GlobalResearch
Center for Research on Globalization

OPCW Inspector Debunks Doctored Syria Report. “The Chemical Weapons Incident That Never Occurred”

The OPCW Fact Finding Mission willfully falsified information, falsely blaming Syrian authorities for a CW incident that never occurred.

By Stephen Lendman
Global Research, January 22, 2020

Region: Middle East & North Africa
Theme: Intelligence, Media Disinformation, US NATO War Agenda
In-depth Report: SYRIA

Last November, WikiLeaks published information from an OPCW whistleblower.

A member of its fact finding mission to Douma, Syria, he expressed grave “concern over intentional bias introduced to a redacted version of the report he co-authored.”

The OPCW’s so-called Fact Finding Mission (FFM) doctored its March 2019 report on the alleged April 7, 2018 Douma, Syria CW incident — that never happened, falsely saying the following:

“Regarding the alleged use of toxic chemicals as a weapon in Douma (Syria)…evaluation and analysis…of information gathered by the FFM (delaying its visit to the site for 11 days) provide(s) reasonable grounds that the use of a toxic chemical as a weapon has taken place on April 7, 2018.”

“This toxic chemical contained reactive chlorine. The toxic chemical was likely molecular chlorine.”

The so-called incident was fake, a US/NATO-staged false flag, Syria wrongfully blamed for a victimless nonevent.

No one in Douma died, was hospitalized, or became ill from exposure to chemical or other toxins.

Local eyewitnesses and medical personal debunked the falsified narrative. Russian technical experts found no evidence of chemical or other toxins in soil samples and other analysis of the site.

Yet the OPCW FFM willfully falsified information — in deference to Western interests, falsely blaming Syrian authorities for a CW incident that never occurred.

In Monday Security Council testimony, former OPCW inspector team leader Ian Henderson debunked the agency’s doctored report on the alleged April 2018 Douma CW incident, saying the following:

“There were two teams deployed, one team, which I joined shortly after the start of field deployments, was to Douma in Syria, the other team deployed to country X,” adding:

“(T)he so-called FFM core team(’s) inspectors…deployed (to) Douma (were) dismiss(ed).”

“(F)inal FFM report…findings…were contradictory…a complete turnaround (from) what the team” actually found on the ground.

When the “interim report (was released) in July 2018, our understanding was that we had serious misgivings that a chemical attack had occurred.”

“(T)he final FFM report…does not reflect the views of the team members (sent) to Douma…”

It “did not make clear what new findings, facts, information, data, or analysis in the fields of witness testimony, toxicology studies, chemical analysis, and engineering, and/or ballistic studies had resulted in the complete turn-around in the situation from what was understood by the majority of the team, and the entire Douma team, in July 2018.”

“In my case, I had followed up with a further six months of engineering and ballistic studies into these cylinders, the result of which had provided further support for the view that there had not been a chemical attack.”

Cylinders found in Douma with alleged toxins were manually placed on the ground, not aerially dropped as the final FFM report falsely claimed. More on this below.

Henderson was an OPCW inspector for 12 years, an inspection team leader and engineering expert.

Evidence compiled by his team in Douma showed no CW attack occurred. The OPCW falsely claimed otherwise in its doctored report.

The Douma incident was a US/NATO-staged false flag. So-called video evidence showing men, women and children foaming at the mouth was fake.

It was prepared in advance by US/UK/NATO/Israeli supported al-Qaeda-linked White Helmets, masquerading as civil defense workers.

Russia’s Defense Ministry earlier debunked the notion that OPCW inspectors found evidence of toxins in Douma soil samples – or that witness testimonies indicated CW incident, just the opposite, adding:

The Trump regime wants the OPCW used as “an instrument of political pressure on Syria under the control for US machinations.”

In response to the doctored OPCW report, Russia’s Foreign Ministry said the following:

“We are concerned that the mission prefers to completely ignore the substantial information provided by the Russian and Syrian parties confirming that this (fake) chemical incident had been staged by the pseudo-humanitarian organization White Helmets.”

At the time, Syria’s Foreign Ministry expressed outrage over the OPCW’s fake report, saying it was prepared by non-professional biased personnel, falsely blaming Damascus for a

staged false flag, pretending use of CWs, adding:

“This report does not differ from the previous mission reports filled with distorted facts” and bald-faced Big Lies.

It “ignored the statements of witnesses who lived with that incident and described the allegations of using chemical weapons in Douma as a play performed by armed terrorist organizations” — White Helmets in cahoots with jihadists, supported by the West.

Syrian technical experts “eas(ily) discover(ed) that the OPCW experts were lying when claiming that they investigated the incident in the report from various aspects.”

Their report excluded “neutrality and objectivity, as they ignored the possession of toxic chemicals by terrorist groups, although the mission found those substances in the warehouses of terrorists when they visited them.”

Monday during the Security Council session on the alleged Douma incident, Russia’s envoy to the OPCW Alexander Shulgin said the following:

“(T)he investigation of the (Douma) incident conducted by the (OPCW’s) Fact Finding Mission in Syria le(ft) much to be desired.”

Its findings were delayed for nearly a year. Testimonies from credible witnesses on the ground were “completely ignored.”

Conclusions in the doctored FFM report “differed (markedly) from the observations of the Russian experts, who were convinced that the chlorine gas cylinders were brought into the premises by militants manually – for provocation.”

“The Russian side kept trying to induce the OPCW Technical Secretariat to have a professional dialogue regarding what happened in Douma” to no avail.

“The current situation with the disputable official report of the OPCW looks like an abscess.”

“We cannot move forward until we eliminate it. How can we talk about trust to the Technical Secretariat and between the States Parties?

Shulgin called for actions to “restor(e) trust and normalization (of) the situation in the OPCW” — what’s currently nonexistent.

Russia UN envoy Vassily Nebenzia Monday’s SC remarks noted “something fishy is cooking (at) the OPCW,” adding:

“(T)he impartiality and integrity of the OPCW…is seriously questioned, and not just by us and other member states…”

“Why do some of our colleagues (sic) so vehemently defend the reports by the OPCW FFM, which…were fabricated?”

“(T)he FFM (Douma) report was made up. (W)e have no illusions about the positions of member states, but we earnestly aimed at restoring the credibility of OPCW, which we see seriously compromised.”

Why was the initial FFM Douma report “shelved…and then disappeared and destroyed” — replaced by a doctored one with no credibility.

Throughout nearly nine years of US aggression in Syria, wanting its sovereign government replaced by pro-Western puppet rule, its ruling authorities were falsely blamed for CW and other incidents they had nothing to do with.

Note: Establishment media reported nothing about OPCW inspector Henderson’s Jan. 20 Security Council testimony.

They’re silent about what reliable alternative media featured, the same true on virtually all major issues mattering most, especially geopolitical ones.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Award-winning author Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. He is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG)

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.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © Stephen Lendman, Global Research, 2020

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