

Strikes on Syria: Failed US WMD Lies and the “Israel Approach”

By [Tony Cartalucci](#)

Global Research, April 09, 2018

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

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

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

After failing utterly to produce public support for a US-led attack on Syria following an alleged chemical weapons attack in Douma, northeast of the capital Damascus, the US appears to have immediately circumvented the United Nations and international law, apparently tasking its proxies in Tel Aviv with carrying out initial attacks on Syria's T-4 airbase.

The Western media has reported missile attacks on the airbase in Syria.

CBS in its article, "[U.S. denies missile strike in Syria, Russia says Israel did it](#)," claims:

Missiles struck an air base in central Syria early Monday, but the Pentagon quickly denied claims from Syrian state media that the strikes were “an American aggression.” As a war monitoring group said Iranian-backed militia members were killed in the strikes, Russia accused Israeli jets of firing the missiles.

An Israeli Strike is Still a US Strike

However, regardless of who carried out the strike, it was still ordered by the US.

US policymakers – who have sought regime change in Syria and its ally Iran for decades – have meticulously laid out their plans for covert terrorism, staged provocations, [feigned peace offers](#), and even [the use of Israel as an intermediary](#) for carrying out attacks the US itself could not initially justify or rally public support behind.

The United States could also look at other ways of bolstering the Israel Defense Forces. The F-15I will remain an adequate long-range strike platform for the immediate future, but it is worth examining whether to provide the F-22 Raptor aircraft to the IDF as an even more sophisticated attack system that would be able to ensure Israel's deterrence capability far into the future. Prime Minister Barak raised this issue with President Clinton at the Camp David summit in 2000, and it should be reconsidered.

Finally, the current administration could try to go one step further and develop a multinational nuclear deterrent for Israel by proposing Israeli membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Under Article 5 of the NATO treaty, an attack on any member is an attack on the whole. As a NATO member, Israel would automatically enjoy the same nuclear umbrella as the existing 26 members. Israel is already a member of NATO's Mediterranean dialogue and participates in limited military exercises with several NATO partners aside from the United States, including notably both Greece and Turkey.

Getting Israel into NATO would be a very hard sell, however, as many of the European allies believe Israel has done too little to bring about peace with its Arab neighbors, and they would probably condition support for Israeli membership on concrete and public moves toward a final peace agreement. European public opinion is increasingly wary of increasing NATO's membership, and many would find Israel an unattractive ally that could commit Europeans to fighting Arabs.

Finally, all the options for expanding Israel's deterrent through new treaty obligations, either bilateral or via NATO, would face substantial opposition from those in Israel who argue such commitments weaken Israel's ability to act unilaterally. A mutual defense alliance does not require advance agreement before one party uses force,

but it certainly increases the political imperative not to surprise your treaty partner with independent action.

PROS AND CONS

The following are the advantages and disadvantages of the Israel approach.

ADVANTAGES:

- As noted, the most salient advantage this option has over that of an American air campaign is the possibility that Israel alone would be blamed for the attack. If this proves true, then the United States might not have to deal with Iranian retaliation or the diplomatic backlash that would accompany an American military operation against Iran. It could allow Washington to have its cake (delay Iran's acquisition of a nuclear weapon) and eat it, too (avoid undermining many other U.S. regional diplomatic initiatives).
- Israeli forces might be able to execute the attack much sooner and with much less prior notice and preparation than American military forces could.
- It would presumably be easier to convince Israel to mount the attack than it would be to generate domestic political support for another war in the Middle East (let alone the diplomatic support from a region that is extremely wary of new American military adventures). At least some important Israelis want to conduct such an attack and would welcome Washington's encouragement. Other Israelis are less enthusiastic but feel it may be necessary if they believe they have no choice, and they, too, would be far more willing to attack if they believed that the United States was firmly behind it.

In the 2009 Brookings Institution paper, "[Which Path to Persia? Options for a New American Strategy Toward Iran](#)" (PDF), US policymakers would state under a section titled "Allowing or encouraging an Israeli Military Strike," that (emphasis added):

...the most salient advantage this option has over that of an American air campaign is the possibility that Israel alone would be blamed for the attack. If this proves true, then the United States might not have to deal with Iranian retaliation or the diplomatic backlash that would accompany an American military operation against Iran. It could allow Washington to have its cake (delay Iran's acquisition of a nuclear weapon) and eat it, too (avoid undermining many other U.S. regional diplomatic initiatives).

The report also states (emphasis added):

It would presumably be easier to convince Israel to mount the attack than it would be to generate domestic political support for another war in the Middle East (let alone the diplomatic support from a

region that is extremely wary of new American military adventures).

The same report would also state (emphasis added):

However, as noted in the previous chapter, **the airstrikes themselves are really just the start of this policy**. Again, the Iranians would doubtless rebuild their nuclear sites. They would probably retaliate against Israel, and **they might retaliate against the United States, too (which might create a pretext for American airstrikes or even an invasion)**.

Clearly these options laid out for Iran in 2009 have been repeatedly used instead against Syria. The fact that US regional aggression has stalled in Syria and has yet to fully manifest itself against Iran indicates a tipping balance of power against Washington.

The response by Syria and its allies to these staged chemical attacks, provocations, and strikes will determine whether or not Washington's failed attempts at regime change ebb into an indignant withdrawal, or provide a vector toward greater and more destructive war.

A US failure in Syria will likely permanently derail its attempts to reassert its global preeminence as a multipolar world order emerges. How far the US and the special interests driving its policy - regardless of America's elected representatives - is willing to go to preserve global hegemony remains to be seen. The task of Syrian, Iranian, and Russian intelligence would be to ascertain this - providing significant deterrence toward engaging in a wider war, and pushing the US back behind its borders as international law, the global public, and even the American people demand.

*

This article was originally published on [Land Destroyer Report](#).

Tony Cartalucci is a frequent contributor to *Global Research*.

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

[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