Mondialisation.ca
Centre de recherche sur la mondialisation

US Ponders Whether to Go to War with Russia to Salvage Al Qaeda in Syria

Par Eric Zuesse
Mondialisation.ca, 08 octobre 2016
Strategic Culture Foundation

Région : Middle East & North Africa
Thème: Terrorism, US NATO War Agenda
Analyses: SYRIA

Sources that will be provided here, document the historical narrative now occurring toward all-out war between the US and Russia, up till the present, as that history will be introduced in the following two paragraphs (the first paragraph for background, and the second for a summary of the documentation that will then constitute the main body of the present report):

FOR BACKGROUND:

The US government (Barack Obama) was being led by the Saudi royal family, who own Saudi Arabia, in selecting members for the so-called 'peace negotiations' with Russia on the Syrian conflict, and those 'negotiations' broke up because the US refused to stop backing Al Qaeda in Syria. As I reported and documented on 6 May 2016:

> «These talks broke down on April 18th because Al Nusra was facing imminent defeat in the key city of Aleppo, and because such a defeat was unacceptable to Mohammed Alloush, the Saudi agent, and head of the Saudi-Wahhabist group, the Army of Islam. He was selected by King Saud to lead the rebel side at Syria's peace negotiations».

FOR SUMMARY OF THE FOLLOWING REPORT:



Al Qaeda in Syria (which used to call itself «Al Nusrah») has been leading the US proxy army of jihadists trying to replace Bashar al-Assad's government in Syria, but now that Russia and the US have broken off negotiations after the US bombed the Syrian army in Syria's Deir ez-Zor on September 18th, Russia and the United States are gearing up for war against each other in Syria.

Both Russia and Syria have now quit trying to work any longer with the United States to defeat Al Qaeda in Syria — they've had enough of America's protecting Al Qaeda in Syria; they are laying down the gauntlet to the US regime, and are saying that the US regime can

henceforth choose either to leave Syria (which it has invaded by its illegal entry into Syria), or else to go to war against both Syria and Russia there, because Syria and Russia will no longer continue to be deterred by US pretenses about its support of alleged 'moderate rebels', no longer deterred from Syria's and Russia's joint goal of destroying all jihadists in Syria, including Al Qaeda there — America's actually *key proxy-force on the ground trying to replace Assad*.

* * *

Now will be presented the documented recent developments producing this historic break towards World War III. We start with America's bombing of the Syrian Army, and continue up through to October 7th:

On 18 September 2016, Reuters headlined, «US-led forces strike Syrian troops, prompting emergency U.N. meeting», and reported that, «The United States military said the coalition stopped the attacks against what it had believed to be Islamic State positions in northeast Syria after Russia informed it that Syrian military personnel and vehicles may have been hit. The United States relayed its 'regret'».

Russia's *Sputnik News* then bannered on the 18th, «Russian FM: Lethal US Strike on Syrian Army 'Borders on Connivance With Daesh'», and reported that, «The Russian Foreign Ministry released a sternly worded statement following a tense 24-hours of diplomacy after an allegedly 'unintentional' US airstrike killed 80 Syrian Army forces 'paving the way' for a Daesh offensive». («Daesh» is a synonym for ISIS.)

Russia's *RIA News agency* headlined on the 18th, «Assad Advisor Explains How the USAF [US Air Force] Might Coordinate with IG [another synonym for ISIS]», and reported that, «As soon as Washington struck [Assad's forces], terrorists launched a ground attack [on Assad's forces]. [It] hit exactly on the territory that was occupied by the Syrian army».

Later on the 18th, *Russian Television* headlined «'Unbelievable' that US strike on Syrian army was mistake – fmr MI5 agent», and reported that a former intelligence officer for Britain's MI5, Annie Machon, said: «I find it slightly unbelievable that the Americans could hit this target thinking this was ISIS… So it seems just strange that the Americans are just saying it was a bit of a mistake». She asserted that, in the unlikely event the US really believed that it was supporting «so-called moderate groups» (as she put it) in Syria, «Americans are dealing with fire,» because the so-called 'moderate rebels' often defect to jihadist groups and bring along with them the weapons that the US had provided.

'Unbelievable' that US strike on Syrian army was mistake – fmr MI5 agent

This US assistance to Al Qaeda in Syria — Al Nusrah — has been reported for years, by many independent sources, such as in Seymour Hersh's two separate reports about Obama's lies regarding Al Nusrah's being the actual source of the 21 August 2013 sarin gas attack that Obama was blaming on Assad's government. In fact, on 16 August 2016, the US government even admitted that in Syria «We're not focused on the former al-Nusra Front. We're focused on Daesh [ISIS], and that's what we're fighting». Evenwhile the US was working with Russia and Syria to kill ISIS in Syria, the US refused to cooperate in attacking Al Qaeda there.

Here was the report, also on September 18th, from Ziad Fadel, a Syrian-born US lawyer (in

Michigan) who has many sources in Syria, and who writes for his own popular news-site about this war, the «Syrian Perspective» site, based upon his constant contacts with those Syrians:

> «DAYR EL-ZOR:
>
> To be specific, at the Al-Tharda Mountain which is still occupied by the Syrian Army – no thanks to the exceptional talent of the Americans for bungling or outright treachery, yesterday, the United States Air Force, flying out of Habbaaniyya AB in Iraq, with 2 F-16s and 2 A-10 Thunderbolts, crossed the Syrian border without permission and entered Syrian airspace without so much as a hint to the government in Damascus, which might have asked the Americans: WHAT IS YOUR TARGET GOING TO BE? And if the Americans responded with something like: 'Those ISIS terrorists on Al-Tharda Mountain', the Syrian government might have said: 'Oh, no. Don't do that. Our army is on that mountain.' And the whole mess could have been averted. 62 Syrian soldiers would still be alive……. We will not forget».

He further reported that,

> «an enraged Syrian Army with the help of the PDC and Shu'aytaat Tribal militias, acting under the tenacious and ferocious aerial support of both the SAAF [Syrian Arab Air Force] and RuAf [Russian Air Force], quickly restored army control over all Al-Tharda Mountain inflicting at least 100 casualties on the terrorist filth, destroying 10 vehicles, 6 of which were pickups with 23mm cannons. The air forces are continuing assaults today all around the area of Al-Tharda, Panorama and Al-'urfi».

On September 20th, the *Wall Street Journal* headlined, «US Believes Russia Bombed Syrian Aid Convoy». But the next day, Britain's Guardian reported that, «US is not revealing what evidence it has to support claim Moscow was responsible». (Russia denied that it had anything to do with that bombing. Whether the US did it is still not known.)

On September 26th, *SANA,* the Syrian government's news agency, bannered, «Al-Moallem: The US wanted to lie and change facts regarding what the Syrian government is doing, but it failed», and reported that: «Deputy Prime Minister, Foreign and Expatriates Minister Walid al-Moallem stressed that the United States, France, and Britain called for a UN Security Council session on Syria this Sunday [September 23rd] in an attempt to support terrorist organizations in Syria… He stressed that the aggression of the US-led coalition on a Syrian Arab Army position in Tharda Mountain in Deir Ezzor was deliberated and in coordination with ISIS, as ISIS rushed to take control of the area only one hour after the aggression».

Also on the 26th, *Reuters* bannered «Gulf may arm rebels now Syria truce is dead: US officials» and reported the likely sharp escalation of support by the oil kingdoms, for the anti-Assad forces, and asserted «the possibility that Gulf states might arm Syrian rebels with shoulder-fired missiles to defend themselves against Syrian and Russian warplanes, US officials said». This report indicated that the US and its allies were now planning to (either by their own forces or by their proxies who are actually led by Al Qaeda there) shoot down Russian and Syrian planes in Syrian air space. *Reuters* was reporting efforts by the Sauds and their friends, to pressure a reluctant Obama into joining with them in an all-out war against both Russia and Syria, in Syria.

On September 28th, The New York Times bannered, «Russia's Brutal Bombing of Aleppo May Be Calculated, and It May Be Working» and reported that:

> The effects of Russia's bombing campaign in the Syrian city of Aleppo — destroying hospitals and schools, choking off basic supplies, and killing aid workers and hundreds of civilians over just days — raise a question: What could possibly motivate such brutality?
>
> Observers attribute Russia's bombing to recklessness, cruelty or Moscow's desperate thrashing in what the White House has called a «quagmire».
>
> But many analysts take a different view: Russia and its Syrian government allies, they say, could be massacring Aleppo's civilians as part of a calculated strategy, aimed beyond this one city.
>
> The strategy, more about politics than advancing the battle lines, appears to be designed to pressure rebels to ally themselves with extremists, eroding the rebels' legitimacy; give Russia veto power over any high-level diplomacy; and exhaust Syrian civilians who might otherwise support the opposition.

This report didn't mention another possible explanation for what Russia was doing there: the goal might simply be to exterminate the jihadists who had been imported into Syria by the US and its allied Arabic royal families, during five years of such 'civil war', in the few areas of Syria where even the vast majority of the local Syrian residents prefer Shariah law and thus favor the overthrow of the highly secular, ideologically non-religious, Assad government. (Those areas of Syria are identifiable by this Western-sponsored poll that had been taken of the Syrian population during July 2015, where, for example, on page 4, Assad's support is the lowest in Raqua, Idlip, Daraa, Der'-Zor, Sewedaa, and Hasakeh; and, on page 7, Nusra's support is by far the highest in Aleppo, but also relatively high in Rural Damascus, Hasakeh, Der'-Zor, Homs, and Daraa.)

This technique of defeating jihadists — exterminating them and their supporters — was the way that Putin had solved the Saudi-led insurgency by jihadists in Russia's own Chechnya region (who had been backed by both the CIA and the Sauds): exterminating everyone in the fanatical neighborhoods. It also served as a model in Tatarstan, preventing jihadism there.

Just as the United States participated in the firebombing of Dresden, and carried out the nuking of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and slaughtered many non-combatants in the process, Russia destroys entire jihadist-supporting neighborhoods, not only the jihadist mercenaries who have taken over control there (and who have either killed or driven out any residents who oppose them). The reason that *The New York Times* doesn't mention such an explanation is that it doesn't fit what the White House is saying about the matter; it fits instead with what 'the enemies' (Assad and Putin) are saying they're doing. In fact, the *NYT* report went so far as to actually sub-headline «Blurring Rebels and Jihadists» and assert that, «Aleppo is a metaphor for the larger war.

The northern Syrian city is one of the few remaining strongholds for non-jihadist rebel groups». Even the Western-sponsored poll in July 2015 showed that to be the exact opposite of the reality. Although the NYT said this, the United States government iteslf had already

asserted the opposite: on 20 April 2016, the Pentagon's official spokesperson on the Syrian war, Steve Warren, said «It's primarily al-Nusra who holds Aleppo». So, the regime sometimes has problems keeping its narrative together (sometimes its press-mouthpieces such as the *NYT* go even beyond the government's own lies), but they needn't really worry much when they slip up like that and state the truth, because, after all, The New York Times reaches far more Americans than does a flunky at an official press conference, and everybody who is involved in the cons knows what the intended story-line is supposed to be (i.e.: Russian government bad; US government good), so such elementary slip-ups are rare, and inconsequential. (But the Pentagon spokesperson, Steven Warren, might miss his next promotion for that error, honesty.)

In other words: the US is allied with Al Qaeda in Syria.

On September 28th, US State Department spokesperson John Kirby was asked in a press conference, «What makes you think that the Secretary's [John Kerry's] threat to begin to take steps to suspend cooperation if the Russians don't act to stop the violence immediately is likely to get the Russians to actually stop the violence?» Like any professional 'news' 'reporter' for the regime, this questioner posed his question with the underlying assumption «Russian government bad» «American government good». Mr. Kirby, likewise very professional as a propagandist, replied, «you'd have to ask Foreign Minister Lavrov» (in the 'enemy' camp). Then, the 'journalist' prodded Kirby further, and Kirby said, «we thought that that could help us advance the fight against a group like al-Nusrah in particular».

He was presenting the US as if it had been against, instead of for, Al Qaeda in Syria. (Actually, Obama is committed to, and highly dependent upon, Al Qaeda in Syria in order to overthrow Assad.) A 'journalist' asked: «Can you foresee any options that the US Government could take, short of full-scale warfare and invasion, that would actually stop the Russian/Syrian onslaught on Aleppo?» Then that was refined to «What are the consequences for Russia?» And, finally, after much to-and-fro, and with obvious great reluctance, Kirby handed to the assembled dogmeat-hungry 'journalists':

> The consequences are that the civil war will continue in Syria, that extremists and extremists groups will continue to exploit the vacuums that are there in Syria to expand their operations, which will include, no question, attacks against Russian interests, perhaps even Russian cities, and Russia will continue to send troops home in body bags, and they will continue to lose resources – even, perhaps, more aircraft.

The US State Department is now officially threatening Russia with war — not only on the proxy-battlefields of Syria, but «perhaps even Russian cities». Was that historic announcement headlined as such in the American 'news' media? In such a country, one can't blame the public for sleepwalking into global annihilation, if that's where we go.

On October 1st, *German Economic News* headlined «Großmächte treiben in Syrien auf einen globalen Krieg zu» or «Great Powers Driving in Syria on to a Global war,» and reported that:

> The battle for Aleppo can evolve into a direct war between the US and Russia. The situation is extremely dangerous.
>
> The international and Islamist mercenaries are, according to the Syrian army leadership, preparing a counteroffensive against the Syrian army in Aleppo. As

> al-Masdar news reports, thousands of mercenaries are assembling in the south and west of the city to expel from Aleppo the Syrian army.

On October 3rd, *Zero Hedge* headlined, «US Suspends Diplomatic Relations With Russia On Syria», and quoted Kirby saying «This is not a decision that was taken lightly» but «Unfortunately, Russia failed to live up to its own commitments, including its obligations under international humanitarian law».

On October 5th, the «*Moon of Alabama*» blogger bannered, «Is Fighting Al-Qaeda In Aleppo Good Or Bad? — US Unable To Decide», and he expressed (and documented) the view that the only reason why Kerry and the rest of the Obama Administration had pretended to negotiate with Russia regarding Syria was in order to buy time to enable enough US weapons to be delivered to Al Nusra and its allies in Syria so as to be able to conquer the nation.

Also on October 5th, Morning Consult headlined «Congress Must Vote on Bombing Assad Regime, Lee Tells Obama», and reported that, «If the Obama administration wants to bomb the Assad regime, it must first get a declaration of war from Congress, Sen. Mike Lee said… 'Should President Obama move ahead without authorization, then Congress must be called back into session to fulfill its obligation to debate and determine whether our nation should once again go to war'». Of course, if America does «once again go to war,» it will be war this time against Russia, and it will be unprecedented, in many ways, perhaps even final (which would be extremely «unprecedented»).

Also on October 5th, Britain's *Daily Mail* bannered «Russia claims nuclear war could be imminent as it evacuates 40 MILLION people in drill and warns that 'schizophrenics from America' could attack», and reported that:

> Russia is evacuating more than 40 million people in drills to prepare for nuclear war after Putin's Ministry of Defence warned of 'schizophrenics from America sharpening atomic weapons for Moscow'.
>
> Citizens have been told a war with the West could be imminent and Kremlin officials have said underground shelters have been built to house 12million people.
>
> The massive evacuation drill started yesterday and will last three days.

On October 6th, Russian Television bannered «'S-300, S-400 air defenses in place': Russian MoD warns US-led coalition not to strike Syrian army», and reported that Russia's Defense Ministry said that «any missile or air strikes on the territory controlled by the Syrian government will create a clear threat to Russian servicemen», as a consequence of which the American invading forces would be shot down.

Also on October 6th, Al Masdar News headlined «Point of No Return as Islamist Rebels Lose More Ground in Aleppo City», and reported that «Islamist rebels of the [Nusra-allied and trained] Fatah Halab coalition have little prospect of breaking the [Syrian Arab Army — Syrian government] SAA imposed siege of eastern Aleppo».

Also on October 6th, Ireland's *RTE* bannered «UN Security Council to Meet on Syria — Diplomats», and reported:

> The UN Security Council will hold an emergency meeting tomorrow on Syria after a UN envoy warned that eastern Aleppo may be totally destroyed in the next few months by the Russian and Syrian air campaign.
>
> Russia requested the meeting to hear from UN envoy Staffan de Mistura, who will brief the council via video conference from Geneva at 1400 GMT, diplomats said.
>
> Mr De Mistura earlier took aim at Russia, suggesting that Moscow was indiscriminately bombing a city with hundreds of thousands of civilians to flush out just a few hundred jihadists.
>
> «We are talking about 900 people, basically, who are becoming the main reason for which there is 275,000 people actually being attacked», he said.
>
> Would this, he asked, be the excuse for «the destruction of the city?»
>
> «In maximum two months, two-and-a-half months, the city of eastern Aleppo may be totally destroyed,» he told reporters.
>
> The envoy urged fighters from the former Al-Nusra Front – which renamed itself Fateh al-Sham Front after breaking with Al-Qaeda – to leave Aleppo under a deal to halt the regime's attacks on the city.
>
> «If you decide to leave with dignity ... I am personally ready to physically accompany you», Mr de Mistura said.
>
> Security Council members were discussing a French-drafted UN resolution calling for a ceasefire in Aleppo.

On Friday, October 7th, *Reuters* headlined «Assad offers rebels amnesty if they surrender Aleppo», and reported that, «Rebels holed up in Aleppo can leave with their families if they lay down their arms, President Bashar al-Assad said on Thursday, vowing to press on with the assault on Syria's largest city and recapture full control of the country». He was willing to allow the estimated 900 Nusra-allied fighters, «inside Aleppo's rebel-held eastern sector» to escape, in order for Aleppo's jihadist-controlled area to avoid being totally destroyed by bombing. «However, rebels said they had no plan to evacuate Aleppo, the last major urban area they control, and denounced the amnesty offer as a deception».

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010, and of CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity.

La source originale de cet article est Strategic Culture Foundation
Copyright © Eric Zuesse, Strategic Culture Foundation, 2016

Articles Par : Eric Zuesse

A propos :

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most

recently, of They’re Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010, and of CHRIST’S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity.

Avis de non-responsabilité : Les opinions exprimées dans cet article n'engagent que le ou les auteurs. Le Centre de recherche sur la mondialisation se dégage de toute responsabilité concernant le contenu de cet article et ne sera pas tenu responsable pour des erreurs ou informations incorrectes ou inexactes.

Le Centre de recherche sur la mondialisation (CRM) accorde la permission de reproduire la version intégrale ou des extraits d'articles du site Mondialisation.ca sur des sites de médias alternatifs. La source de l'article, l'adresse url ainsi qu'un hyperlien vers l'article original du CRM doivent être indiqués. Une note de droit d'auteur (copyright) doit également être indiquée.

Pour publier des articles de Mondialisation.ca en format papier ou autre, y compris les sites Internet commerciaux, contactez: media@globalresearch.ca

Mondialisation.ca contient du matériel protégé par le droit d'auteur, dont le détenteur n'a pas toujours autorisé l’utilisation. Nous mettons ce matériel à la disposition de nos lecteurs en vertu du principe "d'utilisation équitable", dans le but d'améliorer la compréhension des enjeux politiques, économiques et sociaux. Tout le matériel mis en ligne sur ce site est à but non lucratif. Il est mis à la disposition de tous ceux qui s'y intéressent dans le but de faire de la recherche ainsi qu'à des fins éducatives. Si vous désirez utiliser du matériel protégé par le droit d'auteur pour des raisons autres que "l'utilisation équitable", vous devez demander la permission au détenteur du droit d'auteur.

Contact média: media@globalresearch.ca