

The bombing of Yugoslavia, arranged through Robin Cook and his flunky Madeleine Albright, was intended as a stepping-stone to London-directed NATO operations in the Transcaucasus and Central Asia. The recently announced, London-directed jihad against Russia, is integral to that same policy.

Thus, now, in Russia, there are three polarities: the patriots, London's "Russian Pinochet" option, and the four-man cartel operating within President Yeltsin's orbit. From the side of Russia as a nation, it is the interplay among these three polarities, which defines what appears to be Russia's moment-to-moment policy. However, the patriotic interest of Russia has been made painfully clear to those sundry forces which are tending to converge upon broad terms of agreement respecting Russia's desperate strategic situation. Thus, the situation is extremely confused, but nonetheless quite clear. In other words, the situation is highly turbulent, and increasingly so; but, that very fact of increasing turbulence defines its own kind of clarity about the current direction of policy-shaping.

Russia's policy for the North Caucasus is to seek to win the battle decisively, as quickly as possible. For Russia now, "moderation" means promoting a military and strategic quagmire. The very weaknesses in the Russia military forces, merely push the situation all the more in that direction. The issue is not whether or how Russia wins the war in Chechnya; like the Soviet Union's "Finnish war" of the pre-Barbarossa period, the issue today is the role of the Chechnya war in recementing, and restoring the élan of the recently fragmented Russian military and intelligence organizations around a political conception of national defense.

Thus, two Presidents—Clinton and Yeltsin—neither of whom is actually in control of his own policy-making institutions, conducted what was inevitably a pathetic dialogue of the deaf.

In short, never let the *New York Times*' harem grammarian shape the way you define your morality, or define a strategic interest.

## Russians protest British terror

by Jeffrey Steinberg

As reported in last week's *EIR* ("British Declare Terrorist 'Jihad' Against Russia"), on Nov. 12-13, a collection of ostensibly Islamic organizations, including the International Islamic Front, Al Muhajiroun, and Ansar as-Shariah, met in London under the banner of the "Fourth Conference of Islamic Revival Movement." The conference produced a declaration of war against Russia, because of the Russian military's

actions in Chechnya. The conference was sanctioned by the government of Prime Minister Tony Blair and the British Crown. Indeed, the *jihad* declaration against Russia was thoroughly in line with the British Foreign Office's policy of supporting terrorist insurrections and other destabilizations against all "rival empires." Russia heads the list of "rival empires" slated for early extinction, if the British have their way.

But, in the wake of that flagrant provocation, it appears that the Russian government may be in the process of joining a growing list of nations that have labelled Britain as the terror capital of the world. According to a report in the Nov. 16 *Kommersant Daily*, during the second day of the London Islamist conference some of the attendees physically attacked two Russian television newsmen, from ORT and NTV, beating them and destroying their cameras. The two cameramen had captured two days of footage, of non-stop calls for holy war against Moscow.

On Nov. 14, Russia's Foreign Ministry filed an official protest to Andrew Wood, Britain's Ambassador in Moscow. According to *Kommersant*, "The organizers of the event apologized to Russia's mass media, while the British government reported that the case is under investigation by the Home Ministry, and asked Russia not to inflate a scandal."

### Scotland Yard 'does not react'

ORT's cameraman Alexandr Panov, who suffered a concussion in the beating, told *Kommersant* that he is "very surprised at the indifference of the British government. Some of the participants at the 'charity' event were people wanted by Interpol, but Scotland Yard, although evidently aware of their residence [in Britain], does not react. Meanwhile, even English journalists have to be cautious in their coverage of the 'Islamism' issue. A correspondent of the *Sunday Times*, who had published two sensational articles on [training] bases of terrorists in Britain, refused to be featured on Russian TV," for fear of being targeted for retribution, Panov emphasized.

"Most of the organizations represented at the meeting in London are familiar only to a narrow circle of specialists, and often emerge ad hoc, for the occasion of a certain event," commented *Kommersant*'s foreign policy department. "Still, they represent only the tip of the iceberg of the radical Islamist network widespread in Britain. Exactly there, the Islamists train mercenaries for warfare in Yemen, Egypt, Algeria, Kosovo, Tajikistan, and Chechnya. Most similar organizations, based in western Europe and the U.S., act quite legally. In particular, British courts actually ignore requests for extradition of their members, exposed as terrorists."

Russian television had launched the exposé of Britain's role in harboring anti-Russian terrorist networks several days before the meeting in London. On Nov. 10, both NTV and ORT aired stories profiling Osama bin Laden's political organization in Britain, charging that the groups were receiving paramilitary training from British officers.

## The U.S. State Department list of terrorist groups

Under the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, which was passed in the wake of the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing, the U.S. State Department is required to produce a list every two years of organizations to be designated as Foreign Terrorist Organizations. FTOs are subject to a wide range of sanctions. Here is the list of 28 FTOs issued on Nov. 8:

Abu Nidal Organization (ANO)  
Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG)  
Armed Islamic Group (GIA)  
Aum Shinrikyo  
Basque Fatherland and Liberty (ETA)

Hamas (Islamic Resistance Movement)  
Harakat ul-Mujahidin (HUM)  
Hizballah (Party of God)  
Gama'a al-Islamiyya (Islamic Group, IG)  
Japanese Red Army (JRA)  
al-Jihad  
Kach  
Kahane Chai  
Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK)  
Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE)  
Mujahedin-e Khalq Organization (MEK, MKO, NCR, and many others)  
National Liberation Army (ELN)

Palestine Islamic Jihad-Shaqaqi Faction (PIJ)  
Palestine Liberation Front-Abu Abbas Faction (PLF)  
Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP)  
Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command (PFLP-GC)  
al-Qa'ida  
Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC)  
Revolutionary Organization 17 November (17 November)  
Revolutionary People's Liberation Army/Front (DHKP/C)  
Revolutionary People's Struggle (ELA)  
Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso, SL)  
Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA)

The broadcasts documented that Al Muhajiroun, the "political wing" of bin Laden's International Islamic Front, functions freely in the London suburb of Lee Valley, occupying two rooms in the local computer center. Officially, they work under the cover of an Internet company named Info-2000.

Both NTV and ORT showed Al Muhajiroun's boss, Sheikh Omar Bakri Mohammed, threatening Russia's leadership with "severe consequences" if Russia does not cease the military operation in Chechnya. "The Russian military should not feel safe anywhere in the world," he said.

Omar Bakri boasted that his organization was assisted by retired British military officers. He admitted that some mercenaries who receive "theoretical education" in Lee Valley, later complete their training at bin Laden's bases in Afghanistan.

NTV also featured another bin Laden ally in Britain, Acem Chudri, head of Association of Islamic Lawyers, which also protects the Chechen "liberation movement."

The same day that these exposés aired on Russian television, Russia's embassy in Britain filed a protest against Britain's involvement in harboring Wahhabite terrorists.

In its Nov. 19 coverage of the Istanbul summit of the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe, ORT television exposed another British link to the ongoing destabilization in Chechnya. The report mentioned that the guests of the summit included several representatives of the Grozny regime. "They looked especially proud, as they were joined by Haji-Saleh Brand, a British national who converted to Islam and took a Muslim name."

In concluding its coverage of the Russian government's delivery of a diplomatic *démarche* to the British over the London attack on the Russian television journalists, *Kommersant* commented that "the U.S. State Department has not included any of the aforementioned organizations in the list of international terrorist networks published in October. The reason is simple: These organizations are not considered dangerous for the interests of the United States. However, in the 1980s, the Americans treated Osama bin Laden in the same way."

### Not quite accurate

While, as *EIR* documented in last week's issue, the U.S. State Department has generally balked at any action against Britain for its harboring of international terrorists, the *Kommersant* story did not get it right.

The Oct. 8, 1999 official semi-annual list of groups designated as Foreign Terrorist Organizations by the U.S. government, did include the groups that showed up for the London session. Following an Executive Order by President Clinton issued in the wake of the bombings of the U.S. embassies in Tanzania and Kenya in August 1998, the State Department added the Osama bin Laden-linked al-Qa'ida (International Islamic Front) organization to the list of sanctioned terrorist groups.

However, Ambassador Michael A. Sheehan, the State Department Coordinator for Counterterrorism, at the Oct. 8 press conference where the list of 28 groups was released, was careful not to fall into the trap of attributing all of the ostensi-

bly Islamic terrorism, including the destabilization in Chechnya, to the expatriate Saudi millionaire bin Laden. Asked to comment on recent statements by former Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin, that bin Laden was the mastermind of the Chechen insurrection, Ambassador Sheehan stated that while “there’s been a growing recognition between the government of the United States and Russia of a common interest with a common threat of certain terrorist organizations, . . . I don’t have evidence directly leading it to Osama bin Laden or his organization. His organization, by the way, is very loosely organized around the world. It has alliances with other organizations. So people—when they talk about bin Laden, you have to be very specific and I don’t have information on that.”

### The ‘London list’

While bin Laden continues to take refuge in the badlands of Afghanistan, a large number of “Afghansis,” i.e., mujahideen veterans, representing an alphabet soup of terrorist organizations, continue to enjoy the safe-haven protection of Her Majesty’s Blair government. In fact, as was the case in 1997, when the State Department produced its first list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations, the vast majority of groups on the list either have their international headquarters in London, or have a major propaganda and fundraising presence in Britain.

On Nov. 20, 1997, following the release of the State Department’s 1997 FTO list, the London *Daily Telegraph*, admitted that “Britain is now an international center for Islamic militancy on a huge scale . . . and the capital is the home to a bewildering variety of radical Islamic fundamentalist movements, many of which make no secret of their commitment to violence and terrorism to achieve their goals.”

The *Daily Telegraph* reported that there were moves afoot, as the result of pressure from the Clinton administration, to end the safe-haven policy. However, the *Daily Telegraph* noted cheerfully, the prospects of such a policy reversal were dim, given that Home Secretary Jack Straw had stated publicly that he would not allow anyone to be excluded from Britain, merely because he or she had ties to terrorist groups. “The powers to exclude can be draconian,” an official of the Home Office told the newspaper. “One man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter.” The official chastised the U.S. State Department for producing a list of groups that are “merely raising funds for humanitarian aid” in Britain. “There is a thin line between terrorist activity and political freedom fighting,” the official said.

Back in 1997, the Tories were in power in England, under Prime Minister John Major. On Jan. 25, 1997, Tory Member of Parliament Nigel Waterson had introduced a bill—without the support of Major—that would have, for the first time in British history, made it a crime to plot overseas terrorism from British soil. The bill was defeated in committee on Feb. 14, just three weeks after its introduction.

Leading the effort to defeat the Waterson bill was Member of Parliament George Galloway, a close ally of Blair and a

protégé of Britain’s most prominent terrorist supporter and controller, Lord Avebury. Galloway pilloried Waterson for attempting to remove one of the most important tools in the geopolitical bag of tricks of the British imperium. “By definition,” Galloway railed, “a tyranny can be removed only by extraordinary measures. It is sometime possible, although very rare, that massive civil disobedience and huge demonstrations can topple a regime, as some in eastern Europe were toppled; but much more often, at one stage or another during a dictatorship, people have to bear arms and take armed action against it. Inevitably, in conditions of extreme repression, the leadership of such movements will gravitate to countries such as ours where freedom and liberty prevail. The bill will criminalize such people, even though they have not broken any law in Britain.”

### Russian wake-up call

The fact that the British government has been flaunting its patronage of the “*jihād*” apparatus, presently abetting the destabilization of the Northern Caucasus, should serve as a wake-up call to those patriots in Russia who are searching for an effective counter to the terror offensive, aimed at the breakup of Russia and the looting of the strategic raw materials wealth of the Caspian Sea and Central Asia. The message is clear: There can be no effective counter-terror program until and unless Great Britain is named, publicly, repeatedly, as the hub of world terrorism.

## Her Majesty’s favorite narco-terrorists

*In November 1997, following the terrorist massacre of tourists at Luxor, in Egypt, and the release of the U.S. State Department’s first semi-annual list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations, EIR Middle East correspondent Joseph Brewda documented that nearly every group on the State Department roster was either headquartered in London, or maintained high-visibility propaganda and fundraising operations in Britain—with the full blessings of the government. Twenty-seven of the 30 groups named in 1997 were still on the list released on Nov. 8, 1999. What follows are excerpts from Brewda’s Nov. 28, 1997 exposé of the British hand behind the new international terrorism (“England’s ‘Lizard Queen’ Is the Mother of International Terrorism”), which is as relevant today as it was when we first published it.*

When the U.S. State Department released its list of barred terrorist outfits on Oct. 8, [1997] it might not have imagined that it was hitting one of the key “irregular warfare” capabilities used by the Crown throughout the world.