

# End the Double Standard! Shut Down Britain's Stable of Imperial Terrorists

by Michele Steinberg

Dec. 5—The British government has been sitting on a demand from the Indian government to track down terrorists of the Lashkar e-Toiba (LeT) and related Islamic fundamentalist networks since at least 2003. Now, with the latest atrocity in Mumbai being attributed to the same terrorist group, it is urgent to shut down Britain's terrorist safe haven once and for all.

The British major media and their neo-imperial allies are trying to blame the mass killings in Mumbai on Pakistan. But it is not "Pakistan" that organized the attack, but the same City of London, running a destabilization against India. Over the last week, British Empire media such as *The Australian* have had screaming articles saying that India must "bomb the training centers" inside Pakistan and the Pakistan-controlled part of divided Kashmir. This India vs. Pakistan trap is designed to do what the British Empire wants most of all: to stop India from playing a sovereign role in reorganizing the already-dead world financial system. Lyndon LaRouche built his proposal for a New Bretton Woods financial system around the cooperation of "four powers"—United States, Russia, China, and India. The London authors of the separatist and religious warfare against nation-states *want* a new war between India and Pakistan, in a campaign of perpetual war that LaRouche first identified as the British Empire's imperial design in his 1999 video, "Storm over Asia."

## The Challenge to London

In July 2006, while attending the Group of 8 heads of state and government meeting in Moscow, Indian



*EIR* has been tracking the British harboring of—and deployment of—terrorists for more than a decade. Here, our April 4, 1997 blast against the *Empire*.

Prime Minister Manmohan Singh confronted British Prime Minister Tony Blair, just after the bloody train attacks in Mumbai, where 207 people were killed and 600 injured, about Britain's harboring terrorists. The exchange between the two is detailed by *EIR*'s 2006

article, “Behind the Mumbai Bombings: Tracking the British Role” (reprinted below, p. 8). As *EIR* demanded in January 2000, London must be shut down as the world’s biggest protector of terrorism.

In September 2001, right after the 9/11 attacks, Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak blasted the British “safe haven” for terrorists. Mubarak was asked by the French newspaper *Le Figaro*, why he had said that London is “the greatest base of terrorism in Europe.” His reply, published in the Sept. 22, 2001 issue, revealed that warnings that he personally, and his government’s intelligence services, had delivered to Britain and the United States, about harboring of known terrorist groups and individuals, had gone unheeded. Mubarak said, “I had warned [then-Prime Minister] John Major, who didn’t listen to me. I repeated it this week to the BBC, when they asked me questions about people to whom Great Britain granted asylum. I sent a message to [Prime Minister] Tony Blair, recommending he be cautious.”

Six days later, Mubarak rebuked then-British Foreign Minister Jack Straw for “harboring terrorists,” during the latter’s visit to Cairo on Sept. 28, 2001. “Egypt has called on Britain to adopt certain policies to stop terrorist activities on its territories,” said Usama al-Baz, Mubarak’s political advisor, in a press conference afterward. In October 2001, Mubarak again noted the hypocrisy of the British government in an interview with the Egyptian daily *Al-Ahram*: “Some Western capitals continued to grant asylum to terrorists under the pretext of upholding human rights.”

But the voices identifying Britain as *the* major safe-haven for terrorist protection and financing were largely silenced by the pre-emptive war threats of British-asset Dick Cheney’s White House.

The latest Mumbai attacks, in which some 175 people were killed, when terrorists landed by boat and swarmed into the city center, make it ever more urgent to stop the British game plan.

For our readers, statements such as those by Mubarak are not new. On Jan. 11, 2000, *EIR*’s editors prepared a memorandum for Secretary of State Madeleine Albright called “Put Britain on the List of States Sponsoring Terrorism” (see excerpts, p. 11), using the information provided by Egypt and nine other nations—Israel, France, Algeria, Peru, Turkey, Germany, Libya, Nigeria, Yemen, Russia, and India. The memo documented their protests to Britain over London’s giving asylum, funding, and free rein to terrorist

recruitment, fundraising, and training. The memorandum was delivered to top officials of the U.S. Defense Department, Justice Department, the FBI, the CIA, and both Houses of Congress. Had the lengthy dossier been taken seriously, and had the warnings of *EIR* and its founder, Lyndon LaRouche, been heeded then, the tragedy of Sept. 11, 2001 might have been averted.

### **India Nails Britain’s Dope, Inc.**

On Nov. 29, 2008, the *Indian Express* published an article, “Dawood Gave Logistical Support to Mumbai Attackers,” identifying a leading figure in South Asian Dope, Inc. smuggling operations, Dawood Ibrahim, as a key logistical figure behind the asymmetric warfare attack on Mumbai.

Although currently based in Karachi, Pakistan and Dubai, Ibrahim for years was the central mafia figure in Mumbai, and in the Indian Bihar region, bordering with Nepal, smuggling gold in and out of India, and establishing links with South Asia’s major opium-smuggling networks. In 1999, and again in 2001, Ibrahim was linked to major terrorist incidents, including the hijacking of an Air India commercial flight, rerouted to Taliban-controlled Kandahar, Afghanistan (1999), and the assault on the Indian parliament in New Delhi (2001). Since 2003, Ibrahim has been on the U.S. State Department’s list of international terrorists, for his links to al-Qaeda and to the Indian- and Pakistan-based LeT. He has been identified as an asset of British MI6-linked elements of Pakistan’s Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI).

Dawood Ibrahim’s gold-smuggling operations in Dubai are part of Britain’s offshore money-laundering apparatus, which has existed since the time of the British East India Company’s 19th-Century opium war against India and China. U.S. intelligence sources have recently emphasized that the British offshore operations in the Caribbean and on the British Isle of Man, have been extended to Dubai, to facilitate the destabilization of Southwest and South Asia.

Indian intelligence officers, after interrogating several of the Mumbai attackers, concluded that the attacks could not have been carried out without significant “inside” help. The still-powerful elements of the Dawood Ibrahim apparatus, which maintains a dominant position in the Mumbai underworld, and launder massive amount of illegal gold through India’s “Bollywood” motion picture industry, are confirmed to have been key to the attacks.

The role of Ibrahim's Dope, Inc. apparatus, and his links to another British-sponsored key terrorist figure, Ahmed Omar Sheikh, have been highlighted by *EIR* for nearly a decade. In fact, it was the case of LeT leader Ahmed Omar Sheikh, that occasioned the January 2000 memo to the U.S. Administration and Congress demanding a crackdown on Britain's protection of terrorism.

The British role was highlighted "as the result of the December 1999 Indian Airlines hijacking, and the response of the British government to the request of one of the freed Kashmiri terrorists, Ahmed Omar Sheikh, to be given safe passage to England. Mr. Sheikh, a British national, was tried and convicted in India, for his role in the kidnapping of four British na-

tionals and an American in 1995."

The British initially promised to give Mr. Sheikh safe passage to Britain, and would not prosecute him or make any effort to extradite him back to India, but reversed that stance under international pressure.

Ahmed Omar Sheikh was hatched by British intelligence. This student at the Forest School and the London School of Economics (LSE) was, according to Indian and U.S. intelligence sources, recruited by MI6, and deployed to Bosnia before he surfaced in South Asia. After returning to Britain from the Balkans, Sheikh dropped out of LSE and flew to training camps in Afghanistan, whence he deployed into India, and carried out the 1995 kidnapping. He remained in Afghanistan after being freed in the Air India hijack-

## French Attacked London's 'City' Money Laundry

*The following is based on a longer study in EIR, Oct. 26, 2001.*

On Oct. 10, 2001, as Britain's Tony Blair was parading as the leader of the fight against "Islamic terror," in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, French authorities launched a flanking operation against Britain in the form of a parliamentary report denouncing the City of London—as well as other Crown dependencies—as a "fiscal, banking, and financial paradise for criminals."

Attached to that report is a full study on the "economic environment of bin Laden." The French are still waiting for the extradition of Rashid Ramda, the "Islamic" terrorist arrested in Britain in 1996 for having orchestrated the 1995 wave of terror in France.

Entitled "The City Of London, Gibraltar and the Crown Dependencies: Offshore Centers and Havens for Dirty Money," the report denounces the City's great vulnerability to money laundering, but also the British authorities' total lack of political will to engage in the fight against financial crime. "The government of Her Gracious Majesty claims to be lead-

ing the fight against terrorism, but it should first clean its own house," stated Arnaud Montebourg, special rapporteur of the parliamentary commission which issued the report. To the question of why the British government is not willing to have transparency in its financial transactions, Montebourg replied unambiguously that the City of London is the very heart of world finances, and that Britain's own power derives from that financial power. In the year 2000, the "gross domestic product" of the City was close to \$37.7 billion—13% of Greater London's, and 3% of the United Kingdom's.

The French report was issued by the parliamentary commission against money laundering, created in 1999. The commission previously published reports on Liechtenstein, Monaco, and Switzerland.

The report sparked a number of major articles around the world, detailing how French counterterrorism experts refer to the British empire's capital as "Londonistan." And on Oct. 29, 2001, France's *Le Monde* wrote, "London has become, for several years, the political capital of the shape of the international Islamist." "Between the end of 1980 and the beginning of the 1990s, a certain number of intellectual and militant Islamists will unload in London. . . . All the most influential preachers of 'Londonistan,' Abu Hamza al-Masri, Abu Qatada, or Omar Bakri, supported the Islamist causes in turn in Algeria, in Bosnia, in Chechnya, or in Kashmir."

—Christine Bierre

ing deal, and is now in Pakistani custody for the kidnapping and torture/beheading murder of the American journalist Daniel Pearl. Sheikh is also still a prime suspect in the organizing of 9/11.

### World Leaders Know, ‘It’s London’

At the end of 2001, world leaders were riveted on London as the place where terrorists could find a home as “oppressed peoples.” Mubarak was not alone in sounding the alarm. But the Bush-Cheney Administration silenced the outcry. Here is a tiny sampling of the in-depth reports of 2001 that identified the British terror center, and dubbed it “Londonistan”:

- On Oct. 10, 2001, the French National Assembly commission in charge of investigating dirty-money laundering, presented a report denouncing Britain as the center for laundering the “dollars of terror.” “The government of Her Gracious Majesty claims to be leading the fight against terrorism, but it should first clean its own house,” said the special rapporteur of the commission (see box. p. 7). The French daily *Le Monde* wrote on Oct. 29, 2001, “All the most influential preachers of ‘Londonistan,’ Abu Hamza al-Masri, Abu Qatada or Omar Bakri, supported the Islamist causes in turn in Algeria, in Bosnia, in Chechnya, or in Kashmir.”

- In Russia, on Oct. 2, 2001, Sergei Yastrzhembsky, one of President Putin’s top aides on Chechen affairs, praised U.S.-Russian cooperation, while singling out Britain for harboring terrorists, in a press briefing in Moscow. “We estimate that as of the end of last year, Chechen militants received assistance from about 100 . . . foreign public organizations, funds, societies. . . . We drew attention to the existence of a network of such organizations, for example, in London. . . . One of them is al-Muhajiroon, and the leader of the movement is Omar Bakri, who continuously figures among the moral and political sponsors of at least the Chechen militants.”

- In the United States, on Nov. 2, 2001, *USA Today*, the largest-circulation daily in the nation, reported, “No other nation in the West has been found to harbor or have played home to so many terrorists.” Radical clerics such as Abu Hamza al-Masri, an al-Qaeda member whom the Yemeni government has repeatedly asked Britain to extradite, have a field day “recruiting new terrorists” in Britain, “the most critical Western hub for Islamic extremists bent on waging war against ‘infidels’ like the United States.”

---

## Documentation

---

### Tracking the British Role in 2006 Mumbai Bombings

*This article, by Ramtanu Maitra, is reprinted from EIR, Aug. 4, 2006.*

The seven synchronized serial bombs that tore through suburban trains in Mumbai, India on July 11, taking at least 207 lives, and injuring more than 600 others, indicate that the international Islamic jihadis have found a soft target in the country. So far, New Delhi’s investigation has little to show, beyond indicating a Pakistani involvement in this dastardly act. No group has claimed responsibility, and the initial arrests carried out by the Mumbai police have revealed virtually nothing.

As of now, the Indian authorities have named the Pakistan-based Lashkar-e-Toiba (LeT) and India’s banned Students Islamic Movement of India (SIMI) as being behind the bombings. Reports indicate that several teams from LeT and SIMI were arrested, and that huge amounts of explosive materials, including RDX, were recovered during raids at various places in Aurangabad, Nasik, and Nagpur in the last two months. It is evident that if the Indian authorities do not succeed in widening the investigation to get a glimpse of the broader picture, the cut-outs arrested so far will not be able to reveal anything, and the country will continue to be vulnerable to such massive attacks.

In the aftermath of the incident, India postponed foreign secretary-level talks with Pakistan scheduled for July 20-21. The negotiations were a part of the third annual round of dialogue between the two countries, in their attempt to build confidence, while working towards agreement on a variety of disputes.

While there is no question of far-reaching Pakistani involvement in the attack, the investigation must seek to find out how exactly the network functions. Behind the cut-outs that have been put behind bars, there remains, hidden from public sight, a vast and sophisticated killing machine. In this context, the Indian authorities have pointed out that Pakistan Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) has strengthened its base in Nepal and northern Bihar. Investigators have also reportedly ques-



Margaret Bourke-White

*The partition of India and Pakistan in 1947, orchestrated by the British, led to huge migrations of people to escape violence against their ethnic or religious group. Some 17.9 million people left their homes (shown here are Sikhs heading toward India), and 3.4 million were never known to have reached their destination. There was massive bloodletting by both sides, with an estimated 500,000 to 1 million deaths.*

tioned several Islamic clerics in India's northeastern state of Tripura in connection with the bombings.

India has also urged Pakistan to hand over the self-exiled Mumbai mafia-don Dawood Ibrahim, who shuttles between Dubai and Karachi. Dawood, an underworld hood, had long been a Pakistani ISI asset. Long before he fled to Dubai in the 1990s, Dawood, who dealt in opium, heroin, and smuggled goods, had built up a strong underground network in Mumbai, Nepal, northern Bihar, and possibly within the Muslim community of West Bengal. Subsequently, these networks carried out terrorist acts within India. Although the planners of these terrorists' acts have realized that violent acts have little effect on the daily life of the Indian people, their objective is to trigger wide Hindu-Muslim rioting. If they succeed in achieving this goal, by carrying out such acts from time to time, then India can be brought to its knees, the masterminds believe.

### 'Londonistan'

Credit belongs to Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, for the only serious effort that Indian authorities have made so far. According to the *London Times*, during

a discussion between Prime Minister Singh and British Prime Minister Tony Blair, at the G-8 summit in Russia, after the Mumbai bombings, the Indian leader reminded Blair of a detailed dossier that had been handed over, three years ago, which identified 14 men suspected of involvement in the Mumbai bombings, as living in Britain. Blair is said to have assured Singh that the suspects would be investigated.

Another British paper, the *Birmingham Mail*, reported that a jailed taxi driver, of Pakistani origin, and now from the British Midlands, is also being questioned in connection with the Mumbai blasts. The man is currently serving a nine-year sentence for raising funds and buying

weapons for the Lashkar-e-Toiba.

It is widely acknowledged that the origin of most of the international Islamic jihads, lies in London. To those who are aware of the huge number of Islamic militants harbored by British authorities, London is known as "Londonistan." Camille Tawil, a terrorism expert at the Arabic daily *Al-Hayat*, told the *New Statesman*: "The Islamists use Britain as a propaganda base, but wouldn't do anything to a country that harbors them and gives them freedom of speech." What Ms. Tawil did not mention is that these Islamists, perhaps to maintain their bases and prosper, carry out murderous activities against other nations when they are ordered to do so.

For instance, more than 600 Islamists from Britain had gone to join the Afghan mujahideen in the 1980s, to fight the erstwhile Soviet Army. Most of them remained there to join the Taliban and al-Qaeda. Even today, when Anglo-American troops battle insurgents in Iraq, Islamists from Britain are showing up in Iraq.

To get a glimpse of the hidden picture which may clarify why London is such an Islamic headquarters, one has to take a look at the British mosques, and their role in various geopolitical activities. In the 1950s,

Muslims from the Indian subcontinent's disputed state of Jammu and Kashmir began to arrive in Britain. They came mostly from Mirpur, a part of Jammu and Kashmir, to work in the textile industries in Britain. Mirpuris came in droves, because part of their land was submerged by the dams built by the Pakistani authorities. Using their compensation money, the Mirpuris came to Britain to work.

Within a few years, it became evident that these Kashmiri immigrants, who were not only anti-India, but were also seeking an independent Kashmir, somehow got control of the British mosques, from which anti-India Kashmir policies were proclaimed.

Today, Britain has about 2 million Muslims. Of these, about 1 million are of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin. The most prevalent sect that controls the mosques is Sunni, and its adherents belong to the subcontinent's Islamic school of Deoband. Others are Wahhabis. It must be noted that the Deobandis are considered close to the Wahhabis in their orthodox religious outlook. At the time of the migration, the Pakistani ISI was in the process of finding its feet, and these political immigrants were largely under the wings of British intelligence.

### **Bastard Child of a Brit**

The Directorate for ISI was founded in 1948 by an Australia-born British army officer, Maj. Gen. R. Cawthorne, who was then Deputy Chief of Staff in the Pakistan Army. Field Marshal Ayub Khan, the President of Pakistan in the 1950s, expanded the role of ISI in safeguarding Pakistan's interests, monitoring opposition politicians, and sustaining military rule in Pakistan. It is evident that the British MI6 and MI5 had then begun working with Pakistani intelligence to bring about this control. This was primarily done by London to maintain British leverage in the Kashmir quagmire, and encourage the emergence of a "Third Force" in the Kashmir milieu that would not want to be part of either Pakistan or India, but India, in particular.

One of the least understood themes of the partition of India in 1947 by the departing British Raj, is what led the British to do it. Run-of-the-mill analysts point out that the British did not want a unified India which could be strong and anti-British. Some others say the British saw that the minority Muslims were in danger in the hands of the majority Hindus, and that that is why they moved in to form Pakistan. While the British did not want the emergence of a strong India, the formation of

Pakistan hardly helped the Muslims, who felt that they were a threatened minority. To begin with, those provinces that became a part of Pakistan were those provinces where the Muslims were in majority. Hence, the Muslims there were not in danger. The provinces where Muslims were a minority, and ostensibly "in danger," became a part of the Hindu-majority India.

But the British objective in breaking up India was simply not to divvy up the country. The British wanted two things out of it: They wanted a weak nation (Pakistan, that is), which would depend on Britain for its defense. And they wanted that newly-formed weak nation to border the oil wells of Central Asia (part of the Soviet Union, then) and to be close to the Muslim-majority, oil-rich nations of the Middle East.

Corollary to the objective was that India, the larger of the two nations then in the subcontinent (now, with the emergence of Bangladesh in 1972, the subcontinent has three nations) must not have any common border with either Afghanistan (the buffer state) or the Soviet Union.

The British objective to control the oil wells was part of the Great Game to prevent the mighty Russian empire from having access to the oil fields. The former British governor of the North West Frontier Province during the British Raj days, Olaf Caroe, used to say the shadow of the North must not extend over the wells of power. Britain realized during World War II that the one who controls the oil fields controls the destiny of many nations. As a result, beginning in 1940, South Asia was important to imperial Britain for the protection of oil fields of Arabia. Nothing more, nothing less.

### **The Replay**

The 1947 partition pretty much allowed the British to pursue the Great Game. But there remained a small hitch: the disputed state of Kashmir, which borders Afghanistan. Once Britain, with the help of a willing and weak Pakistan, and aided by a vacillating Indian leadership, managed to create a major conflict between the two fledgling nations of India and Pakistan, British intelligence moved in to house and finance the Kashmiris in the mosques in Britain. The advantages of 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 mujahideen 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 ISI. At the time, the 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 ISI, a closely knit network among 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 ISI that later oversaw the Afghan civil war (1989-95) 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.

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 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 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."

---

From EIR's Archives

---

## Put Britain on List Of Terrorist Sponsors

*The following are substantial excerpts from a memorandum, dated Jan. 11, 2000, and prepared for delivery to then-U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. It is a request to launch an investigation, pursuant to placing Great Britain on the list of states sponsoring terrorism.*

To: Hon. Madeleine Albright, Secretary of State

From: The Editors, *Executive Intelligence Review*...

This is a formal request for you to initiate a review of the role of the government of Great Britain in supporting international terrorism, to determine whether Britain should be added to the list of nations sanctioned by the U.S. government for lending support to international terrorist organizations.

This issue has been recently highlighted, as the result of the December 1999 Indian Airlines hijacking, and the response of the British government to the request of one of the freed Kashmiri terrorists, **Ahmed Omar Sheikh**, to be given safe passage to England. Mr. Sheikh, a British national, was tried and convicted in India, for his role in the kidnapping of four British nationals and an American in 1995. He was sentenced to five years in prison in November 1998. Initially, the British government announced that it would provide Mr. Sheikh with safe passage to Britain, and would not prosecute him or make any effort to extradite him back to India.

However, long before the Sheikh case, *Executive Intelligence Review* had documented a pattern of British involvement in harboring international terrorists, dating back to 1995. As of this writing, no fewer than a dozen governments—many of them leading allies of the United States—have filed formal diplomatic protests with the British Foreign Office, over specific instances of British official support for terrorist groups targeting those nations.