

Entente Bestiale

London terrorist meeting cancelled, but the fight has just begun

by Omar Abdul-Aziz

On Sept. 7, it was announced that the London terrorist conference known as the Islamic Revival Rally, scheduled to begin on the following day, was cancelled. Al-Muhajirun, the group which had organized the gathering of a projected 12,000 people in a London sports stadium, decided to call off the conference, reportedly in response to pressure exerted by British security authorities. But Anjem Choudary, spokesman for Al-Muhajirun, indicated that the British themselves had their hand forced; he blamed "Arab states and certain international organizations which started an adverse press campaign," for having created conditions in which the conference could not take place.

As *EIR* reported in this space on Sept. 6 and 13, the conference was to include representatives of some of the top terrorist organizations in the world, all of them with operational centers in London.

There had been an intense mobilization against it, particularly by the government and press of Egypt. The Egyptian press was filled with extraordinarily precise and harsh denunciations of the British imperialists, for allowing London to be used as a staging ground for terrorist activity. Arab press reports indicate that the Egyptians made their feelings known to Washington, and that certain pressure from across the Atlantic, may have been decisive in forcing the British authorities to pressure the sponsors not to hold the conference.

For the past nine months, *EIR*'s correspondent at the White House, William Jones, has been pressing the administration to confront the increasingly obvious role that London plays in world terrorism. On Sept. 6, at a State Department briefing, Jones asked spokesman Glyn Davies whether the U.S. administration were not concerned "that the British have allowed this thing to go forward." Jones pointed out that the conference was being financed by Saudi moneybags Osama

Bin Laden, who was planning to send a videotaped address to the gathering, calling for a *jihad* against the United States. Davies, in his reply, limited himself to a diplomatic expression of "confidence" that Her Majesty's government would do the right thing.

On Sept. 4, the London-based Arabic daily *Al-Arab* had published the full text of a message sent by Bin Laden to his followers. This was the most brazen example to date, of what atrocities the terrorists are planning. He called for "destroying and killing the Americans based in Saudi Arabia," and called

upon elements in the Saudi regime, including the Armed Forces and the Royal Guard, to join the terrorist war. "Although we know that the Saudi regime is responsible for what happened to your people," he wrote, "we should concentrate on ambushing, killing, and destroying the American enemy."

The Egyptian denunciations were typified by an Aug. 31 commentary in the official daily *Al-Ahram*, which accused the British of having a policy of "manipulation of terrorist groups, which serves as a tool for intimidation of the world's nations, and to dictate its imperial policies to the world." On Sept. 7, the editor-in-chief of *Al-Ahram*, Ibrahim Nafi, wrote that "Britain has become the number one base in the world for interna-



tional terrorism."

Egyptian newspapers continued their attacks against the British, even after the cancellation of the conference. Nafi replied to a comment sent to him by the British chargé d'affaires in Cairo, Richard Macbeth, complaining about a previous editorial written by Nafi, and saying that "British law does not ban such conferences." Nafi's reply to Macbeth was even harsher this time: "We tell Mr. Representative of the British

Crown that no one believes anymore what is being pronounced by British officials, especially about 'fighting terrorism.' It is also very difficult to trust that the guarantees they give on this issue could be the solution for the problem created for everyone by Britain through allowing the international terror conference to be held in its capital." He added that "British officials try to ignore the fact that the British field is being used, through official laws and regulations, to destabilize other nations by professional terrorists."

The daily *Al-Akhbar* also ran an editorial saying: "Where was the British bragging about democracy on the eve of Gerry Adams's visit to Washington? . . . Let's invite the IRA for a seminar in Cairo, or Gerry Adams for a conference to discuss the problem of the Irish people, and then let's see what the British have to say about democracy." The editorial demanded concrete action to deal with the British problem. "We can't keep silence in the face of the British acts which put on the cloak of democracy."

The next move

The Egyptian government has a unique chance this time to settle accounts with the British. Egypt has long suffered from the criminal acts of the "Islamic" terrorist groups whose

leadership enjoys political asylum in London. The Egyptian government has sent many warnings to the British government, demanding an end to the British support for those terrorists. The Egyptian government recently handed a detailed report to the British Foreign Office, which included information about all the Egyptians who are involved in terrorism, and who use Britain as a base. The same report was sent to the U.S. State Department, in hopes of increasing the pressure on the British, who have refused to cooperate with the Egyptian government in stopping these terrorists.

Cancelling the conference is the beginning, rather than the end, of the battle between the nations of the Middle East and Britain. The Egyptian government has decided to pursue this case until the British agree either to extradite the leaders of the Egyptian "Islamic" terrorist groups, or to "neutralize" them. Egyptian Interior Minister Hassan al-Alfi said on Sept. 7 that "Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak will propose the implementation of an international mechanism to encounter international terrorists, and stop their propaganda and fundraising activities inside the countries where they are based." Al-Alfi added that the proposal will be forwarded to the United Nations, to be discussed by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Terrorism in Peru: the British connection

In light of the denunciations made by Egypt and other countries, it is instructive to consider the fact that the British government and the Queen herself provide protection for Peru's Shining Path "exiles" in London. The satanic Shining Path death-cult is guilty of barbaric destruction of Peru's economy, infrastructure, and the very indigenous populations it claims to be defending. Its most important foreign headquarters are in London and Paris.

Throughout Shining Path's war against the Peruvian state, the head of its London operations was Adolfo Hector Olaechea, a member of one of Peru's oldest oligarchical families, who ran an 11-language translation service. Repeated requests by the Peruvian government that the British shut down Shining Path organizing in Britain have been refused, to date. Olaechea runs the Peru Support Group (PSG), which has been identified by the Peruvian government as part of Shining Path's international network. Among the PSG's sponsors are Lord Avebury, president of the British Parliament's Human Rights Commission, and a group of British clerics that includes Michael Campbell-Johnston, England's Jesuit Provincial.

In introducing himself in London, Olaechea uses a note

from Buckingham Palace. Dated July 25, 1992, it reads: "[T]he private secretary is commanded by Her Majesty the Queen to acknowledge the receipt of the letter from Mr. Olaechea, and to say that it has been passed on to the Home Office." According to the July 2, 1996 issue of the Lima daily *Expreso*, in 1992, Olaechea succeeded in getting Queen Elizabeth to order her private secretary, Robert Followor, to investigate Olaechea's charges that he and other Shining Path exiles were being "harassed" by the Peruvian ambassador in London.

In 1992, during the worst of the Shining Path terrorist offensive, London's Independent Broadcasting Authority, a dependency of the British Office of the Interior, coordinated with Olaechea to send two journalists to Peru. These contacted Shining Path's units, and filmed a report highly favorable to the terrorists, which was then broadcast, on July 10, 1992, despite Peruvian government protests.

In December 1992, John Simpson, foreign affairs editor for the BBC, issued a televised documentary on Peru that attacked the Armed Forces which operate in the narco-terrorist zones, for "corruption" and for "violation of human rights." Lord Avebury then called on Simpson to testify before his parliamentary commission. Lord Avebury expressed his concern for the "lack of security" for civilians in the narco-terrorist zones, and denounced the "impunity" of the military and their "witchhunts" against the Shining Path networks abroad.—*Cynthia Rush*