



# TERROR

## A SPECIAL REPORT

### Systematic Killing For Fun and Profit As Well as Politics

By Mark Ledermann  
Journal Staff Writer

Political theorists, by and large, define terrorism as "the threat or use of force for political purposes by individuals or groups...when such actions are intended to shock or intimidate a target group wider than the immediate victims."

Between 1968 and 1980, more than 3,668 people were killed and more than 7,770 wounded in terrorist attacks throughout the world. In 1980 there were 760 terrorist incidents, and more than 30 per cent resulted in at least one injury-

**"Terrorism is an assault  
on civilization itself . . . lives  
and freedom and the rule of law  
are under attack."**

—more terror casualties than in any year since statistics were begun 13 years ago.

No one and nothing is safe. Terrorists have struck against governments, businesses, women, children, diplomats, and soldiers. But by far the favorite targets of terrorists are Americans and American symbols of power.

Last year alone, almost 40 per cent of all terrorist incidents were directed against Americans, nearly 280 attacks. Diplomats were the most frequent target of terrorists, followed by U.S. businessmen and U.S. companies overseas.

Most of the attacks occurred in Latin America and in the Middle East, but terrorism is by no means limited to these areas. Overall last year, terrorists struck against American targets in 51 countries.

Although terrorists have a wide range of tactics at their disposal—bombing, skyjacking, kidnapping, and death threats—one weapon has emerged as a clear favorite: the bomb. Cheap, easy to manufacture, and all too easy to conceal, more than 45 per cent of all attacks in the past 12 years have been bombings.

Terrorism has existed for 150 years or more, says terrorist expert Dr. J. Bowyer-Bell, Director of the International Analysis Center in Washington, and governments have always used terrorists to further their political goals. In an interview with *The Journal* he noted that "the United States hired pirates in the War of 1812 and called them privateers."

And according to terrorist expert Dr. Yonus Alexander at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, terrorism could even be considered a tool of foreign policy because it is often used as a form of surrogate warfare when traditional war is impractical or too costly. Dr. Alexander, in fact, defines terrorism as a "technical and strategic tool in the struggle for power between nations."

But although terrorism itself hasn't changed, the world in which it operates has. And this has caused new problems to emerge.

Heretofore, the international system was much more flexible than it is today. Events occurring in one part of the globe did not necessarily reverberate throughout the rest of the world. But telecommunications, jet travel, economic interdependence between nations and a host of other factors have transformed the constellation of nations into a more rigid structure. Some scholars use a mirror as an analog—break the mirror at any one place, and the fractures race along in all directions. Nations are thus not only aware of many more events in the world than before, they must react to them more quickly than ever.

The emergence of this type of international system, linked together by television and telecommunications, have made terrorism a potent new force. Professor Tom Snitch, Director of the Foreign Policy Washington Semester at the American University says terrorism threatens the stability of governments by confronting them with a dilemma: If governments *underreact* to terrorists, that is if they fail to take action to stop the violence, and simply hope the problem will go away, it undermines public confidence. But if governments *overreact* and are forced to adopt police state measures to curb violence, they destroy the very thing they are trying to protect. The danger here, Snitch suggests, is that "terrorism begets counter-terrorism."

The State Department takes an even stronger line, arguing terrorism threatens the international system itself, not just its member governments.

"International terrorism is an assault on civilization itself," Richard T. Kennedy, Under Secretary of Management at the State Department told members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last June. "In addition to the

lives and freedom of the innocent, the rights of the individual, democratic institutions, and the rule of law are under attack."

And said another State Department official who asked not to be identified, "Terrorism represents a step backward toward anarchy. It is a return to renaissance Italy without the art."

But who exactly are these terrorists who represent such a bold challenge?

According to Dr. T.W. Adams, a Cyprus expert at the International Analysis Center in Washington, terrorists are a diverse bunch and "kill for profit, principle and pleasure." But by and large, Adams says, most terrorists are "basically extortionists", who enjoy the good life that money brings and are willing to kill for it. For some, terrorism represents "an avenue to get out of dismal circumstances," and he refers to one mock theory suggesting terrorists strike only between Tuesday and Thursday because the weekends are devoted to driving around in expensive sports cars and sipping vintage wines in the company of beautiful women. In this view, terrorism is not much different from organized crime, and many young people are lured to terrorist organizations with the promise of power and wealth, Dr. Adams says.

Others, such as Italian Radical Party Deputy Marco Boato, see terrorism as basically an expression of political frustration. Boato believes terrorism in Italy arose because of a kind of "short-circuit" in the political system, which frustrated the demands of mass movements for social change during the late 1960's and early 1970's.

"These movements and these new social protagonists," Boato writes in the French monthly *Le Monde Diplomatique*, "represented for Italian society an enormous potential to renew a democratic dialogue and popular participation. But these groups collided with a blocked political system, with an institutional barrier more and more rigid and unyielding. The only response which faced them was ideological 'demonization' and judicial criminalization."

The result, Boato says, was political alienation, and "many young people who had at first tried to apply directly mass movements and participation to social struggles, opted for clandestineness. They chose to arm themselves . . . to enter into one or another armed formations already in existence which practiced terrorism, or even to move to famous 'terrorism hot-spots,' in particular, big urban centers."

But most scholars interviewed by *The Journal* believe terrorist action often precedes ideological thought. Adams and Snitch, for example, suggest that many terrorists are little more than bomb throwing hoodlums who seize upon an ideology to rationalize their acts. This "post-hoc rationalization," Adams says, gives the impression of a more coherent terrorist network than actually exists. In fact, he says, there are only a few truly ideological terrorist groups—the main ones being the Irish Republican Army and the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Because of the number of goals and motives associated with terrorist groups—profit, principle, and pleasure—there seems to be little formal cooperation between them. Instead, as with any underground movement, terrorists may know of each other and may meet informally from time to time to discuss tactics and "talk shop."

Boato says "an analysis of terrorist 'confessions' (in Italy) shows that the use of the term 'armed party' is strictly a metaphor: One notes that there actually exists a plurality of armed parties and of different terrorist groups, often in contact with each other, and often in agreement, but who are not, in any case, attached to a single 'brain', to a central headquarters, or to a single 'strategic direction.'"

United States intelligence agencies and the State Department disagree with this assessment and argue that much of the terrorism in the world is coordinated and funded by the Soviet Union and its proxies.

"The Soviets are deeply engaged in the support of revolutionary violence, which is a fundamental element of Leninist ideology," an unclassified Cen-



Sister Carmen Canaveral, right, a crippled Catholic nun, lost her life when hooded terrorists firebombed vehicle, above, in an attack near Antioquia University in Medellin, Colombia. Attack was believed a protest against visit to Colombia by U.S. Vice President George Bush.

UPI Photos



Fifteen died when a terrorist bomb exploded and created this holocaust in a Beirut suburb last October.

### Death in Damascus on A Rainy Sunday Morning

In the forenoon on Sunday, November 29th, a car threaded its way carefully through the narrow streets of Damascus' shopping district, clogged shoulder-to-shoulder with Syrian shoppers and soldiers underterred by the rain that was falling. The driver steered his vehicle past a checkpoint in front of the Azbakiya district cadet corps headquarters and stopped near the barracks. He stepped from the car and walked rapidly away.

Seconds later a TNT bomb planted in the car exploded into a fireball, killing 64 people at once and wounding more than 135 others.

Within minutes army helicopters were shuttling injured men, women and children to hospitals while rescue workers removed dead and dying from the rubble.

By Tuesday night medical authorities announced more than 150 had died. Since then the death toll has gone even higher, although no final total has been made available.

tral Intelligence Agency report says. "In the Middle East, for example, the Soviets sell large quantities of arms to Libya—knowing that Libya is a major supporter of terrorist groups—and they back a number of Palestinian groups that have conducted terrorist operations. In Latin America, Moscow relies heavily on Cuba—which provides guerrilla and terrorist groups with training, arms, sanctuary, and advice—to advance Soviet interests."

The strongest condemnation is reserved for Moammar Khadafy's Libya, and the CIA charges that Libya "is the most prominent state sponsor of and participant in international terrorism."

"... There has been a clear and consistent pattern of Libyan aid to almost every major international terrorist group, from the Provisional Irish Republican Army, to the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine," a CIA report says. And "Libya's support for terrorism includes financing for terrorist operations, weapons procurement and supply, the use of training camps and Libyan advisors for guerrilla training, and the use of Libyan diplomatic facilities abroad as support bases for terrorist operations."

Khadafy has ordered the assassinations of expatriates critical of his regime, and CIA records show 14 attacks by Libyan assassination teams in the United States and Europe, resulting in 11 deaths and one injury. And most recently, Libyan controlled terrorists have been ordered to kill President Reagan.

What can be done to control terrorism? How has the United States responded to the terrorist threat? And is terrorism inevitable?

Most scholars agree there will always be terrorism.

"Terrorism is here to stay," says Dr. Yonus Alexander, of CSIS, who argues many of the problems giving rise to terrorism—the Palestinian question and tensions in Africa over race and nationalism—will remain intractable. And even if one or another problem is solved, says Dr. J. Bowyer-Bell of IAC, the solution itself may prompt another terrorist group to arise. "The problem," Bell says, "is there is no solution."

All that can be done, these experts say, is to adopt a series of steps to make terrorist attacks more difficult to plan and carry out, and to protect potential targets from attack.

One way to achieve the former, some say, is to beef up intelligence agencies so they can provide early warning of terrorist plans. And according to one State Department official who asked not to be identified, the United States has already increased the scope and intensity of its intelligence operations around the world since the Iranian hostage crisis in 1979. The results have so far been encouraging, he says.

The United States has also adopted a "no bargaining" policy to discourage terrorists from seizing Americans hostage. As Undersecretary for Management, Richard T. Kennedy told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in June. "We have publically put terrorists on notice that they can expect no concession from us. We will not pay ransom or release prisoners. We will not bargain for the release of hostages."

But the State Department argues these measures can only be effective if all countries adopt them, and has urged world leaders to denounce nations supporting terrorism.

"Governments such as the Soviet Union, Cuba, and Libya . . . must clearly be told that their behavior is unacceptable in a world seeking peace and prosperity," a State Department spokesman said.

Some governments, particularly in the Third World, are reluctant to subscribe closely to U.S. proposals for fear they would stifle all revolutionary action, Professor Snitch of the American University says. And trying to determine who is a terrorist and who is a "freedom fighter" is one of the most difficult problems to solve, Snitch says, and complicates all international discussions on terrorism.

Many of these proposals have unleashed a storm of controversy when applied domestically. On the one hand, Sen. John East, R-N.C., says that "the threat from terrorism and violence to the fundamental security of our free society is real" and has urged that greater freedom be given to the FBI and the CIA to combat terrorism in the U.S.

And Lewis Giuffrida, Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, an agency chartered to deal with the consequences of national disasters, argues terrorists now have the capabilities of severely damaging vital U.S. sectors. In a speech before the International Chiefs of Police in New Orleans last September, he said a single terrorist attack on any number of "choke points" such as power grids, or water supply facilities could have a domino effect on the U.S. economy, and he urged stronger steps be taken to combat terrorism in the U.S.

One high-level government law enforcement official said that the government has even drawn up contingency plans to manage the consequences of a terrorist-exploded nuclear bomb in America's cities.

How effective these international and domestic measures will be in stemming the tide of terrorism around the world is unclear. But one fact is certain—terrorism represents a profound challenge to democratic governments which must seek to balance demands for security with the freedoms of its people. And that is perhaps the most difficult challenge of all.