

British-Saudi Terror Team Sparks Sectarian Bloodbath

by Ramtanu Maitra

Jan. 7—It's all going according to the hideous plan. Dozens of sectarian killings are occurring every day in the region spanning from North Africa to Syria to Afghanistan and Pakistan, creating chaos, and threatening to detonate a Sunni-versus-Shi'ite conflict that could drown the region in blood. If the bloodshed doesn't end up provoking a nuclear confrontation between NATO on the one side, and Russia and/or China on the other, it will create the conditions for a level of genocide not seen since the Mongol marauders, at the behest of the Venetian Empire, swept across Asia centuries ago.

This is the British imperial plan. Behind the local militias and jihadis are the kingdoms of Saudi Arabia and Qatar, which fund, arm, and direct the mayhem. But the Saudis and Qataris are themselves not “independent” forces, but integral and controlled assets of the British Empire, which is determined to create the conditions where it can maintain its global financial dominance, as well as to set off the most massive depopulation the world has ever seen, achieving the monarchy's wish for reduction of the world population from the current 7 billion, to something like 1 billion.

The British Empire is determined to use its historical control over radical and royal currents in the Islamic world—emphatically including its control of what is called al-Qaeda—to stir up more than 1 billion Muslims into a bloody conflict that could destroy civilization itself.

At present, the cockpit of this conflict is Syria, where Saudi- and Qatari-funded fanatics are waging a

brutal war against Christians, Shi'as, and the Assad regime, with the support of the Western nations. Soon, however, the British hope to install the same kind of alliance in Afghanistan, as the majority of NATO troops leave. And that, too, will be only the beginning of an uprising that is intended to spread to all of Central Asia, including Russia and China.

Unless a patriotic leadership in the United States succeeds in turning the U.S. Presidency *against* this deadly British game, and that very soon, disaster is certain.

Iraq: Once Again Under Siege

Instead of restraining the sectarian terrorist onslaught, the Obama Administration has given the Saudis a free hand to fund and arm the Sunni militants in the Shi'a-majority nation of Iraq. As a result, in recent months, violence there has risen multifold.

Brian M. Downing, a military analyst, in his article, “The Saudis’ dangerous alliance with Salafi forces, against Arab Spring,” appearing in WorldTribune.com on Dec. 19, 2012, pointed out that Riyadh is out to weaken the Shi'a power in Iraq. Extremist Salafi/Wahhabi forces were central to the anti-coalition insurgency in Iraq and continue to oppose Shi'a rule. “The House of Saud sees the tide of democracy as neither good nor inevitable nor irreversible. Riyadh will use its influence and wealth to roll back democracy. Failure to do so, in Riyadh's view, will weaken its rule and



White House Photo

The monarchies of Saudi Arabia (left: King Abdullah) and Great Britain (right: Queen Elizabeth II) are fomenting bloodshed throughout Southwest Asia, steering and funding such groups as al-Qaeda in Iraq (below). The guise is “democracy,” but the whole world knows that this is a sick joke.



strengthen Shi’a power in the Gulf and beyond. Halting democracy, then, is a moral and strategic imperative. The campaign is likely already underway,” Downing wrote.

The preparation for sectarian violence resumed even before the U.S. troops had left Iraq. A report, “Al Qaeda exploits Iraq’s orphans for a new army of militants,” by Nizar Latif on Dec 7, 2011 in *The National*, revealed that a new generation of al-Qaeda militants recruited from Iraq’s overcrowded orphanages is posing a formidable challenge to security and intelligence officials in Baghdad. There are also reports that Shi’as are getting support from Iran in order to counter the Saudi-led Wahhabi¹ insurgents, furthering the bloodbath.

But if you listen to the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI), a British intelligence-linked think-tank, a larger scheme emerges. It is no surprise or coincidence, RUSI points out, that demonstrators in Anbar (a large Sunni-majority province in western Iraq, bordering Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Syria) are flying the flag of the Syrian revolt, alongside the former flag of Saddam’s Iraq. The ties that bind the populations of Anbar and other Sunni areas in Iraq with those in Syria are strong and were forged in the fires of the Iraq civil war of 2005-07. A post-Assad, Sunni-dominated government in Syria would have a profound impact upon the pattern of political power in Iraq—something that Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki seems to be aware of. (*RUSI Analysis*, Jan. 3, 2013, by Gareth Stansfield, Senior As-

sociate Fellow and Director of Middle East Studies.)

RUSI’s report was corroborated in an article in the Lebanese news daily *Al-Akhbar* on Dec. 30, titled “Could Iraq’s protests lead to a whole new state? Sunnis look for secession.” The journalist wrote, “the most significant aspect of the Anbar sit-in and the accompanying demonstrations has been the growing number of voices calling for the establishment of a self-governing region in western Iraq similar to the Kurdish region in the north. Others have gone further, advocating the creation of a breakaway ‘State of Western Iraq’ consisting of the country’s western governorates as well as neighboring Jordan, in the event of the monarchic regime there falling.”

The article quoted political analyst Ahmad al-Sharifi, pointing out that Prime Minister Maliki’s recent visit to Jordan and offer to extend an oil pipeline across Jordan to Aqaba to export Iraqi oil and satisfy Jordan’s crude oil requirements, was aimed at countering this alleged scheme. “It is part of his plan to back the Jordanian regime and prevent it from collapsing. The kingdom had announced prior to Maliki’s visit that it was going through very hard times,” he noted. “Maliki knows that if the Jordanian regime collapses and Islamist forces come to power, that would provide the cornerstone for the declaration of a State of Western Iraq.”

The break-up of Iraq, of course, does not *end* the process of bloody conflict, but is only a stepping-stone

1. See “What Is Wahhabism?” *EIR*, Sept. 28, 2012.

to larger conflicts and disintegration of the remaining nation-states in the region, perhaps starting with Jordan.

Next Comes Afghanistan

While the mayhem in Syria, Libya, and Iraq spreads, another country waiting for the axe to fall is Afghanistan. Having failed to establish stability in that country over the last 11 years, the Obama Administration, which inherited the mess in 2009, is planning to pull out most of its 68,000 troops by 2014. NATO allies of the United States are also set to move out most of their 30,000 troops around the same time, if not earlier.

However, the problem that Washington encounters is: Who would be left in charge of Afghanistan? Historically, Afghanistan has never had a democratic political process, nor political parties that would effectively represent the multi-ethnic societies. And, as a result of the intervention of Britain's Saudi assets, the country is now riddled with well-armed, pseudo-religious mujahideen groups, who are effectively Wahhabi foot soldiers under the label of the Taliban. These are the militants whom the 2001 U.S. invasion ousted—and which the Karzai government is now being pushed to bring back as the governing party!²

As *EIR* has extensively reported, as far back as 2009, the British imperial plan has always been to bring the Taliban back into power. In fact, one of Britain's major complaints about Afghan President Hamid Karzai, is that he has aggressively opposed this plan, going so far as, on Dec. 27, 2007, to expel two MI6 agents on charges that they posed a threat to the country's national security. An unnamed Afghan government official told the London *Sunday Telegraph* that "this warning," that the men had been financing the Taliban for at least ten months, "came from the Americans. One of the agents, Mervyn Patterson, worked for the United Nations, while the other, Michael Semple, worked for the European Union.

The London *Times* wrote that, when Patterson and Semple were arrested, they were carrying \$150,000, which was to be given to Taliban commanders in Musa Qala. "British officials have been careful to distance current MI6 talks with Taliban commanders in Helmand from the expulsions of Michael Semple, the Irish head of the EU mission and widely known as a close confidant of Britain's ambassador, Sir Sherard Cowper-Coles



Sir Cowper-Coles hit the nail on the head, telling the House of Commons in 2010 that the future of Afghanistan will be like "a double-decker bus," with an American driver, the locals and other parties as passengers, and "with luck, a British back-seat driver"!

Coles, and Mervyn Patterson, a British advisor to the UN," the *Times* wrote.

Sir Cowper-Coles: Britain Must Be in Charge

Now that the Obama Administration—after pursuing a designed-to-fail counterinsurgency policy, which has led to many deaths of American troops and many more Afghans—has come to realize that it has no further card to play, and has turned to London's plan to bring back the Taliban. No one expresses this outlook more clearly than Sir Cowper-Coles, the top British intelligence operative who is *now an executive with BAE*, the very agency that funded al-Qaeda in its 9/11 plots and beyond.

In the uncorrected version of the British House of Commons minutes of evidence (Nov. 9, 2010) taken before the Foreign Affairs Committee on the U.K.'s foreign policy toward Afghanistan and Pakistan, Cowper-Coles was quoted, answering a question from John Baron MP:

"The key question—this was Mr Baron's question—is how you accompany a military draw-down with a serious political process. The analogy that I have used—I thought of it a few weeks ago—is of a double-decker bus. You need an American chassis, an American engine, an American driver and an American sat-nav system.

"The passengers on the lower deck of the bus will be the internal parties. This is about far more than just talking to the Taliban; the Tajiks are increasingly alienated.

2. See "Afghan Warlords Prepare for Another Civil War," *EIR*, Nov. 30, 2012.

“On the top deck of the bus, you have all the external parties. The largest passenger will be Pakistan, but India, China, Russia, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, the emirates and the lower tier of the -stans will all be there. The bus will be painted in Afghan colours and have a UN conductor on each floor and, with luck, a *British back-seat driver*” (emphasis added).

He went on to say: “We are major. We are very much premier league and everyone else is sort of champions league.” (Cowper-Coles’ reference point is the English Football League, where the top teams play in the premier league, while the lesser ones in the champions league.)

Inter Press Service analyst Gareth Porter, in an article, “Afghan Peace Talks Widen US-UK Rift on War Policy,” Oct. 9, 2012, pointed out that Cowper-Coles is reported to have put much of the blame for the deterioration of the situation in Afghanistan on the Karzai government. “The security situation is getting worse,” he quoted Cowper-Coles as saying. The report makes it clear that the British want to withdraw all their troops from Afghanistan within five to ten years. Cowper-Coles is said to have suggested that the only way to do so is through an “acceptable dictator.”

Now, who might this “acceptable dictator” be that Cowper-Coles suggests? Obviously, it is the Taliban supremo, Mullah Omar. And that is why the Obama Administration is running from pillar to post to find a way to talk to him.

A New River of Blood

Will such a dictatorship bring peace? Of course not.

There is no doubt that to put the Taliban back in power in Kabul, thus adhering to the British- and Saudi-led plan, which the hapless Obama Administration is ready to implement, will usher in yet another river of blood. There are widespread reports that the Afghan warlords are arming themselves to meet the violence that would ensue. The Indian news daily *The Hindu* carried an article by Graham Bowley, “Afghan warlords regrouping,” on Nov. 14, 2012, that said one of the most powerful mujahideen commanders in Afghanistan, Ismail Khan, is calling on his followers to reorganize and defend the country against the Taliban as Western militaries withdraw, in a public demonstration of the faltering confidence in the national government and the Western-built Afghan National Army (ANA).

In addition, Marshal Muhammad Qasim Fahim, an ethnic Tajik commander, who is President Karzai’s First Vice President, said in a speech in September, “If the

Afghan security forces are not able to wage this war, then call upon the mujahideen.” Another prominent mujahideen fighter, Ahmad Zia Massoud, said in an interview at his home in Kabul, that people were worried about what was going to happen after 2014, and he was telling his own followers to make preliminary preparations.

Supplementing the historic opposition by the Tajik-Uzbek-Hazara Afghans to the Taliban (who are ethnically Pushtun), the United States has raised the Afghan National Army, with about 350,000 soldiers. Although most of the ANA members are not as competent as their opponents, the fact remains that they have guns, and at least 60% of them are non-Pushtuns who virulently oppose the Taliban.

Gautam Das, a former Indian Army officer who helped train Afghan officers of an earlier period, wrote in *The Small Wars Journal* recently that “while the officer corps is still slightly Tajik-heavy, the ANA as a whole is a little over 40 percent Pashtun, nearly a third Tajik followed by the Hazaras, Uzbeks and the other smaller ethnic groups reflecting the broad composition of the country. It’s an obvious strength, but it also a potential risk. What if soldiers of one ethnic group refuse to take part in operations for some reason or the other; perhaps they don’t want to go on an operation in a Pashtun-dominated area or there is some other cause for disaffection?”

Break the U.S. from British-Saudi Grip

The historical control by the British Empire over the Gulf Arabs, and large sections of the Islamic world, has been extensively documented for decades, including by *EIR*. Thus, it should be no surprise that London is a world-recognized center for terrorists, and exercises the decisive control over its terrorist creations, such as al-Qaeda, Hizb-ut-Tahrir, and other violent jihadi groups.

What makes the British role especially deadly is the fact that the U.S. Presidency, under both George W. Bush and now Barack Obama, is lending its support to the British terror projects—even in the face of the role played by those very terrorists in attacks on the United States, such as 9/11/2001 and 9/11/2012.

Such an alliance can be tolerated no longer. It not only threatens the United States, but civilization as a whole. It’s about time U.S. citizens recalled that the only significant enemy the U.S. has is the British Empire. Once that tie is broken, primarily financially, the prospects for progress and harmony will be back on the agenda.