

—INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, POLICY, and TREATIES BEYOND the MIDDLE EAST REGION —

AN AGREED FRAMEWORK FOR DIALOGUE WITH NORTH KOREA. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 108th Congress, 1st Session, 6 March 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 51p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.108-51

“Those who speak of containment envision a hermetic seal around North Korea, embargoing imports and interdicting shipments of exports, especially ballistic missiles. But the export we should worry most about is plutonium. After North Korea gets five or six bombs from the fuel rods at Yongbyon, it might reckon that it has enough to sell a few and still have enough left over for itself, to sell to other rogues or to terrorists.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS34698>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS34699> (PDF)

AIRCRAFT HIJACKING CONVENTION. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 92nd Congress, 1st Session, 7 June; 20 July (Executive A Session) 1971. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971. 42p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: AI 7

“The action of the 77 countries represented at the Hague International Convention on Air Law last December in adopting the hijacking convention with no negative vote and only two abstentions is the most dramatic evidence to date of the international community’s deep and general concern with the hijacking problem and its willingness to take prompt and effective international measures to combat this menace to civil aviation.”

ANTI-TERRORISM CONVENTIONS. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 107th Congress, 1st Session, 27 November 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 59p. [Report].

SuDoc# Y 1.1/6: 107-2

“These two anti-terrorism conventions address two specific aspects of terrorist conduct: terrorist bombings and the financing of terrorism. Their objective is to require the United States and other States Parties to criminalize such activities and to

cooperate with each other in extraditing or prosecuting those suspected of such activities.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS16776>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS16777> (PDF)

ANTITERRORISM POLICY AND ARMS EXPORT CONTROLS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Security and Science; Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade; Subcommittee on International Operations. 17 March; 19 April 1988. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988. 129p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AN 8/7

“Basically, H.R. 3651 ... reaffirms this country’s prohibition on exports of munitions to terrorist states and requires more detailed and periodic reporting by the executive branch of certain arms exports. The bill makes fairly little substantive change in existing law ... its focus is strictly on arms exports and on certain goods and technology of military or terrorist value to terrorist states, items already regulated by current law.”

ASIAN RESPONSE TO THE CRISIS IN THE PERSIAN GULF. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. 101st Congress, 2nd Session, 19 September 1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 76p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AS 4/25

“In the weeks since Iraq’s brutal invasion and annexation of its neighbor, Kuwait, there has been considerable discussion in the United States on the issue of burden or responsibility sharing. In many instances, this debate has generated demands that our friends and allies around the world provide greater assistance—political and diplomatic, to be sure, but especially economic and military—to supplement the large American presence in the Gulf. It is worth noting, therefore, that several of our Asian friends have already made concrete contributions to the collective effort to deter Iraqi aggression and restore Kuwait’s independence.”

BALANCING MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN CENTRAL ASIA. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Central Asia and South Caucasus. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 27 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 59p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.107-750

“Prior to September 11, United States policy in the region was largely focused on promoting democratic reform, increasing respect for human rights and encouraging economic growth. Many observers of the region now believe that that agenda is in jeopardy, and are concerned that the United States will hold back from promoting democracy and human rights to avoid friction with the central Asian leaders.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS25858>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS25859> (PDF)

BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION PROTOCOLS: STATUS AND IMPLICATIONS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs, and International Relations. 107th Congress, 1st Session, 10 July 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 93p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: B 52/3

“In the biological convention, BWC, the United States and 158 signatory nations pledge never, in any circumstance, to develop, produce, stockpile or otherwise acquire or retain biological agents or toxins for other than peaceful purposes. But the disclosure of a vast Soviet bioweapons arsenal, continuing efforts by Saddam Hussein to acquire weapons of mass destruction and transnational terrorists’ growing interest in what some call the poor man’s atomic bomb, have amplified demands for more tangible means to monitor, and if necessary, enforce that pledge.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS25532> (PDF)

THE BIOLOGICAL WEAPON CONVENTION: STATUS AND IMPLICATIONS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs, and International Relations. 106th Congress, 2nd Session, 13 September 2000. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 80p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: B 52/2

“To what extent is the BWC verifiable? When the same microbe and the same equipment can be used to make a life saving vaccine one day and a deadly weapon the next, will any protocol prove more than a temporary nuisance to a determined violator? Will the uncertain benefits of a traditional arms control verification system outweigh the certain and substantive burdens on governments and private enterprises conducting legitimate medical research and pharmaceutical production activities.?”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS15735>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS15737> (PDF)

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 105th Congress, 1st Session, 8, 9, 15 & 17 April 1997. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997. 340p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.105-183

Examining the national security implications of this treaty, with testimony from supporters and detractors.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (TREATY DOC. 103021). U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 103rd Congress, 22 March; 13 April; 13 & 17 May; 9 & 23 June 1994. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994. 203p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.103-869

“The Chemical Weapons Convention is both a disarmament and a nonproliferation treaty. It addresses the demand for and the supply of chemical weapons. It requires parties to destroy their chemical weapons and also their production facilities and to open up these former facilities to international inspection. The treaty also prohibits them from transferring chemical weapons to others or assisting any nation in doing something that is prohibited by the Convention. Finally, in the event that chemical weapons are used or threatened to be used against parties, the Convention contains procedures for assistance to those who are endangered or threatened by other countries.”

THE CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION: STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES. U.S. Department of Defense. Frederick J. Vogel. Carlisle, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 1997. 34p. [Online Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.146: 2001037508

“On January 13, 1993, in Paris, 130 countries signed the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) to ban the entire class of chemical weapons. Many of those nations have since ratified it ... Frederick Vogel explores the historical, moral, and legal aspects of chemical warfare, and the strategic implications of the convention, including operational, policy, constitutional, and industrial impact for the United States. He concludes that although ‘imperfect,’ the convention will contribute to U.S. national security.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS12729> (PDF)

<http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi/pubs/1997/chemwpns/chemwpns.pdf> (PDF)

CHINESE ARMS EXPORTS: POLICY, PLAYERS AND PROCESS. U.S. Department of Defense. Evan S. Medeiros and Bates Gill. Carlisle, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 2000. 109p. [Online Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.146: 2001034910

“...Chinese ‘pragmatism’ in its arms export policies can be seen in the diversification of its client list to include ‘non-traditional’ recipients of Chinese military hardware, including recipients with which China did not have formal diplomatic ties, or toward which it had been openly hostile in the past. In the 1960s and early 1970s, China was particularly active in supplying revolutionary governments and movements, especially in Asia and Africa. However, from the mid-1970s, China diversified its recipients to include Israel and Saudi Arabia (neither had diplomatic relations with China at the time), Chile, Iran, Iraq, Myanmar, Oman, Sri Lanka, Syria, Thailand...”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS11796> (PDF)

<http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi/pubs/2000/chinarms/chinarms.pdf> (PDF)

CIA’S USE OF JOURNALISTS AND CLERGY IN INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS. U.S. Congress. Senate. Select Committee on Intelligence. 104th Congress, 2nd Session, 17 July 1996. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996. 42p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/19: S.HRG.104-593

“What public policy ought to be with respect to the issue of the use of journalists or clergy or Peace Corps representatives by the CIA.”

THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY AND NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services. 105th Congress, 2nd Session, 18 March 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998. 66p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/9: S.HRG.105-699

“CTBT [Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty] ratification is critical to our ability to effectively enforce the NPT’s global nonproliferation standards which discourage most states from even considering nuclear weapons programs...”

CONSTITUTIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. Subcommittee on the Constitution, Federalism, and Property Rights. 104th Congress, 2nd Session, 10 September 1996. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997. 110p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/2: S.HRG.104-859

“Examining the Constitutionality of the convention on the prohibition of development, production, stockpiling, and use of chemical weapons and their destruction opened for signature and signed by the United States at Paris on January 13, 1993 (Treaty Doc. 103-21).”

CONVENTION ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS (TREATY DOC. 103-21). U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 104th Congress, 2nd Session, 13, 21 & 28 March, 1996. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996. 185p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.104-668

Detailed testimony in favor of and opposing U.S. Senate ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention. Proponents suggest the U.S. must lead by example and increase the potential international costs to nations that pursue chemical weapons programs. Opponents argue that the treaty’s provisions are not enforceable and that perceived U.S. leadership will make no difference in the decision making of rogue nations.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NON-PROLIFERATION PROGRAMS WITH RUSSIA. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 107th Congress, 1st Session, 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 53p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.107-43

“Rogue nations can now seek to buy or steal what they previously had to produce on their own. They seek ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction from the former Soviet Union as a means to intimidate or terrorize their neighbors and deter the United States. This has led many experts to conclude that the current threat environment is less stable and more dangerous than during the Cold War.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS13779>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS13780> (PDF)

DIPLOMACY AND THE WAR ON TERRORISM. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 108th Congress, 1st Session, 18 March 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 70p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.108-90

“The September 11 attacks jarred our country out of complacency toward foreign threats, but what is still missing from American political discourse is support for the painstaking work of foreign policy, and indispensable role that diplomacy plays in our strategic efforts to win the larger war on terrorism. American embassies and diplomatic personnel are on the front lines of the war on terrorism.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS38751>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS38752> (PDF)

DRAGON ON TERRORISM: ASSESSING CHINA'S TACTICAL GAINS AND STRATEGIC LOSSES POST-SEPTEMBER 11. U.S. Department of Defense. Mohan Malik. October 2002. Carlisle, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 2002. 69p. [Online Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.146: 2003003911

“The U.S.-led War against Terrorism in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks has radically altered the strategic landscape and ushered in new geopolitical alignments in Central, South, and Southeast Asia whose ramifications will be felt for a long time to come. This article argues that no other major power has been as much affected by the geopolitical shifts unleashed by the U.S. counteroffensive as China, which has seen its recent foreign policy gains eroded; its long-term strategic goals compromised by the growing U.S. military presence all around China’s periphery; the role and profile of its Asian rivals—India and Japan—increasing while its new-found strategic partner, Russia, has almost defected to the American camp; Beijing’s much-touted model for multilateral diplomacy—the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO)—sidelined in the face of Washington’s post-September 11 unilateralism; and, above all, China’s carefully-cultivated image as Asia’s only true great power dealt a severe body blow. Ironically, all this has happened as China lined up along with the rest of the international community to condemn terrorism in the strongest possible terms and to declare solidarity with the United States in its hour of need.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS24733> (PDF)

<http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi/pubs/2002/dragon/dragon.pdf> (PDF)

ENGAGING THE HERMIT KINGDOM: U.S. POLICY TOWARD NORTH KOREA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific. 105th Congress, 1st Session, 26 February 1997. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997. 82p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: H 42

U.S.—North Korea relations, food shortages, food assistance initiatives, North Korea-South Korea relations, defections. “North Korea remains perhaps the most volatile, belligerent, and dangerously unstable nation in the world. Pyongyang continues to allocate significant and disproportionate levels of scarce resources to its million-man-plus Army.”

FOREIGN POLICY OVERVIEW AND THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2003 FOREIGN AFFAIRS BUDGET REQUEST. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 5 February 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 79p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.107-299

“Today the Committee on Foreign Relations begins what we hope to be a series of hearings to review American foreign policy in the wake of the attacks on the United States last September. The essential objectives of the hearings are two-fold: to highlight the serious national security challenges facing this country, and to ensure that we are allocating our resources properly to meet those challenges. In other words, to do the job the Congress is supposed to do.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS19419>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS19420> (PDF)

THE FORMULATION OF EFFECTIVE NONPROLIFERATION POLICY. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 106th Congress, 2nd Session, 21, 23, 28 & 30 March 2000. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000. 217p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.106-655

“...the motives and methods of these new trans-national threats are very different from those of traditional nuclear powers. Ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction provide a cost effective deterrent for countries who do not welcome American leadership. Rogue nations, regional powers, and terrorist groups view ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction as a means to intimidate or terrorize their neighbors and to deter the United States.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS7283>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS7284> (PDF)

THE FUTURE OF U.S. ANTITERRORISM POLICY AND MARKUP OF H. RES. 118, TO CONDEMN THE RELEASE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF MALTA OF CONVICTED TERRORIST MOHAMMED ALI REZAQ. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on International Security, International Organizations and Human Rights. 103rd Congress, 1st Session, 12 & 15 March; 13 & 22 July 1993. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993. 288p. [Hearing & Markup].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AN 8/11

“The World Trade Center bombing in New York raises the question in dramatic terms of the vulnerability of the United States to international terrorism. In the past, Americans have had perhaps a false sense of security that we were immune to such despicable acts. The bombing of the World Trade Center brings home to all of us the fact that U.S. policy against terrorism is an issue of utmost and immediate concern to all of us.” Also discusses the release of convicted terrorist Mohammed Ali Rezaq by the Government of Malta.”

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF TERRORIST BOMBINGS AND THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE FINANCING OF TERRORISM. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Subcommittee on Crime. 107th Congress, 1st Session, 14 November 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 57p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/1: 107/46

The intent and provisions of these two treaties, as well as their usefulness in combating the kind of global terrorism exhibited in the September 11 attacks.

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42511> (PDF)

<http://www.house.gov/judiciary/76122.pdf> (PDF)

IMPLICATIONS OF THE U.S.-NORTH KOREA NUCLEAR AGREEMENT. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs. 103rd Congress, 2nd Session, 1 December 1994. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995. 97p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.103-891

“The Agreed Framework of October 21 effectively extends our negotiations with North Korea over its nuclear weapons program into the next century. In the early stages, North Korea has agreed to freeze its entire nuclear program, including construction of its 50 and 200 megawatt reactors and its reprocessing plant, and at a later time to dispose of the spent fuel presently sitting in storage ponds in a ‘safe manner.’”

INDONESIA IN TRANSITION: IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. INTERESTS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on East Asia and the Pacific. 107th Congress, 1st Session, 18 July 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 35p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: IN 2/19

“There is no country in the world of such vital significance to the United States that is less understood than Indonesia. The purpose of our hearing today is to improve that understanding, review the complex challenges confronting Indonesia in its transition from authoritarianism to democracy and assess the implications of recent developments in that vast country for American national interests.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42254> (PDF)

http://wwwa.house.gov/international_relations/107/73978.pdf (PDF)

INTER-AMERICAN CONVENTION AGAINST TERRORISM. Office of the President. (George W. Bush). [U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 12 November 2002.] Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 9p. [Communication from the President].

SuDoc# Y 1.1/4: 107-18

“The Convention provides for regional use of a variety of legal tools that have proven effective against terrorism and transnational crime in recent years. Since fighting terrorist financing has been identified as an essential part of the fight against terrorism, the Convention addresses crucial financial regulatory, as well as criminal law, aspects ... In particular, the Convention mandates the establishment of financial intelligence units for the collection, analysis, and dissemination of terrorist financing information and the establishment and enhancement of channels of communication between law enforcement authorities for secure and rapid exchange of information to improve border and customs control measures to detect and prevent movement of terrorists and terrorist-related materials; and technical cooperation and training programs.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS26193> (PDF)

THE JOINT CONVENTION ON THE SAFETY OF SPENT FUEL MANAGEMENT AND ON THE SAFETY OF RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 108th Congress, 1st Session, 1 April 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 45p. [Executive Report].

SuDoc# Y 1.1/6: 108-5

“The Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management (the Convention) was created to achieve a high level of nuclear safety worldwide. This is to be accomplished through international cooperation and the enhancement of the national security measures of the participating Contracting Parties (the Parties) ... The process is viewed as a

mechanism for contributing to improving worldwide safety measures against potential radiological hazards, so as to protect current and future generations, prevent accidents with radiological consequences, and mitigate effects should such accidents occur. The promotion of stable technical environments and regulatory systems in developing countries will also aid these Parties in developing security measures to prevent the theft of waste material, thus lessening the risk of their possible use in radiological dispersal devices.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS30778>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS30779> (PDF)

NATO AFTER PRAGUE: LEARNING THE LESSONS OF 9/11. U.S. Department of Defense. Michael Ruhle. *Parameters: US Army War College Quarterly*. Vol. 33, No. 2, Summer 2003. Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, 2003. p.89. [Article].

SuDoc# D 101.72: 33/2

“The United States is disappointed with what it sees as only qualified European support for the war on terror, and it scoffs at European military weakness. Many Europeans, in turn, are disappointed about what they perceive as a US fixation on military responses, and they resent the US approach of casually lumping together the war on terror with issues such as weapons of mass destruction or regime change in Iraq.”

Online

<http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/03summer/ruhle.htm>

<http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/03summer/ruhle.pdf> (PDF)

NORTHEAST ASIA AFTER 9/11: REGIONAL TRENDS AND U.S. INTERESTS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on East Asia and the Pacific. 107th Congress, 1st Session, 15 November 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 60p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: AS 4/11

Developments in Northeast Asia after September 11. Looks into strained U.S. relations with North Korea, tension between China and Taiwan, the future of market economics in Mongolia, and how these factors relate to U.S. interests.

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42253> (PDF)

http://wwwa.house.gov/international_relations/107/76190.pdf (PDF)

AN OVERVIEW OF U.S. COUNTERTERRORISM POLICY AND PRESIDENT CLINTON'S DECISION TO GRANT CLEMENCY TO FALN TERRORISTS. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps, Narcotics and Terrorism. 106th Congress, 1st Session, 14 September 1999. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000. 37p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.106-259

“Current U.S. terrorism policy is crystal clear: No concessions to terrorists. In the State Department’s annual publication, Patterns of Global Terrorism 1998, U.S. counterterrorism policy is clearly set forth: ‘First, make no concessions to terrorists and strike no deals. Second, bring terrorists to justice for their crimes.’”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS4456> (PDF)

THE PRESIDENT'S MANAGEMENT AGENDA: RIGHTSIZING THE U.S. PRESENCE ABROAD. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations. 108th Congress, 1st Session, 7 April 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 105p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: M 31/29

“More than a decade after the cold war, 5 years after terrorists targeted our embassies in Africa and 18 months since the attacks of September 11th, we still lack a systematic approach to determine who will be tasked to project U.S. ideals and policies into a more dynamic, more dangerous world. International economic, political, military and cultural alignments are changing rapidly. The size and skill of U.S. diplomatic engagements must change with them.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40565> (PDF)

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN SOUTH ASIA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 18 July 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 34p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: AS 4/13

Discusses murders of Kashmiris by terrorists, current tensions between India and Pakistan, weakness of the newly formed government in Afghanistan, Norwegian sponsored peace talks between Sri Lanka and the Tamil Tigers, hunger and poverty of the citizens of Bangladesh, the arming of Pakistan, Burma, Sri Lanka, and Bangladesh by China, Maoist insurgency in Nepal, and tensions between India and China.

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42990> (PDF)

http://www.house.gov/international_relations/107/80819.pdf (PDF)

A REVIEW OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AT THE END OF THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 106th Congress, 2nd Session, 26 September 2000. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 47p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.106-879

“We have also provided opportunities for tens of thousands of former Soviet weapons scientists—including chemical and biological weapons experts—to participate in peaceful commercial and research ventures at home rather than take their expertise to potentially hostile states.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS10947>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS10948> (PDF)

THE ROLE OF BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENTS IN CONTROLLING THREATS FROM THE PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs. 107th Congress, 1st & 2nd Session, 7 November 2001; 12 February; 29 July 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 489p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/9: S.HRG.107-383

“Nonproliferation must become part of the larger system of homeland defense and the response to terrorism that ... Proliferation regimes can make an important contribution to this by identifying the key WMD-related items that need additional safeguards and by coordinating effective security measures.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS28844> (PDF)

<http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/senate/senate12sh107.html>

THE ROLE OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY IN SUPPORT OF THE ANTI-TERRORISM CAMPAIGN. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 107th Congress, 1st Session, 10 October 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 70p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: D 62/4

Why the United States arouses hatred in many quarters of the world, and why the U.S. Government specifically and U.S. media generally do not adequately counter anti-American sentiment in the foreign press.

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42889> (PDF)

http://www.house.gov/international_relations/107/75634.pdf (PDF)

RUSSIA'S POLICIES TOWARD THE AXIS OF EVIL: MONEY AND GEOPOLITICS IN IRAQ AND IRAN. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 108th Congress, 1st Session, 26 February 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 70p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: R 92/12

“Seen within the larger context of President Putin’s realignment of Russian foreign policy in the direction of greater cooperation with the United States and the West in the aftermath of September 11th, Moscow’s policies toward Iraq and Iran constitute a troubling exception...”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42836> (PDF)

http://www.house.gov/international_relations/108/85339.pdf (PDF)

SOUTHEAST ASIAN PERSPECTIVES ON THE RISE OF CHINA: REGIONAL SECURITY AFTER 9/11. U.S. Department of Defense. Rommel C. Banlaoi. *Parameters: US Army War College Quarterly*. Vol. 33, no. 2, Summer 2003. Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, 2003. p.98. [Article].

SuDoc# D 101.72: 33/2

“While the United States views China as a potential threat to its national security, how do Southeast Asian countries view the rise of China? What are the implications of the growth of China for regional security, especially in the aftermath of 9/11?”

Online

<http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/03summer/banlaoi.htm>

<http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/03summer/banlaoi.pdf> (PDF)

TERRORISM AND US DIPLOMACY. U.S. Department of Defense. Lawrence P. Taylor. *Essays on Strategy III*. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986. p.3-30. [Collection].

SuDoc# D 5.402: ST 8/5/985

“The US government has been slow to respond to international terrorism—attention and resources have been forthcoming in moderate amounts only after a major terrorist incident and have not been sustained. The State Department created its counterterrorism office in 1972, but as late as 1982 had staffed it with only six officers. In *The Terror Network*, Claire Sterling quotes a senior US government official in 1978 as downplaying the threat of terrorism to US foreign policy interests. Indeed, the memoirs of US foreign policy officials of the 1970s reveals slight attention to the issue. Terrorism is treated mainly in the context of specific terrorist acts, with limited awareness of the significance of the patterns of trends, particularly state sponsorship of terrorists.”

TERRORISM, THE FUTURE, AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY. Library of Congress. Raphael F. Perl. 11 April 2003. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2003. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: IB95112

“International terrorism has long been recognized as a foreign and domestic security threat. The tragic events of September 11 in New York, the Washington, D.C. area, and Pennsylvania have dramatically re-energized the nation’s focus and resolve on terrorism. This issue brief examines international terrorist actions and threats and the U.S. policy response. Available policy options range from diplomacy, international cooperation, and constructive engagement to economic sanctions, covert action, physical security enhancement, and military force.”

Online

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/19858.pdf> (PDF)

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD INDONESIA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific. 105th Congress, 1st Session, 5 May 1997. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998. 102p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: IN 2/5

“Indonesia, with a population of over 200 million people, almost certainly will be, if it is not already, the dominant nation in Southeast Asia,” and “Indonesia has done much to preserve peace in Southeast Asia, something very much in the U.S. interest.”

U.S. COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION AND NONPROLIFERATION PROGRAMS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on Europe; Subcommittee on International Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Human Rights. 108th Congress, 1st Session, 8 & 14 May 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 106p. [Joint Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: T 41/2

“In late 1991, as the Cold War was just ending, Congress established a program so that the United States could assist Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan with the safe and secure transportation and disposal of nuclear and other weapons. The program was started after a coup in Moscow and the impending collapse of the Soviet Union raised concerns about the security of the Soviet Union’s nuclear weapons arsenal.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS41935> (PDF)

http://wwwa.house.gov/international_relations/108/87088.PDF (PDF)

U.S. COUNTERTERRORISM POLICY. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on International Security, International Organizations and Human Rights. 103rd Congress, 2nd Session, 1 March 1994. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994. 37p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: C 83/4

“...Iran remains the most dangerous sponsor and the greatest source of concern ... Iran’s surrogate, Hizballah, was responsible for the bombing of the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires in early 1992. Iran opposes the Middle East peace process and it arms and funds rejectionist groups who espouse violence ... Last year, we added Sudan to the terrorism list because it knowingly gives safe haven to a number of international terrorist groups, including the notorious Abu Nidal organization ... Despite new international sanctions, Libya has not complied with U.N. Security Council demands that it surrender the suspects in the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 and cooperate with the French in investigating the bombing of UTA Flight 772 ... Syria continues to support groups which carry out terrorist attacks against its neighbors, Israel and Turkey.”

U.S. COUNTER-TERRORISM POLICY. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. 105th Congress, 2nd Session, 3 September 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1999. 67p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. J 89/2: S.HRG.105-977

“The recent terrorist atrocities at the American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, which took hundreds of innocent lives, including those of 12 Americans, have once again raised the specter of the horror inflicted by cowardly acts of terrorism aimed at the United States and our military and civil servants abroad ... We must provide sufficient resources for our security efforts abroad to protect Americans from another heinous attack.”

U.S. DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS IN THE WAR AGAINST TERRORISM. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 107th Congress, 1st Session, 24 October 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 56p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: D 62/5

Secretary of State Colin Powell testifies regarding U.S. diplomatic efforts to prevent future terrorism around the world, specifically long-term U.S. diplomatic objectives in regions not limited to Afghanistan.

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42887> (PDF)

http://wwwc.house.gov/international_relations/107/75843.pdf (PDF)

U.S. GOVERNMENT POLICIES AND PROGRAMS TO COMBAT TERRORISM. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Armed Services. 106th Congress, 1st Session, 9 March 1999. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000. 49p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. AR 5/3: S.HRG.106-464

“Terrorism is a clear and present danger to our citizens, troops and interests. Terrorists will continue to escalate their attacks in order to call attention to whatever misguided cause they are pursuing. They need to make each event more spectacular—and more horrific—than its predecessor. For the terrorists, the world is a stage upon which they perform their hideous acts. If the terrorists’ objective is to maximize U.S. casualties and sow panic, their next attack might well involve chemical or biological agents.”

U.S. INTERESTS IN THE CENTRAL ASIAN REPUBLICS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific. 105th Congress, 2nd Session, 12 February 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998. 60p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: IN 8/17

“The five countries which make up Central Asia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan, attained their independence in 1991, and have once again captured worldwide attention due to the phenomenal reserves of oil and natural gas located in the region. In their desire for political stability as well as economic independence and prosperity, these nations are anxious to establish relations with the United States.”

U.S. INTERESTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade; Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific. 30 May; 19 June 1996. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997. 195p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: IN 8/15

“America’s military role in Southeast Asia and regional attitudes toward security cooperation with the United States.”

U.S. NATIONAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN THE YEAR 2000 AND BEYOND. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 104th Congress, 1st Session, 13 July 1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997. 35p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.104-600

“There needs to be a concentration of concern about the future security of our nation and the world that we propose to leave to our children and grandchildren. For example, the spread of weapons of mass destruction is of great concern. Can we address the proliferation and use of these weapons? Other issues we must consider include: What role do alliances play in our security? ... What is the most effective way to address human rights abuses and to promote democracy? ... What role, if any, do international institutions, such as the United Nations, play in the post cold-war era? And who will prove to be the great power of the year 2025?”

U.S. POLICY ON TERRORISM IN LIGHT OF THE FALN MEMBERS’ CLEMENCY. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. 106th Congress, 1st Session, 1999. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1999. 14p. [Special Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. AP 6/2: S.HRG.106-228

FALN and Macheteros, indictments, current threat assessment, aggressive enforcement, clemency decision, Sheik Rahman’s conviction, Osama Bin Laden’s indictment, charges against Terry Nichols, inconsistency of pardon with terrorist policy, FALN cooperation with law enforcement, effect on future prosecutions, difference between parole and clemency, impact of clemency on criminal justice.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD NORTH KOREA: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE? U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 107th Congress, 1st Session, 23 May 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 34p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.107-54

“In recent years, upwards of 10 percent of its population perished from starvation and disease, but the North Korean regime is continuing to lavish its funds on its huge and offensively posturing military while watching the distribution of food by foreign humanitarian groups.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS15370>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS15371> (PDF)

U.S. SECURITY CONCERNES IN ASIA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific. 106th Congress, 1st Session, 8 March 2000. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000. 76p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: SE 2/8

“Recent escalation of threatening rhetoric by the People’s Republic of China toward Taiwan, backed by the increased deployment of missiles with what seems to be an overt attempt to again affect the outcome of the upcoming presidential election ... Even more immediately alarming is the threat posed by North Korea’s rapid moves toward the development of long-range ballistic missiles.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS4907>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS4908> (PDF)

U.S. SECURITY POLICY IN ASIA AND THE PACIFIC: RESTRUCTURING AMERICA’S FORWARD DEPLOYMENT. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific. 108th Congress, 1st Session, 26 June 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 71p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: SE 2/11

“In terms of the campaign against terrorism, it appears that regional extremist networks in Southeast Asia are larger, more capable, and more active than was previously believed. Our allies in the Philippines, in particular, are presented with a vexing set of problems in Mindanao and elsewhere in the southern reaches of the country.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS41603> (PDF)

http://wwwa.house.gov/international_relations/108/88000.pdf (PDF)

U.S. SECURITY POLICY TOWARD ROGUE REGIMES. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on International Security, International Organizations and Human Rights. 103rd Congress, 1st Session, 28 July; 14 September 1993. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994. 169p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: SE 2/23

“The ‘Rogue Regimes’ are the international bomb-throwers, countries which are on the periphery of the international system, countries which have little stake in

international order and are seeking through various reprehensible means to disrupt that order. These are the countries that are usually on the U.S. list of state sponsors of terrorism, countries that are under sanctions imposed by the United Nations for irresponsible and unacceptable international behavior ... The most serious threat that is posed by some of these 'Rogue Regimes' is the effort that many have made to acquire nuclear weapons. In the last few months, we have witnessed the deadly seriousness of the threat to international security from the acquisition of nuclear weapons by some of these international renegades."

"WHAT'S NEXT IN THE WAR ON TERRORISM?" U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 14 February 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 13p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.PRT.107-59

"...we must continue to take down al Qaeda cells, and hunt down al Qaeda operatives elsewhere—in Asia, Europe, Africa, here and elsewhere in this Hemisphere. Disruption will be an ongoing enterprise—a priority that will require international intelligence, law enforcement and military cooperation for the foreseeable future. These cells of fanatics will reconstitute themselves. We must treat this as a chronic illness that must be aggressively managed, while never assuming it has been completely cured. Where we can help our friends suppress terrorist threats, we should do so, as we are in the Philippines, Bosnia and elsewhere. We must be careful to distinguish that from suppressing their legitimate opposition. And where we see remnants of al Qaeda and its allies regroup in countries with virtually no governments, it may be necessary to act militarily, balancing genuine security gains against potential allegations that we are assuming the role of world policeman."

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS18448>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS18450> (PDF)