

Either Assad Must be the Dumbest Dictator on the Planet or Maybe He Didn't Do It

THE WORLD IS PASSING THROUGH a unique time, a time characterized by a burgeoning global reaction against unipolar liberal hegemony exercised by a powerful international coterie in countries such as France, the United Kingdom and the United States. These three nations cooperated to launch a major missile attack against a beleaguered Syria using the pretext of war crimes allegedly perpetrated by Bashar al Assad who they have accused for the third time of employing chemical weapons against his own people. Unfortunately (for the international coterie), many people are wising up; they prefer peace to ongoing war and threats of war. The tide is clearly turning, and Syria is the turning point. The international arena is significantly changing, but the globalists cannot humble themselves enough to accept the fact that their self-serving liberal hegemony is no longer palatable.

Astutely recognizing the mounting discontent, Donald Trump ran for office on a populist ticket touting a foreign policy consisting of attractive goals such as cessation of regime change, pulling troops out of the Middle East and Syria, reduction of NATO, *rapprochement* with Russia, non-interference in the affairs of sovereign nation states and, corollary with these goals, the reduction of US military bases around the globe. However, due to internal pressures from Neoconservatives, warhawks in both parties, EU Globalists, deep-state bureaucrats, and Zionist lobbies such as the *American Israel Public Affairs Committee* (AIPAC), due to pressure from groups such as these, the new president has

been unable to advance his foreign policy objectives. Recently, however, it appeared as if he might be taking control of the executive office. On March 29, 2018 he stated:

"We're knocking the hell out of ISIS. We'll be coming out of Syria, like, very soon. Let the other people take care of it now" ([Politico](#)).

Less than a week later (April 3), he was stressing the same theme:

"I want to get back, I want to rebuild our nation. It's time. We were very successful against ISIS; we'll be successful against anybody militarily, but sometimes it's time to come back home. And we're thinking about that very seriously" ([NBC News](#)).

During the time he was voicing these sentiments (sentiments he had professed during his presidential campaign), it was becoming increasingly clear that Russian and Iranian backed Syrian forces were also winning the war against the terrorists and that Bashar al Assad would be remaining in power. This is an eventuality that is anathema to Zionist Israel, Neocon warhawks, deep-state bureaucrats and pro-Zionist Christian Fundamentalists, the vocal core of Trump's Christian supporters. More importantly, it raises a vital question about Assad's domestic support and his military and political capabilities, capabilities that have kept him in power despite a seven-year onslaught backed by the globalists. If Trump gets his way, and the United States withdraws, Assad will remain in power, Iran will be on Israel's borders and Russia will be emboldened. In short, the Zionists who rule Israel find themselves in a frightening situation, *ergo*, America must remain. The only thing keeping Trump engaged in Syria is the allegation of a chemical attack, [the same allegation that took the US to war in Syria in the first place and then kept them engaged under President Obama.](#)

Now, the accusation is being used again. However, the allegation is problematic. It is so problematic that it prompted US Senator Rand Paul to opine:

"I still look at the attack and say, you know, either Assad must be the dumbest dictator on the planet – or maybe he didn't do it. I have yet to see evidence that he did do it."

"Either Assad Must be the Dumbest Dictator on the Planet – or Maybe He Didn't Do It." – US Senator Rand Paul (0:50-1:18).

On March 19, [Reuters](#) reported that despite a seven-year international effort to depose him, President Bashar al-Assad is securely in power. In fact, Reuters (by no means friendly to Assad) distributed a video showing the Syrian president driving to meet frontline [soldiers](#) near Ghouta. Describing a road previously riddled by sniper fire Assad can be heard saying:

"The road is open... everything is running now in the city and in Syria."

According to [Reuters](#) :

"While Assad has increasingly been shown traveling around Syria in recent years, it is unusual for him to visit areas close to the battlefield, as he did on Sunday, meeting cheering soldiers as well as civilians who had escaped the fighting. There have been numerous other signs of his increasing confidence, including the release last year of a banknote bearing his image for the first time since he became president in 2000."

The senator from Kentucky is right: Assad must be the dumbest dictator on the planet; he is winning the war and decides to drop chemical weapons. The real story is that the Syrian army has routed the majority of terrorists operating in

Syria and is defeating US backed terrorists in Ghouta. The end of ISIS is in reach, but each time Syria advances to this point, a chemical weapons charge is employed against them.

Is Syria Winning the War?

In September of 2017, Robert Ford, the former US ambassador to Syria, announced that [President Bashar al-Assad had “won” the war](#).

“This stark assessment was endorsed this week by the United Nations special envoy to Syria, Staffan de Mistura, who called on rebel forces to accept that they had lost. Citing “critical” military gains made by government forces over the past nine months, and the involvement of numerous countries such as the US and Russia by proxy, De Mistura said the war was now almost over.”

Highlighting this point, in December 2017, Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered the withdraw of Russian troops from Syria because, as he stated,

“Russia’s task force and the Syrian government troops have routed “over slightly more than two years,” the “most combat-capable groups of international terrorists” ([Jewish Press](#)).

In short, the war was in its final stage; essentially all that was left was the Ghouta District, a district that was captured by US backed rebel forces in 2013 thereby trapping 400,000 Syrian civilians inside. The main US backed rebel faction, **Jaysh al-Islam** – an al Qaeda affiliate – was then harbored in eastern Ghouta in a town named Douma. They were embedded amidst a dense civilian population, which resulted in large number of civilian casualties. There were many reports of theft of food and emergency supplies intended for civilians, the imposition of Sharia law, and the keeping of women and children inside cages to be exploited as human shields to

inhibit Syrian the air force from bombing the city.

Eventually Assad's forces were able to bring Jaysh al-Islam to its knees and then to the bargaining table to negotiate their surrender ([Veterans Today](#) – [AMN](#)). In short, the war was over, the battle for Ghouta was complete; the terrorists were even being evacuated from the city ([BBC News](#)). Even [Newsweek](#) announced, "The Worst of the War is Over, As ISIS nears Defeat."

Then, strangely, hundreds of civilians were reportedly killed in Douma by chemical weapons allegedly employed by Syrian forces. This political *non-sequitur* prompted Senator Rand, and a host of others, to reject the allegation against Assad prompting him to ask can any political leader be so stupid: The war is over; Assad is securely in power and then he acts to bring the whole world against him by unleashing chemical weapons. It does not make sense.

Assad seems to gain nothing and risks losing everything; he has no apparent motive, but the Zionists ruling Israel have a clear motive: If things continue the way they are going, *including the ongoing global demise of liberalism*, the Zionists are about to lose control of their own country.

Mr. Trump might be gloating about a victory over ISIS, but so too is Assad (at least until the allegations were levelled against him); he is (was) poised to win the war. However, as stated above, unlike Trump and Assad, the Zionists are *not* gloating; they are *not* excited about Assad's prospects. They are frightened by the shifting topography of the Middle East battlefield: Iran is now united to Syria *via* Iraq and an existential threat to the Zionists. Due to American foreign policy bungling in Iraq, Iran is *now* a greater threat to the Zionists than they were before the war in Iraq began under President Bush. In addition to external degradation, the Zionists are facing mounting discontent and resultant opposition at home: [Sixty percent of Orthodox men in Israel](#)

[are unemployed](#):

“They are a real danger to Israel,” said Omer Moav, economics professor at the University of London and the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. “If we go bankrupt it’s the end of the story for us. Our strong army rests on a strong economy” ([Reuters](#)).

Israeli economist Omer Moav thinks the situation is so dire that he suggests the use of force to bring the Orthodox (Haredim) into compliance with Zionist social-cultural standards:

“As long as the government won’t make a dramatic change, things will get worse. One cannot reach an agreed upon solution, it has to be forced upon the Haredim,” he said.

Surprising to many, Israel is the most impoverished nation in the Western world:

“The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [released a report](#) showing that, of the world’s thirty-four economically developed countries, Israel is the most impoverished and has one of the highest rates of inequality. With a poverty rate of twenty-one per cent, Israel has a higher percentage of poor people than Mexico, Turkey, or debt-ridden Spain and Greece” ([The New Yorker](#)).

Not only is there an economic problem, Tel Aviv might be considered the [world capital of homosexuality](#) and Israel is denounced as a Zionist puppet state by its Orthodox rabbis:

Things are simply worse for the Zionist faction in 2018 than they were in 2011 or 1990. The Zionists do *not* want to be left alone to face Iran, Syria and Hezbollah. Supported by

Dispensational think tanks such as Christians United for Israel (CUFI) and lobbies such as AIPAC, they expect American blood will be spilled in their defense. Pastor John Hagee would have Americans believe that being killed on the battlefield for Israel is a holy cause:

"I'll bless those (Americans) that bless you (Israel) and I'll curse those that curse you," [said Hagee](#), quoting from the book of Genesis. "That's God's foreign policy statement, and it has not changed."

The Zionist campaign has been lauded by South Carolina [Sen. Lindsey Graham](#), who speaking at a Hagee gathering thundered:

"Here's a message for America: Don't ever turn your back on Israel, because God will turn his back on us."

Given ideological support such as this and news reports such as those quoted above, it is not surprising that just hours following President Trump's March 3, 2018 meeting with his national security team in which he announced his firm intention to "bring the troops home", the president reluctantly did an about-face and agreed to keep American troops in Syria for an unspecified amount of time to "complete the mission", "defeat ISIS" and "secure gains". In the process of acquiescing, President Trump asked his defense team:

"If you need more time, how much more time do you need? Six months? A year?"

His team responded that they couldn't put a time frame to how long it will take to defeat ISIS and to train local forces to maintain their gains after the U.S. leaves. Trump clearly wants out, but his advisors have persuaded him to remain. According to his Defense Secretary, James Mattis,

"The president made his displeasure clear about any kind of long-term presence in Syria," adding that the president was

trying to “light a fire” under his team to get the military mission wrapped up ([NBC News](#)).

Although he was “trying to light a fire” to get the mission wrapped up, in the end, he followed their counsel. He “wasn’t thrilled” according to Mattis, but “agreed to give the (war) effort more time.”

Then, a few days later, French President Emmanuel Macron sealed the deal:

“Ten days ago, President Trump was saying the United States of America had a duty to disengage from Syria, I assure you, we have convinced him that it is necessary to stay for the long-term” ([The Times of Israel](#)).

President Trump had promised to withdraw, his security advisers seconded by the President of France, convinced him to stay and then Syria was bombarded. Just when it looked as if he might actually make some headway toward implementing his foreign policy objectives, the president turned around and ordered a massive missile attack.

According to Macron the attack (despite its *not* being sanctioned by the UN) is justified by International Law because “under a 2013 UN resolution, Syria was supposed to destroy its chemical weapons arsenal” ([Times of Israel](#)). International Law, however, clearly specifies that the only time a nation may employ force is when it has a unanimous resolution by the UN Security Council authorizing use of force to rectify a violation of international peace and security or in the limited case of dire need for self-defense. Regardless of agreement or disagreement with the point, International Law does *not* permit the use of military force (even to punish or prevent chemical weapons attacks) without U.N. Security Council approval ([New York Times](#)). Absent such approval, the use of military force is prohibited for any reason except self-defense.

Thus, regarding the UK's justification for the missile attack, Former British Ambassador, Craig Murray said it is "utter bullshit".

When the government's legal justification for bombing is 1,000 words long, yet contains no reference to the UN Charter, Security Council, to any international treaty or to any international court ruling, you know it is complete and utter bullshit <https://t.co/vmk8733bde>

– Craig Murray (@CraigMurrayOrg) [April 15, 2018](#)

Even Fox News has turned in favor of Assad:

"All the geniuses tell us Assad killed children, but do they really know that? Of course they don't – They are Making it Up" (2:29 – 2:37).

Trump's order to attack (April 2018) was defended by Secretary Mattis who stated that the president had "legal authority" to launch the attack on his own, citing Article II of the United States Constitution and international laws banning chemical weapons.

Likewise, British Prime Minister Theresa May cited reports that the Syrian government employed a "barrel bomb" to deliver the chemicals used in the Douma affair. Consequently, she too concluded the decision to use force was "right and legal."

International law does ban the use of chemical weapons, however, in this case, it was *never* determined that chemical weapons were ever used. Trump ordered a strike *before* analysts could begin their work. He **ordered an attack hours before the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) was to launch its investigation.**

According to Vassily Nebenzia, [Russian Ambassador to the UN](#)

"On 14 April local time, the United States, supported by its

allies, had launched air strikes against Syria. Without a mandate from the Council and in violation of the Charter and international norms, an aggressive act against a sovereign State had been carried out. Just as the action taken one year earlier when an air base had come under attack, the United States had used as a pretext a staged chemical attack, this time in Douma."

"OPCW experts had conducted a field mission. On 10 April, when his country's draft resolution (Russia's) on the OPCW special mission had been blocked, he (the Russian Ambassador) had been assured that such a document had not been needed, and that the (OPCW) mission would visit and investigate the sites. However, the 13 April aggression had laid bare that that was not the issue (missiles were launched before the mission commenced)....'This is how you want international affairs to be conducted,' he asked. 'This is hooliganism' from major nuclear powers" ([United Nations Official Documents](#)).

The Russian ambassador is referring to the fact that **an internationally recognized team was already on the ground and in place ready to investigate the alleged chemical attack, but before they could investigate, The United States, France and Great Britain launched their missile attack** thereby impeding the investigation, which *might* have turned up nothing, thereby exonerating Assad, had it been permitted to investigate. Had it found him guilty, they might have been surprised to see Russia enter the camp in favor of deposing Assad, but this scenario was never tested. Instead, the United States, the UK and France launched an April 14 missile attack on Syrian government facilities, which they believe were used to produce chemical weapons. The Syrian authorities have repeatedly stated that the entire chemical arsenal was taken out of the country years before under the eyes of the international

community monitored by the same OPCW whose investigation was negated by the recent missile attack. In this regard, [American Secretary of State John Kerry Kerry](#) stated in a television interview that:

"We got 100 percent of the chemical weapons out."

Contrary to Ambassador Nebenzia quoted above, his American counterpart, Nikki Haley (US Ambassador to the UN) stated that

"The targets selected were at the heart of the Syrian regime's illegal chemical weapons programme, and the action taken by the three countries was legitimate and proportional. Diplomacy had been given chance after chance, she said, recalling that, in 2013, the Security Council had passed a resolution requiring Syria to destroy its chemical weapons stockpile (the stockpile that Secretary of State Kerry said was "100% out"). The President of the Russian Federation had said that his country would guarantee Syria's compliance. It had been hoped that diplomacy would succeed, but that had not happened, and while Russia was busy protecting the Syrian regime, that regime knew it could act with impunity, and it did."

"We cannot stand by and let Russia trash every international norm that we stand for and allow the use of chemical weapons to go unanswered," she said.

Haley in referring to international norms was careful to state that she considered *only* norms or standards the US agrees with or "stands for", not those adumbrated by the UN. Likewise, "Mad Dog Mattis" cited Article II of the US Constitution. Article II, however, is irrelevant since it authorizes the president to act when vital US interests are endangered, not those of the rest of the world.

In this regard the Russian Ambassador pointed out:

"It was shameful that, in justifying its aggression, that Government (United States) had cited its Constitution. Washington, D.C, must learn: The international code of behaviour regarding the use of force was (is) regulated by the (UN) Charter", not the United States Constitution, however great a document it might be.

The proper mode of action would have been permitting the OPCW to conduct its investigation. Then, *subject to its findings*, Assad could have been either exonerated or punished. The triple alliance, however, acted *before* any investigation could be carried out and in this way **proceeded without any evidence except hearsay** and thus seems to have violated International Law. That is, even though International Law forbids the use of chemical weapons, any allegations of such use **must be confirmed** before the Security Council can be expected to give a green light for punitive or deterrent actions. Absent such an investigation, Russia could *not* bring itself to cooperate. Perhaps if the US would have let the investigators investigate, and if the OPCW team had found chemical weapons pointing to Assad, they might have been surprised to see Russia cooperate to reign in Assad and perhaps work toward his removal. But this hypothetical scenario was never given a chance. Instead: Guilty before investigation and trial. This is a form of international vigilantism based on the premise that might makes right contrary to both the United States Constitution and the nation's Declaration of Independence; it is the type of unilateral hegemony that the rest of the world increasingly finds wearisome.

Thus, Syrian TV called the attacks a "blatant violation of international law that shows contempt for international legitimacy." President Trump responded by lambasteing Russia and Iran, for supporting "murderous dictators." Putin, however, reaffirmed Russia's position that the chemical attack

in Douma was a fake. He then chastised the US for initiating a strike without waiting for inspectors from the international chemical weapons community to conduct an investigation.

Nonetheless, President Trump has carefully avoided striking Russian assets and Russian personnel in Syria. Instead, he has *again* indicated his “desire for improved relations with Moscow and possibly Tehran”, thereby leaving diplomatic channels ajar and avoiding a larger confrontation while leaving the door open for a graceful exit on a double high note: (1) The defeat of ISIS and (2) the whacking of Assad. But, it is Assad who has the greater victory. And it is Israel that now finds itself in a seemingly impossible imbroglio. Perhaps, the region will finally find its way to peace, but that will require the negation of Zionism in Israel and whatever forces are on the horizon to bring such an eventuality to fruition.