

Syria: How far will Obama go to Save the Insurgency?

By [Phil Greaves](#)

Global Research, June 28, 2013

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

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

The Obama administration has yet to publicly reveal any of its 'evidence' to prove the Syrian Government or armed forces have used Sarin, or any other chemical weapon. This can simply be put down to the administration not having have any credible evidence.

Sarin, or a similarly abhorrent chemical weapon may have been used to some extent inside Syria, but by whom, why and how is most definitely undetermined. Indeed, the UN itself has pointed the finger directly at the Gulf proxies fighting on behalf of Obama and his Gulf allies, and several leading chemical weapons experts, along with the Russian Government have immediately cast doubt upon the claims. If the Obama administration had the physical evidence they derive their "belief" from, it would have been on the front page of every newspaper by now.

Yet Obama seems determined to hold his line of intransigence against the Syrian Government, this could be explained because the US has no way back without 'losing face' within the 'International Community', Obama declaring 'red-lines' has effectively backed himself into a corner. The US is the world's arbiter after all, once lines are set, the pride of Empire and the need to uphold the false image of the world's 'moral' judiciary take hold, and any relinquishing of geo-political dictate is a sign of weakness. The paranoid war-careerists within the Pentagon and State Department establishment cannot allow this to happen, and are eager to continue to attempt to inflict damage on Iran and Hezbollah (whether this is even attainable or true remains to be seen). It seems to US militarists and their many allies, defeat and concession to the Syrian government and their respective allies; would be far worse a blow than dragging Syria through yet more years of warfare and death.

The US Governments militaristic hubris knows no bounds, they shall not be defeated, even if the whole Levant is destroyed; The US image of strength and unbeatable military power must not be shown for the self-perpetuating hollow monolith it has become. No doubt Obama wants out; but only from self-interest and on the terms that appease the rest of the US political and military establishment (after all, his public decision to arm rebels came immediately after Bill Clinton called him a wimp). His 'legacy' is almost in tatters; another overt US war in the middle east is off the cards until Obama's presidency comes to an end. Or so we are led to believe; lets not forget, almost every overt, large-scale war the US has engaged in over the past 60 years have all been predicated on outright lies. Do the 'Presidents' incumbent at the time of these murderous lies ever suffer as a consequence? Does anyone?

In essence, Obama's recent rhetoric and statements of intent to directly arm extremist

dominated militants could be seen as self-serving and outright obscurantism. In efforts to salvage his 'dove' persona and Nobel Peace Prize image; Obama must uphold the illusion of the US coming to the aid of "freedom fighters" and "good rebels" in order to justify the fact that the [US has been arming and funding](#) the "freedom fighters" for nigh on two years. Current public opinion, along with the mass of public evidence and reportage that reveals the true nature of the 'rebels' is making this task more and more difficult. The Recent build-up of US patriot batteries, a new fleet of F-16 fighter-jets, along with increased military manoeuvres in Jordan and Turkey suggests muscle-flexing for the benefit of Russia, and also alludes to the US working on new proxy forces; minus the extremists. The sectarian and extremist core of the militant dynamic of the 'revolution' has been acknowledged by the world. This nuance can no longer be hidden by false declarations of freedom and democracy.

Towards and during the recent G8 summit, Vladimir Putin's rhetoric has become increasingly disparaging toward the 'rebel' movement. But his remarks are not mere hyperbole. As David Cameron found out to his horror and embarrassment (which many a Brit took delight in watching), Putin is not about to let the West and its propaganda war walk over Russia's only foothold in the Middle East. Putin was quick to question Cameron's false intent, and did it in spectacular and [public fashion](#). Cameron, the PR man, was lost, bewildered and knee-deep in his own Orwellian mindset. There was no answer ready for Putin's straightforward question: "Do you want to arm those that eat the organs of their enemy on camera?"

The US has been 'in' Syria from the start, obfuscation and media narratives have done much to subvert the US, and its Gulf clients' leading role in the creation and vital support of the plethora of militants fighting the Syrian Government. This policy is not an anomaly, it is a recurrence of a tried and tested US tactic across the globe. From early on we learnt of who, and exactly what, the Syrian 'opposition' was. Its multiple diplomatic creations have formed nothing more than Chalabi-esque outfits engaged in fractious power-struggles in five-star hotels. Furthermore, in what proves to be an ominous precedent, previous US/GCC covert escalation's during the crisis have been synonymous with [drastic increases in both death toll and displacement](#). When based upon this logic, Obama's policy directly contradicts the reasoning he professes. Indeed, the age-old war for peace oxymoron springs to mind. The blatant relationship between death toll and increased militarism has been noted by several major observers during the Syrian crisis, including the UN, who call for a cessation of all arms being sent into to the conflict. Yet this causality seems to evade the highest echelons of Western diplomacy.

Obama's current policy seems to be to continue the proxy insurgency at a steady rate in order to keep what pressure it can on the Syrian Government, appearing to be a dove is obviously important to Obama's image. But, Obama has also taken the decision knowing that Putin will react in kind and aim to shore up his ally in Syria and avert a US attack, so is Obama playing a false hand? Diplomatic brinkmanship with Putin is one thing, but if Putin is openly being resilient towards the West, Obama could be retroactively declaring he will provide arms, simply to cover the now almost two-year old policy of doing exactly that. These public declarations of military plans also come at a time when Obama is under increased domestic pressure. Some analysts have suggested this could be the perfect time for a US war, insofar as to say that certain domestic pressures may be being put upon the Obama administration to force its hand and avert the public's attention; nothing like a war and the rallying cry of 'patriotic' Generals and Senators repeating falsehoods about

‘chemical weapons’ and ‘evil dictators’ to subvert public scrutiny.

The state of Israel is again suspiciously quiet, considering they are the closest western ally to have overtly attacked Syria several times – all acts of war and illegal under international law – there has been rare mention of Israeli Government policy within Western media. Investigative journalist Jonathan Cook [recently noted](#) that the Israeli military put forward an “optimal scenario” of Syria breaking up into three separate states. An effective ‘balkanization’ of Syria, who at times, though not consistently, nor through entirely altruistic intention, has been a key bulwark in the face of Israeli expansion, and a crucial ally to the resistance movements of Lebanon and Palestine. Moreover, the Israeli leadership will see the benefit of Hezbollah and Iran becoming enveloped in a long, protracted war, depleting morale and Hezbollah’s capabilities to defend any future Israeli aggression. None of this is to suggest that Israel particularly want an outright loss for Assad. Broadly speaking, the ultimate Israeli objective is to weaken any opposition to Israeli dominance in the region, by whatever means necessary.

The UK and France are now isolated within the EU, if arms are sent to ‘rebels’ in Syria, or if they already have been and evidence is found; the UK will be in breach of International Law. Cameron has pledged a vote in the Commons to determine whether any future shipments of weapons are to be sent to the rebels; the British public, as well as the majority of British MP’s, including the Mayor of London and the Deputy Prime Minister, are firmly against arming Cameron’s idea of ‘freedom fighters’. Boris Johnson, in an article titled [“Don’t arm Syria’s maniacs”](#) vehemently rejected the idea of the UK arming so-called ‘rebels’, and seemed to be calling on his old chum to call off the charade.

Just last week, a former French foreign minister, who has a penchant for being liberal in the press with certain snippets of information, claimed the [UK Government was plotting a ‘rebel’ insurgency in Syria two years before the so-called “Arab Spring”](#). This may well be true, and it coincides directly with [US/GCC/Israeli covert plans of the same nature](#) that have been covered and reported on thoroughly. To suggest the UK would not be involved or ‘in the loop’ in such a covert policy with such close allies is naive in the extreme. But the same caveat applies to France, during the former ministers employment or not; it is also highly doubtful that the French Government or intelligence services would choose to be ‘out of the loop’ in taking apart their former colony. Particularly considering their direct role in recent colonial-era ‘humanitarian intervention’s’ in Mali and Libya.

It remains to be seen if Obama has truly swayed toward overt US intervention, or whether other regional or international actors will act without the US, this seems highly unlikely. It is also highly doubtful the current President would be foolish enough to deploy US troops into Syria. But many other willing players – including influential members of the US Government – are heavily involved, and have much vested interest in seeing both Syria and its allies at least partially weakened, and otherwise occupied for at least some time to come. But, the SAA, along with Hezbollah, are on the offensive and winning, as that trend continues and Russian support solidifies, there will be nothing left for Obama to bargain with; without the extremist dominated insurgency there is no longer a US stake remaining in Syria, how far will Obama go to save it?

Phil Greaves is a UK based writer/analyst, focusing on UK/US Foreign Policy and conflict analysis in the Middle East post WWII. <http://notthemsmdotcom.wordpress.com/>

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

[**Become a Member of Global Research**](#)

Articles by: [Phil Greaves](#)

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