

Attack on Syria Planned Nearly Two Decades Ago

By K. R. Bolton

Now the world looks on again in confusion and fear as the USA extends its dialectical strategy of “controlled crises” over one of the few remaining redoubts of independence from the “new world order”: Syria.

Again the lines of opposition are drawn between Russia and the USA in a geopolitical struggle for world conquest. Syria in fact has long been viewed as the major obstacle to globalist ambitions: more so even than Libya, Iraq or Iran.

In 1996, the Study Group for a New Israeli Strategy Toward 2000, established by the Institute for Advanced Strategic Studies, Jerusalem, issued a paper titled *A Clean Break*. The think tank included people who would become influential in the Bush Administration, such as Richard Perle, Douglas Feith and David Wurmser.

The major obstacle was Syria, and the major aim was to “roll back Syria,” and to “foil Syria’s regional ambitions.” Even the recommendation of removing Saddam – “an important Israeli strategic objective in its own right” – was seen as a step towards Syria.¹

The world-conquering ambitions of those misnamed “neo-conservatives” in the Bush Administration were taken on board with gusto by the Obama Administration, with the young paragon of liberal-humanitarian virtues impelled into the White House by a lot of very dubious globalist luminaries who were presumably too obscure for the US electorate to discern when they voted for someone they believed would change America’s foreign policy course.²

The 1996 paper recommends a propaganda offensive against Syria along the lines of that employed against Saddam, and indeed against everyone who is an obstacle to the “new world order” and/or Israel, suggesting that the “move to contain Syria” be justified by “drawing attention to its weapons of mass destruction.”³

The report suggests “securing tribal alliances with Arab tribes that cross into Syrian territory and are hostile to the Syrian ruling elite.” They suggest the weaning of Shia rebels against Syria.⁴

The plan of attack against Syria has been long in the making. Arab regimes have recently fallen like dominoes as a prelude to the elimination of Syria and Iran. *The Clean Break* recommends the use of Cold War type rhetoric in smearing Syria.

¹ *A Clean Break*, Study Group for a New Israeli Strategy Toward 2000, 1996, <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article1438.htm>

² K R Bolton, “Obama: Catpaw of International Finance,” August 28, 2008, <http://renew.com/general83/cats.htm>

³ *A Clean Break*, op. cit., “Securing the Northern Border.”

⁴ Ibid., “Moving to a Traditional Balance of Power Strategy.”

We can see the plan unfolding before our eyes. The “weapons of mass destruction” charade used to justify the US bombing of Syria takes the form of alleged chemical attacks on Syrian “civilians,” with a compliant news media showing lurid pictures of suffering children, but usually with the comment that the reports are “unconfirmed.”

The US assurances of “proof” sound as unconvincing to the critical observer as the “evidence” against Saddam. The United Nations supposedly has a report proving that chemical weapons were used, but not who used them.

Sure enough, reports have come out that US-backed rebels have committed the chemical attacks as a means of securing a US assault on the Assad government. Two Western veteran journalists, while captives of the Free Syria Army, overheard their captors – including an FSA General - discussing the chemical weapons attack rebels had launched in Damascus as a means of justifying Western intervention.⁵

In an act of statesmanship, Putin pre-empted President Obama’s determination to bomb Syria by suggesting that Syria place its chemical weapons stockpiles for disposal with the United Nations; a plan that Syria has accepted.

As we have seen in recent days on news conferences, the FSA is livid that the Putin plan has been accepted, as this *might* have scotched their plans for a Western military assault; although, of course, there are an infinite number of other ways that the globalists can concoct to justify military action.

Putin sees the offensive against Syria in world historical terms in determining what type of world is being moulded. While Russian ships face US and some French and British ships, he has rebuked Obama’s statements—like those of US presidents since the days of Woodrow Wilson and his plans for a “new world order”—that the USA has “an exceptional role.”

In his appeal to the American people published in the *New York Times*, Putin questions the USA’s strategy stating that, “It is alarming that military intervention in internal conflicts in foreign countries has become commonplace for the United States.” Condemning the basis of the “new world order” that is being imposed with US weaponry, Putin writes that having studied Obama’s recent address:

...I would rather disagree with a case he made on American exceptionalism, stating that the United States’ policy is ‘what makes America different. It’s what makes us exceptional’. It is extremely dangerous to encourage people to see themselves as exceptional, whatever the motivation. There are big countries and small countries, rich and poor, those with long democratic traditions and those still finding their way to democracy. Their policies differ, too. We are all

⁵ “Journalist and writer held hostage for five months in Syria ‘overheard captors conversation blaming rebels for chemical attacks,’” *Mail Online*, 12 September 2013, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2418378/Syrian-hostage-Domenico-Quirico-overheard-rebels-blame-Damascus-chemical-attacks.html>

different, but when we ask for the Lord's blessings, we must not forget that God created us equal.⁶

“Jihadist” Straw Men

As mentioned in the Clean Break blueprint for regional war, the aim was to create a new “cold war” type global scenario which would continue to uphold the USA as the champion of “freedom,” and “western values,” even when those values need to be imposed on unwilling peoples with armed force.

With the implosion of the USSR, a new world bogeyman was required. One was soon created in the form of “Jihadists” who had served US interests well when fighting the Russians in Afghanistan.

A scenario had arisen that has all the sings of a dialectical plan: controlled crises, or what the “neo-con” strategist Ralph Peters calls “constant conflict”: an “enemy” has been created by the USA and is attacked or supported according to requirements.

Hence, “Jihadists” were created and used against the Russian military. They were at the time portrayed as “freedom fighters.”

Then when Yugoslavia needed carving up and its component parts—especially Kosovo—privatising economically for takeover by predatory international capital, the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA), which had been listed by the US State Department as terrorists and gangsters, became the “freedom fighters” required to overthrow Milosevic.

The KLA were suddenly transformed into good Jihadists fighting for freedom. Years of Albanian separatist terrorism against Serbs⁷ was suddenly reversed into Serb genocide against Albanian Kosovans, and the “cold war” propaganda machine was turned back on and cranked up to incite war against Serbia.

Suddenly it all became a war on behalf of a “new internationalism” and a “new millennium,” to quote then British Prime Minister Tony Blair,⁸ whose present-day counterpart, David Cameron, is as eager to fight the Syrians.

Despite the reduction of Kosovo's economy to ruin, it was opened up to the world for “privatisation,” as the war aims of the globalists had demanded,⁹ and a state commission exists to busily sell off the old state assets and resources.¹⁰

⁶ Vladimir V Putin, “A Plea for Caution from Russia,” *New York Times*, 11 September 2013, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/12/opinion/putin-plea-for-caution-from-russia-on-syria.html?_r=0

⁷ Chris Bird, “Kosovan Serbs under siege,” *The Guardian*, 18 August 1999, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/1999/aug/18/balkans1>

⁸ Tony Blair, *Newsweek*, April 19, 1999.

⁹ Rambouillet Agreement: Interim Agreement for Peace and Self-Government in Kosovo, Constitution, Chapter Four, “Economic Issues,” Article II

(1).http://www.state.gov/www/regions/eur/ksvo_ambouillet_text.html

¹⁰ Privatisation Agency of Kosovo, <http://www.pak-ks.org/?page=2,4>

When Libya's turn came, the USA supported the "Jihadists" with whom they are supposedly in mortal the world over. The strategy was put into operation by Graham Fuller when deputy director of the CIA's National Council of Intelligence, who created the Mujahadeen, to fight the Russians in Afghanistan, and then spawned Al Qaeda.

Fuller stated: "The policy of guiding the evolution of Islam and of helping them against our adversaries worked marvelously well in Afghanistan against [the Russians]. The same doctrines can still be used to destabilize what remains of Russian power..."¹¹

Putin is up against the same strategy with US support for Muslim separatists in Chechnya, another area of great interest to the globalists and, as one would expect, Freedom House has formed yet another "liberation committee," the American Committee for Peace in Chechnya, Orwellian double-think for "war in Chechnya."

Putin in his recent statement published in *The New York Times* has warned that the same forces are at work in Syria, as they were in Libya and throughout the "Arab Spring" revolts which have created a state of permanent crises in North Africa, which the globalists now aim to extend to Syria and Iran.

¹¹ Richard Labeviere, *Dollars for Terror: The Untied States and Islam* (Algora Publishing, 2000), pp. 5-6.