Lyndon LaRouche: "The danger here is that some idiot will be deployed to do something absolutely mad: because they don't care."

Brawls in Britain Over Iraq/Terror Link

by Mary Burdman

Since Prime Minister Tony Blair launched his evangelical crusade to join the George W. Bush Administration in invading Iraq, the war and the campaign of deception used to justify it have divided Britain, including Britain's intelligence and military services. The controversy over the Blair goverment's notorious "sexed up" dossier on Iraq of September 2002, which was used to ride roughshod over the broad national opposition to the war, has led to one revelation after the other of the policy fights in Britain.

Barely 10 days after the July 7 deadly terrorist bombings in London that killed 56 people, the Royal Institute of International Affairs (known as Chatham House), the British establishment's leading policy think-tank, released a report July 18 which states that there is "no doubt" that the Iraq War, and Britain following the policy of the George W. Bush Administration in Iraq, is crippling British intelligence and raising the terror risk to Britain itself.

On the strategic level, the London bombings and the entire brutal terrorist campaign, have been unleashed by networks of Synarchist financiers, who have used terrorism to twist world events for decades. These are the networks which brought fascism to power in Germany and Japan in the last century; the British "liberal imperialist" crowd has played the leading role since the Empire was launched in the 18th Century. Yet, even at the height of the British Empire, certain factions opposed, and at times brought under control, the extreme policies of the "Forward School." Their opposition serves as a precedent for the many in Britain—in and outside the power structure—who are trying to do the same to Tony Blair.

"A key problem with regard to implementing [core counter-terrorism policies] is that the U.K. government has been conducting counter-terrorism policy 'shoulder to shoulder' with the U.S., not in the sense of being an equal decision-maker, but rather as pillion passenger compelled to leave the steering to the ally in the driving seat," the report states.

"There is no doubt that the situation over Iraq has imposed particular difficulties for the U.K., and for the wider coalition against terrorism. It gave a boost to the al-Qaeda network's propaganda, recruitment, and fundraising, caused a major split in the coalition, provided an ideal targetting and training area for al-Qaeda-linked terrorists, and deflected resources

rational, when your opponent is blind to a possibility. And that's good strategy. It's also good tactics.

The other case, is another case which came up, as promoted heavily by the RAND Corp., which was promoted in the case, for example, of the idea of what I was concerned about in 1975 in Lebanon. When I was in Iraq, and I knew that we were about to have a civil war explode under Kissinger's premises in Lebanon. So, I told my friends and hosts then in Iraq, that we could expect a breakout of a civil war in Lebanon, started by Kissinger. And this would be the beginning of a general war in the Middle East. And it happened at that time.

And the point was, a so-called "chicken game," which is a standard thinking among some people, especially neo-conservative types in the United States' configuration. If you say something doesn't make any sense, they may do it. If it's insane, they may do it. It's the great bluff. It's the use of, "I am a madman, playing 'chicken' on the highway," in the highways of California, the narrow highways.

And therefore, the danger here is—and it's a danger also from Israel—that some idiot will be deployed to do something absolutely mad: *because they don't care.* They don't care. The so-called "countervailing factors of risk" will not prevent them from doing something mad. They will do it on the presumption, the same way that somebody did something in New York City on 9/11 in 2001. They didn't have Hermann Göring handy to set fire to something, so they used another device, to create a "Reichstag Fire" effect in order to change the politics of the United States and the world.

Terrorist acts are often of that character. And the mentality of the Israeli right wing and its backers, in the Middle East: They are a terrorist mentality. They will do something for effect, hoping that the sheer horror of what they do, will deter people from an appropriate action, or cause them to launch a flight forward into an even more inappropriate reaction.

and assistance that could have been deployed to assist the Karzai government [in Afghanistan] and to bring bin Laden to justice. Riding pillion with a powerful ally has proved costly in terms of British and U.S. military lives, Iraqi lives, military expenditure, and the damage caused to the counter-terrorism campaign."

The report, titled "Security, Terrorism, and the U.K.," for the International Security Programme of Chatham House, was written by two professors, Frank Gregory of the University of Southampton and Paul Wilkinson of St. Andrews, known for their sober assessments. They state that in the 1990s, British security was focussed on the IRA, and even the existence of the so-called "Londonistan" terrorist circles in Britain was not considered a domestic threat. That has now changed.

"By the mid-1990s, the United Kingdom's intelligence agencies and the police were well aware that London was increasingly being used as a base by individuals involved in promoting, funding, and planning terrorism in the Middle East and elsewhere. However, these individuals were not viewed as a threat to the U.K.'s national security, and so they were left to continue their activities with relative impunity, a policy which caused much anger among the foreign governments concerned," the authors acknowledge.

At that time, the British authorities did not appreciate the al-Qaeda threat. Now, the report states, the "U.K. is at particular risk [from al-Qaeda] because it is the closest ally of the United States, has deployed armed forces in the military campaigns to topple the Taleban regime in Afghanistan and in Iraq, and has taken a leading role in international intelligence, police and judicial cooperation against al-Qaeda, and in efforts to suppress its finances," the report states.

Britain's counter-terrorism goals are: 1) addressing "underlying causes" of terrorism in the United Kingdom and abroad, including the treatment of Muslim citizens; 2) effectively using intelligence to disrupt and apprehend terrorists; 3) ensuring that there are "reasonable security precautions"; and 4) preparedness for any attack. Especially for the first two goals, the Iraq situation is a "key problem," the report states.

Abuse of Intelligence

The Chatham House assessment is *not* new. Already on Feb. 10, 2003, before the invasion of Iraq, Britain's Joint Intelligence Committee told Blair that al-Qaeda and associated groups are "by far the greatest terrorist threat to Western interests, and that threat would be *heightened by military action against Iraq*" (emphasis added). The *Guardian*'s security affairs editor, Richard Norton-Taylor, emphasized the importance of the Joint Intelligence Committee report, as well as the Chatham House document, in his July 19 column on Blair's highly selective "use and abuse of intelligence."

The Joint Intelligence Committee report was released on Sept. 11, 2003, amid Lord Hutton's inquiry into the

EIRNS/Christopher Lewis

Tony Blair's "use and abuse of intelligence" is under attack by senior establishment officials and institutions.

circumstances of the July 17, 2003 death of British weapons expert Dr. David Kelly, by the House of Commons Intelligence and Security Committee, which was investigating Iraqi weapons of mass destruction. The top-secret report, "International Terrorism: War with Iraq," was withheld from members of Blair's Cabinet, and from the Parliament. It warned that in the event of a regime collapse in Baghdad, "there would be a risk of transfer" of chemical and biological weapons to potential terrorists, and acknowledged that intelligence heads had virtually no information about the any quantities of chemical or biological agents in Iraq, and "no intelligence [that] Iraq had provided chemical and biological materials to al-Qaeda."

Although it had no evidence of Iraqi intentions to use chemical or biological weapons, the Joint Intelligence Committee "assessed that any collapse of the Iraqi regime would increase the risk of chemical or biological warfare technology or agents finding their way into the hands of terrorists." This report thus demolished Blair's entire "case" for war, including the alleged Iraq/al-Qaeda connection. Norton-Taylor also cited the now-famous (in the United States) "Downing Street memos" of July 21, 2002, and July 23, 2003.

Britain's security and intelligence agencies and senior officials in Whitehall, Britain's permanent bureaucracy, were opposed to attacking Iraq because "they knew the Bush Administration was not telling the truth when it claimed there was a link between al-Qaeda and Baghdad." Foreign Office diplomats who also opposed the war, "slapped down" these officials, because their views might damage U.S.-U.K. relations, Norton-Taylor wrote.

The Iraq War has also damaged British attempts to recruit agents or informants in the Islamic world, he said. "There are many in Whitehall who believe that the public will forever treat 'intelligence' with dangerous cynicism. . . . Lord Butler's report on the use of intelligence on Iraq's weapons programme [states that] [i]ntelligence . . . 'can be a dangerous tool if its limitations are not recognised by those who seek to use it.' "

Norton-Taylor wrote: "The limitations of intelligence were amply demonstrated in London on July 7. The security and intelligence agencies have said they will learn lessons. Is it too much to hope that Blair and his foreign policy makers will too?"

A Shrill Response

Downing Street has been shrill in its response to the Chatham House commentary. Foreign Secretary Jack Straw and Defense Secretary John Reid both rejected the report. Blair's contention, is that "extremism" causes terrorism. It is certainly the case that fundamentalism, whether of the "Christian," "Muslim," "Jewish," "Hindu," or any other such variety, is a fascist ideology that can generate violence. But this is not what the crusading "Liberal imperialist" Blair has in mind.

A senior City of London analyst told *EIR* July 19 that the Chatham House report is especially interesting, "because Chatham House is full of people associated with the Foreign Office. I think they are getting their revenge on Blair for the Iraq War. Blair ran off on his own unilateral foreign policy from 2002-03 on Iraq, and he did this without the Foreign Office agreement. Chatham House never liked Blair's relationship with Bush, but Blair went 100%. Now, they want a policy more consonant with what they see as British material interests, and not one so subservient to the United State. The Chatham House group does not want Britain to be involved in such a war; it is damaging to British policy in the Mideast, and I am sure their view is that this *does* increase the risk of terrorism against Britain," the analyst said. "It is also now clear that the intelligence services did drop their guard before the bombings."

One British expert on Iraq pointed out that "what is extraordinary about the [Chatham House] report is who wrote it. Paul Wilkinson not only has very strong connections to the intelligence and security services but receives quite a bit of funding from the government. . . . In linking the war in Iraq to the weakening of the fight against international terrorism, the report said what almost every journalist in the country has been wanting to say." This has brought the Iraq War policy question back to "center stage," he said, and adds to the debate, on who actually was behind the London bombings.

Higher Terror Threat

On July 20, just a day before renewed incidents on the London transport system—this time without casualties—the outspoken London Mayor Ken Livingstone blamed Anglo-French and U.S. policy in Southwest Asia since World War I, including the sponsoring of Osama bin Laden, for helping generate the terrorist danger. While denouncing terrorism and violence in all forms, Livingstone told BBC Radio 4's "Today" program: "I think you've just had 80 years of Western intervention into predominantly Arab lands because of the Western need for oil. . . . And I think the particular problem we have at the moment is that in the 1980s . . . the Americans recruited and trained Osama bin Laden, taught him how to kill, to make bombs, and set him off to kill the Russians and drive them out of Afghanistan. They didn't give any thought to the fact that once he'd done that he might turn on his creators.

"If at the end of the First World War, we had done what we promised the Arabs, which was to let them be free and have their own governments, and kept out of Arab affairs, and just bought their oil, rather than feeling we had to control the flow of oil, I suspect this wouldn't have arisen." Livingstone also attacked "double standards," including Western nations' initial welcome to Saddam Hussein when he came to power in Iraq, and the "running sore" of the Palestinian/Israeli conflict.

Liberal Democratic Party leader Charles Kennedy on July 12 repeated his call for a clear timetable for withdrawal of British troops from Iraq, "going hand in hand with political progress," but he also emphasized that "the status quo is not a credible option." While blaming terrorists for their attacks, Kennedy also noted that the occupation of Iraq and the Israel-Palestine situation are terrorism's main "recruiting sergeants. . . . The way we went to war in the first place, as well as the mismanagement of the aftermath, have fuelled the conditions in which terrorism flourishes. Iraq and 9/11 were two different and distinct security issues. But now we have the worst of both worlds, an unstable Iraq, free of the tyranny of Saddam Hussein, but facing the tyranny of the suicide bomber," Kennedy said.

Even Blair's own Joint Terrorist Analysis Center warned in a mid-June report that Britain's intelligence and law enforcement officials had concluded that "Events in Iraq are continuing to act as motivation and a focus of a range of terrorist related activity in the United Kingdom."

The report, leaked to journalists and then published in the *New York Times* July 19, said that "many of our current concerns focus on the wide range and large number of extremist networks and individuals in the U.K. and individuals and groups that are inspired, by but only loosely affiliated to [al-Qaeda] or are entirely autonomous."

However, the Joint Terrorist Analysis Center "concluded" that "at present, there is not a group with both the current intent and the capability to attack the U.K." The government then lowered its formal threat assessment one level, despite the timing: The massive police and security deployment at the G-8 summit in Gleneagles, Scotland, meant that London had to call back many of its top bomb and other experts on an emergency basis after the July 7 bombings.