

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library  
Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

**Collection:** Parvin, Landon: Files  
**Folder Title:** [December 1981:] Hickey, Ed:  
Terrorism Speech (3)  
**Box:** 12

---

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/>

(Rohrabacher)  
December 2, 1981

ED HICKEY: SPEECH ON TERRORISM

Since the late 1960's Western nations have increasingly suffered from acts of political terrorism. By the early 1970's a clear pattern of international terrorism was developing -- a pattern that continues to this day.

If the late 1960's and early 1970's are remembered as years of protest, the 1980's, unless we come to grips with this very real problem, could well be remembered as a decade of terror.

The first year of the decade, 1980, was a record year for international terrorism. State Department figures show there were 760 international terrorist acts, which resulted in more casualties than in any year since the U.S. Government began keeping statistics on the subject. Last year, 642 people were killed in international terrorist acts; 1,078 were wounded. Ten Americans were among the dead; 94 Americans were among the injured.

Recent statistics suggest a frightening trend. Death and injury resulting from terrorist violence is up and much of it is directed against Americans. Of the 760 acts in 1980, 278, or 38 percent, were directed against Americans or American property. In 1981 the high level of terrorist activity continued.

Terrorism is something that everyone seems to be against, yet few can define. So perhaps we should start with a

definition. It evolved from the Latin word "terror", which means to frighten. For our purposes today, we will define terrorism as the use of violence or destructive force to frighten a government or population in order to achieve "political ends."

While domestic political violence is a problem faced by many countries, the threat of international terrorism is a matter of extreme gravity for all non-communist nations -- especially those within the Western alliance.

I am not talking about insurrection -- our focus is international terrorism. It should not be confused with insurrection; if it were the same, all those who fight oppression would be labeled as terrorists. One of the more damaging cliches currently making the rounds is that "One man's terrorist is another's Freedom Fighter." This absurd notion compares the Red Brigade and the Symbionese Liberation Army with Afghan Freedom Fighters and heroes of the American Revolution.

Anyone who compares George Washington to the Weather Underground just isn't playing with a full deck of cards. The radical chic notwithstanding, there is no basis for comparing terrorist to those who have fought for freedom. The principle targets of terrorists are innocent civilians or unarmed officials who are killed in order to terrorize populations or goad the government into unwarranted repression.

Does this description match the Afghan Freedom Fighters who battle Soviet tanks or the patriots of the American Revolution? George Washington, as it will be recalled, met the British army head on. Furthermore, when guerrilla tactics were used, it was against British troops and other combatants. This is a far cry from terrorists who bomb and kidnap unarmed civilians and plot the assassinations of political opponents.

One of the grossest image distortions of recent years is the portrayal of terrorists as Robin Hoods and romantic swashbucklers. In reality, a terrorist is a ghoul -- an individual inflicting death and destruction from hiding on unarmed opponents. Placing a bomb in the rest room of a bank or shooting down a school superintendent takes no courage. Instead these are the dishonorable of acts of cowards who smugly hide and watch their destruction from a distance rather than facing the enemy. These are the acts of defective personalities who see themselves as messianic saviors of mankind, yet don't have the character to compete for influence democratically.

The romanticization of terrorism is no surprise, however. Terrorism in the Western democracies sprang from the protest era of the late 1960's, which itself was romanticized by the media. During that era, leftist marauders were glamorized and idealized by a news media which never mentioned the totalitarian philosophy which served as the underpinning of

many radical activist organizations. It was as if the police were Nazis repressing peace demonstrations because they were inclined toward war. The police, in reality, were often coping with organized groups who considered themselves revolutionaries, seeking violence and confrontation and hiding amidst a crowd of peace marchers.

As protest marches faded it was a small step for the wilder members of the violent Students for a Democratic Society to become bombers for the Radical Weather Underground. In Europe, Germany's Baader-Meinhof gang and Italy's Red Brigades seem to have come from the same "New Left" roots.

They were formed around a nucleus of young people who were radicalized by the street violence and university Marxism of the late 1960's. Unlike their counterparts in the United States, they have been highly successful in kidnapping and assassination. The Red Brigades popularized the term "knee-capping" -- which is nothing more than crippling innocent victims by shooting them in the legs. Their most dastardly act was the kidnapping and murder of Aldo Moro, a man who headed the Christian Democratic Party and would likely have been the Italian Prime Minister except for the intervention of these fanatics.

Similarly, Germany's Baader-Meinhof gang conducted a war of terror which took the lives of innocent Germans for over half a decade. One of the most famous of their crimes was the brutal slaying of industrialist Hanns-Martin Schleyer

in 1977. Recently the remnants of this gang have been attacking American military personal.

What kind of people are these terrorists? They are, generally, individuals who have never worked at a regular job, yet constantly talk about representing the working people. Sounds familiar; doesn't it? Far from being workers, terrorists, especially those in America, are often from affluent families. One study by the German government revealed that 36 percent of those arrested in connection with terrorist organizations in the 1970's were college graduates from the upper income levels of German society.

In the United States, Kathy Boudin, who was recently arrested for alleged terrorist activities, comes from a wealthy family as did several other prominent members of the Weather Underground. Many in her particular clique, it should be noted, began as a protest group on Columbia University -- hardly a working class school.

Unfortunately, the escapades of these Mercedes-Benz revolutionaries have left a road littered with maimed bodies. Their last bit of alleged activism -- the Brinks armored car robbery -- left three men dead . . . working people with families, with children who will no longer have a father to help them along in life.

Another revealing aspect of the personality profile of alleged terrorists is the political background of their family. Many are not only from wealthy homes, but also from

families whose politics are ultra left. Kathy Boudin's father is a wealthy lawyer well known for his defense of left wing radicals.

Similarly, the world's most wanted terrorist, known as Carlos, comes from a wealthy Venezuelan family. His father is so far to the left that he named all of his children after Illich Vladimir Lenin. Carlos's real name is Illich Ramirez Sanchez.

It appears that these revolutionaries are not revolting at all. Instead they are dedicated to fulfilling long-held and deeply-rooted aspirations. This, by the way, is in stark contrast to suggestions that these are psychopaths who are revolting against all authority. These are not anarchists.

Not all terrorist organizations, however, evolved from student activism. The Irish Republican Army, the Palestine Liberation Organization, the Puerto Rican FALN and the Basque ETA all started with some territorial or nationalistic claim; all have bloody histories. The ETA, alone, in the past 13 years has killed more than 350 carefully chosen victims. The bloodletting of the IRA and the PLO is infamous.

And what is it that these and other terrorist organizations really want? Why do these individuals, among millions of their fellow citizens feel justified in conducting campaigns of murder, destruction and kidnapping.

Much can be said of their motives, but one thing is certain, contrary to their image these groups -- especially

the former student activists -- are not democratically-minded reformers faced with the stone wall of authoritarianism.

The Puerto Rican separatists, for example, are not facing the fist of the United States. Instead, they are primarily thwarted by the will of the people of Puerto Rico. Only a miniscule number of Puerto Ricans want independence, they turn it down by huge majorities every time it is voted upon, just as they reject political parties dedicated to independence.

Italy, on the other hand, may be less than perfect, but it is still a relatively free society. Yet terrorism in Europe's boot has been rampant. And those singled out by Italy's terrorists are not the fascists or raving monarchists. The Red Brigaders kidnap and murder Democratic moderates like Aldo Moro.

The infamous Carlos comes from Venezuela -- one of the freest and most prosperous nations in the Western Hemisphere.

No. Today's terrorism is not a case of individuals struggling against tyranny. The plague of terrorism now sweeping the West is far more insidious than that.

All too often the ideology of terrorists is ignored, just as it was of the New Left in the late 1960's. A close examination reveals most of these groups are dedicated to some form of revolutionary communist ideology, a significant yet largely unassimilated fact.



Terrorists, far from being revolutionaries fighting for freedom, are actually totalitarian soldiers trying to destroy liberty. They, clearly, seek more repression. Let me repeat that: Terrorists want the governments they oppose to become more repressive.

Repression, the terrorist calculates, turns idealists into violent revolutionaries. It also can be manipulated to radicalize a specific segment of society -- a minority group, young people, farmers or whoever is most susceptible.

The last thing terrorists want are free elections and civil liberties where ideas compete in a political arena. That is not the type of society they desire. Nor are they simply opposed to all state power as the anarchist as of the last century. Instead, they are Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries, seeking dictatorship of the proletariat; until this is recognized, terrorism will continue to plague the Western Democracies.

Demonstrating this all important fact is not difficult. Why does the Puerto Rican FALN conduct bombings in the United States? The answer is simple: Their goal is to provoke Government retaliation upon the citizens of Puerto Rico, thus radicalizing them and turning them into leftist cannon fodder. To our credit and in testimony to the strength of our democracy there has been no such retaliation.

But what happens in nations without such a strong Democratic heritage? Twenty years ago Cuba almost succeeded

in undermining democracy in Venezuela even before it had a chance to get off the ground. Venezuelans are aware that Castro's terrorist campaign almost scuttled their chance for Western-style Democracy -- something they'd struggled so long to obtain. With a little help from God and the United States of America, the Venezuelan military did not intervene. That would have played into the hands of the terrorists and resulted in civil war.

In Spain terrorism increased after Franco's death. The attempted military coup earlier this year is an example of the knee-jerk reaction terrorists try to provoke. Luckily for Spain, King Juan Carlos is a leader with courage and character. He beat back the coup and continues to oppose terrorism vigorously. That is why the Reagan Administration has unequivocally stood behind King Juan Carlos and the Democratic forces in Spain.

Contemporary terrorism appears to be emulating an Algerian role model. In Algeria the French mistook the terrorism of a small group for an insurrection. French retaliation against the Moslem population resulted in popular revolt.

Most terrorists seek popular revolt because they are convinced it will eventually lead to Marxist-Leninist dictatorship -- and that is their true goal.

Even groups based on territorial or nationalistic claims are often little more than communist revolutionaries

coopting national sentiment to lay the foundation for a new Marxist-Leninist dictatorship.

In Northern Ireland, for example, the IRA conducts a reign of terror in the name of uniting North and South, but the long-range goal of the IRA is not just a united Ireland. Bernadette Devlin, it should be noted, says the struggle in Northern Ireland is "an integral part of the international working-class movement." Now what does that mean? To make it clear, listen to the words of IRAer, Michael Farrell. "Victory in the north," he states, "means not just defeat of the Loyalists" -- that's the Protestants -- "and the unity of Ireland, but also the collapse of the government in the south and an anti-imperialist revolution in that country."

To claim that these people are Catholics is a cruel joke. These are not even Irishmen at heart.

This terrorism is insidious, does not happen in a vacuum. Earlier this year Secretary of State Haig testified that Communist states, especially the Soviet Union, "bear a large measure of responsibility of international terrorism." There is a mountain of evidence to back him up. At the very least, international terrorism as we know it could not function without the support -- the aid and comfort -- given by the Soviet Union.

First, a large number of terrorists have been trained by the Soviets. The infamous "Carlos," for instance, was educated at Patrice Lumumba University in Moscow. Shortly

after leaving, his terrorism career began. You can bet he learned more about explosives than literature at ole Lamumba U.

Terrorism schools in Soviet puppet states grind out terrorist soldiers who create havoc all over the Western world. Czechoslovakia has such a terrorist school. It is under the direct supervision of the KGB, and according to a senior Czech defector, at least 13 of the senior members of Italy's Red Brigade were trained there -- including the men who murdered Aldo Moro.

Cuba is a notorious training and staging area for terrorists. This point was reconfirmed earlier this year when a band of terrorists were caught crossing into Columbia. They admitted being trained and equipped in Cuba. Importantly, Nestor Garcia, a high ranking Cuban intelligence officer who recently defected, says that the Soviet KGB has completely controlled and financed Cuban intelligence since 1969. The terrorist training, then, is at least condoned, and perhaps bankrolled by the Soviets. This is true of Czechoslovakia, Cuba, South Yemen and Libya. This Soviet involvement seems to be part of an overall international strategy.

If you are missing my point, I'll spell it out: Much of the terrorism experienced in the Western Democracies is, as Secretary Haig says, the responsibility of the Soviet Union. And it goes beyond training.

Soviet arms are being funneled to terrorists through Cuba, Libya, and other puppet states. In 1973 the Irish Navy seized the S.S. Claudia. It was crammed with Soviet weapons on the way to the IRA via Libya. Similarly, in 1971 the Dutch intercepted a shipment of weapons from Prague destined for Irish terrorists. At the same time, in the Western Hemisphere, Cuban support for terrorists goes unabated.

Worse yet, there is ample evidence that Soviet puppet states offer refuge for international terrorists. They are not, as some would have us believe, holed up in some dark little inner city apartment. Carlos has been reported to be living a lavish life in Libya. Giangiacomo Feltrinelli, an Italian terrorist, was blown apart trying to attach a bomb to power lines outside of Milan. A police investigation revealed that he had made 22 visits to Czechoslovakia under a false name; does anyone really believe he took all those trips to Czechoslovakia as a tourist?

In our own country radical leftists were helped along by Cuban Intelligence, which, as I've already said, is totally controlled and bankrolled by the Soviet KGB. Two examples of this: In the early 1960's Progressive Labor Party, which labels itself a revolutionary Marxist Party, sent some of its leaders to Cuba. One of them, Philip Abbott Luce, says he came back with a pocket full of cash to help him in his "revolutionary" activities -- activities that included teaching ghetto blacks how to make Molotov

cocktails. More recently, defectors from the Weather Underground indicate the Cuban Embassy in Canada served as a communication liaison when they were on the run.

All of this is obviously happening with full knowledge, if not at the direction of the Soviet government. Soviet motives deserve scrutiny.

One should never forget that the Soviets still have an ideological commitment to the communist philosophy -- a philosophy tied to the concept of violent revolution and dictatorship. Their system -- without profit motive or religion -- is, in fact, so dull and unproductive that support of revolutionaries is one of the few things that gives meaning to their system. But ideology is surely not the only motive. A primary consideration for Soviets is and always has been their own national defense. They surely perceive terrorism as a cheap method of destabilizing the West, which in turn has positive security implications for their own military posture vis-a-vis the West. If so, it certainly is a cheap method of defense as compared the the enormous cost of today's modern weapons systems.

The question remains of what we can do, and what we are doing, to meet this challenge. Obviously, there is not a simple answer; however, the following are some things that can make and will make a difference.

1. First the foremost, America must never turn to repression to combat terrorism. Some nations in Latin

America retorted to brutality, repression and torture to combat terrorism. Doing so, they destroyed their own freedom and created societies that are a little better than those behind the Iron Curtain.

2. The alternative to repression is intelligence. The Reagan Administration is dedicated to rebuilding America's badly damaged intelligence system. We are moving to eliminate unwarranted restrictions placed on those who provide the information necessary to combat terrorism and protect our citizens from this threat.

3. We must continue to call the Soviets to task for their support of international terrorism. Secretary Haig has continued his leadership role in this area. If relations between our nations are to improve the Soviets must agree -- at least privately -- to pull back from their support of international terrorism.

Some people call this linkage. Well that's what it is. It doesn't preclude any cooperation without an agreement on terrorism, but it suggests that relations will be better and agreements more substantial if the Soviets are acting in a civilized way.

4. The Reagan Administration also intends to strictly enforce current law and support any further legislation needed to prevent Americans from aiding terrorist groups. Whether it's financial support for the IRA from Irish Americans

or the contracting of experts to help Libya -- this sort of thing has to stop.

5. We are committed to work even more closely with our allies to combat this international problem. Cleaning up our intelligence mess will help because some of our allies hesitate to work with us for fear of restrictions and leaks.

6. Number six is not so easy. The handling of some terrorist events by the media has been disturbing. Los Angeles Police Chief Darrell Gates at a recent meeting of the International Association of Police Chiefs complained of hostage or terrorist incidents, "It becomes instant drama -- a live show, even entertainment." The news media in these situations must remember what the word "responsibility" means. We do not advocate legal restrictions, but terrorists must know that taking hostages will not insure publicity for their cause. This will require much more voluntary cooperation between authorities and the news media.

7. We must take a close look at the punishment of those convicted of terrorism. Imprisoning terrorists won't work. It leads to further violence during attempts to free jailed gang members. It was just this sort of thing that led the Baader-Meinhof gang to murder Hanns-Martin Schleyer. It also encourages several hijackings in Europe. Terrorists who cause the death of innocent people, even if by accident, should face the death penalty; punishment should be swift and certain.



8. The United States and each of its allies must protect its diplomats and embassies and maintain the special military capability needed to handle any terrorist threat. The Reagan Administration is fully committed to this. As Libyan pilots in the Gulf of Sidra found out, the United States is not afraid to exercise force when necessary to protect the lives and freedom of American citizens. In a speech to West Point's graduating class, President Reagan proclaimed America's era of self-doubt is over -- and it is.

9. Any nation directly aiding terrorists should be diplomatically, economically isolated until such behavior ceases. The first steps toward this have been taken by private airlines who now refuse to fly nations that harbor hijackers. For this reason, earlier this year the U.S. Government gave the boot to the few Libyan diplomats remaining in this country since the cessation of diplomatic relations.

10. Finally, the terrorism that confronts the Western Democracies must be recognized for what it is: a totalitarian threat to freedom. Terrorists are no better than Nazis or fascists. Simply because they do not wear uniforms and march in a row does not make them any less totalitarian. The free people of the world must commit themselves to winning the battle against terrorism, just as they committed themselves in the battle against tyranny a generation ago.

The Reagan Administration is committed to maintain the security and freedom of the people of the United States, and

we need your support in this effort. When President Reagan welcomed home the hostages only a few days after his inauguration, he promised "swift and effective retribution" for acts of terrorism. I support that stance with all my heart because, as an American, I know we must have courage to meet this challenge. Those engaged in terrorism do not respect reason; they do not respect sincerity. But I can tell you with Ronald Reagan as President they will respect the United States. We are confident that we will prevail over the threat of terrorism, just as Americans have triumphed over threats to our freedom in the past. We will do it because it is our responsibility to do it. We owe it to those who came before us. We owe it to the next generation of Americans.

Thank you for having me with you today.

(Rohrabacher)  
December 2, 1981

ED HICKEY: SPEECH ON TERRORISM

Since the late 1960's Western nations have increasingly suffered from acts of political terrorism. By the early 1970's a clear pattern of international terrorism was developing -- a pattern that continues to this day.

If the late 1960's and early 1970's are remembered as years of protest, the 1980's, unless we come to grips with this very real problem, could well be remembered as a decade of terror.

The first year of the decade, 1980, was a record year for international terrorism. State Department figures show there were 760 international terrorist acts, which resulted in more casualties than in any year since the U.S. Government began keeping statistics on the subject. Last year, 642 people were killed in international terrorist acts; 1,078 were wounded. Ten Americans were among the dead; 94 Americans were among the injured.

Recent statistics suggest a frightening trend. Death and injury resulting from terrorist violence is up and much of it is directed against Americans. Of the 760 acts in 1980, 278, or 38 percent, were directed against Americans or American property. In 1981 the high level of terrorist activity continued.

Terrorism is something that everyone seems to be against, yet few can define. So perhaps we should start with a

definition. It evolved from the Latin word "terror", which means to frighten. For our purposes today, we will define terrorism as the use of violence or destructive force to frighten a government or population in order to achieve "political ends."

While domestic political violence is a problem faced by many countries, the threat of international terrorism is a matter of extreme gravity for all non-communist nations -- especially those within the Western alliance.

I am not talking about insurrection -- our focus is international terrorism. It should not be confused with insurrection; if it were the same, all those who fight oppression would be labeled as terrorists. One of the more damaging cliches currently making the rounds is that "One man's terrorist is another's Freedom Fighter." This absurd notion compares the Red Brigade and the Symbionese Liberation Army with Afghan Freedom Fighters and heroes of the American Revolution.

Anyone who compares George Washington to the Weather Underground just isn't playing with a full deck of cards. The radical chic notwithstanding, there is no basis for comparing terrorist to those who have fought for freedom. The principle targets of terrorists are innocent civilians or unarmed officials who are killed in order to terrorize populations or goad the government into unwarranted repression.

Does this description match the Afghan Freedom Fighters who battle Soviet tanks or the patriots of the American Revolution? George Washington, as it will be recalled, met the British army head on. Furthermore, when guerrilla tactics were used, it was against British troops and other combatants. This is a far cry from terrorists who bomb and kidnap unarmed civilians and plot the assassinations of political opponents.

One of the grossest image distortions of recent years is the portrayal of terrorists as Robin Hoods and romantic swashbucklers. In reality, a terrorist is a ghoul -- an individual inflicting death and destruction from hiding on unarmed opponents. Placing a bomb in the rest room of a bank or shooting down a school superintendent takes no courage. Instead these are the dishonorable of acts of cowards who smugly hide and watch their destruction from a distance rather than facing the enemy. These are the acts of defective personalities who see themselves as messianic saviors of mankind, yet don't have the character to compete for influence democratically.

The romanticization of terrorism is no surprise, however. Terrorism in the Western democracies sprang from the protest era of the late 1960's, which itself was romanticized by the media. During that era, leftist marauders were glamorized and idealized by a news media which never mentioned the totalitarian philosophy which served as the underpinning of

many radical activist organizations. It was as if the police were Nazis repressing peace demonstrations because they were inclined toward war. The police, in reality, were often coping with organized groups who considered themselves revolutionaries, seeking violence and confrontation and hiding amidst a crowd of peace marchers.

As protest marches faded it was a small step for the wilder members of the violent Students for a Democratic Society to become bombers for the Radical Weather Underground. In Europe, Germany's Baader-Meinhof gang and Italy's Red Brigades seem to have come from the same "New Left" roots.

They were formed around a nucleus of young people who were radicalized by the street violence and university Marxism of the late 1960's. Unlike their counterparts in the United States, they have been highly successful in kidnapping and assassination. The Red Brigades popularized the term "knee-capping" -- which is nothing more than crippling innocent victims by shooting them in the legs. Their most dastardly act was the kidnapping and murder of Aldo Moro, a man who headed the Christian Democratic Party and would likely have been the Italian Prime Minister except for the intervention of these fanatics.

Similarly, Germany's Baader-Meinhof gang conducted a war of terror which took the lives of innocent Germans for over half a decade. One of the most famous of their crimes was the brutal slaying of industrialist Hanns-Martin Schleyer

in 1977. Recently the remnants of this gang have been attacking American military personal.

What kind of people are these terrorists? They are, generally, individuals who have never worked at a regular job, yet constantly talk about representing the working people. Sounds familiar; doesn't it? Far from being workers, terrorists, especially those in America, are often from affluent families. One study by the German government revealed that 36 percent of those arrested in connection with terrorist organizations in the 1970's were college graduates from the upper income levels of German society.

In the United States, Kathy Boudin, who was recently arrested for alleged terrorist activities, comes from a wealthy family as did several other prominent members of the Weather Underground. Many in her particular clique, it should be noted, began as a protest group on Columbia University -- hardly a working class school.

Unfortunately, the escapades of these Mercedes-Benz revolutionaries have left a road littered with maimed bodies. Their last bit of alleged activism -- the Brinks armored car robbery -- left three men dead . . . working people with families, with children who will no longer have a father to help them along in life.

Another revealing aspect of the personality profile of alleged terrorists is the political background of their family. Many are not only from wealthy homes, but also from

families whose politics are ultra left. Kathy Boudin's father is a wealthy lawyer well known for his defense of left wing radicals.

Similarly, the world's most wanted terrorist, known as Carlos, comes from a wealthy Venezuelan family. His father is so far to the left that he named all of his children after Illich Vladimir Lenin. Carlos's real name is Illich Ramirez Sanchez.

It appears that these revolutionaries are not revolting at all. Instead they are dedicated to fulfilling long-held and deeply-rooted aspirations. This, by the way, is in stark contrast to suggestions that these are psychopaths who are revolting against all authority. These are not anarchists.

Not all terrorist organizations, however, evolved from student activism. The Irish Republican Army, the Palestine Liberation Organization, the Puerto Rican FALN and the Basque ETA all started with some territorial or nationalistic claim; all have bloody histories. The ETA, alone, in the past 13 years has killed more than 350 carefully chosen victims. The bloodletting of the IRA and the PLO is infamous.

And what is it that these and other terrorist organizations really want? Why do these individuals, among millions of their fellow citizens feel justified in conducting campaigns of murder, destruction and kidnapping.

Much can be said of their motives, but one thing is certain, contrary to their image these groups -- especially



the former student activists -- are not democratically-minded reformers faced with the stone wall of authoritarianism.

The Puerto Rican separatists, for example, are not facing the fist of the United States. Instead, they are primarily thwarted by the will of the people of Puerto Rico. Only a miniscule number of Puerto Ricans want independence, they turn it down by huge majorities every time it is voted upon, just as they reject political parties dedicated to independence.

Italy, on the other hand, may be less than perfect, but it is still a relatively free society. Yet terrorism in Europe's boot has been rampant. And those singled out by Italy's terrorists are not the fascists or raving monarchists. The Red Brigaders kidnap and murder Democratic moderates like Aldo Moro.

The infamous Carlos comes from Venezuela -- one of the freest and most prosperous nations in the Western Hemisphere.

No. Today's terrorism is not a case of individuals struggling against tyranny. The plague of terrorism now sweeping the West is far more insidious than that.

All too often the ideology of terrorists is ignored, just as it was of the New Left in the late 1960's. A close examination reveals most of these groups are dedicated to some form of revolutionary communist ideology, a significant yet largely unassimilated fact.

Terrorists, far from being revolutionaries fighting for freedom, are actually totalitarian soldiers trying to destroy liberty. They, clearly, seek more repression. Let me repeat that: Terrorists want the governments they oppose to become more repressive.

Repression, the terrorist calculates, turns idealists into violent revolutionaries. It also can be manipulated to radicalize a specific segment of society -- a minority group, young people, farmers or whoever is most susceptible.

The last thing terrorists want are free elections and civil liberties where ideas compete in a political arena. That is not the type of society they desire. Nor are they simply opposed to all state power as the anarchist as of the last century. Instead, they are Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries, seeking dictatorship of the proletariat; until this is recognized, terrorism will continue to plague the Western Democracies.

Demonstrating this all important fact is not difficult. Why does the Puerto Rican FALN conduct bombings in the United States? The answer is simple: Their goal is to provoke Government retaliation upon the citizens of Puerto Rico, thus radicalizing them and turning them into leftist cannon fodder. To our credit and in testimony to the strength of our democracy there has been no such retaliation.

But what happens in nations without such a strong Democratic heritage? Twenty years ago Cuba almost succeeded

in undermining democracy in Venezuela even before it had a chance to get off the ground. Venezuelans are aware that Castro's terrorist campaign almost scuttled their chance for Western-style Democracy -- something they'd struggled so long to obtain. With a little help from God and the United States of America, the Venezuelan military did not intervene. That would have played into the hands of the terrorists and resulted in civil war.

In Spain terrorism increased after Franco's death. The attempted military coup earlier this year is an example of the knee-jerk reaction terrorists try to provoke. Luckily for Spain, King Juan Carlos is a leader with courage and character. He beat back the coup and continues to oppose terrorism vigorously. That is why the Reagan Administration has unequivocally stood behind King Juan Carlos and the Democratic forces in Spain.

Contemporary terrorism appears to be emulating an Algerian role model. In Algeria the French mistook the terrorism of a small group for an insurrection. French retaliation against the Moslem population resulted in popular revolt.

Most terrorists seek popular revolt because they are convinced it will eventually lead to Marxist-Leninist dictatorship -- and that is their true goal.

Even groups based on territorial or nationalistic claims are often little more than communist revolutionaries

coopting national sentiment to lay the foundation for a new Marxist-Leninist dictatorship.

In Northern Ireland, for example, the IRA conducts a reign of terror in the name of uniting North and South, but the long-range goal of the IRA is not just a united Ireland. Bernadette Devlin, it should be noted, says the struggle in Northern Ireland is "an integral part of the international working-class movement." Now what does that mean? To make it clear, listen to the words of IRAer, Michael Farrell. "Victory in the north," he states, "means not just defeat of the Loyalists" -- that's the Protestants -- "and the unity of Ireland, but also the collapse of the government in the south and an anti-imperialist revolution in that country."

To claim that these people are Catholics is a cruel joke. These are not even Irishmen at heart.

This terrorism is insidious, does not happen in a vacuum. Earlier this year Secretary of State Haig testified that Communist states, especially the Soviet Union, "bear a large measure of responsibility of international terrorism." There is a mountain of evidence to back him up. At the very least, international terrorism as we know it could not function without the support -- the aid and comfort -- given by the Soviet Union.

First, a large number of terrorists have been trained by the Soviets. The infamous "Carlos," for instance, was educated at Patrice Lumumba University in Moscow. Shortly

after leaving, his terrorism career began. You can bet he learned more about explosives than literature at ole Lamumba U.

Terrorism schools in Soviet puppet states grind out terrorist soldiers who create havoc all over the Western world. Czechoslovakia has such a terrorist school. It is under the direct supervision of the KGB, and according to a senior Czech defector, at least 13 of the senior members of Italy's Red Brigade were trained there -- including the men who murdered Aldo Moro.

Cuba is a notorious training and staging area for terrorists. This point was reconfirmed earlier this year when a band of terrorists were caught crossing into Columbia. They admitted being trained and equipped in Cuba. Importantly, Nestor Garcia, a high ranking Cuban intelligence officer who recently defected, says that the Soviet KGB has completely controlled and financed Cuban intelligence since 1969. The terrorist training, then, is at least condoned, and perhaps bankrolled by the Soviets. This is true of Czechoslovakia, Cuba, South Yemen and Libya. This Soviet involvement seems to be part of an overall international strategy.

If you are missing my point, I'll spell it out: Much of the terrorism experienced in the Western Democracies is, as Secretary Haig says, the responsibility of the Soviet Union. And it goes beyond training.

Soviet arms are being funneled to terrorists through Cuba, Libya, and other puppet states. In 1973 the Irish Navy seized the S.S. Claudia. It was crammed with Soviet weapons on the way to the IRA via Libya. Similarly, in 1971 the Dutch intercepted a shipment of weapons from Prague destined for Irish terrorists. At the same time, in the Western Hemisphere, Cuban support for terrorists goes unabated.

Worse yet, there is ample evidence that Soviet puppet states offer refuge for international terrorists. They are not, as some would have us believe, holed up in some dark little inner city apartment. Carlos has been reported to be living a lavish life in Libya. Giangiacomo Feltrinelli, an Italian terrorist, was blown apart trying to attach a bomb to power lines outside of Milan. A police investigation revealed that he had made 22 visits to Czechoslovakia under a false name; does anyone really believe he took all those trips to Czechoslovakia as a tourist?

In our own country radical leftists were helped along by Cuban Intelligence, which, as I've already said, is totally controlled and bankrolled by the Soviet KGB. Two examples of this: In the early 1960's Progressive Labor Party, which labels itself a revolutionary Marxist Party, sent some of its leaders to Cuba. One of them, Philip Abbott Luce, says he came back with a pocket full of cash to help him in his "revolutionary" activities -- activities that included teaching ghetto blacks how to make Molotov

cocktails. More recently, defectors from the Weather Underground indicate the Cuban Embassy in Canada served as a communication liaison when they were on the run.

All of this is obviously happening with full knowledge, if not at the direction of the Soviet government. Soviet motives deserve scrutiny.

One should never forget that the Soviets still have an ideological commitment to the communist philosophy -- a philosophy tied to the concept of violent revolution and dictatorship. Their system -- without profit motive or religion -- is, in fact, so dull and unproductive that support of revolutionaries is one of the few things that gives meaning to their system. But ideology is surely not the only motive. A primary consideration for Soviets is and always has been their own national defense. They surely perceive terrorism as a cheap method of destabilizing the West, which in turn has positive security implications for their own military posture vis-a-vis the West. If so, it certainly is a cheap method of defense as compared the the enormous cost of today's modern weapons systems.

The question remains of what we can do, and what we are doing, to meet this challenge. Obviously, there is not a simple answer; however, the following are some things that can make and will make a difference.

1. First the foremost, America must never turn to repression to combat terrorism. Some nations in Latin

America retorted to brutality, repression and torture to combat terrorism. Doing so, they destroyed their own freedom and created societies that are a little better than those behind the Iron Curtain.

2. The alternative to repression is intelligence. The Reagan Administration is dedicated to rebuilding America's badly damaged intelligence system. We are moving to eliminate unwarranted restrictions placed on those who provide the information necessary to combat terrorism and protect our citizens from this threat.

3. We must continue to call the Soviets to task for their support of international terrorism. Secretary Haig has continued his leadership role in this area. If relations between our nations are to improve the Soviets must agree -- at least privately -- to pull back from their support of international terrorism.

Some people call this linkage. Well that's what it is. It doesn't preclude any cooperation without an agreement on terrorism, but it suggests that relations will be better and agreements more substantial if the Soviets are acting in a civilized way.

4. The Reagan Administration also intends to strictly enforce current law and support any further legislation needed to prevent Americans from aiding terrorist groups. Whether it's financial support for the IRA from Irish Americans



or the contracting of experts to help Libya -- this sort of thing has to stop.

5. We are committed to work even more closely with our allies to combat this international problem. Cleaning up our intelligence mess will help because some of our allies hesitate to work with us for fear of restrictions and leaks.

6. Number six is not so easy. The handling of some terrorist events by the media has been disturbing. Los Angeles Police Chief Darrell Gates at a recent meeting of the International Association of Police Chiefs complained of hostage or terrorist incidents, "It becomes instant drama -- a live show, even entertainment." The news media in these situations must remember what the word "responsibility" means. We do not advocate legal restrictions, but terrorists must know that taking hostages will not insure publicity for their cause. This will require much more voluntary cooperation between authorities and the news media.

7. We must take a close look at the punishment of those convicted of terrorism. Imprisoning terrorists won't work. It leads to further violence during attempts to free jailed gang members. It was just this sort of thing that led the Baader-Meinhof gang to murder Hanns-Martin Schleyer. It also encourages several hijackings in Europe. Terrorists who cause the death of innocent people, even if by accident, should face the death penalty; punishment should be swift and certain.

8. The United States and each of its allies must protect its diplomats and embassies and maintain the special military capability needed to handle any terrorist threat. The Reagan Administration is fully committed to this. As Libyan pilots in the Gulf of Sidra found out, the United States is not afraid to exercise force when necessary to protect the lives and freedom of American citizens. In a speech to West Point's graduating class, President Reagan proclaimed America's era of self-doubt is over -- and it is.

9. Any nation directly aiding terrorists should be diplomatically, economically isolated until such behavior ceases. The first steps toward this have been taken by private airlines who now refuse to fly nations that harbor hijackers. For this reason, earlier this year the U.S. Government gave the boot to the few Libyan diplomats remaining in this country since the cessation of diplomatic relations.

10. Finally, the terrorism that confronts the Western Democracies must be recognized for what it is: a totalitarian threat to freedom. Terrorists are no better than Nazis or fascists. Simply because they do not wear uniforms and march in a row does not make them any less totalitarian. The free people of the world must commit themselves to winning the battle against terrorism, just as they committed themselves in the battle against tyranny a generation ago.

The Reagan Administration is committed to maintain the security and freedom of the people of the United States, and

we need your support in this effort. When President Reagan welcomed home the hostages only a few days after his inauguration, he promised "swift and effective retribution" for acts of terrorism. I support that stance with all my heart because, as an American, I know we must have courage to meet this challenge. Those engaged in terrorism do not respect reason; they do not respect sincerity. But I can tell you with Ronald Reagan as President they will respect the United States. We are confident that we will prevail over the threat of terrorism, just as Americans have triumphed over threats to our freedom in the past. We will do it because it is our responsibility to do it. We owe it to those who came before us. We owe it to the next generation of Americans.

Thank you for having me with you today.