

## Cruising for a Bruising with Russia

By [Michael Averko](#)

Global Research, April 14, 2018

Region: [Middle East & North Africa, Russia and FSU](#)

Theme: [Intelligence, Media Disinformation, Militarization and WMD, US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [FAKE INTELLIGENCE, SYRIA](#)

*Aired in the US, the April 10 BBC World News telecasts, repeatedly opened with the claim that Russia vetoed a proposed UN resolution to inspect the area of an alleged chemical attack in Syria. Later on, in the same telecasts, there is a contradictory and downplayed reference to a Russian proposed UN resolution (on the issue at hand) that was vetoed. The aforementioned contradiction is in line with Anglo-American mass media telecasts, stating an alleged chemical attack by the Syrian government, followed later on by the hosts and guests in (overall majority terms) referring to the claim as a fact, with little if any opposition.*

In conjunction with being fair and balanced on this subject, good journalism would detail the differences between the aforementioned UN resolutions, inclusive of competent analytical input from individuals with truly diverse views. That's the kind of setting which is typically not evident in the geopolitically correct TV news entertainment industry, that heavily slants in favor of anti-Russian leaning views. A [rare exception](#) is Fox News' **Tucker Carlson**.

Far from being monolithic, the UN is subject to biases. Going back to the Cold War period, it was commonplace to hear pro-Israeli supporters in the US complain of biased UN resolutions and UN departments which slanted against the Jewish state. This sentiment lingers on. In the post-Soviet new world order, one finds some predominating biases against Russia at the UN. A point that relates to Russia's stance on investigating the recently alleged chemical attack in Syria. It has been said that history has a way of repeating itself.

**Scott Ritter** and some others have [noted](#) that **Saddam Hussein's** apprehension with the UN inspection of WMDs in Iraq had a reasonable basis. Some of those involved with that investigative process appeared to be influenced by the desire to seek a regime change agenda against the then Iraqi leader. Within Anglo-American foreign policy elite circles, this preference was noticeably prevalent back then - inclusive of seeking inspectors with intel ties, who would acquire non-WMD information, that could be strategically used to militarily overthrow the Iraqi government.

Concerning the most recently alleged chemical attack by the Syrian government, has there been any objectively detailed follow-up on the filmed individuals said to be witnesses and/or victims? In this day and age, movies make very accurate depictions of actual atrocities. As of this writing, the reported World Health Organization [observation](#) of people exhibiting chemical attack symptoms (from the area at issue), is broad and doesn't address the possibility of such traits resulting from something other than a Syrian government chemical attack. [The rebels have possessed](#) the capability for initiating a chemical attack, and [stage](#)

[scenes](#) to conform with their agenda.

Once again noting (from prior correspondences of mine) the stunt from years ago, with the Kuwaiti diplomat, conjuring up the fake claim (using staged video footage) that Iraqi forces were taking babies off incubators in Kuwait. That incident brings to mind others, like the fake evidence, false claim of Iraq having WMDs, a Brit court finding, saying the Russian government “probably” poisoned **Alexander Litvinenko** (never minding his Italian friend, who was arrested for arms smuggling and who was also infected with polonium, along with Litvinenko’s ties to anti-Kremlin propagandist Alexander Goldfarb) and the latest suspect claim of Russian government involvement in the poisoning of the Skripals – along with two prior suspect claims that the Syrian government used chemical weapons.

The [April 10 UN Security Council meeting](#) on the subject of chemical weapons in Syria, underscores the differences between Russia and the leading Western powers. On the previous day, the very same body had a [lively discussion](#) that (among other things) brought into play the history of Russia, the US and UK.

In reply to [Nikki Haley’s churlish remarks](#), her Russian UN counterpart **Vasily Nebenzya**, said that Russia didn’t seek becoming America’s friend. Upon further review, I believe he specifically meant the likes of Haley, as opposed to Americans at large. Nebenzya stated that a true friendship doesn’t involve doing whatever the greater power wants – something which Haley has been on [clear record](#) for advocating.

Regarding this very issue, the UK’s UN Ambassador, **Karen Pierce** noted a close, friendly US-UK relationship. Historically speaking, that hasn’t always been the case. Relative to the US, compare the Russian and UK positions during the American Revolution, American War of 1812 and American Civil War. In addition, note the US assistance to Russia during the Crimean War, when the latter fought against Britain, France and the Ottoman Empire.

In other instances, Britain, the US and Russia found common cause during two world wars. Russia and Britain were earlier allied against Napoleon. Foreign affairs isn’t (at least in many instances) pragmatically gauged in terms of a “friend”, as clearly favored by the Brit statesman **Viscount Palmerston**, who said that Britain has interests as opposed to allies – a more mature approach to Haley’s simplicity.

The situation with the Skripals and the alleged use of Syrian government chemical weapons, have suspect claims that might very well flop in finding any clear proof to legitimately substantiate the blame Russia mantra. Meantime, the anti-Russian double standards are quite evident. On the one hand, some are okay with the British government greatly managing the follow-up on the Skripals, with a noticeably limited neutral overview (to date as of this writing). When it comes to the alleged chemical attack in Syria, some already suggest a guilty Syrian government, with Russian culpability – while readily believing the suspect partisanship of the [White Helmets](#).

The likes of Fox News’ **Brian Kilmeade**, simplistically say that Russia’s strength in Syria is too limited to scare off a definitive US led strike. Kilmeade downplays what Russia could do with its arsenal not in Syria.

At play, is the potential for a kind of modern day Cuban Missile Crisis. Bluster has been reported from Russia’s ambassador in Lebanon – something that Western mass media has featured, along with Donald Trump’s threatening tweet. Since these statements, calmer

and practical views have been expressed within US mass media and the Trump administration. Neocons, neolib and flat out Russia haters, will view a militarily weak Russia (relative to a substantial US attack on Syria) as a means of gradually reducing Vladimir Putin's popularity in Russia.

The Western bombing regime change operations in Iraq and Libya didn't bring greater stability to these nations. My October 9, 2015 commentary "[Answering Russia's Critics On Syria](#)" remains coherent.

\*

*This article was originally published on [Strategic Culture Foundation](#).*

**[Michael Averko](#)** is a New York based independent foreign policy analyst and media critic.

The original source of this article is Global Research  
Copyright © [Michael Averko](#), Global Research, 2018

---

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

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

Articles by: **[Michael Averko](#)**

**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)