

controlling the mosques are manifold. Mosques provide a religious color to a secessionist movement. Mosques also direct the faithful to vote en-bloc for particular politicians, and in the process, virtually own them. This created a number of Members of Parliament in Britain demanding independent Kashmir.

But the scene changed in the 1980s, with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Jihadis and Mujahideens were organized from far and near to battle the Godless communists. It was at that time that the CIA and the British MI6 became extremely dependent on the Pakistani ISI. Although the CIA and the MI6 helped the Mujahideen with cash and arms, all the ground operations were done under the aegis of the Pakistani ISI. At the time, the Pakistani ISI had a very capable director, Lt. Gen. Hamid Gul. Later, in the 1990s, Washington sought and received assistance from Gul to cobble together a Punjab-based political party, the Islami Jamhoori Ittehad (IJI), to defeat the Benazir Bhutto-led Pakistan People's Party (PPP). The party, led by Mian Nawaz Sharif, was an alliance formed by the ISI out of nine mainly rightist parties under Gul. Gul denies this, claiming that the ISI's political cell created by Bhutto only "monitored" the elections.

With Gul at the helm of the Pakistani ISI, a closely-knit network between these intelligence agencies, CIA, MI6, and ISI, with some involvement of the Israeli intelligence agency, Mossad, was set up. Subsequently, when Washington chose

to walk away from Afghanistan in 1989, it was British intelligence and the Pakistani ISI that later oversaw the Afghan civil war (1989-1995) and the emergence of the Taliban (1996). It was also the time when the MI6 and the ISI were sending "committed" Muslim youths from Britain to fight standing next to the al-Qaeda militia, who were seeking no territory, but the establishment of an Islamic Caliphate in the Middle East.

With the Soviet Union decimated and Washington showing scant interest in Afghanistan, the Great Game was back in the hands of the British. They were helped by the Pakistani ISI and the al-Qaeda/Taliban militia. But this phase changed again following 9/11. With the United States moving into Afghanistan, and building bridges with India to counter al-Qaeda and the Taliban, new players emerged on the Great Game canvas.

The emergence of India as an ally of the United States has brought India right into the line of attack of those Islamic zealots who would not allow foreign shadows to fall on the oil wells of Arabia and Central Asia. These zealots, however powerful or committed they are, need organizational support to function and operate in a foreign land which is hostile to Islamic jihadis. That is where the MI6 and the ISI provide the jihadis the organizational and intelligence support. The Mumbai massacre was the outcome of such an organizational "success."

LaRouche: Hit on India Was Strategic Attack

In an analysis entitled "The Strategic Significance of the Hit on India," which appeared in the July 21 *EIR*, Lyndon LaRouche identified the Mumbai bombings as a marker for a new phase of global crisis, being provoked by Synarchist financial forces. We quote from the opening paragraphs of that report:

"This was no ordinary sort of 'terrorist incident'; the characteristics of the attack themselves bespeak the hand of a leading strategic power.

"The admirers of Vice-President Cheney's strategic impulses might be pleased by the intention expressed in these events in India, since what is being served is the same warfare policy expressed by Cheney's wicked partnership with Israel's Benjamin Netanyahu. Worse, although Cheney's conspiring with Netanyahu has been the obvious motive for the presently escalating state of warfare launched, in several directions, by Israel, Cheney himself is merely a disposable pawn in an imperial game played

by forces operating from a much higher level than the current U.S. Presidency, levels higher than Cheney's immediate master, George P. Shultz.

"With the combination of this strategic attack on India, and the continuing actions of Dick Cheney and his accomplice, Netanyahu, in Southwest Asia, a signaled, actually global threat was delivered, in effect, to those assembling for the 'G-8' summit in Russia now. Like the June 28, 1914 assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife at Sarajevo, the Mumbai incident of this past Tuesday has been recognized, in relevant circles in India and elsewhere, as the intended detonator of a global strategic crisis. This is, in fact, a crisis which must be compared with the situation on the verge of the two so-called 'world wars' of the Twentieth Century; unless the present threat is promptly reversed, the outcome will be vastly worse than anything experienced in the two 'world wars' of the preceding century, but of an essentially different type than either of those two great wars."

It is from this standpoint that our Indian correspondent, Ramtanu Maitra, undertook to unravel the international dimensions of the "local" terrorist organizations on the Subcontinent, starting with the historically identifiable culprit, the British Empire.—*Nancy Spannaus*