

Obama's War on Syria Imminent? Moscow confronts Washington on US War Plans

By [Stephen Lendman](#)

Global Research, September 03, 2013

Region: [Middle East & North Africa](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

On September 2, [Russia Today](#) headlined "Evidence of chemical weapons use in Syria should not be kept secret – Lavrov."

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov addressed students at the Moscow State University of International Relations. He called the West's "regime of secrecy" on Syria unacceptable, saying:

"If there truly is top secret information available, the veil should be lifted. This is a question of war and peace. To continue this game of secrecy is simply inappropriate."

John Kerry claims America has evidence Assad used sarin nerve gas on August 21. Put up or shut up, said Lavrov. He did so in diplomatic language.

He called information provided Russia "inconclusive." There's no there there. It's meaningless. It's fabricated rubbish.

"We were shown some sketches, but there was nothing concrete, no geographical coordinates or details and no proof the test was done by professionals," said Lavrov.

"There were no comments anywhere regarding the experts' doubt about the footage circulating all over the internet."

"What our American, British and French partners have shown us before – as well as now – does not convince us at all."

"There are no supporting facts. There is only repetitive talk in the vein of 'we know for sure.'"

"And when we ask for further clarification, we receive the following response: 'You are aware that this is classified information, therefore we cannot show it to you.' So there are still no facts."

Lavrov held a later Monday press conference. Give peace a chance is doomed, he suggested. Anti-Syrian hardliners want more than token bombing. They want "a wider and deeper strike on the country," said Lavrov.

Every effort is being made to choose peace over war, he added. Insurgents are creating "controlled chaos," he said.

Attacking Syria assures greater regional extremism, he stressed. It'll have the opposite effect of what most people expect.

So far, Washington's anti-Assad coalition consists of itself and France. According to Britain's [Telegraph](#), Cameron's under pressure for a new parliamentary vote for war.

Obama gave him time to get it. "Lord Howard, a former Conservative leader, Sir Malcolm Rifkind, a former Foreign Secretary, and Lord Ashdown, a former Liberal Democrat leader, led calls to vote again on Sunday," said the Telegraph.

Rifkind lied claiming "more compelling" evidence exists every day. None whatever links Assad to chemical weapons attacks.

Labour opposition to striking Syria may be weakening. Shadow defense secretary Jim Murphy became Labour's first senior figure to hold Assad responsible.

Former Labour cabinet minister Ben Bradshaw suggested he'll support a second vote. Foreign Minister William Hague and Chancellor of the Exchequer George Osborn so far ruled it out.

At the same time, Hague said he'd consider one if Labour leader Edward Miliband's willing to cooperate.

He warned that not confronting Assad now means a "bigger and more painful" confrontation later.

On August 31, [The Spectator](#) headlined "Could there be a second UK vote on Syria?" Perhaps so if Congress votes yea.

Last Thursday, Miliband said the following:

"On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There having been no motion passed by this House tonight, will the Prime Minister confirm to the House that, given the will of the House that has been expressed tonight, he will not use the royal prerogative to order the UK to be part of military action before there has been another vote in the House of Commons?"

Cameron won't call one without certainty of prevailing. He needs Labour support to do so.

"If there was another vote," said the Spectator, "Labour would have to make the public declaration of its position on intervention that Miliband seems to fear so much."

On September 2, [The Independent](#) headlined "Syria crisis: Nick Clegg rules out fresh Commons vote on military action as Boris Johnson raises pressure on Cameron," saying:

Deputy Prime Minister Clegg said "we're not going to keep asking the same question of Parliament again and again."

"I can't foresee any circumstances that we would go back to Parliament on the same question, on the same issue."

"The Conservative MPs, and there were Liberal Democrats, who couldn't

support us, they have a deep scepticism about military involvement and I don't think another UN report, or whatever, would make the difference."

"Of course I wanted us to be part of a potential military response. Now that is just not going to be open to us now because the House of Commons has spoken."

His comments followed London Mayor Boris Johnson saying:

"If there is new and better evidence that inculpates Assad, I see no reason why the Government should not lay a new motion before Parliament, inviting British participation – and then it is Ed Miliband, not David Cameron, who will face embarrassment."

"The Labour leader has been capering around pretending to have stopped an attack on Syria – when his real position has been more weaselly."

"If you add the Tories and Blairites together, there is a natural majority for a calibrated and limited response to a grotesque war crime."

At issue isn't whether toxic chemicals killed Syrians. It's who bears responsibility. Clear evidence shows insurgents involvement. None indicts Assad.

A previous article explained Washington's prime target is Iran, not Syria. The same goes for Israel. [Robert Fisk](#) expressed the same sentiment, saying:

"Before the stupidest Western war in the history of the modern world begins – I am, of course, referring to the attack on Syria that we all yet have to swallow – it might be as well to say that the cruise missiles which we confidently expect to sweep onto one of mankind's oldest cities have absolutely nothing to do with Syria."

"They are intended to harm Iran. They are intended to strike at the Islamic republic now that it has a new and vibrant president."

"Iran is Israel's enemy. Iran is therefore, naturally, America's enemy. So fire the missiles at Iran's only Arab ally."

"(W)hat in heaven's name are we doing?" After months of conflict, after tens of thousands died, "we are getting upset about a few hundred deaths."

Why not earlier? Why now? It's simple. Assad's winning. He's routing insurgents. Washington wants the battlefield leveled. It wants its proxies given a strategic edge.

A "victory for Bashar is a victory for Iran," said Fisk. "And Iranian victories cannot be tolerated by the West."

"(I)f we are to believe the nonsense coming out of Washington, London, Paris and the rest of the 'civilised' world, it's only a matter of time before our swift and avenging sword smiteth

the Damascenes.”

Observing Arab leaders “applauding this destruction is perhaps the most painful historical experience for the region to endure. And the most shameful.”

On September 1, The [New York Times](#) headlined “Arab League Endorses International Action,” saying:

It did so “to deter what it called the ‘ugly crime’ of using chemical weapons.”

“It was a major step toward supporting Western military strikes but short of the explicit endorsement that the United States and some Persian Gulf allies had hoped for.”

It moved beyond its earlier cautious approach. It refuted what [Mint Press News](#) headlined on August 29, saying:

“Exclusive: Syrians in Ghouta Claim Saudi-Supplied Rebels Behind Chemical Attack,” saying:

“Rebels and local residents in Ghouta accuse Saudi Prince Bandar bin Sultan of providing chemical weapons to an al-Qaida linked rebel group.”

Insurgents had “tube-like” weapons. Others were in a “huge gas bottle.”

A previous article said the following:

Pentagon contractors provided chemical weapons training. Syrian forces seized a warehouse. It contained barrels marked “Made in KSA (Kingdom of Saudi Arabia).” Protective masks were found. So were drugs used when inhaling chemicals.

“The Qatari-German Company for Pharmaceutical Industries (was) inscribed on them.”

Last May, Turkish authorities arrested 12 Al Nusra fighters. They caught them red-handed. They two grams of sarin nerve gas.

On May 5, the UN Commission of Inquiry on Syria (COI) said testimonial evidence indicates “rebel forces” used sarin. A day later, COI suggested “no conclusive findings.”

Other credible reports confirmed anti-Assad elements used chemical weapons. They’ve done so multiple times before.

Key now is what happens going forward. For sure it looks like more war. Obama bears full responsibility.

It bears repeating. He’s an out-of-control rogue menace. Stopping him matters most.

Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net.

His new book is titled "Banker Occupation: Waging Financial War on Humanity."

<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanII.html>

Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com.

Listen to cutting-edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network.

It airs Fridays at 10AM US Central time and Saturdays and Sundays at noon. All programs are archived for easy listening.

<http://www.progressiveradionetwork.com/the-progressive-news-hour>

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Stephen Lendman](#), Global Research, 2013

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Stephen Lendman](#)

About the author:

Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III."

<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html> Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com. Listen to cutting-edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network. It airs three times weekly: live on Sundays at 1PM Central time plus two prerecorded archived programs.

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