

that “there are many questions around this conference, for which we hope answers will be given soon.” The statement by Mubarak came one day after British Foreign Minister Malcolm Rifkind had said that Britain will not stop the Revival Conference, as long as it does not violate the laws of the United Kingdom. (Rifkind, who was visiting Pakistan late last month, told reporters there that his government will not extradite the leader of the Sindhi separatist, terrorist group Mohajir Qaum Movement, Altaf Husain.)

Meanwhile, Egyptian Deputy Foreign Minister Nihad Abdul Latif summoned the British Chargé d’Affaires Richard Macbeth, to express to him Egypt’s deep concern, and demanded information and precise details about the nature of the planned conference. Abdul Latif handed Macbeth a letter from Foreign Minister Amre Mousa, addressed to Rifkind. An Arabic daily, *Al-Hayat*, quoted Egyptian officials, who excoriated Britain’s allowing the Revival Conference to be organized as a “double standard policy” and “support for international terrorism.” One official stressed, “There should be a clear distinction between terrorists and real political refugees,” adding, “the asylum law in Britain has provided a safe haven for terrorists.”

International outcry

While the attacks by Egyptian political figures against Britain’s role have become more and more precise, they were joined on Aug. 31 by the Italian daily *Avvenire*, which is connected to Italy’s Catholic Bishops Conference. *Avvenire* is the first Western news medium, outside of *EIR*, to expose the London terrorist gathering in these terms. The article, headlined “London Protects Terrorists,” reported statements from the Egyptian and Algerian governments, whose countries “have since long engaged a hard confrontation with integralists. So much so, because less than two years ago, from the same meeting in London, fundamentalist leaders called for overthrowing moderate Islamic regimes, accused of being corrupt and enslaved to the West—a call which was not left unanswered. ‘The leaders of the terrorist movement will participate in the meeting,’ was the angry statement from a spokesman of the Algerian Foreign Ministry.”

British authorities, *Avvenire* reported, “do not seem intent upon forbidding the demonstration. This behavior reinforces the feeling shared by many observers, according to whom the British capital is becoming—thanks to its traditional hospitality and liberality—a refuge for dangerous Islamic terrorists.”

Other international protests came from Algeria’s main opposition party, the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS); the Muslim Brotherhood of Egypt; the moderate faction of the Palestinian group Hamas; and Tunisia’s Nahdha Islamic Party, all of which have distanced themselves from the Revival Conference. Spokesmen for these moderate Islamic movements said that they have nothing at all to do with the conference being organized by Al-Muhajirun, a fanatical group led by the Syrian Omar Bakri.

Abdullah Anas, FIS spokesman in Europe, made clear that “there will be no message from the FIS leader Ali Belhaj, who is in prison in Algeria, to be delivered to the participants in the conference.” Al-Muhajirun had listed Belhaj as one of the conference speakers in their pamphlets, in order to tar FIS with the pro-terrorist brush. Kamal Halabawi, the London spokesman for the Muslim Brotherhood of Egypt, remarked that “no moderate Islamic organization was invited to this conference.” He added: “Moderate Islamic groups have methods which are totally different from these of the conference organizers who call for violence. Violence and force have no place in our methods of social and political change.”

Sudan hijacking points to U.K. as terror haven

A debate is breaking out in Britain, in the aftermath of the Aug. 26 hijacking of a Sudan Airlines jet, in which the terror-hijackers demanded that the plane be flown to London, where the hijackers would seek asylum. “It’s our belief that Britain is soft on terrorism,” said Mike Whine of the Board of Deputies of British Jews. “Most of the main Muslim opposition groups are represented in London. We object to the fact that some are plotting activity, some of it aimed against Western and Jewish interests,” he told one British outlet.

Any crackdown on terrorists in Britain was set back when Home Secretary Michael Howard last March failed in a bid to deport Saudi dissident Mohammed al-Masari. On Aug. 29, Howard wrote in the *Daily Telegraph* that terrorists “must not abuse the hospitality of free nations by claiming asylum while they concoct terrorist outrages. . . . We [have] proposed a new international instrument to put beyond doubt the proposition that terrorists and those who plan, fund, or incite terrorism have no right to be considered for asylum.”

The leading spokesman for terrorist protection is Lord Avebury, who has worked with Baroness Caroline Cox and the Christian Solidarity International against Sudan. Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee on Human Rights, Avebury told the press: “I don’t think Britain is being too soft at all. There are lots and lots of people who are refused entrance because of their links to armed opposition movements, for example, the Kurds. People who look at these problems should be careful to distinguish between those who are involved with political problems and those who are occupied with terrorism.” Avebury was a main defender of Masari.