

Trump's Ambassador to UN: We Must Sanction Assad Over Chemical Weapons!

By [Daniel McAdams](#)

Global Research, February 27, 2017

[Ron Paul Institute](#) 24 February 2017

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

Theme: [Media Disinformation, United Nations, US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

Recently, we [had a look](#) at the ways President Trump's Ambassador to the UN, **Nikki Haley**, is making her predecessor, "humanitarian bomber" Samantha Power, look like a model diplomat by comparison. It turns out Haley's ghastly performance at the UN thus far is no fluke. Each time she opens her mouth she spews not the kind of foreign policy that President Trump campaigned on, but rather the boot-in-the-face know-nothingness that we have grown accustomed to in recent years.

In the latest "Haley Alert," the Ambassador is furious over a Russia-threatened veto of a UN Security Council resolution offered by the US, UK, and France to impose new sanctions on the Syrian government over unproven allegations that Syria used chemical weapons against its own population.

Yes, under Ambassador Haley we have entered a time machine back to 2013, where the US is ready to deploy its entire diplomatic (and perhaps military) arsenal against the one government in the Middle East actually fighting President Trump's sworn enemies: ISIS and al-Qaeda.

President Trump, in one of his first interviews after the November election, [starkly contrasted](#) his position with those both of the outgoing Obama Administration and his defeated opponent, Hillary Clinton:

I've had an opposite view of many people regarding Syria. ...My attitude was you're fighting Syria, Syria is fighting ISIS, and you have to get rid of ISIS. Russia is now totally aligned with Syria, and now you have Iran, which is becoming powerful, because of us, is aligned with Syria... Now we're backing rebels against Syria, and we have no idea who these people are.

His employee, the US Ambassador to the UN, clearly does not share her boss's "opposite view" on Syria. And she is not afraid to contradict her boss's position on a regular basis. Today the US Mission to the UN released Ambassador Haley's [remarks](#) condemning the threatened Russian veto of new sanctions against Syria, and her comments do not in any way suggest a diplomat remotely well-informed about the complex matters at hand:

I think what we saw in there was pretty amazing, because you had unity in the fact that we needed to be concerned about chemical weapons being used in Syria. You had an overwhelming vote to say we need an investigative mechanism that would prove that these chemical weapons were being done by

the Syrian regime. Now you've got the results that have come out, and people don't like what the results are. It is ridiculous. How much longer is Russia going to continue to babysit and make excuses for the Syrian regime? People have died by being suffocated to death. That's barbaric.

So what we're going to do is - we were given all these reasons on why we shouldn't propose the resolution. We were given all these reasons on why the timing was wrong. That is exactly why the timing is right. That is exactly why this resolution needs to happen. Whether people are going to veto it or not, you are either for chemical weapons or you're against it. People died because of this, and the United States isn't going to be quiet. Thank you.

Let's unpack this head-scratcher of a statement. First off, "we need an investigative mechanism that would prove that these chemical weapons were being done by the Syrian regime." So she is stating that there must be an investigation to prove what she has pre-determined to be true before the investigation took place? Does that sound like "innocent until proven guilty"? Or does it sound like Hoxha-era revolutionary justice? "We must have a trial to prove comrade X guilty so we can execute him!"

And this from Haley: "How much longer is Russia going to continue to babysit and make excuses for the Syrian regime?"

Ms. Ambassador: Do you mean the regime that just liberated Aleppo from its murderous occupation by al-Qaeda? You know, those guys who attacked the US on 9/11?

If Assad is using chemical weapons against his own people (Why? Presumably for fun?) then why once Aleppo was cleansed of the al-Qaeda occupiers have former residents [flocked to return](#) to an Aleppo under Assad's control? Do they enjoy being gassed?

US Ambassador to the UN Nikki Haley is an absolute train wreck. She embodies the worst traits of her predecessors with a much lower level of understanding of foreign affairs or diplomacy. Will President Trump recognize his mistake in appointing her to represent the US at the UN and replace her with someone who will actually carry out his foreign policy? Or was he simply lying when he said he had an "opposite view" from the conventional Washington wisdom on Syria (and Russia as well)?

The original source of this article is [Ron Paul Institute](#)
Copyright © [Daniel McAdams](#), [Ron Paul Institute](#), 2017

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Daniel McAdams](#)

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