
III. U.S., UN Protect London

British press admits, London is a safe haven

In response to the escalating Egyptian attack on British harboring of international terrorists, the British press has come out into the open, trying to explain away this protection, or implying that it is merely the policy of the current Labour government, and not the policy of the Crown. What follows, typifies the response.

Daily Telegraph, Nov. 19. In a lead editorial entitled "Islam's Fifth Column," the paper writes, "The United Kingdom has, in recent years, become a safe haven for an impressively diverse array of extremist groups, often to the despair of those allied governments imperilled by their activities. These include front organizations for such Islamist terrorists as the Egyptian al-Jamaa al-Islamiyya [Islamic Group] and Jihad groups, the two likeliest perpetrators of the massacre by the Nile; the Palestinian rejectionists of Hamas; and the Algerian GIA. Their quarrels often spill over with lethal effect onto our soil, as exemplified by the assassinations of dissident elements here in London. How has this free society made itself so vulnerable? Part of the answer is to be found in our highly liberal asylum laws."

Daily Telegraph, Nov. 20. "Groups supporting Egypt's Islamic extremists operate openly in London," states an article entitled "Law Allows Dissidents to Plot from British Bases." "Britain is now an international center for Islamic militancy on a huge scale. Islamic groups use London, to support terrorist movements in their homelands. Security chiefs in Israel and France say some terror operations are actually controlled from London. The Algerian and French governments say British-based groups were behind bombs in Paris. The Israelis say Hamas supporters in Britain are helping to orchestrate terrorist attacks, something disputed by British security sources."

Times of London, Nov. 24. "In the past two years Britain has been increasingly embarrassed by the large number of Islamic extremists coming here," writes Michael Binyon, in an article entitled "London Is Not Terror Haven, Say Ministers." He adds: "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."

Observer, Nov. 24. "Millions from Britain for Luxor Killers," is the headline about British responsibility for the Luxor massacre.

State Dept. covers up for British terrorism

The U.S. State Department has consistently covered up for London's role in harboring and deploying international terrorists such as Hamas, the Kurdish Workers Party (PKK), and Islamic Group, in response to questions from *EIR* over the last two years. It has routinely attempted to shift the blame to third parties, such as Iraq, Iran, and Sudan. This State Department behavior is not a result of ignorance. All of the information in this dossier is a matter of public record, largely admitted to by the British government. The following exchanges between *EIR* and State Department officials reflect the Anglophilia in the department:

March 25, 1996, State Department regular press briefing with spokesman Nick Burns.

EIR: Nick, with regard to Hamas, the Israeli government has expressed concern to the British that there has been a considerable amount of financing; to a large extent Hamas has found a safe haven in Great Britain. This is not the first indication of that. The PKK also is operating quite freely because of the nature of British legislation. And the Israelis want them to crack down on this. Has this been also of concern to the United States, and has it been a subject of discussions in the bilateral meetings with Prime Minister Major and the President at Sharm el-Sheikh?

Burns: I would not single out the United Kingdom in determining how we can foreclose terrorist options for Hamas in the future. I wouldn't single out the United Kingdom. I would single out Iran. Iran directly supports Hamas and directly funds Hamas. We know that. And that's undeniable. I'd single out other states in the region which can do more—which can do much more to choke off support for Hamas. I wouldn't single out the United Kingdom for this treatment.

EIR: The Israeli government has.

Burns: All of us—I think the message from Sharm el-Sheikh is that all of us need to combine efforts to fight the suicide terrorism of Hamas and the other terrorist groups in the Middle East.

EIR: Has there been any concern—has this been a subject of discussion with regard to the British on—in terms of specifically . . . ?

Burns: I simply—I simply don't know if this particular subject has been raised diplomatically by the United States with the United Kingdom. But, again, I would argue very strongly that singling out the United Kingdom would be most curious right now. I think we ought to single out Iran and

some of the other states in the region.

May 1, 1997 press conference of Ambassador Philip Wilcox, State Department Coordinator for Counterterrorism, releasing the State Department report, "Pattern of Global Terrorism—1997."

EIR: On Feb. 14, a member of the British Parliament put forward a bill which would have made it illegal for anyone residing in Britain to carry out international terrorism. Right now it is [legal]. This bill was voted out of committee, and didn't even reach the floor of the British Parliament. Has this raised concerns in the States Department, that in Britain, it is actually legal to sponsor terrorism, as long as it is not done in Britain itself?

Wilcox: I am not familiar with that legislative proposal, in the United Kingdom. I do know that the United Kingdom, and the United States, and many other governments have worked closely together, in a common effort against terrorism, and that from our perspective, the policy and laws of the United Kingdom are quite strict. They have had an immediate experience over many years with terrorists attacks from the IRA. There have been terrorists attacks by foreign groups inside of Great Britain, from time to time. So, I believe that the United Kingdom has a very strong and firm policy against terrorism—no question about that whatsoever.

EIR: The fact that legislation was voted out, seems to indicate otherwise. Nine nations have officially filed complaints against Britain for harboring terrorists, for example, the case of Saudi terrorist Al Masari.

Wilcox: The United States has never, has never associated itself with any such complaint.

Dec. 9, 1997, State Department regular press briefing with spokesman James Foley.

EIR: In the aftermath of the Luxor massacre, a lot of attention has been placed on London as being a center of terrorism. President Mubarak the other day had asked for the extradition of terrorist Al Sirri. It was reported in *Al Ahram* that there are 1,400 terrorist groups operating freely in London, putting out their videotapes, making their calls, publishing their information. Most of this, of course, is aimed against the United States. And I was wondering if the U.S. has taken any measures to bring the subject up and to demand action from the British government about terrorists who are operating on British soil.

Foley: Well, I was going to say that the question as you posed it struck me as being a bilateral question or issue between Egypt and the United Kingdom. However, as far as we are concerned, you're familiar with the fact that the secretary has made designations of terrorist groups, and we feel that we've done our part to ensure that groups engaging in terrorist activity are not allowed to do so on American soil. We have clearly a very intense and thorough dialogue on security, on terrorism with our friends and allies around the world. And I'm sure that's something that we discuss privately with them.

But I'm not prepared to discuss publicly the nature of those exchanges.

EIR: If you see no change on the issue, would the United States be prepared to put pressure in the form of sanctions or whatever on the British to stop this activity?

Foley: I really think that's a preposterous assumption on your part. We have, as I said, a thorough and—thoroughgoing and very productive security and terrorism dialogue with the British authorities, who face the same kinds of threats in other arenas as we do around the world. We see eye to eye on the issue. I see no daylight between us and the U.K. on that important subject.

UN's Kofi Annan okays British terrorist haven

The United Nations Security Council has imposed sanctions on Iraq, which have killed over a million people since 1989, and is step-wise increasing its murderous sanctions against Sudan, and other targets, all under the pretext of fighting terrorism, including state-sponsored terrorism. But what is the UN doing about Britain, which admits to protecting the same terrorist groups that Iraq, Sudan, and other countries are blamed for deploying?

EIR asked UN Secretary General Kofi Annan to explain this contradictory policy. The occasion was a forum at Princeton University Woodrow Wilson School of Diplomacy, on Nov. 24, 1997, which Annan addressed, on "A Trans-Regional Study of the Contemporary Middle East, North Africa, and Central Asia."

EIR's Matthew Guice asked Annan for his response to President Hosni Mubarak's allegations that "London had harbored terrorists, specifically those who financed the recent tragic terrorist attack in his country." Guice added: "In light of the fact that much talk had been spent at the UN regarding putting sanctions on Sudan, for its harboring of one terrorist group, would you, Mr. Annan, support a move for sanctions against London, for harboring 26 of the 30 terrorist groups banned by the U.S.?"

Annan responded: "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. [British Prime Minister Tony] Blair, cannot imagine that he would knowingly 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."