



Anglo-Americans reap the terror whirlwind

By Elisa Barwick

Former British Labour MP and Mayor of London Ken Livingstone wasn't telling authorities anything they don't already know when he warned the USA and UK to stop their interference in foreign nations if they want to reduce the threat of terrorism. In a 30 April article for RT News, Livingstone laid the blame for the global spread of Islamist terrorism at the feet of the Anglo-American alliance, pointing to foreign interventions from the US sponsorship of the Afghani mujahedin to the US-UK coalition-led Iraq war.

Critical to launching the war in Iraq, Livingstone recounted, was the cover-up of the US Congress's investigation of the 9/11 terror attack with the excision of 28 pages from the final publication of its Joint Inquiry Report. "The people of Britain and America were told we had to invade Iraq because it had weapons of mass destruction and had been linked to the 9/11 terror attacks in the US", wrote Livingstone. "The US Congress conducted a detailed investigation of this but when their report was published, 28 pages were withheld. Had those pages been revealed Congress and the British House of Commons would not have voted to support the invasion of Iraq because these pages alleged that the funding for Osama bin Laden's terrorist organisation came from Saudi Arabia."

The Joint Inquiry released its report in December 2002, but President George W. Bush and subsequently President Barack Obama refused to release the missing chapter on the grounds of "national security". It was finally released in July 2016, fourteen years after the original report, under excruciating pressure generated by collaborators of the Citizens Electoral Council in the LaRouche Political Action Committee, the 9/11 families, and a bipartisan group of Congressmen. When one [reads those pages](#) it is not hard to see why they were concealed for so long. They form a devastating indictment of the Saudi sponsorship of terrorism—with Saudi Arabia's then Ambassador to the USA Prince Bandar bin Sultan the leading protagonist, conducting money transfers to Saudi intelligence agents assisting the hijackers—and expose the complicity of the relevant Anglo-American agencies.

Why the complicity? Because terrorism is wielded as a tool of political control. Livingstone pointed to this fact by citing the rise of far-right extremism, which is rationalised as a reaction to Islamic terrorism. "The growth of far-right terrorism is seen as being fuelled by Islamist threats", he wrote. As this publication has emphasised recently in its coverage of the Christchurch and Sri Lanka terrorist attacks,¹ the Anglo-American sponsorship of terrorism is designed to spark a tit-for-tat religious war, which would pitch citizens at each others' throats and prevent nations from collaborating to unleash peace and economic development as a new global financial crisis nears.

Britain's MI5 intelligence agency has warned that while Islamist terrorism is still the greatest threat, violent extremism on both the far right and far left is growing. Following the Christchurch attack, anti-extremism

commissioner Sara Khan reported there had been a surge in far-right groups which are "organised, professional and actively attempting to recruit". This was the pretext for the latest in a series of politically constrictive police-state laws—one of the desired outcomes of this process—PM Theresa May's proposed internet censorship against "Online Harms".²

A lack of understanding of the origins of Islamist terrorism, deliberately perpetuated by the airbrushing of the 28 pages, has fuelled the far-right reaction tarring all Muslims with the same brush. This is as ridiculous as equating Christianity with the Ku Klux Klan, indicated Livingstone. "Every faith has its extremist elements", he wrote, also making a comparison with The Troubles in Northern Ireland when some British press "depict[ed] every Irish Catholic as a terrorist".

The Wahhabist perversion of Islam was founded by Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab (1703-92) and adopted as the official and dominant sect of Islam by Saudi King Abdulaziz ibn Saud (1875-1953), the Brits' man in Arabia following the fall of the Ottoman Empire, on their payroll for more than ten years. With the doctrine dedicated to purging non-Wahhabi Muslims as well as non-Muslims, moderate religious leaders were thrown out and exiled. It is this craziness which the Anglo-American partners stirred up—by design—beginning with their Iraq intervention.

British historian and author Mark Curtis reminded readers of the folly of Western regime-change interventions in a 2 May article for *Middle East Eye*, titled "How the West's war in Libya has spurred terrorism in 14 countries". Re-counting the effort to overthrow and kill Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi, Curtis wrote about how the 2011 conflict "produced an ungoverned space in Libya and a country awash with weapons, ideal for terrorist groups to thrive". Afterwards, the country "became a facilitation and training hub for around 3,000 fighters on their way to Syria", many of whom joined ISIS or al-Qaeda affiliates. Libya itself became a base for ISIS operations linked to major terror operations across Europe, from the 2015 Bataclan attacks in Paris, to the Tunisian beach resort attack in 2015 and the 2017 Manchester bombing in the UK. Numerous attacks in Egypt and the Sahel region of Africa are attributed to al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) and Boko Haram, both fostered in Libya. Curtis reports that fighters embedded in Libya from numerous other countries are now "potentially available to return to their own countries after receiving training". This is a truly horrifying prospect, as we have already witnessed in Sri Lanka.

Faced with this reality, there are two clear options. Accept a police state crackdown limiting freedoms on an unprecedented scale but leaving the terrorists untouched, or, as Livingstone suggests, reverse the policies supporting regime change, terrorism and war. This requires a purge of both neo-conservatives and liberal interventionists on both sides of the political spectrum. Fortunately there is a growing alliance, both in the USA and UK, of political figures from both sides of the aisle, rallying against Anglo-American imperialism. It has truly come back to bite us.

1. "The Christchurch massacre: British imperial 'population control'" Pt I & II, AAS, 24 Apr. and 1 May; "The Australian connection to the Sri Lanka Easter massacre", AAS, 1 May.

2. "British Establishment lays out its plan to control the internet", AAS, 17 Apr. 2019.