

Was Chemical Attack in Syria a “False Flag” to Trigger U.S. War?

By [Alex Newman](#)

Global Research, April 13, 2017

[The New American](#) 7 April 2017

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

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

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

While there is no proof yet either way, there are good reasons to at least consider the prospect that the sarin gas attack on civilians in Syria this week could have been a “false flag” operation. The last time Syrian president Bashar al Assad supposedly used chemical weapons, the [story quickly collapsed under scrutiny](#). The more likely scenario, [according to United Nations investigators and virtually every credible analyst who looked at the 2013 crime](#), was that [globalist-backed jihadist “rebels”](#) used the chemicals in a “false-flag” scheme. The goal: Blame Syrian authorities in a bid to trigger U.S. government intervention against Assad.

Foreign officials and more than a few prominent analysts have suggested the same deception may have just played out once again, albeit more successfully this time. Former Congressman and longtime non-interventionist Ron Paul, for example, declared that there was “zero chance” that Assad had ordered the chemical attack. “It doesn’t make any sense for Assad under these conditions to all of a sudden use poisonous gases,” he said, noting that the situation for Assad and his regime was looking better until the chemical attack this week. In a tweet that sparked headlines around the world, Paul called the attack a “false flag.”

Syrian officials were among the first to allege that a false-flag operation was underway in the chemical attack that killed over 100 civilians in northern Syria this week. In a statement released by the Assad regime’s Foreign Ministry, authorities denied responsibility for the deadly attack. Instead, the regime said the gruesome killings with banned weapons were actually a “premeditated action that aimed to justify the launching of a U.S. attack on the Syrian army.” The regime claims it destroyed all its WMDs under United Nations supervision years ago. Russian authorities, allied with Assad, agreed.



Of course, even if Damascus did use chemical weapons on civilians, it would be unlikely to

admit that. But a simple analysis of motives — a basic first step in any serious investigation — would suggest that Assad had every reason to avoid the use of chemical weapons at all costs. On the other hand, jihadist rebels on the verge of annihilation had every reason to use them. After years of fighting [globalist-backed jihadists and terrorists](#), the dictatorship in Damascus was reportedly close to victory — at least until Trump intervened by firing dozens of missiles at Syrian targets.

Russian authorities, which have stood by Assad in the war against [jihadist groups backed by Western governments and Sunni dictatorships](#), echoed the claims of Syrian officials and blasted certain globalist governments for being “obsessed” with regime change in Syria. Kremlin officials suggested that a strike by Assad’s war planes in the rebel-held area hit a jihadist weapons-production depot that was manufacturing chemical weapons for terrorists in the region. That explanation would appear to make more sense, multiple analysts said.

Russian officials, also citing intelligence, were unequivocal in explaining what happened.

“Yesterday [Tuesday], from 11:30am to 12:30pm local time, Syrian aviation made a strike on a large terrorist ammunition depot and a concentration of military hardware in the eastern outskirts of Khan Sheikhoun town,” Russian Defense Ministry spokesman Igor Konoshenkov was quoted as saying in media reports. “On the territory of the depot there were workshops which produced chemical warfare munitions.”



Western governments and supposed “experts” trotted out by establishment propaganda organs promptly ridiculed the claims. Instead, they claimed to have alleged “intelligence” that supposedly showed Assad was guilty. Despite the non-stop videos on TV of dying children likely played for emotional manipulation, the alleged intelligence proving Assad’s guilt was not released to the public. First, the attack had Assad’s “fingerprints” on it, alleged “anonymous” and potentially fake “U.S. intelligence” sources were quoted as saying. Then, there was “no doubt.”

However, when Obama cited alleged “intelligence” purporting to blame Assad for a similar 2013 attack, [a very similar situation unfolded](#). Top Obama officials claimed with certainty that their “intelligence” proved Assad was guilty. But as the days, weeks, and months went on, it quickly [became evident to virtually every credible analyst that it was, in fact, the Obama-backed jihadist rebels who had used chemical weapons](#) in a bid to set up Assad’s regime for elimination via international intervention. Only a massive outcry by Americans and Congress stopped the plot.

But the evidence showing what really happened was clear. A [2014 MIT report and analysis](#)

[on that attack](#) the year prior, for example, offered evidence that the Obama administration almost certainly used deception and bogus “intelligence” in its failed bid to more deeply embroil the United States and its military in Syria’s ongoing war. Entitled “Possible Implications of Faulty U.S. Technical Intelligence,” the report found the nerve-agent attack in Syria “could not possibly” have come from the center or even the Eastern edge of regime-controlled territory. Other evidence also showed that the rebels, not the regime, deployed the chemical weapons.

Citing “egregious errors in the intelligence,” the explosive MIT report warned that the process by which those errors were made must be rectified to avoid future tragedy.

“If the source of these errors is not identified, the procedures that led to this intelligence failure will go uncorrected, and the chances of a future policy disaster will grow with certainty,” concluded the authors, former United Nations weapons inspector Richard Lloyd and MIT Science, Technology, and National Security Policy Professor Theodore Postol.

It seems likely that the warning went unheeded, and many of the same “Deep State” operatives behind the previous scam remain employed in the federal bureaucracy.

U.S. officials already knew that the jihadist “rebels” had access to chemical weapons at the time of that 2013 attack, too. A classified U.S. military document obtained by WND the month after the attack [confirmed that al-Qaeda-led fighters with the “rebel” Jabhat al-Nusra Front in Syria, which top officials admitted was supported and armed by Obama’s “coalition,” were in possession of sarin gas](#). U.S. officials knew that because about five pounds of the toxic gas was confiscated from the terror group earlier that same year by authorities in Turkey.

And after the previous use of chemical weapons in Syria, which Obama claimed was perpetrated by Assad, even [UN investigators concluded “rebels” were responsible](#).

“Our investigators have been in neighboring countries interviewing victims, doctors and field hospitals and, according to their report of last week which I have seen, there are strong, concrete suspicions but not yet incontrovertible proof of the use of Sarin gas, from the way the victims were treated,” said Carla Del Ponte, the former attorney general of Switzerland and a member of the UN independent commission of inquiry on Syria. “This was use on the part of the opposition, the rebels, not by the government authorities.”

According to [a January 29, 2013, article published by](#) leading British newspaper the *Daily Mail*, the Obama administration actually backed a scheme to have jihadist rebels use chemical weapons — and then blame it on Assad. The article, which received widespread publicity at the time but has since been deleted for reasons that remain unclear, pointed to an alleged leaked e-mail from defense contractor Britam. The December, 2012, document in question refers to chemical weapons and claims the scheme is “approved by Washington.”

U.S. 'backed plan to launch chemical weapon attack on Syria and blame it on Assad's regime'

- Leaked emails from defense contractor refers to chemical weapons saying the idea is approved by Washington
- Obama issued warning to Syrian president Bashar al-Assad last month that use of chemical warfare was 'totally unacceptable'

By J. A. ADAM, SYDNEY
 PUBLISHED: 14:00 GMT, 28 January 2013 | UPDATED: 14:00 GMT, 28 January 2013
 Comments (25) | 4 Share | Tweet | Facebook | +1

Leaked emails have allegedly proved that the White House gave the green light to a chemical weapons attack in Syria that could be blamed on Assad's regime and in turn, spur international military action in the devastated country.

A report released on Monday contains an email exchange between two senior officials at British-based contractor British Defense where a scheme 'approved by Washington' is outlined regarding that Cedar would fund rebel forces in Syria to use chemical weapons.

Barrack Obama made it clear to Syrian president Bashar al-Assad last month that the U.S. would not tolerate Syria using chemical weapons against its own people.

Scroll down for video



War games: An explosion in the Syrian city of Hama last month. It has been now been suggested that the U.S. backed the use of chemical weapons to spur international military intervention

According to [Infowar.com](#), the December 23 email was sent from British's Business Development Director David Gough to company founder Philip Douglis.

It reads: "Phil, We've got a new offer it's about Syria again. Cedar's propose an attractive deal and want that the idea is approved by Washington."

We'd hope to deliver a CW to Homs, a Soviet origin g-chem from Libya similar to those that Assad should have."

"They want us to deploy our Libanese personnel that should speak Russian and make a video record."

"Frankly, I don't think it's a good idea but the sums proposed are enormous. Your opinion?"

Kind regards, David

British Defense had not yet returned a request for comment to MailOnline.

Leaked: The email was allegedly sent from a top official at a British defense contractor regarding a 'Syrian plan approved' (Email dated 14 January 2013) to launch a chemical weapon

The emails were released by a Malaysian hacker who also obtained senior executives' resumes and copies of passports via an unsecured company server, according to [Cyber War News](#).

David Gough's LinkedIn profile lists him as Business Development Director at British Defense Ltd in Security and Investigations. A business networking profile for Phil Douglis lists him as Chief Operating Officer for British, United Arab Emirates, Security and Investigations.

The U.S. State Department had not returned a request for comment on the alleged emails to MailOnline today at time of publication.

However the use of chemical warfare was raised at a press briefing in D.C. on January 28.

A spokesman said that the U.S. "strongly condemned community in 'red line' corner involves about the consequences of using chemical weapons."



Chemical weapons: Rebels attempt to identify the bodies of Syrian fighters shot and dumped in a hole in the western Syrian city of Aleppo today



Deceitful: People gather at a site hit by what activists said was released by a Syrian Air Force fighter jet from Hama today in Hama, after weeks of civil unrest in Hama on January 23

A leaked U.S. government cable revealed that the Syrian army more than likely had used chemical weapons during an attack in the city of Hama in December.

The document, revealed in [The Cable](#), revealed the findings of an investigation by Scott Friesen, former U.S. consul general in Istanbul. His accusations that the Syrian army used chemical weapons in the December 23 attack.

- Here...
- Is President Assad's safe proposal? British-born Bono, 37, said to be expecting her fourth child
 - President for under: when Barack Obama's wife Michelle has been absent 27 million times, and he didn't even realize he was going to go public

An Obama administration official who had access to the document was reported as saying: "We can't identify any 100 per cent, but Syrian contacts made a compelling case that Agent 13 was used in Hama on Dec. 23."

As Obama's investigation included interviews with children, doctors, and rebels present during the attack, as well as the former general and head of the Syrian WHC program, Mustafa al-Zahrani.

Or perhaps Abu Adab, a neurologist in Hama, in certain chemical weapons were used. He told The Cable: "It was a chemical weapon, we are sure of that, because hear gas can't cause the death of people."



Thanks Barack: Obama told Syria a month ago that it might need chemical weapons against its own people it would be 'totally unacceptable'



Barack: Barack and Michelle Obama, pictured with his wife, in a meeting with international partners over the last anniversary of the war in Syria

Even without accounts from the investigation revealed that a tank buried chemical weapons and caused people exposed to them to suffer nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain, dizziness, and respiratory distress.

The symptoms suggest that the weaponized compound Agent 13 was responsible. Syria denied using chemical weapons and said it would never use them against its citizens.

Speaking to Pentagon reporters at the time, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said his biggest concern was that the U.S. would not be able to ensure the chemical and biological weapons that scattered across Syria and ensure the components don't end up in the wrong hands if the regime falls, particularly under rebel conditions.

Government forces and rebels in Syria have both been accused by human rights groups of carrying out brutal warfare in the 22-month-old conflict, which has claimed more than 60,000 lives.

WARNING GRAPHIC CONTENT: SYRIAN REBELS TESTING CHEMICAL WEAPONS ON RUSSIA



Reaf scene: Barack Obama's speech, (Washington Agreement), Plan to Stop Chemical Weapons 2013 in Syria

Ironically, certain Western governments, as well as establishment and globalist war propaganda organs, pretended to be shocked at the mere mention of the term false flag following the latest attack. However, more than a few establishment sources suggested the recent terrorist attack in St. Petersburg, Russia, may have been just such an event. Putin's regime has previously been accused — credibly — of having staged such attacks as a pretext to advance certain policies. But the double standard is glaring. How establishment propaganda organs can be so sure that designated terror groups and jihadists — or rogue Western bureaucrats — would not perpetrate a false flag was not explained.

Just last month, though, left-wing extremist Noam Chomsky suggested President Trump might stage a false-flag terrorist attack to rally his supporters and distract from his failure to follow through on his promises.

"We shouldn't put aside the possibility that there would be some kind of staged or alleged terrorist act, which can change the country instantly," Chomsky declared, with establishment media voices dutifully reporting the remarks by the "left-wing intellectual" as if they were perfectly sane and reasonable.

A false-flag attack by an embattled jihadist terror group in Syria with nothing left to lose is almost certainly a more likely possibility than a false flag by Trump to rally supporters.

Already, smoking-gun evidence exists proving that the globalist establishment was willing to facilitate unspeakable crimes to remove Assad from power. In fact, the Obama administration, Sunni Muslim dictators, and others were so determined to achieve regime change that they were willing to support a rebellion that they knew was led by al-Qaeda and the Muslim Brotherhood, [according to a 2012 U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency document](#). That same document outlines an illegal plot to help create a "salafist principality" — known today as the Islamic State, or ISIS — in Eastern Syria to destabilize Assad. Trump is well aware of this scheme. And [top Obama officials admitted it in public](#).

Senator Rand Paul (R-Ky.), among America's most prominent lawmakers, has taken what may be the most sensible approach to the issue: Demanding to see the evidence. Speaking of Assad, Paul said

"he's either the dumbest dictator in the world, or it may be more confusing."

Speaking on *The Laura Ingraham Show*, the senator noted the obvious: It would not make sense for Assad to use such weapons when he was winning the war, had strong Russian support, and had already learned that the Trump administration was abandoning the Obama administration's failed "regime change" scheming. "I would like to see the evidence," Paul added, saying he did not dispute it but would like to see it.

To the horror of some of Trump's most loyal and important supporters, [many of the same establishment-globalist institutions such as the Council on Foreign Relations that dominated Obama's warmongering administration have burrowed their way into Trump's administration](#), too. And that is despite Trump's oft-repeated promise to fight against globalism, the warmongering establishment, and other evils. The Trump administration should present whatever evidence it has about the source of the latest attack to Congress

and the public. That way, Americans and their representatives can judge the facts for themselves instead of relying on warmongering “deep state” bureaucrats and their discredited propagandists in the establishment media.

Alex Newman, a foreign correspondent for The New American, is normally based in Europe. Follow him on Twitter [@ALEXNEWMAN_JOU](#) or on [Facebook](#). He can be reached at anewman@thenewamerican.com.

The original source of this article is [The New American](#)
Copyright © [Alex Newman](#), [The New American](#), 2017

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Alex Newman](#)

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