

Al Qaeda Must be Saved, as Top Washington Officials are Ready to Attack Syria Without UN Resolution

By [Alex Christoforou](#)

Global Research, October 06, 2016
[The Duran](#) 6 October 2016

Region: [Middle East & North Africa, USA](#)
Theme: [Terrorism, US NATO War Agenda](#)
In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

Top Washington Officials, the Clinton Campaign, and main stream media (including The Washington Post and New York Times) have thrown their full support behind Al Qaeda and ISIS in Syria, in an effort to not have the last terrorist strong hold of East Aleppo be liberated by the internationally recognized Syrian government.

The WaPo is talking about Russian war crimes. Talk about a parallel universe. Russia, the country that has been invited legally under international law, is being accused of war crimes because it is fighting to liberate Aleppo from Al Qaeda and ISIS control...while the uninvited (in Syria illegally) United States, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey fight to keep Al Qaeda alive.

Unfortunately this is the America, that for all intensive purposes, has crossed the rubicon, fallen off the wagon, and has entered into an evil alliance with jihadists terrorists...the very same terrorists who attacked the US in 2001.

If only, everyday Americans could know that their government are now interlocked, brothers in arms, with Al Qaeda and ISIS in Syria, in an effort to wipe out a secular and stable middle east government, and hand over the keys of the country to Wahhabi, Saudi sponsored, butchers.

The reality of what America has become is hard to stomach. News coming in that top Washington officials are discussing striking positions of the Syrian military without a UN Security Council resolution is the real war crime.

The war hawks are working out a plan to bomb air force runways in Syria, with missiles fired from US and US-coalition planes and ships.

One administration official who is to take part in the discussions told the war ready Washington Post...

“One proposed way to get around the White House’s objection to striking the Assad regime without a UN Security Council resolution would be to carry out the strikes covertly and without public acknowledgment.”

The CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, represented in the Deputies Committee meeting by Vice Chairman Gen. Paul Selva, are now pressing for more “kinetic” options.

“There’s an increased mood in support of kinetic actions against the regime. The CIA and the Joint Staff have said that the fall of Aleppo would undermine America’s counterterrorism goals in Syria.”

“Kinetic” options is US double speak for illegal war.

The “fall of Aleppo”...how about the liberation of Aleppo.

Is Aleppo not a city belonging to Syria, and does Syria’s internationally recognized government not have the right to remove Al Qaeda terrorists from inhabiting the city?

The “fall of Aleppo” double speak for the fall of Al Qaeda and ISIS in Syria. The “fall” of the Saudi and Qatari pipeline dream. The “fall” of America’s evil and destructive regime change operation.

It is now up to Obama. We can only hope the “hope and change” president still has some good left in him. The WaPo reports (much to the paper’s disappointment) that...

–“there’s still great skepticism, however, that the White House will approve military action. Other administration officials told The Post this week that Obama is no more willing to commit U.S. military force inside Syria than he was previously and that each of the military options being discussed have negative risks or consequences.

The National Security Council’s senior coordinator for the Middle East, Rob Malley, and the president’s special envoy to the coalition for the fight against the Islamic State, Brett McGurk, are also said to be against any military escalation against the Assad regime, officials said. There’s no consensus on what options should be sent to the president’s desk. Other options include increased weapons for some Syrian rebel groups and an increase in the quality of such weapons, to allow rebels to defend Aleppo’s civilians.”

Not happy with the prospect that sanity and logic will prevail in Syria, the [Washington Post](#) is still pushing for conflict, as the US drums of war beat ever louder.

The WaPo continues to demonise the legitimate government of Assad, and the invited military campaign of Russia...in an all out media blitz to prop up Al Qaeda, and keep Aleppo under the occupation of jihadist terrorists.

U.S. military strikes against the Assad regime will be back on the table Wednesday at the White House, when top national security officials in the Obama administration are set to discuss options for the way forward in Syria. But there’s little prospect President Obama will ultimately approve them.

Inside the national security agencies, meetings have been going on for weeks to consider new options to recommend to the president to address the ongoing crisis in Aleppo, where Syrian and Russian aircraft continue to perpetrate the deadliest bombing campaign the city has seen since the five-year-old civil war began. A meeting of the Principals Committee, which includes Cabinet-level officials, is scheduled for Wednesday. A meeting of the National Security Council, which could include the president, could come as early as this weekend.

Last Wednesday, at a Deputies Committee meeting at the White House, officials from the State Department, the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff discussed limited military strikes against the regime as a means of forcing Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad to pay a cost for his violations of the cease-fire, disrupt his ability to continue committing war crimes against civilians in Aleppo, and raise the pressure on the regime to come back to the negotiating table in a serious way.

The options under consideration, which remain classified, include bombing Syrian air force runways using cruise missiles and other long-range weapons fired from coalition planes and ships, an administration official who is part of the discussions told me. One proposed way to get around the White House's long-standing objection to striking the Assad regime without a U.N. Security Council resolution would be to carry out the strikes covertly and without public acknowledgment, the official said.

If Obama does not approve greater support for the Syrian rebels or increased coalition pressure on the Assad regime, the only option left is to wait out the siege of Aleppo and reengage the Russians if and when Aleppo falls, albeit in a weaker position.

Former State Department Syria official Frederic Hof wrote Monday that any policy going forward that hinges on the assumption that Russia is looking for a near-term diplomatic solution in Syria is destined for failure.

"Whatever excuses the administration offers for leaving Syrians defenseless against mass murder, the continued search for common ground with Vladimir Putin should not be one of them," he wrote. "If nothing else, John Kerry's exhaustive diplomatic due diligence should retire that illusion permanently."

Kerry's deputy, Antony Blinken, testified last week that the U.S. leverage in Russia comes from the notion that Russia will eventually become weary of the cost of its military intervention in Syria. "The leverage is the consequences for Russia of being stuck in a quagmire that is going to have a number of profoundly negative effects," Blinken told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The argument against more U.S. military intervention in Syria, including strikes against the regime, is based on risks that should be taken seriously but that are ultimately hypothetical. The effects of continuing the current policy are not hypothetical. They include more of what we are seeing now: Russia and the Assad regime committing war crimes against civilians with impunity and destroying Syria's largest city.

The original source of this article is [The Duran](#)
Copyright © [Alex Christoforou](#), [The Duran](#), 2016

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Alex Christoforou](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca