

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library  
Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

**Collection:** Coy, Craig P.: Files  
**Folder Title:** Terrorism Meeting with the British  
05/28/1986 (2)  
**Box:** RAC Box 2

---

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/>

# WITHDRAWAL SHEET

## Ronald Reagan Library

**Collection:** COY, CRAIG: Files

**Archivist:** dlb

**File Folder:** Terrorism Meeting with the British 28 May 1986 (2 of 2)  
 Box CPC-1; FBI-098 *BAL Box 2*

**Date:** 8/18/99  
 Wills - F97-108/1

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
1. <del>Draft Talking</del> Pts.	May 28 Meeting with British Terrorism Delegation, 3 p. <i>R 4/13/06 NUSE97-108/1 #151</i>	n.d.	P1/F1
2. Memo	Peter Sommer to John Poindexter, re: Your Meeting with Douglas Hurd: 10:30 a.m., May 28, 1986 (notes on verso of both pages), 4 p.	5/27/86	P1/F1
3. Notes	<i>Part " u #152</i> Handwritten Notes on US/UK Meeting - May 28, 1986, 8 p.	n.d.	P1/F1
4. Notes	<i>D u #153</i> Handwritten Notes on US/UK Meeting - May 28, 1986, 6 p.	n.d.	P1/F1
	<i>D u #154</i>		

### RESTRICTION CODES

**Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**

- P-1 National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
- P-2 Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA].
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA].
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

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

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

DRAFT TALKING POINTS

Collective Security Strategy Against State-Sponsored Terrorism

- State-sponsorship of terrorism is one of the most reprehensible manifestations of international terrorism.
- But fortunately, it is also the form of terrorism that we can do quite a bit about.
- We can act collectively against the outlaw nations that conduct state-sponsored terrorism.
- Through steadily escalating political, economic, psychological, and, as necessary, military actions against these criminal countries, we can eventually stop their sponsorship of terrorism by either:
  - Convincing them that the costs of continuing their policy of support to terrorism are too high; or
  - Making it physically impossible for them to direct and support terrorism from their diplomatic and commercial institutions abroad.

DECLASSIFIED/REVEALED.  
NLS F97-10871 #151

37 : CU, NARA, DATE 4/13/06

- Of these two, we would obviously prefer the former:
  - The change in policy could be by "voluntary" choice of the regime, following its enlightened perception of its own self interest after relatively mild collective steps -- perhaps not much more than signalling.
  - Alternatively, the costs inflicted may have to be so high that the regime in power is changed in order that the policy of support to terrorism can be changed.
  
- The most extreme case is of a totally uncomprising regime that weathers the domestic pressures created by the ~~various~~ <sup>various</sup> diplomatic, economic, and military pressures of the Western nations and yet persists in state direction and execution<sup>ON</sup> of terrorist acts. In such an extreme, though unlikely case, no diplomatic or commercial representation would be allowed to such a bandit regime.
  
- If the state sponsors of terrorism are gradually but steadily blocked in this manner, residual international terrorism (by small, autonomous groups) becomes more manageable.
  - Traditional security and law enforcement methods would apply and be effective.

- Although terrorism wouldn't "go away," the level that would exist after state-sponsorship is removed would be "acceptable."
  
- Training, financing, documentation, arms and ammunition, and travel will all become considerably more difficult for international terrorists without support by patron states.



~~SECRET~~

RECOMMENDATION

That you draw on the above in preparing for your meeting with Hurd.

Approve \_\_\_\_\_

Disapprove \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>C</sup>  
Craig Coy concurs

Attachment

Tab I Embassy London message

~~SECRET~~







SECRET

U.S.-UK DISCUSSIONS  
Wednesday, May 28, 1986  
12:00-2:00 p.m.

AGENDA

- I. Intelligence
  - Review of Libyan/Syrian involvement in recent terrorist acts CIA
  - Internal political situation in Libya CIA/UK
- II. Review of political/economic actions against Libya
  - U.S. measures State
  - UK measures UK
  - Other nations (Italy, France, FRG) State/CIA
- III. Next Steps Against Libya
  - Collective strategy against state-sponsored terrorism NSC
  - Libyan actions that would trigger a response NSC
  - Options for a response NSC
    - o Further political/economic steps
    - o Military actions
    - o Covert operations
- IV. Application of the Strategy Against Syria State
- V. British Reaction and Planned Next Steps UK

DECLASSIFIED  
White House Guidelines, August 28, 1997  
By dlb NARA, Date 8/18/95

SECRET  
Declassify on: OADR

RONALD W. REAGAN LIBRARY

THIS FORM MARKS THE FILE LOCATION OF ITEM NUMBER 3-4 LISTED ON THE  
WITHDRAWAL SHEET AT THE FRONT OF THIS FOLDER.

# DRAFT

## STATEMENT ON U.S.-UK EXTRADITION TREATY

Last June representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom signed a supplementary extradition treaty designed to make clear that persons accused of crimes of violence in one of our two countries could not escape justice by fleeing to the other country and claiming some political motivation for their offense. Too often in the past, terrorists who had kidnapped, killed, and maimed in Britain had fled to the United States and been protected by our courts on the ground that their offenses were "political."

Recent events have underlined more clearly than ever the need for the civilized international community to stand together in the fight against terrorism. Ensuring that terrorists will be brought to justice is a key weapon in that fight. Our joint declaration on terrorism at the Tokyo Summit emphasized that there can be no justification whatsoever for terrorist acts and recognized the need for "improved extradition procedures...for bringing to trial those who have perpetrated acts of terrorism."

Unfortunately the United States Senate has refused -- for nearly a year now -- to approve our supplementary extradition treaty with the United Kingdom. This is the first attempt to amend an extradition protocol; it will be followed by negotiations with other nations with whom we have extradition treaties.

Our friends around the world see this as a test of whether the United States operates under a double standard, demanding the surrender of terrorists in other countries who claim they acted for political reasons, but granting safe-haven to terrorists who flee to the United States and offer the same excuse. The Senate's refusal to approve this treaty undermines our ability to get other countries to extradite terrorists we are trying to apprehend -- such as Abu Abbas, admitted mastermind of the ACHILLE LAURO hijacking, who recently threatened publicly to perpetrate further acts of terrorism against Americans.

Some of the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have prepared a "substitute" treaty. Their version would allow terrorists who murder policemen or soldiers -- the very people who protect the rest of us from terrorism -- to avoid extradition on the ground that their heinous actions were "political" in nature. At the same time, this substitute treaty would create wide loopholes through which even terrorists who attack civilians could escape justice. This proposal would not in any way contribute to our battle against international terrorism. It is simply unacceptable.

I find it especially shameful that the Senate is unwilling to help the people of the United Kingdom, including northern Ireland, fight their terrorist threat at the same time that we ask -- and receive -- invaluable British assistance in responding to terrorist threats from Libya and elsewhere.

Our supplementary extradition treaty with the United Kingdom is not a radical new departure or a threat to civil liberties. Its concept is based on that of the European Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism, concluded ten years ago, and since ratified by many European countries -- including states like Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, and the Netherlands, which have strong and demonstrated commitments to human rights.

Prompt Senate approval of the treaty would be a significant step in fighting terrorism under the rule of law. We can no longer shirk our responsibility to put our own home in order in the international campaign against terrorism.

# REAGAN SAYS U.S. MUST AID BRITAIN ON EXTRADITIONS

## Fears Senate Refusal to Back New Treaty Would Offend Thatcher and Aid Terror

By GERALD M. BOYD  
 Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, May 31 — President Reagan, seeking to prod the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to act on a new extradition treaty with Britain, warned today against allowing "terrorists" a "safe haven" in the United States.

Mr. Reagan, in his weekly radio address, linked the treaty with Britain to larger efforts at combating international terrorism. He said the refusal of the Senate to ratify the agreement would "undermine our ability to pressure other countries to extradite terrorists who have murdered our citizens."

The revised 1972 treaty, which was signed a year ago by the United States and Britain, includes new provisions that end exemptions from extradition for crimes that have been justified as politically motivated. At least four fugitives of the Irish Republican Army have avoided extradition by invoking the political exemption, including one convicted 18 months ago of killing a British soldier in Belfast, Northern Ireland.

### Thatcher's Solid Support

Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has been urging the new treaty's ratification as a reflection of United States concern about combating terrorism, and she stepped up her efforts after Britain allowed United States Air Force planes based in Britain to be used in the bombing raid on Libya on April 15.

In a rare personal message, Mr. Reagan urged the Senate not to offend the British Prime Minister, who was one of the few European leaders to support the Libyan bombing. The Administration has defended the raids as necessary retaliation for Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi's support for terrorism.

"Any rejection of this treaty would

be an affront to British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, one European leader who at great political risk stood shoulder-to-shoulder with us during our operations against Qaddafi's terrorism," Mr. Reagan said.

### Vote Could Come Soon

Supporters on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are hoping to get the measure to the floor next week. In the past, they have been stymied by two factions opposing the revisions on different grounds.

Mr. Reagan, who delivered the radio address from the Presidential retreat at Camp David, Md., addressed his remarks to both sides in saying that the treaty, if ratified, "would prevent terrorists who have kidnapped, killed, or maimed people in Britain from finding refuge in our country."

"Today these killers are able to do just that, by labeling their vile acts as 'political,'" he said.

"If the actions by a few senators allow terrorists to find safe haven in the United States," he said, "then there would be irreparable damage."

Mr. Reagan referred to an amendment that had been offered by Senator Claiborne Pell, Democrat of Rhode Island, that would allow the extradition of fugitives involved in civilian attacks, but maintain the exemption for those

involved in military attacks against targets in uniforms.

"Some members of the Foreign Relations Committee have gone so far as to prepare a substitute treaty permitting those who have murdered British policemen and soldiers for so-called political reasons to avoid extradition," Mr. Reagan said.

"This substitute is not a compromise," he said, "it's a retreat. Its passage would be a victory for terrorism and a defeat for all we've been trying to do to stop this evil."

### Addresses Helms's Concern

Mr. Reagan also addressed a concern that has been raised by Senator Jesse Helms, Republican of North Carolina, that the revisions could establish a precedent to force the extradition of fugitives from Communist regimes.

"One concern," the President said, "about the treaty is that it may set a precedent for other treaties which will then be used against those who simply oppose totalitarian regimes. We can never permit that to happen."

Proponents of the new treaty have argued that Mr. Helms's opposition is unfounded in that the United States already has similar agreements with Mexico, Colombia, the Netherlands and West Germany. Moreover, the Administration has asserted that such exemptions on political grounds are unnecessary in democracies where fugitives stand a good chance of fair treatment in judicial proceedings.

But some advocates of civil liberties like Morton H. Halperin, the director of the Washington office of the American Civil Liberties Union, have suggested that the issue is more complex. Appearing before the committee last September, he said although some fugitives committing violent crimes should be regarded as terrorists, a need still existed to deny extradition for some violent acts that are part of a rebellion against a government.

### Thatcher Role in Tokyo

Administration lobbyists have been hoping to garner the support of Mr. Helms or several Democratic committee members, including Alan Cranston of California and Thomas F. Eagleton of Missouri.

Mr. Reagan's decision to make a strong statement supporting the new treaty was apparently prompted also by Mrs. Thatcher's role in securing the statement on terrorism at the economic summit meeting of industrialized democracies in Tokyo earlier this month. After the three-day meeting, Secretary of State George P. Shultz had praised her as a "terrific leader" and said the United States was prepared to assist her in any way it could.

The statement by the Western leaders singled out Libya as supporting state-sponsored terrorism and provided a joint declaration to fight terrorism through determined actions that combined "national measures with international cooperation."

<SOURCE>REUTERS  
<DATE>06-JUN-1986 12:54  
<TEXT> REUTER 1254  
R083R W1111)LCZCRYRZYR

AM-IRISH-TREATY

THIRD ATTEMPT TO VOTE ON U.S.-U.K. EXTRADITION TREATY DELAYED  
BY SUE BAKER

WASHINGTON, JUNE 6, REUTER - A THIRD ATTEMPT TO HOLD A KEY SENATE VOTE ON RATIFICATION OF A NEW U.S.-BRITAIN EXTRADITION TREATY FAILED TODAY WITH REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS CONTINUING TO WRANGLE OVER TERMS OF THE CONTROVERSIAL ACCORD.

SEN. RICHARD LUGAR, AN INDIANA REPUBLICAN AND CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, PROPOSED A COMPROMISE LAST WEEK THAT HE HOPED WOULD BREAK THE MONTHS-LONG DEADLOCK.

THE TREATY SEEKS TO DENY SUSPECTED IRISH REPUBLICAN ARMY (IRA) GUERRILLAS POLITICAL REFUGE IN AMERICA.

BUT DEMOCRATIC SENATORS, ARGUING THAT THE UNITED STATES HAS TRADITIONALLY OFFERED FREEDOM FROM EXTRADITION TO POLITICAL DISSIDENTS, DEMANDED TIME TO WORK ON THEIR OWN COMPROMISE PROPOSAL.

THOSE SENATORS, SEVERAL OF IRISH DESCENT, ALSO QUESTION THE STATE OF CIVIL LIBERTIES IN NORTHERN IRELAND AND ARGUE THAT THE NEW TREATY COULD MAKE THE UNITED STATES A PARTY TO SUPPRESSING POLITICAL DISSENT IN THE DIVIDED PROVINCE.

BOTH THE U.S. AND BRITISH GOVERNMENTS HAVE STEPPED UP THEIR CALLS IN RECENT WEEKS FOR QUICK COMMITTEE ACTION ON THE NEW TREATY, CITING LONDON'S HELP IN ALLOWING U.S. BOMBERS TO FLY FROM BRITISH SOIL IN THE APRIL 15 AIR RAIDS ON LIBYA.

THE TREATY, A REVISED VERSION OF AN EXISTING EXTRADITION ACCORD, WAS SIGNED BY WASHINGTON AND LONDON LAST JUNE BUT HAS BEEN BOGGED DOWN IN THE COMMITTEE SINCE LAST JULY.

IT WAS RESURRECTED IN MARCH, UNDER PRESSURE FROM THE ADMINISTRATION WHICH VIEWS IT AS PART OF ITS FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM, BUT ONLY AFTER LUGAR MADE APPROVAL OF AN IRISH AID BILL POPULAR WITH DEMOCRATS CONTINGENT ON ITS RATIFICATION.

DESPITE THAT, ATTEMPTS TO VOTE ON RATIFICATION LAST MONTH AND EARLIER THIS WEEK HAVE FAILED AND LUGAR CANCELED TODAY'S SCHEDULED COMMITTEE MEETING, EXPLAINING THAT MORE TIME WAS NEEDED TO CONSIDER THE VARIOUS PROPOSED CHANGES.

"WE ARE MAKING SOME REAL PROGRESS," HE SAID. "I HOPE THAT BY EARLY NEXT WEEK THE COMMITTEE WILL BE ABLE TO MEET AND APPROVE BY A LARGE MAJORITY A REVISED EXTRADITION TREATY THAT MEETS THE CONCERNS OF ALL PARTIES."

LUGAR, IN A STATEMENT, ALSO SAID THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF PRIME MINISTER MARGARET THATCHER HAD REQUESTED MORE TIME TO REVIEW THE POSSIBLE COMPROMISES.

HIS COMPROMISE DEFINES THE CRIMES FOR WHICH THE POLITICAL ARGUMENT COULD NOT BE USED, INCLUDING MURDER, MANSLAUGHTER, HOSTAGE TAKING, KIDNAPPING AND SETTING OR EXPLODING A BOMB -- WHETHER PERPETRATED AGAINST A CIVILIAN OR THE MILITARY.

SOME DEMOCRATS HAD INSISTED THAT ONLY PERSONS COMMITTING SUCH CRIMES AGAINST CIVILIANS BE EXTRADITABLE. THE ORIGINAL VERSION REMOVED THE POLITICAL EXEMPTION FOR ALL CRIMES.

AN AIDE SAID THE COMPROMISE STRUCK A BALANCE BETWEEN THE TREATY AS SUBMITTED BY THE ADMINISTRATION, WHICH WOULD HAVE REMOVED THE POLITICAL DEFENSE CLAUSE FOR ALL CRIMES, AND THE NARROW LIST OF OFFENSES FAVORED BY THE DEMOCRATS.

WHILE THE LUGAR COMPROMISE WOULD ALLOW THE ADMINISTRATION TO DECIDE WHETHER A BRITISH REQUEST FOR EXTRADITION SHOULD BE GRANTED, IT RETAINS A LIMITED ROLE FOR U.S. COURTS AS A



SAFEGUARD AGAINST ABUSE OF THAT POWER.

ON APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE, THE FULL SENATE MUST VOTE ON THE  
TREATY.

<SOURCE>UPI

<DATE>06-JUN-1986 14:29

<TEXT>UP074R XTRADITE

BY E. MICHAEL MYERS

WASHINGTON (UPI) -- THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS

COMMITTEE SAID FRIDAY HE HAS DROPPED THE CRIMINAL OFFENSE OF CONSPIRACY FROM A NEW EXTRADITION TREATY WITH BRITAIN IN AN EFFORT TO WIN APPROVAL OF THE PACT.

SEN. RICHARD LUGAR, R-IND., TRYING TO HELP PRESIDENT REAGAN GAIN SENATE APPROVAL OF THE TREATY SIGNED NEARLY A YEAR AGO, SAID THE AGREEMENT WOULD GUARANTEE THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF ALL FOREIGN NATIONALS SEEKING POLITICAL REFUGE IN THE UNITED STATES.

AT BRITAIN'S REQUEST, THE TREATY NO LONGER WOULD ALLOW AN EXCEPTION FROM EXTRADITION TO PEOPLE ACCUSED OF CERTAIN VIOLENT ACTS THEY MAY CLAIM ARE POLITICALLY MOTIVATED: MURDER, MANSLAUGHTER, KIDNAPPING, INFLECTING GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM AND USE OF EXPLOSIVES.

LUGAR'S CHANGE, HOWEVER, WOULD ALLOW THOSE CHARGED WITH CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT SUCH ACTS TO FIGHT EXTRADITION ON GROUNDS THAT THE CONSPIRACY WAS A POLITICAL OFFENSE.

BRITISH PRIME MINISTER MARGARET THATCHER ASKED THAT THE TREATY BE REVISED TO EXCLUDE MURDER, KIDNAPPING, AND OTHER VIOLENT CRIMES FROM THE "POLITICAL OFFENSE" EXCLUSION, AND SHE WON THE ENDORSEMENT OF REAGAN AND LUGAR.

THE TREATY MUST BE APPROVED BY THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE AND THEN BY THE FULL SENATE.

UPI 06-06-86 02:32 PED

WASHFAX RECEIPT  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MIS: Copy for US/UK FILE  
E C  
THANK.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

86 JUN 12

8

B

S/S #

8 JUN 12 P 8: 02

C

MESSAGE NO. 008551

CLASSIFICATION LOW <sup>dlb</sup> <sub>8/18/95</sub>

WHITE HOUSE  
SITUATION ROOM  
No. of Pages 1

FROM: M. K. KRAFT  
(Officer's Name)

S/67  
(Office Symbol)

7633  
(Extension)

2376  
(Room Number)

MESSAGE DESCRIPTION: SUMMARY OF UK TREATY ACTION

(Agency)	DELIVER TO:	EXTENSION:	ROOM NO.
VSC	COL NORTH	395 3737	392 OEB

OR: CLEARANCE  INFORMATION  PER REQUEST  COMMENT

REMARKS:

S/S Officer: MB L Tracy

dlb 8/18/77

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee today approved a Lugar-Eagleton compromise version of the US-UK Supplementary Extradition Treaty by a vote of 15-2. The compromise proposal eliminated certain firearms provisions from the crimes covered and added two new articles permitting persons sought for extradition to argue in US courts that there was insufficient evidence to warrant extradition and that they might be restricted, tried or punished because of their race, religion, nationality or political opinions.

Following heated discussion by Senators Biden and Eagleton, Senator Helms offered four amendments, only one of which was approved. That amendment deleted Article II of the Treaty, which stated that the statute of limitations of the requesting state would apply. Senators Biden and Kerry then took procedural steps to make clear that the person sought for extradition might also challenge the fairness of the judicial system to which he was being returned. With that, the Committee approved the treaty by a vote of 15-2, with only Senators Helms and Borinsky dissenting. The Treaty, as modified, will now be sent to the Senate floor for final advice and consent.

On the heels of the Treaty vote, the Committee approved \$10 million per year in Irish aid for FY 86-87 with the conditions approved by the House.

?  
Doesn't  
this  
undermine  
the whole  
thing...?