

The Real Reasons For U.S. Airstrikes In Syria - Breaking The Assad Regime

By [Brandon Turbeville](#)

Global Research, September 25, 2014

[Activist Post](#) 24 September 2014

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

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#), [Women's](#)

[Rights](#)

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

Image: [Anthony Freda Art](#)

With the recent and ongoing airstrikes launched against Syria by the United States and its “regional” and NATO allies, a number of questions have arisen from a variety of quarters who remain entirely confused as to the ongoing angles of the players involved in the Syrian crisis. Confusion, of course, is a natural state resulting from the mainstream media’s attempt to conceal the fact that the United States and NATO/GCC are entirely responsible for the Syrian crisis to begin with as well as for the massive seizure of territory across Iraq and Syria by ISIS militants. These same media outlets have also played a major role in the obfuscation of the understanding of the crisis by providing false delineations and name changes bound to confuse an American population already afflicted with a short attention span.

With even the basic facts surrounding the Syrian crisis forced into obscurity by mass ignorance of their existence, the facts surrounding the recent US bombing of Syria have also given way to more questions.

For that reason, a number of points must be made regarding the recent events and those that will unfold in the future inside Syria.

Information Does Not Equal Coordination

The recent airstrikes by the United States and its allies allegedly against ISIS positions in Syria have been soundly condemned by [both Iran and Russia](#). Both countries have accurately pointed out that the airstrikes were a violation of Syria’s national sovereignty and a violation of international law. Syria, however, has refrained from outrage and has even stated that the United States informed it of the attacks before they took place.

Syria’s reaction has caused many to believe one of two things: First, that the United States truly is focused on eliminating ISIS; and, second, that the United States and Syria are now working together to achieve this end.

Despite Syria’s forbearance, however, the truth is far from either of these ideas. The United States is in no way interested in destroying its own proxy army nor is it interested in working with the secular Assad government. After all, Assad and the Syrian government are the ultimate target of the West to begin with.

It is thus very important to note that informing Syria of attacks taking place on its soil is not

the same as coordinating those attacks or cooperating with the Syrian government. In other words, information is not the same as cooperation.

The United States [has repeatedly stated](#) that it refuses to coordinate any airstrikes with the Syrian government and responded with an Orwellian statement that it would oust Assad military if he dare defend himself against American attacks.

Even Congressman Justin Amash, during the Congressional debate on whether or not to support arming the mythical “moderate rebels,” was able to recognize the fact that the plans to “detect and degrade” ISIS was a clever disguise for a war on the secular government of Syria with no options off the table, including the use of ground troops. [In his own statement](#) announcing his opposition to the amendment, Amash stated,

Today’s amendment ostensibly is aimed at destroying ISIS—yet you’d hardly know it from reading the amendment’s text. The world has witnessed with horror the evil of ISIS: the public beheading of innocents, the killing of Christians, Muslims, and others.

The amendment’s focus—arming groups fighting the Assad government in Syria—has little to do with defeating ISIS. The mission that the amendment advances plainly isn’t the defeat of ISIS; it’s the defeat of Assad.

[...]

The Obama administration has tried to rally support for U.S. involvement in the Syrian civil war by implying that our help would be at arm’s length. The amendment Congress will vote on broadly authorizes “assistance” to groups in Syria. It does not specify what types of weapons our government will give the groups. It does not prohibit boots on the ground. (The amendment is silent on the president’s power to order our troops to fight in the civil war; it states only that Congress doesn’t provide “specific statutory authorization” for such escalation.) It does not state the financial cost of the war.

[...]

If the Syrian groups that are “appropriately vetted” (the amendment’s language) succeed and oust Assad, what would result? Would the groups assemble a coalition government of anti-Assad fighters, and would that coalition include ISIS? What would happen to the Alawites and Christians who stood with Assad? To what extent would the U.S. government be obligated to occupy Syria to rebuild the government? If each of the groups went its own way, would Syria’s territory be broken apart, and if so, would ISIS control one of the resulting countries? While Amash was correct to suggest that Congress should have opposed the amendment and that the amendment was actually a plan for an assault against the Syrian government as well as the fact that that anarchy, chaos, and unspeakable violence will reign supreme in Syria if the “appropriately vetted” groups managed to gain control of the country, Amash does miss part of the point.

The truth is not that “we don’t know much about the groups we are funding in Syria.” The truth is that “we” know full well that they are ISIS/Al-Qaeda terrorists, with only an occasional name change and branch off due to Western political motives or internal squabbling. That has been and still is the whole point.

Assad's refusal to react in frothing rage and declarations of war could very well be an attempt to save face in the eyes of world opinion and in the eyes of the Syrian people. The only other options available to the Syrian government would be to shoot down the American fighter jets and sign Syria's death warrant or to denounce the attacks and seem impotent when it comes to defending against them. Considering the options at the moment, one can clearly see how admission of foreknowledge with no immediate consequences directed at the United States might seem to be the best available selection.

Who Were The Actual Targets?

The low level of death squad casualties resulting from the U.S. airstrikes brings to mind one question - Were the airstrikes really meant to deal a significant blow to IS? After all, the bombing in areas like Deir al-Zor would have produced minimal results against IS to begin with since the Western-backed terrorists conveniently began leaving the city and many of their positions days ago.

Indeed, the [SAA had already launched an](#) offensive against death squad positions in Deir al-Zor, causing many observers to assume that the military assault was the reason IS and its "moderate" terrorist affiliates began evacuation. However, six days later, after bombs and missiles were rained down upon the city and surrounding areas, the reasons for death squad evacuation have become clearer to avoid U.S. airstrikes and move north to reinforce other IS battalions. Thus, one must ask whether or not the IS terrorists were evacuating for fear of defeat at the hands of the SAA or on the orders of the USA?

In addition, while some mainstream outlets have attempted to claim that the [death squads "simply managed to escape" Deir al-Zor](#) in order to avoid being struck by US airstrikes, the question then remains how they would have been aware of the bombing plans when even Assad was not informed until the last minute. Thus, any media outlet that claims this is the reason for low casualties among the terrorists is admitting to the fact that the terrorists had some kind of forewarning. Otherwise, how would they have known to evacuate these specific areas? Was it by intuition? Did they have a crystal ball? Or were they warned and/or ordered by their NATO commanders to reconfigure their forces in other locations?

Bombing Campaign Or Death Squad Herding?The fact that the terrorist casualties [were much lower than one would have expected](#) considering the previously heavy presence of fighters in the area should lead one to question the true objective of the bombing mission. After all, some reports even put the number of dead civilians higher than that of dead terrorists.

Yet, with the terrorists evacuating Deir al-Zor, cities and towns such as Kobani (Ayn El Arab) have seen a dramatic rise in the presence of IS fighters. In short, IS may have reduced the amount of fighters in Deir al-Zor but it has reinforced its positions at Ayn El Arab, a smaller town but one located on the Turkish border. Significantly, the Turkish border has facilitated tens of thousands of death squad fighters in their access to Syria over the last four years making it a main artery for the influx of Western-backed foreign jihadis into Syria.

[The Huffington Post reported](#) the situation in Ayn El Arab by recording the statement of a Syrian Kurd who had fled into Turkey with his family to escape IS. The report is revealing as to how the situation in Ayn El Arab disintegrated after the bombing of Deir al-Zor and the "escape" of terrorists from that city and region. The article reads,

“Because of the bombing in Raqqa, Islamic State has taken all of their weapons and brought them here. There are more and more Islamic State fighters in the last two days, they have brought all their forces here,” said Ahmed Hassan, 60, a Syrian Kurd who fled to Turkey with his family.

“They have heavy weapons. We are running away from them. YPG haven’t got heavy weapons. That’s why we need help,” he said, referring to the main Kurdish armed group.

Thus, the new assault on Ayn El Arab might very well be an attempt to re-secure and reopen the Turkish/Syrian border so as to allow even greater numbers of IS fighters and military equipment to flood into Syria. It also goes some distance in aiding the future creation of a “buffer zone,” in Northern Syria, a wish of NATO since the beginning of the Syrian crisis. With the establishment of this “buffer zone,” a new staging ground will be opened that allows terrorists such as ISIS and others the ability to conduct attacks even deeper inside Syria.

Working together with its NATO/GCC allies as well as the ever-present provocateur Israel, the United States is helping to create a buffer zone in the North and East of Syria while continuing to facilitate [the opening of a “third front”](#) on the Syrian border with Israel. Such a strategy was discussed in 2012 by the Brookings Institution in its publication [“Assessing Options For Regime Change,”](#) where it stated

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 Assad 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.

[...]

In addition, Israel’s intelligence services have a strong knowledge of Syria, as well as assets within the Syrian regime that could be used to subvert the regime’s power base and press for Assad’s removal. Israel could posture forces on or near the Golan Heights and, in so doing, might divert regime forces from suppressing the opposition. This posture may conjure fears in the Assad regime of a multi-front war, particularly if Turkey is willing to do the same on its border and if the Syrian opposition is being fed a steady diet of arms and training. Such a mobilization could perhaps persuade Syria’s military leadership to oust Assad in order to preserve itself. Advocates argue this additional pressure could tip the balance against Assad inside Syria, if other forces were aligned properly.

Are The Airstrikes Designed To Provoke Assad? One possibility of the purpose US airstrikes in Syria is that the aggressive presence of the U.S. military is in reality an attempt to poke and prod Assad into shooting down an American aircraft. As American planes currently act as a deadly and mechanical sheepdog to the terrorist herd, it is quite likely that the mission will creep closer and closer to Damascus and government-held territory. This “mission creep” will likely begin in and around the Aleppo region since the city and surrounding areas are strategically significant with heavy fighting taking place between government forces and the Western-backed death squads.

As these airstrike missions grow closer and closer to government-held territory and Syrian military forces, perhaps even making the occasional “mistake” of hitting SAA military installations or soldiers, Syria will be forced into a walking a tight rope between defending itself against open US military aggression before it inflicts too much damage to Syria’s military capabilities or responding in kind and sealing its own fate against the superior US Air Force. [As Tony Cartalucci writes](#),

For now, Syria and its allies must formulate carefully a strategy that resists overreaction to immense provocations, understand the true nature of America’s aggression, determining whether it was exercised from a position of strength or immense weakness, and devise countermeasures that accommodate long-term consequences of America’s current campaign. A balance between allowing the West to exhaust its last desperate options, but preventing long-term entrenchment of Western-backed proxies must be struck.

At the end of the day, it is important to remember that the U.S. airstrikes against Syria are nothing more than a farce. The death squads running amok in Syria are themselves entirely creatures of NATO and they remain under NATO’s command. The true enemy of ISIS, Khorasan, and the cannibals of the Levant has always been and continues to be Bashar al-Assad.

Brandon Turbeville is an author out of Florence, South Carolina. He has a Bachelor’s Degree from Francis Marion University and is the author of six books, [Codex Alimentarius – The End of Health Freedom](#), [7 Real Conspiracies](#), [Five Sense Solutions](#) and [Dispatches From a Dissident, volume 1](#) and [volume 2](#), and [The Road to Damascus: The Anglo-American Assault on Syria](#). Turbeville has published over 300 articles dealing on a wide variety of subjects including health, economics, government corruption, and civil liberties. Brandon Turbeville’s podcast [Truth on The Tracks](#) can be found every Monday night 9 pm EST at [UCYTV](#). He is available for radio and TV interviews. Please contact [activistpost \(at\) gmail.com](#).

The original source of this article is [Activist Post](#)
Copyright © [Brandon Turbeville](#), [Activist Post](#), 2014

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Brandon Turbeville](#)

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