

# ParsBrief

Number 80  
July 2014

1. France warns against "disinformation" campaign by Iranian opposition
2. International meeting for ISIL in France
3. Why Canada is getting it wrong on Iran
4. What the 'Wall Street Journal' and the MEK Get Very Wrong About Iran's Nuclear Program
5. European MEK Supporters Downplay ISIS Role in Iraq
6. Controversial Iranian Exile Shakes up Canadian Parliament's Human Rights Program
7. Big money buys powerful friends: Column



### France warns against "disinformation" campaign by Iranian opposition

KUNA, June 26, 2014

France on Thursday issued a stern warning about what it said was a growing lobbying and disinformation campaign being carried out by the Iranian opposition group, Mujahideen Khalq, which is currently banned in this country.

The movement, which for years has sought to make implicit and explicit attacks against Iran, was for a long period headquartered outside of Paris until European Union members decided to place it on the "terrorist black list" in the EU.

Some countries have retreated from this ban but France maintains the organisation as illegal here.

"France has no contact with the Organisation of the People's Mujahideen of Iran which is known for resorting to violence," Foreign Ministry spokesman Romain Nadal stated here.

This group has "no legal existence in France in the form of an Organisation," Nadal stressed.

He warned that the Iranian opposition movement has "a violent inspiration" and is "non-democratic" and has been criticised by several human rights groups such as "Amnesty International".

The Mujahideen Khalq carried out "sectarian practices" and refuses to renounce violence, the French official added.

"We express our greatest reservations faced with the intense lobbying and disinformation campaign being carried out" by the Iranian group, Nadal warned.

### International meeting for ISIL in France

Voltarie Network, Editorial Staff , Jul 1, 2014

The Mujahidin-e-Khalq (MEK) (Iranian armed opposition group financed by Washington) held a large rally in Villepinte, near Paris, on 27 June 2014. More than 80 000 people attended the event.

While the main objective of the meeting was to support the Mujahidin military base in Iraq, Camp Asharaf and their fight against Iran, MEK president Maryam Rajavi seized the opportunity to violently lash out against Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki and rejoice over the progress achieved by the Islamic Emirate in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL)

French politics nowadays are profoundly schizophrenic: on one hand France (as the U.S.) officially condemns the destabilization of a State by a terrorist organization, while on the other hand, the Élysée participates alongside the U.S. in the secret war in the Middle East and details Foreign Legion officers to oversee the ISIL in Syria and Iraq.

More than 600 political figures from NATO member countries turned up for this meeting. This list included:

Gen. Hugh Shelton, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff ;

Gen. George William Casey, former commanding general for Operation Iraqi Freedom ;

Newt Gingrich, former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives ;

Senator Joseph Lieberman (his friend Senator John McCain was unable to make the trip, but addressed the gathering via video) ;

Rudy Giuliani, former Mayor of New York ;

José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero, former Socialist Prime Minister of Spain ;

Michèle Alliot-Marie, former French Defense Minister ;

Bernard Kouchner, former French Foreign Affairs Minister ;

Rama Yade, vice president of the conservative Radical Party of France .

Members of the Mujahidin-e-Khalq have been fighting in Syria and Iraq for three months alongside the ISIL. On 23 May 2014, Maryam Rajavi met with the President of the Syrian National Coalition in Paris.

### Why Canada is getting it wrong on Iran

Saeed Kamali Dehghan, Guardian, May 17 2014

As west moves towards reconciliation with Tehran, Ottawa is making a big mistake by pursuing a wrong policy which isolates Iran and hurts its people

Ever since Canada broke off diplomatic relations with Tehran, Ottawa has toughened its stance on Iran, taking a similar approach to that of Israel.

As the west seizes upon the opportunity to engage with the moderate president, Hassan Rouhani, Canada just seems to be going in the opposite direction, ignoring not only calls for dialogue by the international community but also from the very Iranian dissident voices Ottawa claims to be defending. Instead, Canada is siding with radicals – dodgy exiled groups and rightwing Israelis – and moving away from the realities on the ground.

In 2012, Canada's foreign affairs minister, John Baird, described Iran as "the most significant threat to global peace and security in the world today" as it announced a unilateral decision to shut down his country's embassy in Tehran and expel Iranian diplomats from the Canadian soil.

Within a year, as Rouhani travelled to New York to revamp Iran's relations with the west backed by strong popular support at home, Baird warned "kind words, a smile and a charm offensive are not a substitute for real action."

Later, as Iran and six world powers including Britain and the US, reached a historic nuclear agreement in Geneva, trying to defuse the threats of yet another war in the Middle East, Canada injected deep scepticism.

Canada's big excuse is human rights. Of course, Iran's appalling human rights record, including the high rate of executions and arbitrary arrests of political activists, remains a big concern.

But Ottawa's policy of isolating Tehran, at the time Rouhani is under pressure from internal hawks and fundamentalists, is doing a disservice both to the future of peace in the world and the wellbeing of Iranians themselves. By rejecting engagement with Iran, Canada is also turning a blind eye to repeated calls by leading Iranian opposition figures, for the unique opportunity created because of Rouhani's election.

This week's Iran human rights event at Canada's parliament embodied what is wrong with Ottawa's approach. A key speaker at a programme studying violations of human rights in Iran was Maryam Rajavi, the leader of the radical exiled group MEK, which was listed as terrorist organisation by the US and the UK until recently. The MEK, characterised by many observers as a cult-like group, has been repeatedly slammed by the United Nations because of mistreating its own members.

The MEK appearance at the programme reportedly made the UN special rapporteur for human rights in Iran, Ahmed Shaheed, to withdraw from the event, the Nation's Ali Gharib reported on Wednesday. To much criticism by the Iranian authorities, Shaheed has extensively reported on the violations of rights in Iran, including mistreatment of prisoners, some of whom are in fact in jail in Iran for having links to the MEK.

"If you want to improve human rights in Iran, don't invite MEK leader, a group accused of serious human rights violations, as a speaker," tweeted Golnaz Esfandiari, who blogs on Iran. The MEK remains extremely unpopular in Iran because of its support for the former Iraqi leader, Saddam Hussein, during the eight-year war between Iran and Iraq. MEK fought against their countrymen at the time.

Earlier this month, Lobelog's Eldar Mamedov detailed how the MEK is using human rights as its casus belli to mix up the complexities of politics inside Iran for an outsider eye and derail the process of Iran-west rapprochement. It looks as Canada is repeating a mistake the US and some European countries did decades ago by relying on radical groups such as MEK, or some Iranian monarchists, to keep itself updated about the complicated bigger picture of today's Iran.

Moreover, Canada often berates Iran in the excuse of defending human rights activists and opposition figures who have been imprisoned in Iran. But when the very same people, including 50 prominent political prisoners, reached to US president Barack Obama asking him to end "crippling" economic sanctions hurting ordinary people in Iran and seize "the last chance" for dialogue with Tehran under Rouhani, Canada seemed to have sealed its ears.

Instead, it should listen to more reasonable voices, such as its own former ambassador to Tehran, John Mundy, who has stated it was wrong for Ottawa to cut diplomatic ties.

Let's be clear, no one is denying the gross abuses of human rights in Iran or the challenges ahead in finding a permanent nuclear settlement with the Islamic republic. But human rights in Iran can only be improved by the ways of dialogue and engagement. This is why the recent visit to Iran by the EU's foreign policy chief, Catherine Ashton, who visited a number of leading women rights' activists, was more effective than Canada's many human rights statements.

Canada has had a very frosty relations with Iran since the 1979 Islamic revolution. It became more restrained in 2003 when an Iranian-Canadian photographer, Zahra Kazemi, died while in jail in Iran under torture because of a skull fracture. But if Ottawa is genuine about the wellbeing of Iranian citizens, including those persecuted in the country, it should reconsider its Iran policy. But for now, Canada is just getting it wrong on Iran.

## What the 'Wall Street Journal' and the MEK Get Very Wrong About Iran's Nuclear Program

Eli Clifton, The Nation, May 29, 2014

The Wall Street Journal's opinion pages have long served as a welcoming home to pundits toeing a hawkish line on Iran, Iraq and a laundry list of foreign policy challenges facing the United States. Tuesday, the Journal's editorial board exclusively published details of a report provided by the Mujahedin-e Khalq (MEK), an exiled Iranian opposition group that until less than two years ago was designated a terrorist group in the United States and Canada.

Noticeably, the WSJ did not claim to have verified the MEK's allegations that Tehran has continued to pursue nuclear weaponization research.

Even while uncritically reporting on the allegations, the article contained one major factual error. It read:

...having ceded a right to enrich and permitted the Islamic Republic to develop an advanced enrichment capability, the West is now left with preventing weaponization as the final barrier against a nuclear-capable Iran...

In fact, no administration or international negotiating body has "ceded" Iran the "right to enrich." Iran has enriched uranium for the better part of the last decade despite sanctions from the past two administrations and demands that they cease enrichment. Even in the recent flurry of diplomacy between the P5+1 and Iran, no agreement has been made public and nothing has been formally conceded. (A November accord accepted de-facto enrichment while limiting Iran's enrichment from 20 percent down to 5 percent.)

But perhaps more surprisingly, the WSJ editorial board apparently felt no compunction to inform readers about the source of this "plausible new report." This, despite the fact that the Journal's editorial team even includes one outspoken critic of the MEK, Sohrab Ahmari, an editorial page writer based in Europe.

In a 2011 Radio Free Europe column, Ahmari characterized the MEK as "a mostly irrelevant group as ideologically coherent as Lyndon Larouche's cult and just as ineffective." Later that same year, Ahmari, writing in Tablet, warned that the MEK was an "Islam-Marxist cult." Many critics have pointed to the group's cult-like features, though over the last the few decades the MEK shed its Islam-Marxist roots—a past many adherents today deny entirely.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, Ahmari, along with a small group of neoconservative pundits, promoted the article on Twitter but Ahmari, even while defending the MEK report, admitted the source was "problematic" in a tweet directed at me.

.@Ali\_Gharib @EliClifton Because problematic sources can never disclose important, useful and newsworthy info, right? #Natanz #Arak

— Sohrab Ahmari (@SohrabAhmari) May 27, 2014

Indeed, the MEK has proven an unreliable source in the past.

In 2010, following an MEK claim to have discovered a secret nuclear site near the Iranian city of Qazvin, State Department spokesperson PJ Crowley told Fox News, “The MEK has made pronouncements about Iranian facilities in the past—some accurate, some not.”

While the Journal’s standards may be different for editorial content, a simple warning that the source was “problematic” and that much of the report was unverified, would be a reasonable expectation from one of the world’s most widely read newspapers.

“The MEK has a mixed record,” Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association, a Washington-based arms control advocacy group, told The Nation. “It’s curious that it occurred in the editorial page section and not the news section,” said Kimball. “The editors don’t appear to have tried to vet the information and they don’t stand behind it.”

The MEK may be onto something with its contention that Iran continued with its nuclear weapons work (the IAEA’s reporting about the “possible military dimensions” of Iran’s nuclear program only covers the period before 2003). But relying almost exclusively on the organization is, to borrow a word, problematic, and raises a question: Why did the MEK approach the ideologues of the Journal’s opinion pages instead of its newsroom staff with its exclusive report? Perhaps the paper’s veteran foreign affairs reporters, who have no doubt had many interactions with the MEK, are more skeptical of the group’s claim.

### European MEK Supporters Downplay ISIS Role in Iraq

Eldar Mamedov, lobelog

While the world watched in horror as jihadist extremists from the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) seized the Iraqi city of Mosul, some members of the European Parliament (MEPs) claimed that these actions were not carried out by ISIS, but were “part of a popular uprising” against Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki.

At the same time that ISIS was reportedly committing mass executions in Mosul, these MEPs “disputed” that Mosul and Tikrit had been taken by ISIS, and announced the creation of the European Iraqi Freedom Association (EIFA), a “new NGO with the mission of improving the political and human rights situation in Iraq.”

The comments were made at a June 11 press conference in Brussels, according to a press release for the event.

The ousting of Maliki and the “complete eviction of the Iranian regime from Iraq” are the group’s primary goals, according to the press release of the EIFA, which has no website other than a Facebook page that was created on May 6.

There is no shortage of people arguing that Iran holds excessive influence over Iraq and that Maliki has aggravated many of Iraq’s problems, so why did these MEPs resort to downplaying the horrors of ISIS’ actions in calling for an end to Tehran’s hold on Baghdad?

A clue appears in the EIFA's emphasis on the security situations of Camps Ashraf and Liberty.

Camp Ashraf became the Iraqi base of the exiled Iranian dissident organization, the Mujahedin-e Khalq, (aka MEK, MKO, PMOI and NCRI), in the 1980s after its exodus from the Islamic Republic.

The MEK, frequently described as a "cult", was classified as a terrorist organization by the EU until 2009 and by the US until 2012, and has been accused of human rights abuses.

Despite its expensive claims to the contrary (MEK op-eds and advertisements regularly appear in Western media outlets), the NCRI, the MEK's "parliament-in-exile" and political wing, has no popular support in Iran. In fact, the MEK sided with Saddam Hussein during the 1981-88 Iran-Iraq war and even attempted to take Iranian territory. The vast majority of Iranians inside Iran either consider the group insignificant or harmful to reformist efforts. The MEK is also despised by many Iraqis for its role in crushing Shia and Kurdish uprisings against Saddam's dictatorial rule. Yet thanks to well-funded lobbying and advocacy efforts, the MEK has still been endorsed by some Western politicians in the US and Europe as a legitimate Iranian opposition movement.

Before setting its sights on the United States, the MEK, through the NCRI, embarked on a well-organized campaign to bring European politicians to its side. After years of unchecked lobbying efforts, the MEK has convinced some MEPs to advocate in its favor. In addition to the leftist groups who uncritically support the MEK because it claims to have Marxist beliefs (along with Islamic ones!), right-wing MEPs seem taken in by its fervent anti-Iranian government stance. It is therefore not surprising that the individuals endorsing the EIFA have also endorsed the MEK.

The foremost MEK-EIFA endorser is Struan Stevenson, a British conservative who chaired the European Parliament (EP) delegation for relations with Iraq in 2009-2014. Under his watch, the delegation has devoted disproportionate attention to the security of Camp Ashraf while almost completely neglecting the more relevant economic, social, security and human rights challenges facing Iraq. When the EP negotiated a 2014 resolution addressing the surge of violence in Iraq in February, Stevenson made every effort to downplay the involvement of ISIS, while directing all blame towards Maliki and Iran.

Another notable promoter of the EIFA is Alejo Vidal-Quadras, a Spanish conservative. During his tenure as Vice President of the EP (2009-14), he functioned as one of the NCRI's chief supporters. The EIFA has also been endorsed by former Portuguese socialist MEP Paulo Casaca (2004-09), a self-styled "expert on Iraq" who reportedly employed a MEK member as one of his personal assistants during his parliamentary stint.

Seen in the light of their MEK connections, it's clear why these MEPs are trying to downplay the role of ISIS as a serious threat to the stability of Iraq and the broader region. The MEK and its supporters view Maliki as an Iranian pawn and believe that if Maliki goes, the Iranian government (which the MEK detests) will suffer. So in following the proverb, "the enemy of my enemy is my friend", the MEK's supporters and ISIS have found a common cause in pushing for Maliki's ouster.

Even though Vidal-Quadras, Stevenson and Casaca will not be serving in the incoming European Parliament as of July 1, the MEK will surely try to recruit more MEPs for its cause, including with new tools like the EIFA. Of course, whoever is approached by the MEK — and most MEPs will be approached if they haven't already — would be wise to

think twice about associating with an organization that attempts to minimize the acts of a group so murderous and fanatical that even al-Qaeda has declared it too extreme.

### Controversial Iranian Exile Shakes up Canadian Parliament's Human Rights Program

Ali Gharib, The Nation, May 14 2014

A weeklong series of events in Canadian parliament on Iran's human rights record caused worry among some human rights advocates who fear that the activities could harm their efforts. The controversy centers around Iran Accountability Week, a program of hearings at the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Human Rights and other events organized by members of parliament from the three major parties, with Liberal MP Irwin Cotler taking the lead. The program runs through Thursday.

A human rights lawyer and pro-Israel figure, Cotler has organized three Iran Accountability Weeks. In the past, the events included testimonies highlighting Iranian political prisoners and other victims of Iranian human rights abuses. This year's lineup, however, was different: Maryam Rajavi, the leader of a controversial exiled Iranian opposition group called the Mujahedin-e Khalq (MEK), appeared in the program along with a UN rights official and pundits from a hawkish American think-tank.

One human rights advocate working on Iran, who asked not to be named, raised the issue of other advocates sharing a platform with the head of the MEK, which the activist called "toxic and irrelevant"—a view widely held among Iranians of all political stripes, save members of the MEK itself.

The MEK, which until two years ago was listed as terrorist organization by the United States and Canada, has a tortuous history that carried it from its founding in the mid-1960s as an Islamo-Marxist anti-Shah group to its current position as a vocal opponent of the Islamic Republic. Many critics say the group exhibits cult-like behavior. In addition to its history of violence, the MEK has, notably, been accused of its own human rights abuses.

In a phone interview, Cotler, the Canadian MP whose office spearheaded the multiparty Iran Accountability Week, said the invitation to Rajavi was only to give "issue-specific testimony"—specifically the alleged killings of MEK members by Iraqi security forces.

The MEK moved its operations to Iraq in the 1980s, to fight alongside Saddam Hussein in the bloody Iran-Iraq war, taking up in a desert military base called Camp Ashraf. In September 2012, nine years after the fighters had been disarmed following the US invasion, Iraqi forces evacuated Ashraf. Those MEK members and fighters who remained in country moved into Camp Liberty—an erstwhile American military installation. At various points since Hussein's overthrow, both Liberty and Ashraf had come under attack, mostly by Iraqi security forces, and disarmed MEK members have been killed.

When asked why a notice for the event sent around by his office, obtained by The Nation, said Rajavi would discuss more broad "violations of the rights of the Iranian people"—a category that expands beyond the Ashraf/Liberty incidents—Cotler repeated that the invitation was "issue-specific," though he noted Rajavi may speak on or be asked about



other matters. (In 2012, Colter reportedly joined a campaign to get the MEK removed from terror rolls in the United States and Canada.)

The association with the MEK, however, raised red flags for another participant, Dr. Ahmed Shaheed, the UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Iran. Since 2011, when his mandate was initiated, the Maldivian diplomat has been a main address for credible information about Iran's alleged human rights abuses. Shaheed was scheduled to address the subcommittee on Thursday, May 8 by video link in an open hearing.

According to his office, however, Shaheed requested to withdraw from the official Iran Accountability Week proceedings. He agreed, an assistant said, to brief lawmakers "in a different context than Accountability Week." Asked why, Shaheed's representative responded, "He just didn't think it was appropriate."

The assistant explained that Shaheed felt the event's framing "made it feel less like a briefing and more of something that encroached upon what he believes is his independence on the issue" of human rights in Iran.

Cotler confirmed that, fifty minutes before he was set to go on, Shaheed phoned and requested his testimony be delivered on camera, or in a closed-door session. But the Canadian parliamentarian denied Shaheed withdrew from Iran Accountability Week: "He was not taken off the program. His appearance was in camera," Cotler said, adding that Shaheed did not request in their phone call to withdraw.

Divining whether Shaheed was indeed withdrawn from the program proved difficult. Cotler's office referred The Nation to the bureaucrats who run the subcommittee, but none would comment on whether Shaheed remained part of Iran Accountability Week. Asked if Shaheed was on the public program, Miriam Burke, the subcommittee clerk, said, "I can't tell you." Shaheed's name did not appear in a May 8 press release on Cotler's official website.

Several sources said the MEK's involvement spurred Shaheed's request to be removed from the program. One source with knowledge of the decision said several human rights groups reached out to Shaheed's office, "and it didn't take long for them to make this decision." Two other sources confirmed the account. "From our understanding he was unaware he was part of this broader program," said a rights activist. "Once it was discovered, the MEK issue was a critical concern."

The issue is particularly fraught because Shaheed has, over the years of his UN mandate, attempted to negotiate with the Iranian government for access to the country. The Islamic Republic rejected Shaheed's latest report in March. One Iranian MP remarked that "the intelligence sources for Ahmed Shaheed's reports are the hypocrites"—the way Iran refers to the MEK—"and the Islamic Republic of Iran's opposition."

Cotler said he would explicitly renounce any connections made between various witnesses at hearings in a press conference marking Iran Accountability Week's closing. "We will not make any association between Dr. Shaheed and the MEK," he said. "The last thing any of us would want to do would be to hurt Dr. Shaheed's work or testimony. Not that [the Iranians] need any excuse to do that."

## Big money buys powerful friends: Column

USA Today, Hamid Babaei, July 10, 2014

Why are Newt Gingrich, Joe Lieberman and Patrick Kennedy hanging with members of a terrorist cult?

Several well-known American political figures appeared at a rally in Paris on June 27 in support of an anti-Iran organization that was until recently formally listed as a terrorist group by the United States and Europe. They included Howard Dean, John R. Bolton, Bill Richardson, Newt Gingrich, former Rep. Patrick Kennedy, and Joseph I. Lieberman. Their appearance and their support for the People's Mujahedin Organization (MEK) as an Iranian "opposition group" demonstrates their cluelessness about Iran. Considering the group's history, its popularity in Iran is comparable to an American-led affiliate of Al-Qaeda.

Among the many victims of MEK terror are innocent civilians in Iran, as well as Westerners including Americans. Its violent history, cultic nature and oppression of its own members spans close to four decades. It supported Saddam Hussein's regime in the 1980s, and its leader even boasted about killing thousands of Iranians while this cult served ex-Iraqi dictator's expansionist ambitions. The scope of their crimes against the people of Iran and Iraq among others is baffling, and yet many Western countries seem to be unwilling to impose serious restrictions on the MEK the way they do with other terrorist groups.

It has also been reported that some in the American foreign policy community are conflicted about there being a possible role for this group in the future of American policy towards Iran. But one must wonder what state of bewilderment has befallen American foreign policy when such a group is seen as even a potential part of a solution to its policy conundrums in the Middle East.

Some American politicians supporting the MEK have claimed that these accusations are merely allegations from opponents in Tehran. In fact, scores of journalists, government agencies, and think tanks from around the world have catalogued these practices. The U.S. Department of State has stated that the MEK is "responsible for violent attacks in Iran that victimize civilians" including "attacks against clearly civilian targets." Adding that the MEK "joined Saddam Hussein's brutal repression of the Kurdish rebellion" in 1991. The State Department has also referred to them as a "repressive cult despised by most Iranians and Iraqis." This is the reason why the Iraqi people, Kurds and Shiites in particular despise this group, not Iranian political influence as some have tried to claim.

U.S. based Human Rights Watch (HRW) has extensively recorded the MEK's oppression of its own members, demanding that they divorce their spouses and "all physical and emotional attachments in order to enhance their 'capacity for struggle.'" HRW also stated that MEK members are exposed to "solitary confinement to beatings, verbal and psychological abuse, coerced confessions, threats of execution, and torture that in two cases led to death."

Recently the French Foreign Ministry decried the MEK's "violent and non-democratic inspirations," its "cult nature" and "intense campaign of influence and disinformation."

U.S. officials attributed their removal from the list of terror groups to what they deemed the MEK's "public renunciation of violence." But the MEK's stated renunciation of violence also

involved the claim that it had never itself targeted civilians — an assertion the State Department has clearly said is false. After the September 11 attacks, the MEK understood that their fate would lie in the hands of the West and that they could no longer rely on their benefactor, Saddam Hussein. The decision in 2001 to lay down arms and stop murdering civilians was a tactical decision — not a moral epiphany — that can be overturned if the aforementioned strategic calculation was ever to change.

Moreover, in 2009, the State Department submitted information in court stating the MEK had trained individuals "to perform suicide attacks" and a declassified FBI report from 2004 similarly found that MEK cells around the world were "actively ... planning and executing acts of terrorism." Most importantly, none of the members of the organization have ever been brought to justice by the Western governments who give them shelter.

Instead Washington lobbyists and former American politicians and officials have accepted millions of dollars from the group, as campaign donation or speakers fees — the exact amounts of which most refuse to disclose publicly — in return for which they have publicly supported the MEK, claiming them to be an opposition group that deserves the protection of the U.S. By undertaking these efforts that the Rand Corporation called "cultic practices and its deceptive recruitment," the group managed to get itself removed from the terror list. The dual nature of standards against terrorism is likely the greatest threat being faced by international efforts to stop terrorism today. If politicians are to be selective in opposing one terrorist group while supporting another based on their potential geopolitical usefulness, many nations would have many reasons to support various terrorist groups. When fighting terrorism, reaching for moral consistency cannot be seen as a possible option or an inconvenience; it must be considered a necessity.

It remains unclear why an organization with such a violent history would be allowed so freely to operate in many Western countries, raise money, build institutions, and ultimately be allowed to engage in a multi-million dollar political campaign. It's simply impossible to imagine al-Qaeda or Boko Haram having the same level of freedom to operate.

The principle of the prevention of impunity dictates that acts of terror must not remain without legal consequence and those responsible must be brought to justice. The many victims of the MEK, those who have been killed or maimed and their family members deserve justice and the principles that Western nations claim to be unflinchingly dedicated to in the context of the so-called war on terror are trampled on every day that they accommodate terrorists, rather than contribute to their prosecution.

Hamid Babaei is counselor for the Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations.