

U.S.Diabolical Design for Syria

By [Dr. Ismail Salami](#)

Global Research, September 03, 2013

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

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

Politically entrenched in a self-made predicament, US President Barack Obama is going through tough times these days regarding Syria.

Those whom he thought would unconditionally support him in launching an invasion of Syria and ridding the West of Bashar al-Assad and installing a West-friendly puppet in the country have turned their backs on him. The President has now no choice but to wait for the formal report the UN would release on Monday to expose the real culprit behind the use of chemical weapons in Syria which reportedly killed 1500 people, among them, women and children.

But does it really matter what the UN report would be?

Obama has already said that beyond a reasonable doubt, Assad is to blame for the chemical massacre and any claim to the contrary would be bizarrely detrimental to the interests of Washington.

Besides, war-thirty Obama may have to wait until September 9 when the Congress recess will be over. But what of that? He has already [said](#) he does not need anyone else's permission though he'll go to Congress for approval before launching a strike against Syria.

"While I believe I have the authority to carry out this military action without specific congressional authorization, I know that the country will be stronger ... and our actions will be even more effective" if the strike is authorized by Congress,' Obama said Saturday in a televised address from the Rose Garden.

Whilst the western media are brandishing the blade of blame at the Syrian government, other independent sources claim the rebels are to blame as they improperly used the chemical weapons provided to them via Saudi intelligence boss and mastermind of political mayhem in the region Bandar bin Sultan AKA Bandar Bush.

According to a recent [report](#) published by Mint Press News, the rebels and local residents in Syrian Ghouta claim that Saudi Prince Bandar bin Sultan is behind providing chemical weapons to an al-Qaida-affiliated group.

Certain rebels received chemical weapons via the Saudi intelligence chief, Prince Bandar bin Sultan, and were responsible for carrying out the dealing gas attack.

Abu Abdel-Moneim, the father of a rebel fighting to unseat Assad, who lives in Ghouta, says,

“My son came to me two weeks ago asking what I thought the weapons were that he had been asked to carry.”

Abdel-Moneim said his son and 12 other rebels were killed inside a weapons tunnel provided by a Saudi militant known as Abu Ayesha. The father described the weapons as having a “tube-like structure” while others were like a “huge gas bottle.” Abdel-Moneim said his son and the others died during the chemical weapons attack.

“They didn’t tell us what these arms were or how to use them,” complained a female fighter named ‘K.’ “We didn’t know they were chemical weapons. We never imagined they were chemical weapons.”

In consideration of the fact that the government of Assad could possibly reap no benefits in using chemical weapons on its own civilians, it would be a rather fair judgment to believe that the Takfiris fighting against the government of Assad and who have a long history of brutalities from beheading the Syrians to eating their innards would be held accountable for the chemical attacks. Former US congressman Ron Paul also [believes](#) that a chemical attack in Syria was a “false flag” likely carried out by the US-backed militant groups.

“We are not really positive who set off the gas,” Paul, a long-time Republican representative from Texas, said during a Fox News interview filmed Wednesday.

“The group that is most likely to benefit from that is al-Qaeda. They ignite some gas, some people die and blame it on Assad,” he noted.

A recent US [report](#) called ‘Government Assessment of the Syrian Government’s Use of Chemical Weapons on August 21, 2013’ sheds no new light on the chemical attacks in Syria; rather, it is to be considered but a flagrant declaration of war against the sovereignty of Syria.

In this grotesquely engineered report, the United States Government “assesses with high confidence that the Syrian government carried out a chemical weapons attack in the Damascus suburbs on August 21, 2013. We further assess that the regime used a nerve agent in the attack. These all source assessments are based on human, signals, and geospatial intelligence as well as a significant body of open source reporting. Our classified assessments have been shared with the U.S. Congress and key international partners. To protect sources and methods, we cannot publicly release all available intelligence but what follows is an unclassified summary of the U.S. Intelligence Community’s analysis of what took place.”

Interestingly, most of US reports are based on the reports of intelligence bodies rather than actual facts and that’s exactly where the problem arises. And this one is no exception. All wars fought by Washington in the name of democracy and fighting terrorism have been waged on the strength of the reports released by American spy apparatus.

At any rate, all this claim stands in need of reasonability and is far removed from the realities on the ground.

In a similar strain, Russian Foreign minister Sergei Lavrov said during an address to the students of the Moscow State University of International Relations on Monday, said, “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.”

Ironically, the US report says, “We assess the Syrian opposition does not have the capability to fabricate all of the videos, physical symptoms verified by medical personnel and NGOs, and other information associated with this chemical attack.” How can the report question the capability of the ‘opposition’ while they are well-provided, well-funded and well-financed thanks to the generosity of Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Turkey and the West?

Though confronted by critics of war, Obama does not seem willing to stand back and discount this potential casus belli to start a war to the full satisfaction of Tel Aviv.

Be that as it may, the US is beefing up its military presence and preparing for an invasion of Syria. On Friday, the USS San Antonio, an amphibious US warship with hundreds of US Marines on board, joined five US destroyers armed with cruise missiles in the eastern Mediterranean. According to [Reuters](#), the sixth warship has received orders to remain in the eastern Mediterranean after it passed through the Suez Canal on Thursday from the Red Sea.

In the final analysis, one can say that nothing may stop Washington from embarking on another military expedition in the Middle East in order to expand its sway in the region on the one hand and to curtail the political muscle of its archenemy Iran on the other. However, the situation has changed politically and barely does anyone buy the fabricated narrative the West presents to the world regarding Syria.

Yet, in all this murky diabolical design is some degree of pleasant optimism: Washington no longer enjoys the support of other western countries in its military adventurism. It should act solo.

The US is desperately alone now.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Dr. Ismail Salami](#), Global Research, 2013

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Dr. Ismail Salami](#)

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