

## British declare terrorist 'jihad' against Russia

by Jeffrey Steinberg

On Nov. 7, the London *Sunday Telegraph* advertised that "Muslim fundamentalists are receiving weapons training in Britain to become 'holy warriors' in armies led by the world's most wanted terrorist—Osama bin Laden." The paper reported about interviews with "dozens of volunteers who are drilled in the use of guns and explosives to prepare them for the military wing of the International Islamic Front (IIF), founded by bin Laden last year. . . . More of the volunteers recruited in Britain are heading for Chechnya." The *Telegraph* noted, "The political wing of the IIF will hold a public meeting Friday in London to appeal for both jihad (holy war) volunteers and funds."

Indeed, on Nov. 12, the "Fourth Conference of Islamic Revival Movements" issued a jihad declaration against Russia, which has been since sent out worldwide. The declaration, obtained by *EIR*, read in part:

"We declare that the atrocities being perpetrated by Russia against Muslims in Chechnya is war against Allah, his Messenger Muhammad, and Muslims worldwide. This cannot and will not be tolerated and we therefore declare full-scale jihad against Russia, its military establishments, its forces and government wherever they are." The declaration ended with the warning: "You are fighting people who love death more than you love life."

What the *Telegraph* refused to report, was that scores of jihad organizations (which have nothing to do with actual Islam), including the bin Laden IIF, operate in London with the full backing of the British Foreign Office, the Blair government, and the British Crown. The declaration of holy war against Russia comes from the highest official circles in London, and conforms with Britain's "Great Game" objective of breaking up Russia into a string of powerless micro-states

that can be looted by London-centered strategic raw material cartels. Similarly, China, India, and Iran are targeted for British destabilization, sources in and around the British Foreign Office have boasted to *EIR*. And, in every instance, London-headquartered and British-sponsored terrorist groups are the preferred instruments for the destabilizations.

Indeed, as the U.S. FBI stumbles about in hot pursuit of bin Laden, who is off in the wastelands of Afghanistan, the actual directors of the "Afghansi" terrorist infrastructure operate openly and freely in London.

Sheik Omar Bakri Mohammed, bin Laden's chief spokesman in London, boasted to the *Telegraph*, "Last week we sent 38 people to Chechnya." The *Telegraph* added that volunteers say "they have been fully drilled in weapons use, often by former British soldiers."

### What the State Department knows and won't tell

That London is the headquarters of world terrorism is known at the highest levels of the U.S. Department of State. Indeed, on Oct. 8, 1997, and again last month, the State Department issued a list of 30 organizations officially labelled as "terrorist." Of them, ten are officially headquartered in London, and another 15 have major international operations and fundraising networks there.

Furthermore, at least ten governments—predominantly strategic allies of the United States—have filed formal diplomatic protests with the British Foreign Office, for providing safe-haven to terrorists carrying out acts of violence against their citizens and territory. The list includes Egypt, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Pakistan, Bahrain, and France.

No government has been more adamant and forthcoming

on the issue of London's harboring of international terrorists, than America's staunchest ally in the Arab world, Egypt. This has placed Egypt at the top of the list of Middle East nations targeted for British destabilization.

As early as April 1996, Egyptian Interior Minister Hasan al-Alfi had told the British Arabic weekly *Al-Wasat*, "All terrorists come from London. They exist in other European countries, but they start from London."

Following the massacre of 62 tourists in Luxor, Egypt on Nov. 17, 1997, President Hosni Mubarak gave a press conference in Aswan, in which he bluntly declared, "The terrorists [who took responsibility for the massacre] 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."

On Dec. 8, 1997, President Mubarak charged, in an interview with the German weekly magazine *Der Spiegel*: "I do not understand why people on whose hands there is blood, are granted asylum in England. Why they are being granted the freedom to call, in interviews and newspaper articles, for the assassination of people who think differently? Why is the convicted assassin of a girl, Yasser al Sirr, being allowed to move and act freely? London asked us for documents on his criminal record. Well, we sent those documents, but nothing has moved so far."

Six days later, on Dec. 14, Egypt's Foreign Minister Amr Musa summoned British Ambassador David Batherwick to the ministry to deliver to him an official *démarche*, demanding that Britain "stop providing a safe haven to terrorists, and cooperate with Egypt to counter terrorism."

President Mubarak took his campaign against Britain to the Organization of the Islamic Conference summit in Tehran, Iran on Dec. 9-11, 1997, and to the Gulf Cooperation Council summit in Kuwait on Dec. 22. On Dec. 19, 1997, Amr Musa told the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe meeting in Copenhagen, "I seize this opportunity to call from this podium for the serious reconsideration of the practice of granting asylum and providing a safe haven to individuals and fugitives implicated in violent activities in their home countries. These terrorists have exploited the banner of human rights, as well as their host countries, to plan and finance deadly terrorist operations around the world."

Days after President Mubarak's press conference at Aswan, the Egyptian State Information Service published a list of 14 Islamic Group terrorists wanted for the Luxor massacre. The top seven names on the list — Yasser al Sirri, Adel Abdel Bari, Mustafa Hamzah, Tharwat Shehata, Osama Khalifa, Refai Mousa, and Mohamed el Islambouli — all reside in Lon-

don. Yasser al Sirri was tried and convicted for the failed assassination attempt against Prime Minister Dr. Atef Sidqi in 1993; yet the British government granted him asylum, along with Abel Abdel Majid, who was convicted of bombing the Egyptian Embassy in Pakistan in 1995, killing 15 people.

Despite this mountain of evidence, when U.S. State Department spokesman James Foley was asked, on Dec. 9, 1997, by *EIR* correspondent Bill Jones, if the United States would be prepared to impose sanctions on Britain, to force it to stop harboring terrorists, like those who committed the Luxor massacre, Foley responded, "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 the U.S. and the U.K. on that important subject."

### **EgyptAir 990**

Given that the British government has been waging a jihad against the government of Egypt, identical to their now ongoing "Afghansi" operations against Russia in Chechnya and Dagestan, the obvious question is: If the crash of EgyptAir Flight 990, on Oct. 31, proves to be the result of a terrorist act, should the British government be placed at the top of the list of suspects? Did London order the sabotage of Flight 990?

Shortly after 1:00 a.m. on Oct. 31, as EgyptAir Flight 990 was passing near Nantucket, off the coast of New England, en route to Egypt, the plane crashed into the ocean, killing all 217 people on board. At least 33 senior Egyptian military officials were killed in the crash.

It is not known, as this issue of *EIR* goes to press, precisely what chain of events caused the crash. Data retrieved from the voice and data recorders have enabled investigators to rule out several possible mechanical causes of the crash.

In typical fashion, many U.S. and international news organizations have concocted a kooky, bogus account of the crash, which claims that an auxiliary co-pilot crashed the plane into the ocean in an act of suicide. The rush to cover-up by the vast majority of the American media, based on typical unreliable and/or fabricated "source" reports, was appropriately attacked by the Egyptian government. Egypt's Minister of Information Sawfat Sherif told reporters on Nov. 17 that the accusations that the auxiliary pilot, Gameel Batouti, had committed suicide were "speculation, theories, and fantasies which do not measure up to the facts." On the same day, the Egyptian ambassador met with the State Department, the FBI, and the National Transportation Safety Board, to demand that the investigation not be turned over to the FBI, before Egyptian experts had the opportunity to review the evidence assembled to date. The United States has agreed to the request, and, as of Nov. 19, the investigation remained in the hands of the NTSB.

According to highly reputable U.S. intelligence sources,

the soap opera “suicide” account contradicts much of the evidence, and therefore, represents a willful disinformation campaign. Many things about the crash do not yet add up, and will require careful analysis by teams of American and Egyptian experts. The suicide story, one source emphasized, makes no sense. Why was the relief pilot alone in the cockpit, if indeed he was?

The source emphasized that any sophisticated hijackers today know that the cockpit of a commercial jetliner is outfitted with at least four voice recorders and numerous data recorders. Anything that happens inside the cockpit, therefore, will almost certainly be known to investigators. However, anything occurring just outside the cockpit is lost to post-crash investigators. Did terrorists somehow seize control of the cockpit? Was one of the pilots of the plane compromised by terrorists’ threats or blackmail before the flight? None of these vital questions have yet been answered, and such questions will likely not be answered, purely on the basis of analysis of the technical data gathered from the crash site.

### **Sanction Britain for terrorism**

One thing is clear: If evidence points toward a terrorist act, Britain’s ongoing targetting of Egypt must be considered the most likely source of the downing of Flight 990. The United States has a cooperative partnership with the Mubarak government in Egypt. Apart from U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and a handful of other British stooges inside the Clinton administration, there is no U.S. interest in such a terrorist attack being carried out against an important ally.

Israel’s Prime Minister Ehud Barak has developed a close partnership with President Mubarak, in pursuit of Mideast peace. Particularly since the death of Jordan’s King Hussein, the Barak-Mubarak collaboration has been an important feature of the effort to reach a final status agreement with the Palestinian Authority, and to pursue other avenues of regional peace.

Such a Middle East peace process is, however, harshly at odds with Britain’s geostrategic objectives.

Even as the probe continues into the crash of EgyptAir Flight 990, the recent British declaration of jihad against Russia presents, once again, an opportunity for President Clinton to take a bold step against the new international terrorism: Impose sanctions on Great Britain for harboring the world’s most violent terrorists. Such an action would win the instant support of all of the governments who have been hounding Britain to end its official policy of giving aid and comfort to the world’s leading killers. Russian officials have urged a strategic partnership between Washington and Moscow, to defeat the terrorist menace. Unless such a top-down approach is taken to the very real terrorist and irregular warfare threat posed by London, it is a virtual certainty that the weeks and months ushering in the new millennium will be bloody ones.

## **Wahid visit improves U.S.-Indonesia ties**

by William Jones

The visit of Indonesian President Abdurrahman Wahid to Washington on Nov. 12, appears to have helped put U.S.-Indonesian relations back on track. During the period of turmoil, in which Indonesia, the world’s fourth-most-populous nation, was rocked by the international financial crisis, combined with an attempt by British Commonwealth forces to rip the country apart along ethnic lines, U.S.-Indonesian relations had become seriously frayed. In particular, U.S. military aid to Indonesia had been suspended over the situation in East Timor, pending a resolution of the crisis. The election of Abdurrahman Wahid as President on Oct. 20, however, appeared to herald a stabilization of the political crisis and an improvement in U.S.-Indonesian relations.

Relations appear set to improve, despite the fact that the “human rights” cabal in Madeleine Albright’s State Department had exerted enough pressure on the administration for it to urge Indonesia to abandon the highly successful system of economic development fostered under President Suharto. The horrendous policy coming from the U.S. State Department, combined with the disastrous effects of the international financial crisis on the Indonesian economy, resulted in the overthrow of President Suharto, and a relatively unstable political situation for his immediate successor, B.J. Habibie. The fomenting of a gaggle of “independence movements” in various parts of that vast nation by the Commonwealth forces, is now threatening to pull the world’s most populous Muslim nation apart at the seams.

### **Respect for Indonesia’s territorial integrity**

While President Clinton stopped short of sending U.S. troops to East Timor, a former Portuguese colony which was the first enclave to “declare its independence” from Indonesia, the United States did cut aid to the Indonesian military. It is clear, however, that the President is also concerned that Indonesia not be carved into “micro-states,” apparently aware of the disastrous implications of such a development for the entire Pacific region.

At a photo opportunity prior to his meeting with President Wahid, President Clinton was asked whether he thought that the territorial integrity of Indonesia was more important than the “self-determination of the peoples.” The President re-