

PRESSURES ON RUSSIA: US Attempts to Mass-Murder Its Way to Victory in Syria.

US to Russia: "Give Up" or Swim in Sea of Syrian Blood

By [Tony Cartalucci](#)

Global Research, June 06, 2012

landdestroyer.blogspot.com 6 June 2012

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

Theme: [Crimes against Humanity](#), [US](#)

[NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

As revelations emerge that the violence in Syria [has been premeditated by Western planners years before the Arab Spring unfolded](#), and as the facade of “democratic aspirations” [collapse in the face of a sectarian-driven bloodbath](#), US officials and Western think-tank policy makers speaking [with Bloomberg have](#) stated that their final message to Russia in order to begin regime change is essentially this: the violence will continue to be purposefully escalated until regime change is accomplished – Russia can capitulate now and have a say in how a transition occurs, or capitulate later and suffer exclusion as was the case in Libya.

Bloomberg cites “US officials” who claim they are meeting with Russia to seek an “orderly transition.”



Saving Syria: Assessing Options for Regime Change

David Byrne, Michael Doran, Kenneth Pollack, and Sabran Shabb

SYRIA IS TRAPPED ON A CRUMBLING PRECIPICE, and however it might fall will entail significant risks for the United States and for the Syrian people.

The brutal regime of Bashar al-Assad is employing its loyal military forces and sectarian thugs to crush the opposition and reassert its tyranny. Even if Bashar falls, Syria may not be out of the woods: an increasingly likely alternative to the current regime is a bloody civil war similar to what we saw in Lebanon, Bosnia, Congo, and most recently in Iraq. The horrors of such a war might even exceed the brutal reassertion of Assad's control, and would cause spillover into Syrian neighbors—Turkey, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, and Israel—that could be disastrous for them and for American interests in the Middle East.¹

But the unrest in Syria, which is now entering its second year, also offers some important opportunities, ones that would come from the fall of the regime of Bashar al-Assad, whose family has ruled the country with an iron grip for over forty years. Syria is Iraq's oldest and most important ally in the Arab world, and the Iranian regime has disabled them as Assad, providing him with financial aid and military support to shore up his regime. Assad's departure would deal a significant blow to Tehran, further isolating it at a time when it has few friends in the region or the world. In addition, Damascus is restless in its hostility toward Israel, and Assad's regime is also a longtime supporter of terrorist groups like Hezbollah and Hamas, and has at times aided al-Qaeda terrorists and former regime

defectors in Iraq. The regime's collapse, therefore, could have significant benefits for the United States and its allies in the region.

Actually ousting Assad, however, will not be easy. Although the Obama administration has for months called for Assad to go, every policy option to remove him is flawed, and some could even make the situation worse—seemingly a recipe for inaction. Doing nothing, however, means standing by while Assad murders his own people, and Syria plunges into civil war and risks becoming a failed state. Already the violence is staggering: as of March 2012, at least 8,000 Syrians have died and thousands more have been arrested and tortured in trying to topple the regime. At the same time, Syria is fragmenting. The Syrian opposition remains divided, and the Free Syrian Army is more a brand than a meaningful, unified force. Al-Qaeda is urging fighters to join the fray in Syria, and sectarian killings and atrocities are growing. Should the violence continue to intensify, Syria's neighbors may increase their meddling, and instability could spread, further weakening already-fragile neighbors like Iraq and Lebanon.

So to protect U.S. interests, Assad cannot triumph. But a failed Syria, one attacked by civil war, would be just as bad. Thus, U.S. policy must walk this tightrope, trying to remove Assad, but doing so in a way that keeps Syria an intact state capable of policing its borders and standing aside at home. At the end of the day, however, removing Assad may not be the

Image: Brookings Institution's Middle East Memo #21 "[Assessing Options for Regime Change \(.pdf\)](#)," makes no secret that the humanitarian “responsibility to protect” is but a pretext for long-planned regime change.

..

Just how close the US is, or believes it is to actually overthrowing the Syrian government is a matter of varied opinion. What is not opinion is the fact that the US has openly conspired [to “bleed” Syria to death](#) to either perpetually limit its geopolitical influence throughout the Middle East, or to eventually precipitate the fall of the government. This was stated very clearly in Brookings Institution’s “Middle East Memo #21 [“Assessing Options for Regime Change \(.pdf\):”](#)

“An alternative is for diplomatic efforts to focus first on how to end the violence and how to gain humanitarian access, as is being done under Annan’s leadership. This may lead to the creation of safe-havens and humanitarian corridors, which would have to be backed by limited military power. This would, of course, fall short of U.S. goals for Syria and could preserve Asad in power. From that starting point, however, it is possible that a broad coalition with the appropriate international mandate could add further coercive action to its efforts.” [-page 4, Assessing Options for Regime Change, Brookings Institution.](#)

On pages 8 and 9, the memo states:

“The United States might still arm the opposition even knowing they will probably never have sufficient power, on their own, to dislodge the Asad network. Washington might choose to do so simply in the belief that at least providing an oppressed people with some ability to resist their oppressors is better than doing nothing at all, even if the support provided has little chance of turning defeat into victory. Alternatively, the United States might calculate that it is still worthwhile to pin down the Asad regime and bleed it, keeping a regional adversary weak, while avoiding the costs of direct intervention.” [-pages 8-9, Assessing Options for Regime Change, Brookings Institution.](#)

For those following the “humanitarian” rhetoric proposed by the West as their alleged motivation for involvement in Syria, it is clearly unconscionable to purposefully perpetuate violence, particularly the brutal sectarian violence now admittedly unfolding, simply to keep “a regional adversary weak.” And it is from this position of moral depravity that the West is negotiating with Russia for a “transition” in Syria.

The West believes that by continuing this bloodshed and by manipulating public perception that it is “the doing of the Syrian government,” “enabled” by the Russians, Chinese, and Iranians, they can “shame” opponents of their campaign of destabilization into backing this ongoing crime against world peace. However, Western propaganda is faltering in the face of the alternative media. Additionally the public in general, weary of unending war, are increasingly voicing suspicion over the motives and involvement of the West in regards to Syria. The intended sting of what appears to be [a Western orchestrated atrocity in Houla Syria](#), exists only in the op-eds of the Western press, and extends no further – not even in the comment sections below. In other words, no one has bought it.



Before (1939)



After (1941)

Image: *Never again? Appeasing tyranny never works. In 1939 Hitler signed a non-aggression pact with Russia it never intended to honor. Up until the day Hitler invaded Russia in 1941, he denied his intentions of driving all the way to Moscow, claiming he was lining up troops on Russia's borders to "protect them from British bombing." Today, we see NATO playing the same game with the European ballistic missile shield intended for "Iran," while undermining and invading one Russian ally after another. Apathy and tacit complicity for wars of aggression may seem "easy," that is until one considers the price Germans ultimately paid when their fortunes finally turned.*

....

What Russia decides to do with Syria will determine the shape of the battlefield upon which they will fight when inevitably forced to confront the encroaching machinations of Wall Street and London.

One misconception that cannot be made, however, is that by appeasing the West by giving up on Syria, like was done with Libya, will somehow placate the hegemonic ambitions driving this agenda in the first place. Like Hitler denying he intended to invade Russia up to the day he indeed invaded, Wall Street and London intend [to go all the way to Moscow and Beijing](#), despite the myriad of excuses and denials they make along the way, and denials and excuses they will continue to make until the very day Western forces and their proxies begin unraveling both Russia and China.

China, likewise faces encirclement and containment as the Pentagon openly declares it is shifting its attention and its fleets into the Pacific. While [Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta attempts to "dispel" concerns](#) that the US is arraying its forces to confront China, his less than credible word contradicts [nearly 20 years of US policy papers](#) that describe containing and collapsing China by this very method of reasserting US hegemony in the Pacific.

Confrontation will come sooner or later, and for those wondering why the world was so apathetic in the face of the Nazis, an obvious threat to world peace in retrospect, we are given a front row seat today as Wall Street, London, and those in their orbit incrementally violate the sovereignty and destiny of nation after nation, aided by their own population's seemingly infinite apathy and ignorance. And like Germany, it will be these populations that pay the ultimate price for complacency and inaction in the face of their own governments' reckless hegemonic ambitions.

The original source of this article is landdestroyer.blogspot.com
Copyright © Tony Cartalucci, landdestroyer.blogspot.com, 2012

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Tony Cartalucci](#)

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