

US Increases Violence in Syria in Response to Attack in Iraq

By [Lucas Leiroz de Almeida](#)

Global Research, March 10, 2021

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

Theme: [Intelligence, US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [IRAQ REPORT, SYRIA](#)

All Global Research articles **can be read in 27 languages by activating the “Translate Website”** drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

*In Washington, military plans for the Middle East are unclear. Biden’s aggressive speech has remained the same since his election campaign, with a strong inclination to guarantee American interests in that region. However, **Secretary of State Antony Blinken** made statements saying that there is currently no American interest in carrying out operations and interventions that are too expensive. Meanwhile, the American escalation in northeastern Syria continues and creates uncertainty for the future.*

After the attack on the Ain al-Asad base in Iraq, White House press secretary **Jen Psaki** said: “If we assess a further response is warranted, we will take action again in a manner and time of our choosing”. The pronouncement is curious when we consider Blinken’s promises. Would responses be necessary for an attack that left virtually no victims? It is necessary to emphasize that the attack on the American base in Iraq did not happen by chance. Previously, on February 25, American forces bombed installations of an Iraqi Shiite militia in Syria. Still, several mutual attacks have been reported for a long time, and the March 3 attack was certainly the mildest and most harmless of all. However, the American rhetoric from now on will be that this attack “justifies” new measures – such “justification” is simply due to the exaggerated media attention given to the case.

According to most experts, an American response would certainly be carried out through a new attack on enemy bases installed in Syria. The attacks outside Syria are, most of the time, exceptional measures, since it is in Syria that strategic movements occur most frequently. But, until “the great response” is announced, the US has already carried out new attacks in Syria – and no media attention was paid to this in the West. The targets of the most recent attacks were the Kataib Hezbollah and Kataib Sayyid al-Shuhada militias. The number of victims of the retaliation is still uncertain.

Meanwhile, on the American domestic political scenario, there is a strong outcry for tougher and more effective measures against Washington’s enemies in the US. In particular, radical Democrats claim that the attack is clearly financed and led by Iran. The State Department, having to deal with strategic rather than ideological issues, avoid taking impetuous actions and this causes irritation among globalists. Globalists supported Biden on the basis of his promises to safeguard Western agendas across the planet – and they are really demanding this from the new government. For some representatives of the American elite, Biden has

been ineffective so far.

In a recent NBC News [article](#), **Mark Dubowitz**, CEO of the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, says:

“‘We’re not going to prejudge.’ State Department spokesperson Ned Price deployed this classic Washington euphemism last week to avoid responding to a question over how much culpability Iran and its Shiite militias bear for recent rocket attacks against a US military base in northern Iraq. (...) Why is the Biden administration not connecting the dots between the Islamic Republic of Iran and its proxies — and not doing more to publicly deter this behavior? Is it simply that the new administration is still finding its feet after just one month in office?”

This clash brings us back to the question that all the experts asked when Biden’s promises were made: does Washington really have the strength to recover its global hegemony? The ideologically elite with the mission of “bringing (the American way of) democracy” to all parts of the world cries out for endless wars, interventions, sanctions, blockades, and retaliation. Those who actually operate such measures call for calm and claim for an end to overly expensive operations that only cause stress to the troops and take the lives of Americans away. This clash will not end anytime soon. The ideological part of the government is committed to objectives that require measures that they cannot operate alone - and those able to operate such measures visibly want to avoid them because they know their real conditions and know that every care is necessary when it comes to military operations.

However, the military also wants to respond - its only difference for Democrats is that they recognize their real conditions for action. The American military presence in northeastern Syria is increasing day by day. On March 6, American aircraft landed at the Al-Shaddadah military base carrying about 20 boxes containing missiles. New soldiers also disembarked there. Visibly, violence will escalate in the region and there are no good expectations for the near future.

While Democrats are calling for action against Iran, the military is likely to be concerned with increasing violence in Syria as a proxy war against Tehran and Shi’ite militias. The ideological wing of the Biden government will have to conform to material reality and understand that the current circumstances do not allow for a general increase in the American power of aggression.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

This article was originally published on [InfoBrics](#).

Lucas Leiroz is a research fellow in international law at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro.

The original source of this article is Global Research

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Lucas Leiroz de Almeida](#)

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