

# Syria: Why Washington is Determined to Oust Assad Even if it Means Supporting the Terrorists

Syria is a Sovereign Nation That is Not Under America's "Sphere of Influence"

By [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#)

Global Research, September 23, 2016

[Silent Crow News](#) 22 September 2016

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

Theme: [Terrorism](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

*Washington will stop at nothing to remove Syria's President Bashar al-Assad. There will never be peace in Syria as long as Washington and Israel continue to arm and support terrorists groups including the Islamic State, the Al-Nusra Front and other terrorist organizations to defeat the Syrian government. It is evident that Washington gave the green light for airstrikes against Syrian forces in close proximity to an army base by the al-Tharda Mountain in the Deir-ez-Zor region killing more than 62 and wounding over 100 Syrian government forces.*

*The airstrikes allowed ISIS to advance on an army base which was an important front against ISIS. The U.S. and Russia began a ceasefire to target ISIS and other terrorist groups but instead the U.S. decided to aid ISIS fighters by attacking Syrian government and help advance ISIS fighters.*

*The New York Times headline read as if it were an accident on September 17th 'U.S. Admits Airstrike in Syria, Meant to Hit ISIS, Killed Syrian Troops' quoted a senior Obama administration official who claimed that "its regrets to the Syrian government through the Russians for the "unintentional loss of life of Syrian forces" fighting the Islamic State." Russia called for an emergency United Nations Security Council (UNSC) meeting which was called a "Stunt" by Samantha Power, U. S. ambassador to the United Nations.*

Was it an accident? *Press TV* reported what Russian Ambassador to the United Nations Vitaly Churkin thought about the incident when he said *"It is highly suspicious that the United States chose to conduct this particular air strike at this time."* The ceasefire was supposed to take full-effect on September 19th. *"It was quite significant and not accidental that it happened just two days before the Russian-American arrangements were supposed to come into full force."* The U.S. aided ISIS fighters by hitting Syrian government targets in a strategic location already surrounded by ISIS. Churkin was correct to point out that if the U.S. had waited two days they could have conducted airstrikes on al-Nusra targets which would have been more effective:

The beginning of work of the Joint Implementation Group was supposed to be September 19. So if the US wanted to conduct an effective strike on al-Nusra or Daesh, in Dayr al-Zawr anywhere else, they could wait two more days and coordinate with our military and be sure that they are striking the right people... Instead they chose to conduct this reckless operation

U.S. airstrikes against the Syrian government forces was clearly intentional since it allowed ISIS to advance to a key position. What does not make sense is Centcom's response to the airstrikes. *The New York Times* published Centcom's statement claiming it was "tracking" Daesh for some time, but could not distinguish between ISIS fighters and Syrian government forces? Centcom's response:

"Coalition forces believed they were striking a Daesh fighting position that they had been tracking for a significant amount of time before the strike," the Centcom statement said. "The coalition airstrike was halted immediately when coalition officials were informed by Russian officials that it was possible the personnel and vehicles targeted were part of the Syrian military"

However, The Syrian government also believes that the U.S. airstrikes were intentional. *The New York Times* article published the Syrian government's response:

The Syrian government insisted that the strike was not a mistake. Instead, the government said it was "a very serious and flagrant aggression" that aided the Islamic State and proved its long-held assertion that the United States supports the jihadist group as part of an effort to oust President Bashar al-Assad.

*"These attacks confirmed that the U.S. clearly supports the terrorism of Daesh," SAMA television, a state-run news outlet, said, using an Arabic acronym for the Islamic State, also known as ISIS or ISIL. The channel quoted a statement issued by the Syrian military's general command, which said the attack exposed "false claims of fighting terrorism" by the United States*

### Syria Does Not Want to Be Under America's "Sphere of Influence"

Washington wants a Syrian president that would allow Western corporations, banks to exploit Syria. Washington also wants a president that would allow its policies dominate the political landscape. Assad is not that president. Syria is not on their list of vassal states. There are several reasons to consider Washington's motivation to remove Assad from power. First, the Republic of Iran has significant influence in the Middle East and has a strong relationship with Syria. As we know, Iran and Syria are part of the "7 countries in 5 years" plan that was admitted by a Pentagon official to former General Wesley Clark on *Democracy Now* that included Iraq, Sudan, Somalia, Lebanon, Libya, Syria and then the major prize, Iran. Syria, Lebanon (Hezbollah in Southern Lebanon) and Iran have not surrendered their sovereignty which is a major problem for Washington's geopolitical blueprint.

Washington is not concerned about the Syrian people or democracy. It's about [geopolitical control over natural resources](#) to enrich American corporations. Pipeline politics plays an important role in the Middle East. Assad refused a gas pipeline through Syria to make its way to the European Union. Pepe Escobar wrote an article in 2015 for the *Strategic Culture Foundation* titled 'Syria: Ultimate Pipelineistan War' which explains the motivations behind Washington's call for Assad's removal:

It all started in 2009, when Qatar proposed to Damascus the construction of a pipeline from its own North Field – contiguous with the South Pars field, which

belongs to Iran – traversing Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Syria all the way to Turkey, to supply the EU.

Damascus, instead, chose in 2010 to privilege a competing project, the \$10 billion Iran-Iraq-Syria, also known as «Islamic pipeline». The deal was formally announced in July 2011, when the Syrian tragedy was already in motion. In 2012, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed with Iran. Until then, Syria was dismissed, geo-strategically, as not having as much oil and gas compared to the GCC petrodollar club. But insiders already knew about its importance as a regional energy corridor. Later on, this was enhanced with the discovery of serious offshore oil and gas potential

[Oil and gas](#) has always been a major factor for conflict in the Middle East and soon it will be water. The Middle East including Syria (crude oil, gas, iron ore, asphalt, marble etc.) has abundant natural resources and that is something Western corporations and governments will stop at nothing to gain control of.

Another important factor to consider is the fact that Syria's central bank is state-owned and operated by the Syrian government, not the Rothschild's banking dynasty, not Wall Street or any other member of the international banking cartel located in the U.S., U.K. and the European Union. The Syrian government issues its own interest-free currencies that help the Syria's real economy in terms of labor and production. The Syrian government also provides "*no-interest credit*" to help Syrian people finance small businesses, housing, helps maintain roads and numerous other initiatives. No-interest credit and issuing currencies is an alternative to a usury-based banking system that provides high interest rate loans provided by the banking cartels (JP Morgan Chase, Goldman Sachs, the IMF, and the World Bank etc.) that accumulates massive debts which becomes impossible to repay. What happens when the debt cannot be repaid? Privatization forces the government to sell public assets for "*pennies on the dollar*" to pay back the debts and apply austerity measures by cutting their citizens pensions, cut social services and other benefits and an increase in taxes on almost everything including food. Leave it up to the banking cartels and you will have a country of "debt slaves". Something Assad would wish to avoid for Syria.

Syria is also relatively "*debt-free*" from the claws of the *International Monetary Fund* (IMF) which has enslaved numerous countries. Debt is a form of control for international banking cartels as Latin America, Asia and Africa has witnessed for decades. Sovereign nations have suffered economically under IMF economic reforms.

Washington is also aiding Israel's long-term goal of becoming the sole nuclear power in the region and is one of the only U.S. allies besides Turkey (whose relationship with Washington remains intact despite recent tensions) and the despotic regimes in the Gulf States including Saudi Arabia, the UAE and Qatar. Washington and Israel are intent on "*Balkanizing*" Syria for Israel's expansion. An article written by *Global Research* author [Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya](#) in 2011 titled "[Preparing the Chessboard for the 'Clash of Civilizations': Divide, Conquer and Rule the 'New Middle East'](#)" explains Israel's long-term plan by breaking several Middle Eastern and North African countries into smaller and more controllable 'nation states' so that Israel can be the dominant power in the region. Nazemroaya wrote:

The Atlantic, in 2008, and the U.S. military's Armed Forces Journal, in 2006, both published widely circulated maps that closely followed the outline of the Yinon Plan. Aside from a divided Iraq, which the Biden Plan also calls for, the Yinon Plan calls for a divided Lebanon, Egypt, and Syria. The partitioning of

Iran, Turkey, Somalia, and Pakistan also all fall into line with these views. The Yinon Plan also calls for dissolution in North Africa and forecasts it as starting from Egypt and then spilling over into [Sudan, Libya, and the rest of the region](#)

In early 2016, *The Guardian* reported that Obama's Secretary of State John Kerry suggested that Syria could be partitioned as a solution to the civil war saying *"this can get a lot uglier and Russia has to be sitting there evaluating that too. It may be too late to keep it as a whole Syria if it is much longer"*. Kerry's idea of breaking-up Syria into several small states is obviously following in the footsteps of the Yinon Plan.

An ideal democracy for Washington in Syria is a *"Syria without Assad"*. Washington is not looking for peace in Syria unless they have someone they can manipulate politically and economically as they continue to arm and support ISIS and other terrorist organizations. That is what Syria and Russia must come to realize because any negotiations with Washington must be observed with caution. Until then, there is no peace or justice for the Syrian people and that is the reality. How far is Washington willing to go? The evidence is clear; we know that the U.S. government will do anything even if it means doing something only the criminally insane would consider and that is to arm and support terrorists for geopolitical objectives.

The original source of this article is [Silent Crow News](#)

Copyright © [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#), [Silent Crow News](#), 2016

---

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#)

#### About the author:

Timothy Alexander Guzman is an independent researcher and writer with a focus on political, economic, media and historical spheres. He has been published in Global Research, The Progressive Mind, European Union Examiner, News Beacon Ireland, WhatReallyHappened.com, EIN News and a number of other alternative news sites. He is a graduate of Hunter College in New York City.

**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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)