

Clinton must impose sanctions against Britain for terrorism

by Joseph Brewda

President Bill Clinton must impose sanctions against Britain because of its harboring of international terrorists, as the bloody shootings in Luxor, Egypt on Nov. 17, which left 62 tourists and other innocent bystanders dead, again reaffirms. The massacre was the work of the Islamic Group, whose leaders have been given political asylum in Britain. The same group was responsible for the 1993 World Trade Center bombing in New York City.

In proclaiming responsibility for the massacre, Islamic Group leader Adel Tawfiq al Sirri, who fields an international terrorist campaign out of his offices in London, told the London Arabic daily *Al Quds al Arabi*, "The attack in Luxor came as a response to the violent practices by the Egyptian government against the Islamists in Egypt." Al Sirri was granted political asylum in Britain, despite his conviction in Egypt for a 1993 assassination attempt against former Egyptian Prime Minister Atif Siddiqi. Al Sirri's London sidekick, Abel Abdel Majid, was convicted for bombing the Egyptian Embassy in Pakistan in 1995, which left 15 dead.

In February 1997, the British government gave the terrorist duo permission to open Islamic Group offices in London. It is from there, that they order massacres in Egypt, according to statements of both the Egyptian government and the Egyptian attorney of the terrorist group.

London's protection of the Islamic Group is hardly the only instance of such hospitality, as *EIR* has reported. At least 22 of the 30 organizations on the U.S. State Department list released on Oct. 8 of terrorist groups banned from the United States (among them the Islamic Group), have London headquarters, or are dependent on British funding and logistical support (see "England's 'Lizard Queen' Is the Mother of International Terrorism," *EIR*, Nov. 28, 1997).

Meanwhile, new attacks are expected. On Nov. 19, the U.S. State Department issued a worldwide warning to U.S. citizens travelling or residing abroad, "to exercise greater than usual caution." It added, "U.S. diplomatic posts worldwide are taking appropriate security precautions."

Of course, the Islamic Group could also strike within the United States, as it did in 1993. In May 1997, the group issued a statement vowing to kill President Clinton and any other

U.S. government employee, if the group's spiritual leader, Sheikh Omar Abdul Rahman, were to die in a U.S. prison, where he is now incarcerated for his role in the World Trade Center bombing.

Mubarak takes leadership

In response to the latest outrage, Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak has courageously taken the initiative, and denounced British protection of these terrorists. At a press conference in Aswan, Egypt on Nov. 23, President Mubarak emphasized, in statements published by the Egyptian government press, that the Luxor murderers "live in Britain, Afghanistan, and other countries, where they plan and finance their crimes. If these states had cooperated in eliminating these criminals, such crimes would not have happened."

"If a terrorist group has committed a crime, we have to find out who is behind them," he told the international press corps. "The terrorists live in England, and in other countries, like Afghanistan. They have committed crimes, and some of them have been sentenced. Despite all that, they are still living on English soil, and raise money, and plan [their actions], together with fugitives in Afghanistan. The whole lot of them are murderers.

"All these terrorist actions would not have happened if European states had not protected these terrorists. The harboring and financing of these terrorists by foreign powers, has helped increase the violence."

Significantly, President Mubarak refused to let Britain off the hook. When one journalist suggested that Sudan, a frequent scapegoat for British crimes, was responsible, Mubarak replied, "No. No. They exist in Europe and Afghanistan. Sudan has changed, and the situation is better there now. But there is a coordination between those who are in England, and those in Afghanistan."

Mubarak also had little use for Western journalists, who put out the tired old line that his government should hold a dialogue with the terrorists, out of so-called humanitarian concerns. "Dialogue with whom?" Mubarak asked. "We tried for 14 to 20 years, and each time we had a dialogue with them, they became stronger. And if these foreign states had not



Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak with President Clinton. In the aftermath of the Luxor shootings, Mubarak charged England with harboring terrorists. The Luxor murderers “live in Britain, Afghanistan, and other countries,” he said, “where they plan and finance their crimes. If these states had cooperated in eliminating these criminals, such crimes would not have happened.”

harbored those who received hard sentences, all this would not have happened!”

Mubarak also angrily responded to British newspaper attacks, which in their typical racist fashion have accused the Egyptian government of provoking the Luxor massacre, through violating the terrorists’ human rights. In the case of the London *Independent*, Mideast correspondent Robert Fisk has gone so far as to say that the massacre was a direct result of Egypt adopting “Washington’s view of eliminating terrorism in Egypt,” which, he said, is simply creating “bigger torture cells” for arrested terrorists.

Referencing such smears, Mubarak exclaimed, “The terrorists who make the plans, and have the money, are living in Europe. And now, the terrorists have killed their children. Therefore, they shouldn’t be attacking us. How long are they going to protect terrorists? If you don’t want your children killed, why do you protect terrorists, and give money to the murderers, who violate human rights; and they will continue to do so, as long as you give them safe haven.”

In an interview with the French daily *Libération* later that day, Mubarak specified just who in the British government is responsible for this terrorist protection. Accusing the British government of “laxity, if not collusion with Islamists who are refugees on British soil,” Mubarak blasted the previous Conservative government of John Major, and British intelligence, for failure to act against the London group. “We contacted John Major and his security services,” Mubarak said. “They found all sorts of excuses.” These excuses revolve around a law which supposedly prevents them from taking effective action against terrorists safehoused there,

such as Islamic Group leader Tawfiq al Sirri, who, Mubarak emphasized, was implicated in the “assassination attempt against the ex-prime minister, Atif Siddiqi.”

“We got nowhere” with the Major government, Mubarak said. “We are now asking the government of Tony Blair to return these men to us. If they have a problem with the law, the law can be changed, to protect people.” He concluded that the British seem to have no desire, to act to protect people.

British run for cover

Such lessons have yet to be learned by Anglophilic Republicans in the U.S. Congress, such as Sen. Al D’Amato (N.Y.), who continue to target the Palestine Liberation Organization, Sudan, Iraq, and other third parties for terrorist sanctions, in order to provide Britain an alibi. Nor has President Mubarak’s statements been covered in the United States to *EIR*’s knowledge, except for an Associated Press wire published in Texas.

But, back in Britain, the Crown is showing nervousness about the exposure of its role, and responding with typical evasion and lies.

On Nov. 24, the day after Mubarak’s speech, the London *Times* published the official government response to Mubarak’s condemnation, in an article entitled “London Is Not Terror Haven, Say Ministers.” The newspaper, which serves as the mouthpiece of the British foreign policy establishment, reported that “the government yesterday denied President Mubarak’s accusation that Britain was a haven for Islamic terrorism. The Foreign Office said that the government unre-

servedly condemned terrorism, and took the threat from Muslim radicals very seriously. 'We are strongly committed to taking action against anyone who uses the U.K. as a base for terrorist activities,' an official said, adding that Britain's record was good compared to other countries."

However, the paper admits some problems, such as the fact that planning overseas terrorist actions is not a crime in Britain. The paper says that the government is trying to deal with this lapse, which an increasing number of governments, such as Egypt's, are complaining about. "The government is urgently seeking ways to tighten the law to prevent Islamic exiles and asylum-seekers from using Britain to promote action against friendly governments. Jack Straw, the Home Secretary, is to begin consultations in January on two specific new laws bringing in a ban on fundraising in Britain for terrorist groups and making it an offense to conspire to plot terrorism overseas."

But, the paper also admits that the proposed legislation will not really deal with the problem. For one thing, the Home Secretary has already reported that the government "would not propose the ban on incitement to terrorism demanded by many foreign governments," because it "would clash with the right to free speech."

"The government is also looking at a proposal to proscribe terrorist organizations," which, the *Times* frankly confesses,

would be a "clear break with past policy." It argues that the reason for the failure to proscribe terrorist organizations, is that "until now, officials have said a blanket ban would only drive extremists underground."

The paper adds that the reason the government is contemplating at least a cosmetic change in the law, is that it is being forced to. "In the past two years," it reports, "Britain has been increasingly embarrassed by the large number of Islamic extremists coming here. Many governments, including those of Egypt, Algeria, Tunisia, Turkey, Bahrain, and Saudi Arabia, have denounced their presence in Britain and called for tighter laws. Unlike almost all other European countries, Britain does not forbid foreign exiles from engaging in politics provided they do not break British law. At present, moreover, the law does not specifically outlaw masterminding terrorist activities overseas."

It adds that "there are at least 15 extremist groups in Britain seeking to overthrow established governments in the Muslim world. They also oppose the Middle East peace process, denounce current rulers and want all secular governments overthrown and Islamic states established."

London's official response to Mubarak's statement makes it clearer than ever, that President Clinton must act, and impose sanctions on Britain, until such time it chooses to join the ranks of civilized nations.

EIR SPECIAL REPORT

The True Story Behind The Fall of the House of Windsor

Reprints of EIR's 1994-1997 groundbreaking exposés

The studies reprinted here are essential combat manuals for the war which must be fought to save civilization, from the financial, economic, and social breakdown crisis brought on by British Imperial dominance of the world economy.

The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor
(Oct. 28, 1994)

The Sun Never Sets on the New British Empire
(May 24, 1996)

Britain's "Invisible" Empire Unleashes the Dogs of War,
(Aug. 22, 1997)

Epilogue: Can the House of Windsor Survive Diana's Death?
(Sept. 12, 1997)

Order from:

EIR News Service

P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390 Order number EIR 97-004 **\$75**

