

Washington's Hidden Agenda: Syria Must Be Rendered Defenseless Ahead Of U.S. Invasion?

By [John Robles](#)

Global Research, January 11, 2013

[Voice of Russia and Stop NATO](#)

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

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

Some pundits and analysts are saying: Use the Kosovo model, or the Libyan scenario, or the Afghanistan example, or don't repeat the mistakes in Iraq. However each and every one of them is missing the whole point and that being from Yugoslavia to Iraq, from Afghanistan to Libya, from the Arab Spring to Syria, US intervention is not wanted or asked for.

Yugoslavia was a watershed moment for NATO and the US and the more or less success of the operation emboldened the US to attempt to do more. To launch a war, reshape part of Europe, devastate a people and do so all on the whim of a president who wanted to distract the electorate from a sex-scandal, seemed bold and dangerous, but it more or less worked.

Poised and ready to invade Syria and continue its plans for complete global military and political domination at any cost, the US is faltering and has yet to invade Syria. Most likely stopped by the fact that Syrian defenses are robust enough to effectively deal with the invader's forces and that Russian troops are on the ground, the US is stuck in a holding pattern. The next illegal US act of aggressive war is Syria. Coming soon! Rated: XXX.

The West continues to debate what the United States should do in Syria and the US what options it has to bring about another interventionist invasion, yet is continuing to have problems in bringing about the conditions it needs to give the green light to military forces staged and waiting to pounce.

The arrogance of those debating the fate of Syria from thousands of miles away, as if they even have a right to in the first place, is mind-boggling. Who told the United States that they are responsible for deciding the fate of Syria or the Syrian people? No one. Who told the United States that they have some right or some mandate under international law to "intervene" wherever they desire? No one. Yet that is what they are doing.

Some pundits and analysts are saying: Use the Kosovo model, or the Libyan scenario, or the Afghanistan example, or don't repeat the mistakes in Iraq. However each and every one of them is missing the whole point and that being from Yugoslavia to Iraq, from Afghanistan to Libya, from the Arab Spring to Syria, US intervention is not wanted or asked for.

The US understands this and knows the real reason it is going after these countries, that being resources and geo-political plans, yet it can not openly state such to the world.

Yugoslavia worked because the right propaganda was spread at the right time and the world was not ready nor did it have reason to believe that the US' intentions were anything more than what they were publically touting. Since then every pretext for invading Yugoslavia has been found and proven to have been false and self-created by the US whose real goal was

to carry out the geo-political redesigning of the Balkans.

It became clear in Yugoslavia and in what has taken place since then in that region that the United States has one thing in mind when carrying out their interventionist invasions and that is control of resources and the advancement of geopolitical ambitions and position.

If anyone doubts look at who they supported and continue to support in Serbia and in Kosovo: Muslim extremists, drug traffickers and black-market organ traders. Why? Because the US is able to manipulate and “work” with these elements, whereas Christian Serbians who lean geopolitically towards Russia are a bit more difficult to manipulate and bend to the American will.

We can see this same kind of thinking all over the world and in particular in the Middle East. The United States has no real interest in human rights or in oppressed peoples; that is a proven given what it does care about is resources, ease of manipulation and geopolitical clout.

Yugoslavia was a watershed moment for NATO and the US and the more or less success of the operation emboldened the US to attempt to do more. To launch a war, reshape part of Europe, devastate a people and do so all on the whim of a president who wanted to distract the electorate from a sex-scandal, seemed bold and dangerous, but it more or less worked.

There were doubters and there were detractors and the destruction of Yugoslavia did not have the broad support that the planners in Washington had hoped for. So a group of neo-conservatives was tasked with studying the issue of how to bring about the pretext for a global war of domination. Those in power were tired of the United Nations and the international community and even the American electorate always sticking their noses into everything and asking for reasons and justifications. They wanted a free rein.

So those neo-conservatives, calling themselves the Project for the New American Century, came up with a plan for complete and total world domination. The only problem as they saw it was that to allow for the implementation of the plan, after all what they were doing was illegal, would require a catalyst, and as they called it themselves, “A new Pearl Harbor”.

The carefully planned and orchestrated events of 9-11 were the catalyst that they needed to launch an open-ended and endless “War on Terror” that had no borders and allowed for anyone to become a target. First on the list was the invasion of Iraq and second Afghanistan, Hussein was the first target because he had changed all oil trade in Iraq to the Euro the day before the invasion and United Nations and international inspectors already knew that Hussein had no weapons with which to fight back.

Afghanistan was another story but it did not really matter because the Taliban, like al-Qaeda, had always been on the US payroll and wiping out that little backward country, as the US military planners thought, would be no problem. That little invasion took place over ten years ago and the US is still in Afghanistan and has been completely defeated.

Then we have the case of Libya, another country that had agreed to US inspections for those evil WMDs and had proven it did not possess weapons and then was invaded after changing its oil trade to the Euro. Libya had long been on the US wish list of countries to invade but the problem was that by then the US had pretty much lost the capital it had gained from the orchestrated events of 9-11, and people started questioning.

Now we have the Syrian “intervention”, and everything that the United States now does is being questioned. The world has seen one act of aggressive invasion after the other carried out by the US and NATO and has quite frankly had enough.

Why hasn't the US invaded Syria yet? One reason is you and I. Every false flag plan they come up with, we are there to expose it. Every false and sanctimonious move they make to allow them to invade and rape another country we are there to document. We know they are funding terrorists and mercenaries and that the Syrian people themselves do not want America. Lastly Russia is stopping it, by giving the Syrian people what Libya and Iraq did not have, the tools and the ways and means to defend themselves and defend their country.

Stop NATO e-mail list home page with archives and search engine:

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/stopnato/messages>

Stop NATO website and articles:

<http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com>

The original source of this article is [Voice of Russia and Stop NATO](#)

Copyright © [John Robles](#), [Voice of Russia and Stop NATO](#), 2013

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [John Robles](#)

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