

UN's Kofi Annan okays Brit terrorist haven

by Joseph Brewda

United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan publicly endorsed the British government policy of safehousing international terrorists, at a forum at Princeton University on Nov. 24. By so doing, the secretary general has helped bring into focus the outrageous fraud routinely committed by the UN Security Council, through its sanctions against Iraq, Sudan, Libya, and other states charged with terrorist crimes—sanctions, which in the case of Iraq, have resulted in millions of deaths. Sudan and Iraq, in particular, continue to be high on the list of targets of British-steered military action, carried out under UN cover. But, as Secretary General Annan well knows, the terrorist groups these and other states are charged with protecting, are actually headquartered in Britain.

Annan bows to Blair

Annan made his statement defending British policy toward terrorists during the question session after his address at Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School of Diplomacy, where he spoke on "A Trans-Regional Study of the Contemporary Middle East, North Africa, and Central Asia." *EIR*'s Matt Guice asked Annan to comment on Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak's allegations that "London had harbored terrorists, specifically those who financed the recent tragic terrorist attack in his country." Guice noted that *EIR* has long identified London as the world capital of terror. "In light of the fact that much talk had been spent at the UN regarding putting sanctions on Sudan, for their harboring of one terrorist group," Guice continued, "would you, Mr. Annan, support a move for sanctions against London, for harboring 26 of the 30 terrorist groups banned by the U.S.?" Guice was referring to the U.S. State Department list, released in October, of 30 terrorist groups banned from the United States. *EIR* research confirms that almost all of these groups are headquartered in or financed out of Great Britain.

Annan's illuminating answer was as follows: "We must recognize, that the government of Great Britain has denied these allegations vehemently. The government of Britain is a democratically elected government, unlike some. As a center of democratic government, London has opened its doors to many refugee groups, and made a stipulation that they not engage in political activities, while residing in Britain. If groups have violated this promise, I, knowing Mr. Blair [Britain's prime minister], cannot imagine that he would know-

ingly allow this to go on, without taking action. Finally, if what you meant, were to imply, that Britain, if challenged in the UN, would exercise their veto power in the Security Council on the topic, then I would not know the answer to that."

Unfortunately for Secretary General Annan, the British role in safehousing terrorist organizations is admitted, and is a matter of law. Specifically:

- It is not illegal in Britain to incite, plan, or finance terrorist actions, as long as these actions are carried out outside of Britain.
- No terrorist organization is illegal in Britain, except for those which commit terrorism on British soil.
- No foreigner is denied political refugee status in Britain, based on membership in a terrorist organization, as long as the organization's crimes are committed outside of Britain.

Substitute the name "Sudan" for "Britain" in Annan's response, and ask yourself: Would such an explanation fly before the UN Security Council? And in what other state, besides Britain, is it perfectly legal to plot murder, as long as the target is foreign?

The Luxor bloodbath

Under the cynical cover of its "liberal policy of asylum," Britain is currently slaughtering innocents throughout the world, on behalf of its geopolitical aims. The bloody massacre in Luxor, Egypt, on Nov. 17, which killed over 60 people, is a case in point. The massacre was the work of the Islamic Group, which is headquartered in London.

In the aftermath of the bloodbath, Egyptian President Mubarak demanded on Nov. 23, that Britain stop safehousing the Islamic Group. The head of that group, Adel Yusif al Sirri, who was granted political asylum status by Britain, despite Egyptian protests, took credit for the Luxor slaughter in statements to the British press following the attack. He called it "justified." Al Sirri was convicted and sentenced to death *in absentia* by an Egyptian court in 1995, for an attempt to kill a former Egyptian prime minister. His group is one of the 30 banned from the United States by the State Department. It was responsible for the February 1993 World Trade Center bombing in New York, which killed six and wounded nearly a thousand.

The British Foreign Office formally rejected President Mubarak's demand that they do something about al Sirri and his group, in a statement it released the next day. Whitehall said—contrary to all evidence—that Britain is "strongly committed to taking action against anyone who uses the U.K. as a base for terrorist activities." But there are no indications that Britain will now extradite al Sirri, and his associates, back to Egypt for this most recent atrocity. What would have been the UN Security Council and Secretary General Annan's response, if London resident al Sirri had instead lived in Sudan, Iraq, or some other nation, which the British have targeted for destruction?