINATION WITH THE SELF IMPOSED DUTY TO MILITARILY GUARD THE "SOCIALIST ACHIEVEMENTS," WHICH DERIVES THE SOVIET UNION TO ASSIST, UNDER ART.

28 OF THE CONSTITUTION, VIRTUALLY ALL KINDS OF UNREST, AND TO INTERVENE WHEN A DESTABILIZATION STRATEGY SUPPORTED BY TERRORIST MEANS REACHES A CRITICAL POINT. (TROUBLE MAKING HAS BECOME A CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLE.)

BY WAY OF SUMMARY I SHOULD LIKE TO POINT TO THREE PROPOSITIONS.

- 1) AS TOTALITARIAN REGIMES BASED ON HOLISTIC PHILOSOPHY TEND TO BE TOTALITARIAN, NOT ONLY WITH REGARD TO THEIR SUBJECTS BUT ALSO TOWARDS THE "OUTSIDE," THEY DO NOT RESPECT INTERNATIONAL LAW WHENEVER IT DOES NOT COINCIDE WITH THEIR TOTALITARIAN PHILOSOPHY.
  
- 2) THE LENINIST PRINCIPLES OF "PEACE POLICY" ESSENTIALLY CONSISTS OF THE ASSISTANCE WHICH IS TO BE GIVEN TO THE "PEOPLES" IN THEIR FIGHT FOR "SOCIAL PROGRESS." SIGNIFICANTLY, THE SOVIET CONSTITUTION USES THE TERM "PEOPLES" BY APPLYING LENIN'S REVOLUTIONARY THEORY, WHEREAS INTERNATIONAL LAW, WITH ITS DUTY UNDER ART. 2 OF THE UN CHARTER TO KEEP PEACE, ADDRESSES "STATES." WHENEVER THE FIGHT OF A "PEOPLE" FOR "PROGRESS" RESULTS IN SO-CALLED "SOCIAL ACHIEVEMENTS," OPEN WARFARE BY THE USE OF MILITARY (ART. 31), OR HIDDEN WARFARE BY WAY OF ASSISTANCE UNDER ART. 28, ARE OBLIGATORY UNDER THE USSR-CONSTITUTION. FOR THE SOVIET THEORY OF FOREIGN POLICY, THE NUCLEAR STALEMATE POSES THE PROBLEM OF HOW TO ASSIST THE "PEOPLES" IN THEIR FIGHT FOR "PROGRESS" WITHOUT TRIGGERING NUCLEAR WAR. ONE SOLUTION IS HIDDEN WARFARE INCLUDING TERRORIST ACTIVITIES.

3) GIVEN THE PHILOSOPHICAL BACKGROUND OF MARXIST AND MOST OTHER FORMS OF TERRORISM, FIGHTING TERRORISM IS ALSO A MATTER OF BETTER PHILOSOPHY. THE PURPORTED IDEOLOGICAL SUPERIORITY OF THE TERRORISTS'S PHILOSOPHY, BE IT AN ALL-EMBRACING ISLAM, AN ALL-EXPLAINING MARXISM, OR ANARCHY "UNMASKING" EVERYTHING AS "VIOLENCE" AND "JUSTIFYING" EVERY VIOLENCE AS A COUNTER-VIOLENCE, PRACTICALLY ALWAYS EMANATES FROM A CULTURAL-ECONOMICAL CRITIQUE. MEETING THAT CRITIQUE, WITHOUT VIOLENCE AND IN AN OPEN DIALOGUE ON VALUES, MEANS ALSO MEETING TERRORISM.

A STUDY GROUP ON IDEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS AND ON THE ENSUING THINK-WAY DEFINITE RELIEF SHOULD THEREFORE BE INCLUDED IN THIS "VOLUNTARY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION" OF FREE NATIONS, BESIDES THE FEW ELEMENTS OF INTELLIGENCE, STRATEGIC, OPERATIONAL AND POLITICAL COOPERATION. THE GOALS OF TERRORISTS MUST HAVE AN INFLUENCE NOT ONLY ON THEIR MEANS BUT ALSO ON THE MEANS TO BE APPLIED TO FIGHT TERRORISM. OFTEN THESE GOALS HAVE THEIR ROOTS IN ETHNIC, RELIGIOUS, OR ECONOMICAL DISCRIMINATION.

DOING JUSTICE IN THIS WAY TO THE SMALL, THE WEAK AND THE UNPROTECTED IS A JOB FOR DEMOCRATS, FOR THE CITIZENS OF THE FREE NATIONS! DEMOCRATS ARE THUS OF NECESSITY, ANTI-TERRORISTS.

LET ME END WITH THE WORDS PERICLES SAID TO HIS FELLOW CITIZENS, THE ATHENIANS WERE THERE TWO THOUSAND YEARS AGO! ALWAYS KEEP IN MIND THAT THE SECRET OF PEACE IS FREEDOM, AND THE SECRET OF FREEDOM IS--COURAGE.

STATEMENT BY LORD CHALFONT  
AT THE OPENING SESSION  
OF THE JONATHAN INSTITUTE'S  
SECOND CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM  
SUNDAY, JUNE 24, 1984  
THE FOUR SEASONS HOTEL  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

May I begin by saying what a special privilege it is to preside over this Second Conference of the Jonathan Institute on International Terrorism. It is five years since the first meeting in Jerusalem, and since we met there we have been saddened and diminished by the death of two distinguished international figures, both closely involved in our aims and aspirations -- Sir Hugh Fraser and Senator Henry Jackson. It is strange to think that, on an occasion like this, they will not be here to enliven us with their humour and to enlighten us with their wisdom. I shall not ask you to observe any formal act of remembrance this evening -- somehow suspect that they are not too far away at this moment, and neither of them would have patience with too much solemnity or formality. But I know that many of you will, like me, think often of Hugh Fraser and Scoop Jackson as we go about our business over the next two days.

This occasion has one special element of appeal to those of us who were at the Jerusalem Conference -- and to many others as well. It is, almost to the day, the 8th anniversary of Operation Jonathan -- the dramatic rescue at Entebbe which set new standards for those concerned with counter-terrorist operation. The only fatal casualty among the Israeli forces on that incredible occasion was Lt. Col. Jonathan Netanyahu, the commander of the operation. It was after him that the Jonathan Institute, which has sponsored and organized this

Conference was named; and it is a matter of special pleasure that his father, Professor Benzion Netanyahu and his brother Benjamin are here tonight. Both will be speaking to us later -- Prof. Netanyahu this evening and Benjamin on Tuesday. We ought to give a special welcome.

Just over a month ago an unarmed London policewoman was murdered by a gunman firing from the window of the Libyan Embassy in the centre of the city. For many people in my country already scarred by years of assault by the gunmen and bombing of the IRA this was the first realization that state-sponsored international terrorists now strike anywhere in the free world; it was also a chilling reminder that they can often do so with complete impunity. The man who fired indiscriminately into St. James's Square with an automatic weapon had brought that weapon into England in a diplomatic pouch. He took it out the same way; and he went back to Libya to be embraced in front of the television cameras by the leader of his country. It is not my concern this evening to comment on the handling of this affair by the British Government. The problem was an agonizing one, and when thousands of British citizens were living as potential hostages in a country ruled by unpredictable fanatics, there were no easy solutions.

I mention the London incident simply to comment that it illustrated, in an especially vivid way for British people, the problem which we have gathered here in Washington to discuss.

By the standards of the international terrorist it was not an especially apocalyptic event -- not to be compared with Lod Airport or the Munich Olympics -- and to anyone who has followed closely the development of international terrorism it came as no great surprise. Indeed, those of us who met in Jerusalem for the first Jonathan Institute Conference five years ago gave a clear warning that terrorism was being developed by certain states as a weapon for the systematic disruption of the political institutions of the free world. Since the Jerusalem conference the pattern has become clearer and the intensity of the threat has increased. We are now in a phase of low-intensity warfare in which state-sponsored terrorism is being systematically employed as a paramilitary alternative to overt attacks upon Western democracies.

In the last 10 years, sixty embassies and consulates have been attacked or occupied; hundreds of government officials, business executives and diplomats have been murdered, tortured and kidnapped; the President of Egypt, a former Chief of the British Defence Staff and a former Prime Minister of Italy have been assassinated; attempts have been made to kill the Pope, and the commander of the U.S. Army in Europe; embassies, government buildings, hotels and airport lobbies have been destroyed by terrorist bombs; and hostages have been taken all over the world. Since 1968, when official statistics were first compiled, there have been 8,000 major terrorist incidents;

over 8,000 people have been wounded and nearly 4,000 killed; and, even more significantly the graph of terrorism has risen and is still rising. According to U.S. government figures the numbers of attacks rose from under 200 in 1968 to 800 in 1983; the number of attacks which caused death or injury rose from about 25 in 1968 to over 200 in 1980, and it is still rising.

Faced with this sombre picture, it seems to me that there are some hard questions to be answered; and in this conference we intend to ask, and possibly even to answer, some of them. What is the link between terrorism and totalitarianism? How has the growth of religious fundamentalism affected the "non-suicidal" nature of terrorism? How do terrorist groups organize and co-ordinate their operations? What is the role and responsibility of the media? And finally, what can we do to ensure that the free world prevails in this special form of warfare? In this last context, I hope we shall have some discussion about the four major pieces of legislation now before the United States Congress.

Each of these subjects will be addressed over the next two days by some of the world's leading experts and authorities of international terrorism. It is not, therefore, my intention to elaborate upon them any further at this stage.

It is my pleasant duty now to introduce the opening speakers of this important conference.

"DEMOCRACY VERSUS TERRORISM"

STATEMENT OF JEAN FRANCOIS REVEL

TO THE JONATHAN INSTITUTE

SECOND CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1984

1. International state-to-state terrorism or highly organized and manipulated terrorism is one of the many tools totalitarianism uses to destroy democracy.

I refer to international terrorism such as it has been described here: triggered, masterminded, funded penetrated and armed by the Soviet Union or one of its proxies. What is the evidence? There is almost no systematic terrorism taking place in authoritarian countries. Of course, there is no terrorism in the totalitarian system itself. But even outside this totalitarian world terrorism flourishes predominantly in democratic countries. Let's look at its main targets during the past twenty or twenty-five years, and especially during the past fifteen years.

--Western Europe. Practically all members of NATO have been systematic victims of international terrorism. I won't recall the two well-known examples of Germany or Italy, but I shall insist on the special cases of Spain and Portugal before and after their democratization. There was of course a Basque terrorism against Franco when the Basques were unable to express their will except through violent action. But Basque terrorism, strangely enough, has become much more efficient and murderous after democratization despite the fact that the statute of autonomy had been adopted in the Basque provinces in a free election by a wide margin. This autonomy granted to the Basque country much more internal independence and freedom than, for instance, Quebec has in Canada. The goal of the Basque terrorists was to topple the young Spanish

democracy; to bring the Army to the point of exasperation where the generals would attempt a coup (which they almost succeeded in doing). Even after the election of a Socialist Government, the Basques assassinated in Madrid a high-ranking general just before Felipe Gonzalez was officially inaugurated.

--In Portugal, Mario Soares has arrested last week a whole network of organized terrorists.

--Let's take now the example of Turkey. Until 1980, when the military took power, Turkey was a democratic country. Destabilization through daily terrorist acts grew stronger and stronger between 1976 and 1980. It was not because the government was a Right-wing, oppressive reactionary-type of regime; in fact, the main target of terrorist destabilization was a social-democratic prime minister, Bulent Ecevit. By contrast, let's remember that there was no terrorism at all in Greece during the period of authoritarian rule of the colonels.

--If we turn now to Latin America, we see the same pattern. Authoritarian countries are spared and terrorism starts as soon as the country becomes democratic. It was the case when Venezuela became a democratic country at the beginning of the sixties and

there was a Castrist attempt to assassinate President Romulo Betancourt. Later we have seen democracy toppled in Argentina and Uruguay by the Montoneros and the Tupamaros respectively. We know by reading numerous theoretical manifestos and books that this is called "the strategy of tension". The idea is that it is much easier to go from fascism to communism than from democracy to communism. So, the "revolutionaries" must first push the democratic governments towards a fascist pattern of behavior in order to be able, in a second phase, to build socialism on the destruction of fascism. Usually the first part of the plan works magnificently; we have seen that in Argentina and Uruguay. Thank God we did not see it in Italy or Spain! But we could have. The same strategy is now being applied to Peru. During eleven years, Peru had a military dictatorship from 1968 to 1979, admittedly a left-wing military dictatorship which achieved the reduction, the collapse of the gross national product by sixty per cent in only ten years. In any event, it was an authoritarian regime, and there was no terrorism during its rule in Peru. As soon as a president, Mr. Belaunde, was again democratically elected in 1980, terrorism spread throughout the country under the label "Sendero Luminoso".

To return to Europe for a moment: We have seen recently in France a kind of terrorism which is completely disconnected from any politically achievable goal: the ASALA killings at Orly, Marseilles and the railroad trains. It is beyond the reach of any

French Government to abolish retrospectively the Armenian genocide of 1915. Moreover, France is the European country where most of the Armenians found a new home and became easily French citizens. It is clear that the ASALA killings aim at pure intimidation and destabilization.

## TWO

We have seen that the main enemy of state-sponsored international terrorism is undoubtedly the democratic world. Moreover, this shows the unbalanced relationship between totalitarianism and democracy. The totalitarian terrorists can mind their business almost freely among us; we cannot even dream of inducing or helping any kind of violent action in a totalitarian country. One might object that if terrorism or pacifism or social unrest or civil wars reach such dimensions in the non-communist world it is because of our shortcomings, failures and injustices. This is both true and not true. Assuming it were true, the question would still remain: they can use our imperfections to destroy us from within. We cannot use theirs.

We are accepting their propaganda when we endorse the idea that we have no rights to go on living unless we reach perfection and sanctity, a duty they have not. So terrorism is like so many other phenomena in East-West relations, aimed at the

annihilation of our political will and making us accept the other side's political will. And even worse, it is designed to make us accept the way they see us. Many of our media describe us as the Soviet propagandists want people to see us. Terrorism, therefore, takes its whole meaning within the context of a global operation in order to demoralize democracies.

THREE

What are the remedies?

1. To realize that to fight terrorism is a problem of defense and not only a problem of internal law and order. So the question, won't we endanger democracy by fighting international terrorism with appropriate means, is irrelevant.

2. The defense has to be a common and coordinated defense of all democratic countries. France has had a tendency to consider Italian or Spanish terrorists as interesting ideological freedom fighters. Spain, though indignant about France's benign neglect of their national tragedy, has nevertheless invited, last October, Tony Negri--the convicted Italian terrorist ideologue and murderer--to speak at the Universidad Complutense in Madrid about Marx. During the worst hours of the Baader-Meinhof terrorism in the Federal Republic of Germany the radical chic in France supported by Jean Genet and Jean-Paul Sartre, was to explain that

the FRG was a fascist country and that it was all too normal that they were punished by the Red Army Fraction. All that has to come to an end.

3. We must realize that terrorism cannot be understood and fought if it is seen as an isolated phenomenon. It is part of a global approach of the Soviets' program of domination, a program that includes military superiority, one-sided doctrines of noninterference, infiltration of the Socialist International and the nonaligned movement, UNESCO, the World Council of Churches and huge technology of disinformation. So we must ourselves have a global approach. We must stop considering terrorism as a purely "leftist" domestic phenomenon.

#### CONCLUSION

Do I advocate dangerous "confrontation"? I don't think so. I think that weakness invites aggression and that the more the Soviet Union will see that its methods of destabilization of the democracies are easy to implement, the more we will be in a dangerous situation. Historical experience shows that the Soviet Union never goes on in a direction when it has understood once and for all that it cannot achieve its objectives at an acceptable cost.

STATEMENT BY PAUL JOHNSON  
AT THE OPENING SESSION  
OF THE JONATHAN INSTITUTE'S  
SECOND CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM  
SUNDAY, JUNE 24, 1984  
THE FOUR SEASONS HOTEL  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

THE CANCER OF TERRORISM

## The Cancer of Terrorism

Terrorism is the cancer of the modern world. No state is immune to it. It is a dynamic organism which attacks the healthy flesh of the surrounding society. It has the essential hallmark of malignant cancer: unless treated, and treated drastically, its growth is inexorable, until it poisons and engulfs the society on which it feeds and drags it down to destruction.

Modern terrorism dates from 1968, when the PLO formerly adopted terror and mass murder as its primary policy. Terrorism was thus able to draw on the immense financial resources of the Arab oil states, and on the military training programmes of the Soviet Union and of its satellites, Cuba, South Yemen, Vietnam and North Korea. Over 1,000 PLO killers have been trained in the Soviet Union alone. Moreover, from 1970-1982, the PLO operated a quasi-occupation of Lebanon, and was thus able to enjoy, in practice, all the advantages of its own sovereign territory. It acquired the weaponry of a sizable modern army, and set up terrorist training camps of its own, used as facilities by the Red Brigades, the IRA and a score of other killer gangs throughout the world.

This physical growth of the terrorist cancer was accompanied by a progressive elevation in its moral status. Yasser Arafat ceased to be a mere gangster leader and became, in effect, a

terrorist statesman. He moved around the world with increasing diplomatic pomp, and was greeted, on a level of moral equality, by more and more world leaders. He and his organisation finally achieved, at the United Nations, a position of privilege granted to no other body not a sovereign state. But perhaps his greatest moral triumph was to be received, and photographed, being greeted by the Pope, His Holiness and His Depravity together.

Inevitably, with the physical and moral growth of the terrorist international, came a growth in its military capacity. From the ability to kill individuals grew the ability to kill scores, then hundreds, now thousands. Not merely the PLO but its junior allies began to handle munitions on a prodigious scale. It is now common for the IRA, for instance, to stage killings involving two or three tons of high explosives. International terrorists operating in a score of countries now have the power to shoot down aircraft, destroy armoured vehicles and destroy heavily-protected security posts. There is the danger, frighteningly obvious to all of us, that terrorists will eventually possess nuclear weapons, but a more immediate risk is that they will secure -- perhaps already have secured -- devastating modern equipment now moving into the inventories of official armies: high-speed machine pistols firing 1200 rounds a minute and almost soundless; lightweight grenade-launchers and mortars, squirtless flame-throwers, short-range portable anti-tank weapons, shoulder fired

multi-rocked launchers and, most alarming of all, the new generation of guided missile-throwers which have long-ranges, are highly accurate, and can be carried and fired by one man or woman.

At whom will these devastating new weapons be aimed? The question is pointless. They are aimed at the world, at civilized society everywhere. They will be used not merely to destroy security forces, but ordinary civilians, men, women, children. For, just as there seems to be no upper limit to the terrorist's arsenal, so there is no lowest depth beyond which the terrorist cannot sink in his moral declension. So -- ask not for whom the terrorist bell tolls: it tolls for thee, and thee, and thee -- for all the nations represented in this room, and for decent, innocent people everywhere.

But in the growth of the terrorist cancer, a still more sinister aspect even than the expansion of its arsenals, is the arrival of the first terrorist states. If Soviet Russia and four of its satellites actively train and arm terrorist movements, we now have the phenomenon of two regimes -- Iran and Libya -- which constitute terrorist states in themselves. These states do not merely finance, arm and train foreign terrorists, providing them with bases and havens, they operate their own official machinery of international terrorism.

Both Iran and Libya now deploy, as part of their official armed forces and government machinery, assisted and provisioned by their embassies and diplomats, heavily armed, highly-trained and totally ruthless gangs of killers, who roam the world seeking out and destroying political or religious opponents -- or mere critics -- and in the process killing and maiming bystanders and destroying property throughout the civilized West. These states conduct such policies of government terrorism while still enjoying all the privileges of sovereign status and all the protection of international law -- membership of the UN and its agencies, access to the IMF and World Bank, to the International Court and the Vienna and Hague Conventions.

Iran and Libya illustrate the extent to which the terrorist cancer has established its grip on the world's health, and our paralytic failure to treat the disease. Let me remind you that four years ago Iran committed a gigantic crime of state terrorism: it seized all the occupants of the embassy of the United States -- the greatest power on earth -- and held them hostage. That crime goes unrepented and unpunished. Yet Iran still operates privileged embassies throughout the world, to service its killers. It is still a member of the UN, where it can defend its policies of mass murder. It is now destroying the world's shipping in the Gulf -- maritime terrorism on a gigantic scale -- or to give it the old name, piracy. Will that go unpunished too?

Or again, two months ago, one or more professional state terrorists, living in and working from the Libyan Embassy in London, murdered a young British policewoman, in broad daylight and in front of hundreds of people. Under the protection of the Vienna Convention, on whose provision Colonel Qadafi insisted down to the last comma, the killer or killers were allowed to leave the country without search or investigation. Here was a murderous dictator who has sponsored terrorism all over the world, who operates his own terror-squads, organizes and finances others, who has caused, extended or prolonged no less than ten civil and interstate wars in Africa, who is responsible for the deaths of at least a million people, and who openly proclaims his contempt for international order, here he is able to take the maximum possible advantage of the conventions which govern behavior between law-abiding states.

Thus, with the emergence of the Terrorist State, the cancer has spread to the point where it is multiplying its cells from within the framework of world order. The inmates are taking over the asylum; the doctors are helping to spread the bacillus. There is, then, no alternative to drastic treatment.

I have three propositions to put to you tonight -- the first on the moral level, the second on the legal level, the third on the military level. On the moral level, let us clear our minds of cant. By this I mean let us reject the ambivalence with which civilized people often approach the problem of terrorism. They condemn terrorism in general and on principle, but there is often one particular group of terrorists which arouses their sympathy, for historical, racial, ethnic or ideological reasons, and whom they are not prepared to describe as terrorists, but rather as freedom-fighters and guerrillas. One case is a small section of the Irish community in the United States and its sympathy for the IRA. The IRA is beyond question one of the most evil and destructive terrorist movements on earth. But it could not exist without the regular financial support it receives from otherwise law-abiding and peaceful American-Irish.

So I would counter this ambivalence in the civilized world by a simple proposition there is no such person as a 'good' terrorist, anywhere, at any time, in any circumstances. In fighting terrorism, there cannot be qualifications. Terrorism must be fought with the same absolutist rigour with which the civilized powers once fought piracy and the international slave-trade. There were no 'good' pirates. There were no 'good' slavers. There can be no 'good' gunmen.

And let us note, at the same time, that the gunmen, the terrorists, do not, and by their nature, cannot, achieve legitimate political aims. Under no circumstances can democratic societies be the beneficiaries of terrorism. The only gainers are anarchy on the one hand, and totalitarianism on the other, the twin Frankensteins which threaten to overwhelm the democratic West.

Let me give you two examples of what I mean. The modern age of terrorism began in 1968 with the PLO. Today, sixteen years later, the PLO and the other terrorist movements it has succoured, have racked up an appalling total of lives extinguished and property destroyed. But how far has the PLO progressed towards achieving its political ends? It has made no progress at all -- it had, in fact, regressed. The Palestinian state is further away than ever. The Israeli state is stronger and more firmly established than in 1968. The victims have been the Arab states which harboured the gunmen. Jordan saved itself in 1970 because it threw them out. Lebanon perished because it lacked the courage to do the same. That is always the pattern: if the only ultimate beneficiaries of terrorism are totalitarian regimes, the chief victims are weak-minded democracies which lack the perception and courage to treat terrorism as a mortal enemy.

Again, take the IRA. They have killed over a thousand people,

most of them their own countrymen, since 1968. But the unitary Irish-state is as far away as before, and they themselves constitute the chief obstacle to its realization. Meanwhile, what has happened to the Irish Republic, which has throughout observed that fatal ambivalence towards terrorism which I have described? Its economy is in ruins, the very fabric of its state is under threat, and -- since the IRA finances itself through the drug-trade -- Ireland now has the biggest drug problem in Western Europe. No harm of any consequence has been inflicted on Britain -- it is Ireland and her people who are the victims of the men with guns.

Now let us look briefly at the legal level. If there are no 'good' terrorists, it follows that civilized states must act collectively against all of them. Of course, the UN is useless -- terrorist states are among its honored members. NATO is inappropriate. I put no faith in the European Anti-Terrorist Convention, even if everyone could be persuaded to sign it. Indeed, I put no faith in any formal treaty arrangement -- you end up with a Vienna Convention. But I have a lot of faith in practical, informal and flexible arrangements between the major civilized powers.

We have to grasp the fact that to hurt one terrorist movement is to hurt them all. So I would like to see a coordinated,

well-financed, informal and secret effort by the major civilized powers to discover and exchange information about movements, routes, identities, weapons stocks, methods, plans, codes, safe houses and bases of all terrorists everywhere. And it follows we must be prepared to devise and carry through concerted operations. The hydra is less likely to survive if struck simultaneously in several places. All the legitimate powers must have their trained anti-terrorist units, and they must be accustomed to acting in concert.

For the terrorist, there can be no hiding places. The terrorist must never be allowed to feel safe anywhere in the world. He must be made to fear he is being followed not just by agents of the government against which he is conspiring, but the agents of many governments, coordinated by a common system. A terrorist kept constantly on the defensive is an ineffective terrorist.

No hiding places -- and that means, sooner or later, that the civilized powers must be prepared to act directly against the terrorist states. Looking back over the last two decades, we can claim some notable successes against individual terrorist movements. But these have been essentially defensive successes. Only on one occasion has a major offensive blow been dealt against the system of international terrorism itself. That was in 1982, when Israel crossed into Lebanon and expelled the PLO by

force. The truth is, by having the moral and physical courage to violate a so-called sovereign frontier, and by placing the moral law above the formalities of state rights, Israel was able for the first time to strike at the heart of the cancer, to arrest its growth, and to send it into headlong retreat. That is the kind of thing I mean by drastic treatment.

I believe this conference should study the example set by the Israelis in 1982, and debate in what circumstances, and by what means, the civilized West as a whole will be prepared to act physically against the terrorist states in the future. I think it must be made clear to the master-killers of Teheran and Tripoli, that there can be no ultimate hiding place for them either, that the arm of civilization is long, and sinewy, and may be stretched out to take them by the throat. Let us in the West consider these possibilities. Let us have no formal treaties or arrangements. But let us debate privately among ourselves when, and if so how, we will be prepared to discard the obstacle of sovereignty and national frontiers, behind which the state killers shelter. Let us calmly and discreetly amass and train the forces which will be necessary for such police-action, and discuss how we will deal with the political and international consequences. Let us decide in good time the limits beyond which terrorist states will not be allowed to pass, and let us perfect a military instrument of fearful retribution when and if those limits ever are crossed.

I believe the knowledge that the civilized world has the courage and means to act in this manner will itself serve as a deterrent to state terrorism. I stress the word courage, and the physical preparedness without which courage is useless. For the cancer of terrorism feeds on weakness in all its forms -- on all the hesitations and divisions and ambiguities inseparable from free, liberal societies. We must put these weaknesses behind us, and act, in Lincoln's words, with malice towards none -- except the killers; with charity to all -- especially their innocent victims; above all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right. We must, as the Book of Joshua puts it, 'Be strong and of good courage', for it is the combination of strength and courage which alone can arrest and destroy the terrorist cancer.

STATEMENT OF PROFESSOR TAKESHI MURAMATSU  
TO THE JONATHAN INSTITUTE  
SECOND CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM  
TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1984

---

JAPAN MAY VERY WELL BE THE SAFEST ADVANCED COUNTRY IN THE WORLD AS FAR AS TERRORISM IS CONCERNED, AS MY COLLEAGUE MR. ISHIHARA MENTIONS IN HIS PAPER. BUT ANY DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY IS VULNERABLE TO ASSAULT FROM THOSE WHO SEEK TO IMPOSE THEIR OWN WILL BY VIOLENCE. PLATO PREDICTED THAT IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY, THERE WILL ALWAYS BE THOSE DISSIDENTS WHO WILL DISRUPT PEACE TO FULFILL THEIR OWN ENDS. EVEN IF THESE DISSIDENTS WERE CAUGHT AND SENTENCED, PLATO SAID, THEY WOULD REAPPEAR AGAIN AS PHANTOMS.

AS PLATO PREDICTED, JAPAN'S DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY HAS PHANTOMS THAT APPEAR AND ENGAGE IN TERRORIST ACTIVITIES ABROAD. THERE ARE THREE PARTICULAR GROUPS OF PHANTOMS ABOUT WHICH I WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TODAY. ONE IS THE FAMOUS RED ARMY, WHOSE BASE IS BELIEVED TO BE IN BALBEC, A CITY IN LEBANON. ANOTHER GROUP HIJACKED A PASSENGER PLANE IN 1970 AND FLED TO NORTH KOREA. SINCE THEN THEY HAVE BEEN CONFINED SOMEWHERE IN A SUBURB OF PYONGYANG. ALTHOUGH THEY ARE PRESENTLY NOT ACTIVE, THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT THE NORTH KOREAN GOVERNMENT IS WAITING FOR A RIPE OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE USE OF THE GROUP AS A POLITICAL TOOL.

THE THIRD ORGANIZATION APPEARED ON THE WORLD STAGE IN PARIS THIS APRIL. THE BUILDINGS OF SONY FRANCE AND A SALES OFFICE OF MITSUBISHI AUTOMOBILE COMPANY WERE DESTROYED BY BOMBS SET BY AN ANARCHIST GROUP. THEY CALL THEMSELVES THE JAPANESE ANARCHISTS.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THIS GROUP AND THE JAPANESE RED ARMY IS NOT YET CONFIRMED, BUT SOME OBSERVERS SUSPECT THAT SOME COMMUNICATION EXISTS BETWEEN THE TWO GROUPS. A SPOKESWOMAN FOR THE RED ARMY NAMED SHIGENOBU GRANTED AN INTERVIEW TO A PHOTOGRAPHER WHO WAS KNOWN TO BE SYMPATHETIC WITH THE PLO IN BALBEC. SHIGENOBU CLAIMED THAT THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE RED ARMY IS GREATER THAN IS GENERALLY ESTIMATED. ACCORDING TO THE POLICE, THE RED ARMY SENDS APPEALS TO THE JAPANESE PUBLIC AND OBTAINS INFORMATION ABOUT THE POLITICAL SITUATION AND LEFTIST ACTIVITIES IN JAPAN THROUGH THE AID OF SUPPORTERS IN PARIS AND THE WEST COAST OF THE UNITED STATES. IT IS POSSIBLE THAT THEY WERE RECRUITED JAPANESE TERRORISTS IN PARIS OR OTHER PLACES.

THE JAPANESE RED ARMY WAS ORIGINALLY ORGANIZED UNDER WADI ELIAS HADDAD OF THE PFLP IN 1971 UNDER THE ORIGINAL NAME ARAB COMMITTEE OF THE RED ARMY. SINCE 1974, HOWEVER, THE RED ARMY HAS DEMONSTRATED A PREFERENCE FOR INDEPENDENCE FROM THE PFLP. WHEN THE RED ARMY TOOK OVER THE FRENCH EMBASSY IN HOLLAND IN 1974, FOR EXAMPLE, NO ARAB TERRORISTS WERE INVOLVED. AMONG THE TERRORISTS KILLED AT ENTEBBE, NO JAPANESE WERE FOUND. AND THE TERRORISTS WHO HIJACKED A JETLINER BELONGING TO JAPAN AIR LINES IN DACCA IN 1977 WERE ALL JAPANESE.

THIS INDEPENDENCE FOR THE RED ARMY CAME TO AN END AFTER THE IRAN-IRAQ WAR BROKE OUT AND SADAM HUSSEIN DECIDED TO EXPEL FROM HIS COUNTRY ALMOST ALL TERRORIST GROUPS. ONLY ABU NIDAL'S GROUP WAS ALLOWED TO REMAIN IN IRAQ AT THAT TIME. THE JAPANESE RED ARMY FOUND ITSELF OBLIGED TO REASSOCIATE ITSELF WITH THE ARAB TERRORIST ORGANIZATION. (THE RED ARMY HAD HAD THEIR TRAINING CENTER IN HEBANIA.)

IN 1981, THE RED ARMY BEGAN TO ISSUE A BI-WEEKLY MAGAZINE IN ENGLISH ENTITLED "SOLIDARITY". THE TITLE ITSELF REVEALS HOW DEEPLY THE RED ARMY FELT THE NECESSITY TO SHOW THEIR SOLIDARITY WITH ARAB TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS. AS A MATTER OF FACT, THEY STRESSED IN THEIR MAGAZINE THE NEED FOR COOPERATION WITH PLO AND THE FORMATION OF A UNIFIED ANTI-IMPERIALIST FRONT WHICH WOULD INCLUDE THE PARTICIPATION OF THE USSR. SHIGENOBU, THE RED ARMY SPOKESWOMAN, CLAIMED IN HER INTERVIEW THAT DURING THE OPERATION PEACE FOR GALLILEE, MEMBERS OF THE RED ARMY FOUGHT IN NABATIA, KHALED, AND EVEN IN CHATEAU BEAUFORT.

IN JAPAN IT IS ESTIMATED THAT THERE ARE ABOUT THIRTY-FIVE THOUSAND EXTREME LEFTISTS AND THEIR SUPPORTERS. THEY ARE DIVIDED INTO MANY DIFFERENT FACTIONS AND DISPUTES AMONG THEM ARE COMMON. ALTHOUGH THE RED ARMY FACTION IN JAPAN IS SMALL (THE ESTIMATED NUMBER OF ITS MEMBERS IS SOME ONE HUNDRED FORTY), SOME OF OTHER ORGANIZATIONS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS "TERRORIST RESERVES", SOMETHING SIMILAR TO MILITARY RESERVES, EASILY HANDLED AND UTILIZED BY EITHER THE USSR OR NORTH KOREA.

SINCE THE OIL CRISIS OF 1973, THE PLO HAS USED PETROLEUM AS ITS POLITICAL WEAPON; IN FACT, ONE WOULD THINK THE PLO HAD ITS OWN OIL WELL. THE JAPANESE BUSINESS COMMUNITY ARE WEAK IN THE FACE OF SUCH ECONOMIC PRESSURE. ONE SERIOUS PROBLEM WITH WHICH THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT MUST CONTEND IS THAT OF HUGE CONTRIBUTIONS OR DONATIONS, (SOME MIGHT REFER TO THEM AS PAYOFFS) THAT JAPANESE BUSINESSES MAKE TO THE TOKYO OFFICE OF THE PLO. A RECENT EPISODE SUGGESTS THAT THE PLO ENJOYS A CONSIDERABLE FINANCIAL SUPPORT FROM SEVERAL JAPANESE ENTERPRISES. A REPRESENTATIVE IN THE PLO'S TOKYO OFFICE WAS RECENTLY TOLD HE WAS BEING REPLACED. THE FORMER REPRESENTATIVE ACCEPTED HIS ORDERS ONLY RELUCTANTLY, AS HE KNEW THAT HE WAS LEAVING A POSITION IN TOKYO THAT WAS EXTREMELY LUCRATIVE. EVEN THOUGH HE WAS MAKING A FORTUNE IN HIS TOKYO POSITION, HOWEVER, A PORTION OF HIS ENORMOUS RECEIPTS WOULD BE SENT TO THE PLO HEADQUARTERS AND USED IN HIS MILITARY BUDGET.

I WOULD LIKE TO TURN FOR A MOMENT TO JAPANESE DEMOCRACY AND HOW IT CAN AFFECT, AND INDEED BE AFFECTED BY, TERRORISM.

AS MANY PEOPLE WHO ARE FAMILIAR WITH JAPAN KNOW, JAPAN HAS SO FAR SUCCEEDED WELL IN MAINTAINING PUBLIC ORDER. WHILE IT MAY SEEM THAT JAPAN WILL REMAIN RELATIVELY PEACEFUL INTERNALLY FOR SOME TIME TO COME, THERE ARE SEVERAL REASONS WHY A SPARK OF VIOLENT TERRORISM COULD SERIOUSLY THREATEN THIS CALM.

FIRST, AS AN ISLAND NATION, JAPAN HAS NO BORDER TO DEFEND AGAINST A NEIGHBOR. AS A RESULT, THERE IS NOT A STRONG SENSE OF ENEMY IN JAPAN. THEREFORE, WHEN AN ENEMY TO DEMOCRACY PRESENTS

HIM OR HERSELF UNDER THE GUISE OF "FREEDOM FIGHTER", FOR EXAMPLE, THE JAPANESE DON'T NECESSARILY SENSE A SERIOUS THREAT.

IN THIS CONNECTION, THE JAPANESE TEND TO SYMPATHIZE WITH THE "UNDERDOG" IN A GIVEN SITUATION. IF AN "ATTACKER", A TERRORIST, BECOMES AN "ATTACKEE", AN OBJECT OF POLICE DISCIPLINE, THE AUTHORITIES ARE PRESENTED WITH A DELICATE SITUATION WHEREBY PUBLIC SYMPATHY GOES OUT TO THE CRIMINALS DESPITE THE FACT THAT THE TERRORISTS ARE THREATS TO DEMOCRACY AND SOCIAL HARMONY.

THIS PUBLIC SYMPATHY MAY BE COMPOUNDED BY AN AVERSION TO AUTHORITARIANISM WHICH GREW UP OUT OF THE PRE-WAR EXPERIENCE IN JAPAN. IT IS FURTHER COMPOUNDED BY THE MASS MEDIA; JAPANESE JOURNALISTS ARE SOMETIMES THOUGHT TO BE SYMPATHETIC TO SO-CALLED OPPOSITION FIGHTERS, FREEDOM FIGHTERS, ANARCHISTS, OR ANTI-IMPERIALISTS.

IN CONCLUSION, I WOULD LIKE TO STATE MY OPINION THAT THE WEAKNESS AND VULNERABILITY OF DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY TO WHICH PLATO REFERRED SOME 2500 YEARS AGO IS EVIDENT PARTICULARLY IN THE ISOLATED MASS SOCIETY THAT IS JAPAN. ONCE TERRORISM STRIKES AT JAPANESE DEMOCRACY, SYMPATHY FOR THE UNDERDOG AND EXCESSIVE COVERAGE BY THE PRESS MAY COMBINE TO AFFECT PUBLIC OPINION IN AN UNFORTUNATE WAY. THIS COULD PROVE TO BE A WEAKNESS OF JAPAN'S DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY IF TERRORISTS ARE SUCCESSFUL IN UPSETTING SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ORDER.

THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT CAN CONTRIBUTE TO A LESSENING OF WORLDWIDE TERRORISM BY CONVINCING THE JAPANESE BUSINESS COMMUNITY THAT IT IS ACTUALLY FINANCIALLY SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM BY MAKING CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PLO IN TOKYO. IN ADDITION, THE JAPANESE SHOULD ASSIST IN CREATING AN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION TO DEFEND THE FREE WORLD AGAINST INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM, AS SECRETARY OF STATE SHULTZ AND GENERAL RABIN PROPOSED LAST EVENING. SUCH AN ORGANIZATION WOULD PROMOTE THE FREE EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION ON A GOVERNMENTAL LEVEL AND FOSTER COOPERATION AMONG GOVERNMENTS TO COUNTER TERRORISM. THE DEVELOPMENT OF STRONG COOPERATION IS A NECESSITY. SUCH AN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION IS ONE TOWARDS WHICH WE SHOULD BEGIN WORKING NOW.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.