

OPCW Completes Inspection in Syria Beginning to Look More Like Fake News

FOLLOWING THE ALLEGED APRIL 7 chemical attack laid at the feet of Syrian President Bashar al Assad, the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW – an independent international organization that works in conjunction with the UN but is governed by its own Executive Council.) sent a team to Syria to investigate the allegations. However, *before* they could conduct their investigation, the combined forces of the United Kingdom, France and the United States launched an April 14 missile attack on Syria.

After the attack, the OPCW team was delayed from initiating their investigation. [Liberal media outlets accused Russia of being behind the delay's](#). Their motive, according to media sources was time needed to clean up the chemicals left behind, the residue of Assad's alleged attack.

This scenario, while interesting and highly provocative, does *not* make much sense, especially when it is realized that it was the Russians who asked for the original investigation launched by the OPCW. On April 10, following the allegations of a chemical attack by Assad and prior to the missile attack by the US, Vassily Nebenzia, [Russian Ambassador to the UN](#) issued a draft resolution at the UN calling for a special mission to investigate the allegations. In the resolution, it is stated that:

“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 (US missile attack) 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 (he said) is hooliganism' from major nuclear powers" ([United Nations Official Documents](#)).

The Russian ambassador was 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.

Similarly, the Syrian Ambassador to the UN stated that his country had:

"...officially invited OPCW to send its fact-finding mission to investigate alleged chemical weapons use. Syria welcomed that visit and stood ready to cooperate fully, and it looked forward to the fact-finding mission conducting its work with transparency and professionalism while relying on evidence. The fact-finding mission would get full access to a liberated Douma" ([United Nations Press Releases – April 10, 2018](#)).

The US launched the airstrike on April 14, but on April 9th the Russian delegate to the UN was (as stated above) pleading for an independent investigation to be conducted by the OPCW going so far as to assure that Russian soldiers would protect the OPCW team and facilitate the mission:

"[The Russian envoy](#) called for the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) investigative team to conduct a thorough inquiry surrounding the allegations of chemical weapon use, saying these teams could be escorted

by Russian and Syrian forces as soon as Tuesday” (April 10).

Ambassador Nebenzia iterated the fact that:

“The draft by his country had also reflected the Government of Syria’s invitation to the OPCW fact-finding mission in order to carry out its investigation in line with that organization’s standards” ([UN Press Release](#)).

[UK Envoy to the UN, Karen Pierce](#), even expressed her interest in pursuing this course of action:

“I was very interested to hear the Russian offer that OPCW fact-finding mission could visit and would have the [protection](#) of Russian forces.... I believe that this is an offer worth pursuing but it would of course be necessary for the OPCW mission to have complete freedom of action and freedom of [access](#).”

Most importantly, the OPCW itself announced the fact, that both Syria and Russia had called for an investigation after the allegations that Assad had deployed chemical weapons and before the US led missile strike:

“Today (April 10), the OPCW Technical Secretariat has requested the Syrian Arab Republic to make the necessary arrangements for such a deployment. This has coincided with a request from the Syrian Arab Republic and the Russian Federation to investigate the allegations of chemical weapons use in Douma. The team is preparing to deploy to Syria shortly” ([OPCW Website](#)).

In short, it is *not* likely that the Russians or the Syrians impeded the *post-missile strike* investigation, they both desired a *pre-missile strike* investigation. It was the France, the UK and US that impeded the investigation by launching a

large scale missile attack hours before it was to be conducted thereby making a pre-strike investigation impossible.

Here is a Concrete Example of Fake News “Cherry Picking” to Manufacture a False Story from Partial Truths

The CBS news report cited in sentence two above is an example of fake news by means of partial truths. Despite a full two page letter drafted by Ahmet Üzümcü, the Director General of the OPCW regarding its investigation, [CBS](#) reported only one sentence from the two page report, the only one that in any way supports their case:

“The Syrian and the Russian officials who participated in the preparatory meetings in Damascus have informed the FFM (Fact Finding Mission) Team that there were still pending security issues to be worked out before any deployment could take place.”

Focusing on this one sentence, CBS simultaneously disregarded the remaining letter that negates their illusory case. The [actual entire letter](#), reveals a quite different story. It contains sentences such as the following:

*“On Tuesday 10 April, we (the OPCW) handed to the Syrian delegation a note verbale notifying them of our decision to deploy the FFM as early as possible, as well as the names of the team members for issuance of visas. **On the same day, the Syrian delegation submitted to the Secretariat a note verbale requesting the FFM to be dispatched. We also received a letter from the Ambassador of the Russian Federation supporting the Syrian request. Following these communications which are circulated to the States Parties on 10 April, I received a letter from the Syrian Vice Foreign Minister expressing his government’s support for the deployment of the FFM”** ([OPCW Executive Council](#)).*

And

“An advance group of three experts from the FFM arrived in Beirut on Thursday (three days before the missile firings), while the remaining six members joined them on Friday. The full team received a security briefing from the UN Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS) in Beirut on Friday. On Saturday the team proceeded to Damascus (hours before the missile attack), where they met with officials of the National Authority to work out a plan for the deployment.”

The fact is that both Russia and Syria were the initiators of the investigation, both favored and asked for it as well as made plans to facilitate it. Three days prior to the missile attack the OPCW team was already in Lebanon (Beirut); on Saturday they were moved to the Syrian capital in Damascus from which they were to proceed to Douma pending final arrangements by the Syrian military. Before final plans could be implemented, US-UK missiles rained over the city and province thereby directly affecting the ability of the OPCW to carry out the Russian-Syrian requested investigation of the alleged chemical site.

If the US, the British, French and Israeli intelligence communities were unaware of the OPCW presence on the ground in Syria and Jordan, it is a failure of gross proportions – the whole reason of the OPCW’s existence is to investigate chemical sites. Or did they know the OPCW team was on the ground undertaking an active investigation, and that is precisely the reason they bombed Syria – that is, to interrupt the investigation? If so, this is tampering of ultimate proportion.

Moreover, the *tweet* employed by CBS to distort the news and chastise Russia and Syria is merely an irrelevant tweet, an unidentrified opinion emanating from the Official Twitter account of the [#UK](#) Delegation of the OCDF, a delegation that

stands in opposition to Russia and Syria. In short, it is a nonsense tweet from an unidentified source from a highly biased UK delegation, a delegation of a nation engaged in war with Syria.

https://twitter.com/UK OPCW/status/985816921395298305?tfw_site=CBSNews&ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cbsnews.com%2Fnews%2Frussia-opcw-syria-alleged-chemical-attack-after-us-strikes-2018-4-16%2F

Future Investigation

Regardless of the above situation, over two weeks have passed since the missile attacks; finally, OPCW inspectors have entered Douma and taken [samples](#) from the site of the alleged April 7 chemical attack. [According to the OPCW itself](#),

“...samples collected will be transported to the OPCW Laboratory in Rijswijk and then dispatched for analysis to the OPCW’s designated labs” ([Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons Website](#)).

The findings will have to wait until analysis is completed, but anticipation is growing as the UK, France and US have all made claims that both the Syrians and Russians have “tampered” with the site and [delayed](#) the OPCW investigation.

The OPCW, however, has stated that the [only obstacle](#) to their post-missile investigation of Douma was the UNDOSS. Moreover, experts are highly skeptical about the possibility of removing all chemical evidence from the site. That is, if chemicals were used, evidence will be found. According to Dr. Homer Venters, Director of Programs for Physicians for Human Rights, which investigated Halabja, Iraq, in 1992 (four years after a chemical weapons attack), despite the passage of four years, samples still showed evidence of a chemical attack on Kurdish villages in Iraq. Therefore,

“It is unlikely”, he said, “that all traces of evidence could be removed” (in Syria or anywhere) [NBC News](#).

In conclusion, no matter how much the news is twisted, an objective analysis reveals that Russia and Syria did *not* impede the investigation of Douma prior to the firing of missiles by the US cohort; rather, **they asked for and facilitated that investigative mission.**

Given the fact that both Russia and Syria asked for, and fully cooperated with, the UN investigation team prior to the missile attacks seems to negate any further allegations of tampering with the alleged crime scene.

It is more likely that the forces behind the missile attacks, attacks that occurred just *prior to* the planned on-site investigation, are the same forces that delayed efforts *following the missile attacks*. First the Syrians are accused of using chemical weapons and then of delaying tactics employed to buy time necessary for the removal of evidence. Unfortunately, they are being accused by the very forces that *obviously*

(1) ignored the UN plans for an investigation by firing over 100 missiles thereby

(2) obliterating the OPCW investigation, an investigation that would have been much different prior to the firing of missiles than after.

Yes, the whole thing is beginning to look a whole lot more like “fake news”.

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.”

<https://youtu.be/K4V3jQCi8-o>

“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:

<https://youtu.be/fXgseuoaEIs>

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".

<https://twitter.com/CraigMurrayOrg/status/985436044677079040>

Even Fox News has turned in favor of Assad:

<https://youtu.be/U0niyl-vDBk>

"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 lambasting 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.

Nations of World Want Peace - Against Jerusalem being the Capital of Israel

[PART ONE OF THIS ARTICLE](#) traced the history of Palestine from the 1917 Balfour Declaration (which declared to the world Britain’s support for the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine) up to the 1947-48 Israeli War that followed the withdrawal of British troops and cessation of British responsibility for the governance of Palestine, which was transferred to the United Nations (UN). It was then

that Zionist forces occupied areas of Jerusalem and the West Bank that were designated by the UN as belonging to the Palestinians. Based upon this original designation of the West Bank to the Palestinians, the Palestinians, like the Israelis, had hopes of forming a future state in areas the international community with full US backing had ceded to them.

Anticipating the (47-48) evacuation of British forces and transfer of governance from the UK to the UN, the UN drafted a two state solution, one Israeli and the other Arab (Christian and Muslim).

According to the 1947 [UN Resolution 184](#):

“Independent Arab and Jewish States and the Special International Regime for the City of Jerusalem, set forth in Part III of this plan, shall come into existence in Palestine two months after the evacuation of the (British) armed forces of the mandatory Power (UK) has been completed but in any case not later than 1 October 1948.”

“The period between the adoption by the General Assembly of its recommendation on the question of Palestine and the establishment of the independence of the Arab and Jewish States shall be a transitional period.”

The idea of two states was firmly established in directives given to the UN Commission charged with overseeing the transition from British control to the establishment of independent Israel and Arab states in Palestine:

“The Constituent Assembly of each State shall draft a democratic constitution for its State and choose a provisional government to succeed the Provisional Council of Government appointed by the (UN) Commission. The constitutions of the States shall...include inter alia provisions for:

(a) Establishing in each State a legislative body elected by universal suffrage and by secret ballot on the basis of proportional representation, and an executive body responsible to the legislature;

(b) Settling all international disputes in which the State may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered;

(c) Accepting the obligation of the State to refrain in its international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations;

(d) Guaranteeing to all persons equal and non-discriminatory rights in civil, political, economic and religious matters and the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of religion, language, speech and publication, education, assembly and association;

(e) Preserving freedom of transit and visit for all residents and citizens of the other State in Palestine and the City of Jerusalem, subject to considerations of national security, provided that each State shall control residence within its borders.

Fighting broke out almost immediately following the UN partition into Arab and an Israeli zones. Jewish nationalists backed by International Zionist Organizations, British support, and modern weaponry simply out gunned their poorly equipped and under-trained peasant opponents (remember this was 1947-48). Zionists forces caused over 700,000 Arab Christian and Muslim refugees to flee lands that were ceded to them in Palestine and seek what they thought would be

temporary shelters in refugee camps established in Jordan and elsewhere. Seventy years later, descendants of original refugees are still living in Lebanon and some can still be found living in Jordanian refugee camps. They are living as refugees because Israeli leaders refuse to honor their right of return as [required by International Law](#), although the [idea is contested](#).

The history of Israeli-Arab relations in Palestine has been one of continual land confiscation on the part of the former to the ongoing determinant of the latter. Thus, two decades following the 1948 imbroglio Israel claimed both the Golan Heights and additional land in the West Bank.

The UN In resolution after resolution (the latest being [Resolution 2334](#)) has repeatedly referred to these illegally held lands as “occupied territory” or territory illegally occupied by an invading army, much like the illegal land grab perpetrated by President Andrew Jackson who simply ignored the Supreme Court’s ruling that private property in Georgia legally belonging to the Cherokee Indians. Jackson wanted their land and therefore ordered federal troops to force them off of it and onto reservations in the Oklahoma Territory. The American Indians, however cruelly they were treated, did not have to suffer the additional humiliation of having walls built around their reservations enhanced by lethally armed soldiers to check their coming and going. In Palestine offense has followed offense; Palestinian civilians have been forced to flee their homes in fear for their lives and then never permitted to return as required by International law.

This ongoing series of violations has been summed up in [UN Resolution 2334](#) thereby

“Condemning all acts of violence against civilians, including acts of terror, as well as all acts of provocation, incitement and destruction”,

*“Reiterating its (UN) vision of a region where **two democratic States, Israel and Palestine**, live side by side in peace within secure and recognized borders”,*

“Stressing that the status quo is not sustainable and that significant steps, consistent with the transition contemplated by prior agreements, are urgently needed in order to

(i) stabilize the situation and to reverse negative trends on the ground, which are steadily eroding the two-State solution and entrenching a one-State reality, and

(ii) to create the conditions for successful final status negotiations and for advancing the two-State solution through those negotiations and on the ground”,

1. *“Reaffirms that the **establishment by Israel of settlements in the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem, has no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law and a major obstacle to the achievement of the two-State solution and a just, lasting and comprehensive peace”;***

2. *“Reiterates its demand that **Israel immediately and completely cease all settlement activities in the occupied Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem**, and that it fully respect all of its legal obligations in this regard”;*

3. *“Underlines that **it will not recognize any changes to the***

4 June 1967 lines, including with regard to Jerusalem, other than those agreed by the parties through negotiations”;

*4. “Stresses that the **cessation of all Israeli settlement activities is essential for salvaging the two-State solution**, and calls for affirmative steps to be taken immediately to reverse the negative trends on the ground that are imperilling the two-State solution”;*

*5. “Calls upon all States, bearing in mind paragraph 1 of this resolution, to **distinguish**, in their relevant dealings, **between the territory of the State of Israel and the territories occupied since 1967**”;*

*6. “Calls for immediate steps to **prevent all acts of violence against civilians**, including acts of terror, as well as all acts of provocation and destruction, calls for accountability in this regard, and calls for compliance with obligations under international law for the strengthening of ongoing efforts to combat terrorism, including through existing security coordination, and to clearly condemn all acts of terrorism.”*

Israel has consistently refused to abide by the norms of international law; it has not ceased from illegally claiming Palestinian lands and homes in the “occupied” West Bank and elsewhere – this seems to be the root cause of hostilities within its borders today.

“The refusal to recognize the Palestinians’ right to self-determination and statehood proved over the years to be the main source of the turbulence, violence, and bloodshed that came to pass” ([Israeli author, Simha Flapan, “The Birth Of](#)

[Israel](#)).

Consequently, over the years (1955-2013) Israel has managed to bear the brunt of nearly seventy UN condemnations including violation of human rights, illegal confiscations, deportations, illegal settlements, refusal to abide by the original 1949 UN Charter and the Fourth Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. Some of these resolutions are listed below. For a full list, visit [If Americans Knew](#).

Israeli Condemnations by Resolution

Resolution 106: "condemns' Israel for Gaza raid"

Resolution 111: "condemns' Israel for raid on Syria that killed fifty-six people"

Resolution 171: "determines flagrant violations' by Israel in its attack on Syria"

Resolution 237: "urges' Israel to allow return of new 1967 Palestinian refugees"

Resolution 248: "condemns' Israel for its massive attack on Karameh in Jordan"

Resolution 250: "calls on' Israel to refrain from holding military parade in Jerusalem"

Resolution 256: "condemns' Israeli raids on Jordan as 'flagrant violation"

Resolution 262: "condemns' Israel for attack on Beirut airport"

Resolution 265: "condemns' Israel for air attacks for Salt in Jordan"

Resolution 270: "condemns' Israel for air attacks on villages in southern Lebanon"

Resolution 280: "condemns' Israeli's attacks against Lebanon"

Resolution 298: "deplores' Israel's changing of the status

of Jerusalem”

Resolution 316: “condemns’ Israel for repeated attacks on Lebanon”

Resolution 332: “condemns’ Israel’s repeated attacks against Lebanon”

Resolution 337: “condemns’ Israel for violating Lebanon’s sovereignty”

Resolution 425: “calls on’ Israel to withdraw its forces from Lebanon”

Resolution 446: “determines’ that Israeli settlements are a ‘serious obstruction’ to peace and calls on Israel to abide by the Fourth Geneva Convention”

Resolution 452: “calls on’ Israel to cease building settlements in occupied territories”

Resolution 476: “reiterates’ that Israel’s claims to Jerusalem are ‘null and void’

Resolution 497: “decides’ that Israel’s annexation of Syria’s Golan Heights is ‘null and void’ and demands that Israel rescind its decision forthwith”

Resolution 592: “strongly deplores’ the killing of Palestinian students at Bir Zeit University by Israeli troops”

Resolution 605: “strongly deplores’ Israel’s policies and practices denying the human rights of Palestinians

Resolution 904: “strongly condemns’ the massacre in Hebron and its aftermath which took the lives of more than 50 Palestinian civilians and injured several hundred others”

Resolution 1405: “emphasizes’ the urgency of access of medical and humanitarian organizations to the Palestinian civilian population”

Resolution 1435: “demands’ that Israel immediately cease measures in and around Ramallah including the destruction of Palestinian civilian and security infrastructure”

There seems to be a clear problem with Israeli occupation, a

problem recognized by virtually the entire world. Israel has been abbbbnce with UN resolutions because Israel has had the backing of the United States, one of five nations that sits on the [UN Security Council](#) thereby wielding veto power over any action decided upon by the rest of the world represented in the UN General Assembly. [The US has used its veto power 43 times to shield Israel from International Justice.](#)

Since the inception of Russia, the US has used its veto power more than any other nation. According to the [Huffington Post](#), “a little perspective is required here”:

“Since 1970, China has used its veto power eight times, and Russia (and the former Soviet Union) has used its veto power 13 times. However, the United States has used its veto power 83 times.... Forty-two of these US vetoes were to protect Israel from criticism for illegal activities, including suspected war crimes. To this day, Israel occupies and colonizes a large swath of southwestern Syria in violation of a series of UN Security Council resolutions, which the United States has successfully blocked from enforcing.”

This hegemonic veto verity, however, seems to be nearing an end as more and more nations are taking up the banner of opposition to unilateral decisions made by the US in defiance of the rest of the world. The opposition to what is perceived as totalitarian strong arm tactics by the United States has come into clear perspective with the recent US recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel in violation of all UN mandates and resolutions regarding Jerusalem since the UN’s inception nearly seventy years ago.

According to [The Atlantic](#) (a Boston based monthly moderate magazine), the United States has undertaken to promote, defend and sustain global liberalism by adopting a worldview based upon a “hybrid” of Vladimir Lenin’s analyses: The United States is engaged in promoting International Liberalism as Lenin promoted International Communism. According to [The Atlantic](#) “Washington’s ambition to create a U.S. dominated world order” or what they also refer to as a “global liberal economic regime”

"...cannot be maintained simply by an internationalized economic elite's desire for it to exist; it can be maintained only by American power."

That is a proposition that the rest of the world is increasingly questioning and that President Trump has exacerbated with his Jerusalem pivot. All the other nations voted 139 – 7 against the idea.

In response to this negative vote, the American President decided to show the rest of the world some US *"realpolitik"* – that is persuasion by force, bribes and intimidation. Normally, such political moves are made behind closed doors and then covered in the press by a veil of democracy and respect for human rights. But President Trump is not known for being *"politically correct"*, not even on the world stage. In another foreign policy blunder, he has decided to show rest of the world how the US does business: When things do not go its way, the world leader in democracy and individual rights, rather than accepting majority rule, acts like a totalitarian dictator when others exercise their legal right to disagree.

President Trump needs to learn rather quickly that he is making the US look like a hypocrite. Third world nations are rapidly maturing, rising to the reality that they too have rights and liberties. Supported by other more advanced nations tired of liberal hegemony, they increasingly resent being bullied. All over the globe voices are echoing in cadence; they are regurgitating their resentment to the force-feeding of economic, cultural and political liberalism that has become economically, politically and culturally nauseating and therefore being burped up before being expelled from their malnourished national bodies. Liberalism has long hid behind a veil of democracy. Beginning with Woodrow Wilson, US and UK plutocrats have expanded their word-wide reach behind the shibboleth of *"universal education"* and *"making the world safe for democracy"*....

Something, however, has gone wrong; the IMF- World Bank liberal diet that has been fed to under-developed nations is beginning to turn in their stomachs. In response, the not so benign face of democracy is beginning to show. Following the

lead of her boss, US Ambassador to the UN Nikki Haley, is setting her face like flint in defiance. She and President Trump are acting as if the UN is telling them what to do, when in fact it is the US that has told the UN what to do ever since its inception, up to and including the recent Jerusalem donnybrook.

Clearly the UN cannot dictate its wishes to the US, the US has a veto over anything the rest of the world might decide.

Unlike the US Constitution that provides a Constitutional remedy that empowers Congress to override a presidential veto, the General Assembly of Nations has no such legal power to override a US veto.

The US and Great Britain have used their economic influence and veto power to rule the UN for decades. They advocate liberal democracy world-wide, profess that democracy is and must be the wave of the future *etc*, and then hypocritically proceed to act like tyrants when it comes to getting their way at the UN. A veto is apparently not enough; President Trump and Ambassador Haley had to throw in threats of economic pain by threatening to [“take names” of countries that dared to vote in favor of a UN General Assembly Resolution that rejected US recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.](#)

It is *not* necessary to threaten underdeveloped nations with economic sanctions; [the US can simply veto any Resolution recommended by the UN General Assembly, as it did in opposition to the overwhelming Resolution against the US decision to recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital.](#) The economic threat is an unnecessary additional measure such as that used by a liberal bully when he kicks his clearly defeated victim to further make an already proven point: Support me against your will or I will do more to harm you.

Haley is not upset with a the status of Jerusalem (the US got its usual way in the UN by means of veto); she is upset

because the rest of the world dared to stand up in an unusual display of defiance; it refused to be bought out, would not bow or turn a blind eye to manifest and continued injustices in Israel and beyond. Economic threats are *not* only inducements; they are NOW punishments – US liberals and neo-liberals are acting like victims battered by the UN, when in fact, they have almost ALWAYS gotten their way at the UN.

What is *new today* is that the real victims, third world Christian and other developing nations, such as Hungary in Central Europe, and many others are tired of being bullied, beaten so badly that they are now standing up, coming out of the closet of victimization and challenging the liberal agenda: *no mas*, to abortion and homosexuality; *no mas* to population control; they are saying in Nigeria and other African and Middle Eastern nations: *no mas* to usury and financial exploitation; they are saying in Latin America and Asia: *no mas* to your carrot and stick diplomacy, to your neoliberal economic and moral policies intended to impose secular materialism in our countries contrary to our deepest values, beliefs and sentiments; *no mas, no mas*.

<https://youtu.be/BzToBNKVwBs>

To conclude on a more humorous, yet profoundly serious, note regarding *no mas* to liberalism and its relationship to bullying, Brother Nathaniel provides a much unsupported and unscholarly video clip. Although flipiant, it speaks volumes that could be edited to become a highly plausible, well documented, and intelligent article regarding the imminent death of liberalism and the changing face of global relations in general and UN-Israeli relations in particular.

Although it is unclear what Brother Nathanael intends by this video, New Era forecasts an increasing inability of the US to support Zionism and the continued growth of anti-liberal forces within and beyond Israeli borders. The situation is

changing, changing significantly, a change that, to the chagrin of Neocon war hawks, bodes peace not war.

At Fatima, the Mother of God promised peace, an “Era of Peace”. Peace it will be as globalist liberal warmongers are being checked around the globe as they are being checked in Israel and the Middle East.

<https://youtu.be/KkFVAa2xSp4>

“Israel’s Desperate Hour” could be More Accurately Titled “Do not Despair: Zionism-Liberalism Tottering as World Moves Toward Peace Promised by the Mother of God at Fatima”.

[Is Jerusalem the Capital of Israel - Should it Be? Part One](#)

[New Era World News and Global Intelligence Report](#) This article could easily be entitled: Is President Trump a Dispensational Zionist or just Theologically Illiterate?

PRESIDENT TRUMP HAS UNLEASHED an international and global sunami with his recent declaration that Jerusalem is the capital city of Israel. Every nation on earth (including the Vatican) except the United States and Israel has been opposed to the idea ever since Zionist nationalists cooperated with the British government to repopulate Palestine with Jewish

immigrants in the wake of World War I. Prior to post-war British involvement, Jewish immigrants had already been returning to the Levant during the nineteenth century. Unlike later Zionist inspired and British supported immigrants, these earlier settlers came for religious motives; they were Orthodox Jews devoted to the Torah. They were *not* nationalist zealots willing to forcibly remove indigenous Muslim and Christian Arabs from their millennial homeland, nor were they part of the political-eschatological maneuver engineered by Zionist adepts, men and women who are experts at [pretending to be Jews but are not](#) ([Rev 3:9](#); [Rev 2:9](#)). Consequently, it should *not* be surprising that an increasing number of authentic Orthodox Jews are voicing their opposition to Zionist occupation of the Levant.

<https://youtu.be/zA5is7IcEqA>

More Detailed Versions: (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nM09C6vni0w>) and (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=awC0SRg-gks>)

According to scholars writing for the [Middle East Research Project](#):

“Most of them (pre-Zionist Jewish settlers) observed traditional, orthodox religious practices. Many spent their time studying religious texts and depended on the charity of world Jewry for survival. Their attachment to the land was religious rather than national, and they were not involved in—or supportive of—the Zionist movement that began in Europe and was brought to Palestine by immigrants”.

In the first decades of the twentieth century Britain and France (assisted by the United States and what would later become Saudi Arabia) cooperated to defeat the Ottoman Empire and Germany in World War I. “By the end of 1916, the French had spent 1.25 million gold francs in subsidizing the (Arab)

revolt. (against the Ottoman Empire)” Likewise, “[by September 1918, the British were spending £220,000/month to subsidize the revolt.](#)” Britain promised their Hashemite (Arab) allies that following the war they would help the Arabs establish an independent state under indigenous rule in land carved from the defeated Ottoman Empire. Unfortunately for the Arabs, British authorities were simultaneously colluding with Zionist illusionists. Despite Arab hopes, by 1917, the same year the Mother of God appeared at Fatima, the British government inspired by its Foreign Minister, Lord Arthur Balfour, issued the “*Balfour Declaration*” thereby proclaiming its determined intent to establish a “Jewish national home in Palestine.”

Successful establishment of a nationalist Zionist project in the Levant required the cooperation of French adepts who complemented Balfour’s efforts by concluding the so-called “*Sykes-Picot Agreement*”. According to this agreement, former Ottoman controlled territories in the Levant were to be monitored by British and French forces who were to act as peace ministers in the newly manufactured Jewish and Arab enclaves. This agreement was immediately confirmed by the [League of Nations](#). Britain obtained what was referred to as a “mandate” (the legal instrument that contained the internationally agreed-upon terms for administering the territory on behalf of the League of Nations) over what is today

- Jordan
- Iraq and
- Israel including the Gaza Strip and the West Bank of the Jordan River.

France, on the other hand, received the mandate over

- Syria (an ancient Christian region) including the Golan Heights and
- Lebanon (having a Christian majority)



Britain decided that the land west of the Jordan would be referred to as Palestine, and the area east of the ancient river would be referred to as "Transjordan", which constituted three-fourths of the territory included in the Mandate to be ruled as *per* agreement by a Hashemite prince (Hashemite and Saud families vied for power throughout the region). Thus, King Faysal's brother, Abdallah (Arab leader who assisted British against Ottoman Turks in WWI), became ruler of Transjordan – Faysal became King of Iraq after being defeated in Syria. The Sauds would consolidate power south to the Arabian Sea.

Despite assurances to its Hashemite allies to establish an independent Arab State, British authorities appeared to be more interested in the Zionist project, even if it meant disrupting the indigenous Palestinian population that had resided there for nearly two thousand years.

Naturally, Arab Palestinians insisted upon self-rule in Palestine as they enjoyed in Transjordan, so too did the newly arriving Zionists in Palestine; nonetheless, although the

Palestinians whose ancestors had lived upon and cultivated the land since the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD, although these same Palestinians had the stronger claim to self-rule, their claims were prejudicially ignored. Arabs living in Palestine therefore opposed the British Mandate because it thwarted their aspirations for self-rule. They understood that [“the last thing the Zionists really wanted was that all the inhabitants of Palestine should have an equal say in running the country.”](#)

Chaim Weizmann (Zionist leader and first president of Israel) had convinced Winston Churchill that representative government in Palestine (equal voting among Arabs and Jews) would have meant the end of the Jewish hopes for a National Home in Palestine. Thus, Churchill could be heard saying,

“The present form of (autocratic) government will continue (in Palestine) for many years. Step by step we shall develop representative institutions leading to full self-government, but our children’s children will have passed away before that is accomplished.” ([David Hirst, “The Gun and the Olive Branch”](#)).

Jean Jacques Rousseau expressed a similar political astuteness over a century earlier. Although he seemed an advocate of representative government, no such government could exist in France until through annihilation, demographics favored a new secular elite and through education the people had been primed to vote the “correct” way.

Locating Jews on land previously belonging for centuries and millennia to Palestinians (Christians and Muslims) was probably *not* a good idea. Cognizant of this fact, British authorities were careful to name the area “Palestine” *not* “Israel”. The more populous indigenous farmers of Palestine were poor and defenseless peasants. Nonetheless, Zionist settlers had the support of international Jewish organizations

and of the British government. Consequently, the land was plagued with continual but lopsided conflict, conflict that favored Zionist settlers to the detriment of native Palestinians.

The League of Nations Mandate created so much trouble for the British that following World War II they asked the region be transferred to the newly established United Nations. Thus, before the League of Nations mandate terminated in 1948 the United Nations had already adopted [Resolution 181](#) (November 29, 1947), which dealt with the future of Palestine. It envisaged the creation of separate Jewish and Arab states in Palestine, with Jerusalem being transferred to UN trusteeship.

British-Zionist forces operating within the UN did *not* wait long to implement their vision; on the last day of the League Mandate, they decided that Palestine (not including Transjordan) should be further divided to better represent the interest of both parties, *i.e.*, Jews and Arabs. They therefore proclaimed their intent to create two States one Jewish, the other Arab. At this time the Jews, who owned roughly six percent of the land in Palestine, were bequeathed nearly 55% of the land, a massive increase from the British mandate.

This ideological imbalance in favor of the Jews was waged against the Palestinians from the beginning. Despite the fact that Palestinians outnumbered Jews nearly 2-1, the UN delegated the latter over half of the available land. However, in recognition of their spiritual patrimonies, **the UN was quick to re-affirm the League of Nations mandate that Jerusalem remain an International City** a holy site sacred to Muslims, Jews and Christians. Jerusalem was therefore declared as an "International City". It has been recognized by every nation on earth including the Vatican and the United States ever since, that is until [President Trump](#) made his recent announcement.

The recognition of Jerusalem as an international city was more than a gesture; it is an international spiritual, religious

and political necessity. Nonetheless, it was not enough to keep temporal peace. Because their Christian and Muslim ancestors had labored for centuries to cultivate their land and make it fruitful, because militant Zionists had no legal right to these lands and rested their case on some specious outdated and already fulfilled prophecies, and because Christians and Muslims Arabs outnumber Zionists nearly 2-1, the Palestinians were understandably distraught with the UN plan. UN backed British-Zionists had crafted a plan that permitted unwelcome Jewish foreigners to dispossess rightful owners of land that had been in Christian and Muslim hands for centuries, a plan that made Christians vagabonds in their own homeland, a plan that justified property confiscation by religious zealots backed by international dollars and British military power, by a plan lacking all moral support, justified by Social-Darwinism, by a supposedly outdated Law of the Jungle: "might makes right", because of these things, the Palestinians rightfully felt persecuted. But that was only the beginning – the newly arriving Zionists would not respect the boundaries designated by the United Nations.

ASIDE: The bond between Israel and England is deeply etched in English lore, in its music and cultural mores. If anyone doubts the British resolve to back the Zionists, the link between Zionism and British Masonry (the architects of King Solomon's earthly temple), let him consider the unofficial British National Anthem, esp 1:01 and 2:08-2:28 in the musical video below:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MKRHWT6xdEU>

Thus, within days of the UN partition, fighting broke out. Jewish nationalists backed by International Zionist Organizations, British support, and modern weaponry supplied through Czechoslovakia, simply out gunned their poorly

equipped and under-trained peasant opponents. Not only did the Zionists occupy territories assigned to them by the UN, they continued an offensive assault throughout the West Bank claiming unprotected or poorly protected territories beyond established UN borders and thereafter claimed to legally incorporate them (despite their being in violation of International law) as part of Israel. It was not until then (1948-49) that Egypt, Iraq, Syria, and Jordan (all but Egypt under French and British influence) responded militarily in an unsuccessful attempt to rescue Arabs from Zionist seizure and control.

Palestine had been home to *both* Christians and Muslims for nearly two thousand years. Thus, the nomenclature "**Arab**" should *not* be misconstrued to mean Muslim; it means **both Muslim and Christian peoples of Arab descent. Palestine is the land where Christ preached the eternal Gospel**, where He suffered and died; it is the site where death was defeated: "*O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting*" ([1 Cor 15:55](#))? **It is the land in which Christ established His everlasting Kingdom, the New Israel.** Thus, when Zionist nationalists lashed out against Palestinians in the name of God, they were (and are) spilling Christian blood, while Dispensational Protestant Preachers, who forge unbreakable bonds between America and England, spin out an odd sort of eschatology calling for ever more money to be sent to support Israel against Christians.

<https://youtu.be/n9FVLFILVig>

Political-Zionist Cooperation: John Hagee Evangelical Pastor Crying for Military and Financial Support of Israel says Jewish people don't need Christ.

As a result of Zionist intransigence, the Palestinian state planned by the UN never materialized and no one stood up against this flagrant violation of International Law. Instead,

in the aftermath of the 1947 onslaught, Palestine was again divided, this time into three parts, each governed by a different authority designated by a boundary referred to as the "Green Line". Israel expanded, grabbing nearly 20% of the land designated for the Palestinians; they now occupied nearly 80% of the entire land of Palestine despite substantial numeric inferiority. According to the UN's 1947 partition plan, Jerusalem was to be an international city. However, the 1949 UN sponsored armistice cut the city in two; Jordan was assigned East Jerusalem (including the old walled city home of major Christian, Jewish, and Muslim religious sites), the West Bank or "Hill Country" abutting the Jordan River and extending westward into the craggy regions of Palestine. Egypt assumed control of Gaza Strip. The Golan Heights remained in Syrian hands.

Despite the fact that Israel was referred to as a "state" no such designation was afforded the increasingly marginalized Palestinian Christians and Muslims.

Although no one manifestly assented to the idea that "might makes right"; it was certainly the determining principle in this early act of Israeli aggression. Despite UN Resolutions to the contrary, lands seized from nearly 700,000 fleeing Palestinian civilians were *never returned* to their rightful occupants who were forced by Jewish immigrants to become fleeing refugees thereby affirming the accusation of hypocrisy hurled by Jesus at the Jews ([Matt 7: 1-6](#)).

"The first UN General Assembly [Resolution-Number 194](#)—affirming the right of Palestinians to return to their homes and property, was passed on December 11, 1948. It has been repassed no less than twenty-eight times since that first date. Whereas the moral and political right of a person to return to his place of uninterrupted residence is acknowledged everywhere, Israel has negated the possibility of return... [and] systematically and juridically made it impossible, on any grounds whatever, for the Arab Palestinian

to return, be compensated for his property, or live in Israel as a citizen equal before the law with a Jewish Israeli" [The Origin of the Palestine-Israel Conflict, pg 12](#)).

Article 11 expressly "Resolves":

"... that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the Governments or authorities responsible

Zionists did not like being made refugees but had (and continue to have) little problem making others suffer the same plight. Lord Balfour had little problem dealing with charges of hypocrisy. According to him,

*"In Palestine we do not propose even to go through the form of consulting the wishes of the present inhabitants of the country...The four powers are committed to Zionism and **Zionism, be it right or wrong, good or bad**, is rooted in age-long tradition, in present needs, in future hopes, of far profounder import than the desire and prejudices of the 700,000 Arabs who now inhabit that ancient land."* (Edward Said, ["The Question of Palestine" pg. 16](#)).



Furthermore,

“No British officers, consulted by the Commissioners, believed that the Zionist program could be carried out except by force of arms” ([If America Knew](#)).

Zionist leaders in Israel have been imbued with perverse ideas; they have relentlessly and illegally displaced Syrian and Palestinian people from the Golan Heights, West Bank and Gaza. As early as 1921, Dr. Eder, a Member of the British Zionist Commission, made known that from the beginning:

“The Zionists made no secret of their intentions, for a member of the Zionist Commission, boldly told the Court of

Inquiry, 'there can be only one National Home in Palestine (not the promised two states), and that a Jewish one, and no equality in the partnership between Jews and Arabs, but a Jewish preponderance as soon as the numbers of the race are sufficiently increased.' He then asked that only Jews should be allowed to bear arms" ([The Origin of the Palestine-Israel Conflict, pg 7](#)).

Even [David Ben-Gurion](#), founder of the State of Israel and its first Prime Minister, following an attempted Palestinian revolt recognized the hypocrisy of Zionism, what today we might call "Fake news":

"...in our political argument abroad, we minimize Arab opposition to us,' but he urged, 'let us not ignore the truth among ourselves.' The truth was that 'politically we are the aggressors and they defend themselves... The country is theirs, because they inhabit it, whereas we want to come here and settle down, and in their view we want to take away from them their country, while we are still outside'."

The British commitment to Zionism, even under false pretenses was clearly recognized by American intellect Noam Chomsky who reported that,

"The revolt was crushed by the British, with considerable brutality" ([The Fateful Triangle, pg 98](#)).

In the aftermath, Mahatma Gandhi declared that although the Zionists claimed that God had for-ordained their military conquest of Palestine,

*"A religious act cannot be performed with the aid of the bayonet or the bomb. They (the Zionists) can settle in Palestine only by the goodwill of the Arabs... As it is, **they are co-sharers with the British in despoiling a people who have done no wrong to them.** I am not defending the Arab*

excesses. I wish they had chosen the way of non-violence in resisting what they rightly regard as an unacceptable encroachment upon their country. But according to the accepted canons of right and wrong, nothing can be said against the Arab resistance in the face of overwhelming odds” ([Virtual Jewish Library](#)).

Echoing Ben-Gurion, Menahem Begin, founder of [Likud](#) and the [sixth Prime Minister of Israel](#) (before the creation of the state of Israel, the leader of the Zionist militant group [Irgun](#)), Begin echoing Gurion informs us

*“...how ‘in Jerusalem, as elsewhere, we were the first to pass from the defensive to the offensive...Arabs began to flee in terror...The Israelis now allege that the Palestine war began with the entry of the Arab armies into Palestine after 15 May 1948. **But that was the second phase of the war**; they overlook the massacres, expulsions and dispossessions which took place prior to that date (committed by the Zionists) and which necessitated Arab states’ intervention” ([The Origin of the Palestine-Israel Conflict, pg 10](#)).*

Fake News is not something new; it has been operative for quite a while. Jordan’s King Abdullah let the cat out of the bag when he informed Western sources that the Palestinians never stood a chance; their forces he said were “ill equipped and lacked any central command to coordinate their efforts”. Moreover, he promised the British and the Israelis that

“His troops, the Arab Legion, the only real fighting force among the Arab armies, would avoid fighting with Jewish settlements. Yet Western historians record this as the moment when the young state of Israel fought off “the overwhelming hordes’ of five Arab countries. In reality, the Israeli offensive against the Palestinians intensified” ([If America Knew](#)).

Concluding Part One, it may be stated that following the self-admitted 1947-48 Israeli aggression, Israel *again* showed its hypocrisy by refusing to concede to the Palestinians what it declared as a right for itself:

*“Palestinians were trying to save by negotiations what they had lost in the war—a **Palestinian state** alongside Israel. Israel, however... Israel [preferred] tenuous armistice agreements to a definite peace that would involve territorial concessions and the repatriation of even a token number of refugees. The refusal to recognize the Palestinians’ right to self-determination and statehood proved over the years to be the main source of the turbulence, violence, and bloodshed that came to pass” ([Israeli author, Simha Flapan, “The Birth Of Israel](#)).*

Vatican response to President Trump’s decree on Jerusalem:

<https://youtu.be/YBDP6nixR9I>

Short of Israel becoming a Christian State (something New Era is closer to forecasting), President Trump’s unilateral move is more than misguided; it is politically anti-peace and theologically anti-Christian.

Part Two Continued

Remembering 9-11: What is the True US Strategy in Afghanistan?

(New Era World News)

AFGHANISTAN FELL UNDER Soviet control from 1978 until 1989 when the Communists withdrew. From 1978 onward the Soviet Union backed a secular Socialist government known as the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan (DRA). In 1979 the DRA requested the Soviet Union to send forces into the country to assist them against indigenous forces headed by warlords known as the mujahideen. For ten years thereafter the Soviets engaged in war against these Islamic jihadists. During this time, radical Sunni Islamists from other countries, including Al Qaeda and its leader, leader Osama Ben Laden (Saudi Arabia), came to the assistance of the Mujahideen in which effort they were aided by the United States.

Following the importation of Osama Ben Laden, economic and military assistance as well as radical Islamic forces from around the globe began to funnel into Afghanistan with significant support coming from Saudi Arabia and Pakistan.

Although the Soviets continued to support the DRA after their withdrawal in 1989, much of Afghanistan fell to the US backed Mujahideen who overthrew the DRA's last president, Mohammad Najibullah in 1992. **Thereafter, the Mujahideen fought among themselves and eventually morphed into what is now known as the Taliban**, the force that sheltered Al Qaeda and the radical Sunni Muslims that planned terrorist attacks from their safe abode inside Afghanistan, including what many believe to be the planned attack against the United States known as 9-11.

Triggered by the 9-11 attacks of 2001, the United States has been militarily involved in Afghanistan against the Taliban

for seventeen years, the longest war in American History. Yet according to Senator John McCain, not only is victory elusive, the US is losing the war:

"We have no strategy. And we are losing. When you're not winning, you're losing. And the ANA, the Afghan National Army, is taking unacceptable losses" ([CBS News July 2017](#)).

At its peak (2010-2011) the United States deployed approximately 100,000 troops in Afghanistan. Then President Obama made the decision to begin withdraw. Although the Afghan mission was formally halted in December of 2014, eight thousand plus US troops remain stationed there to assist a NATO coalition (approximately five thousand troops) to train indigenous security personnel collectively referred to as the *"Afghan National Defense and Security Forces"*, which are currently engaged in joint-offensive military operations to combat terrorism throughout the country.

For decades multiple terrorist organizations, headed by the Taliban (see Note below), have disrupted political, social, and economic activity in the region. As noted above, prior to US involvement post 9-11, Soviet Communist troops dealt unsuccessfully with the Afghan mujahideen who, backed by the United States, forced the Soviets to retire (1989) from the exhausting confrontation ironically leaving the battle to the Americans who likewise later withdrew (2014), thereby handing the conflict to NATO and the American backed secular Afghan government and its *"Afghan National Defense and Security Forces"*. This government has also proved unable to handle the proliferating problem, a problem that now includes additional Islamic State (ISIL-Daesh) terrorists, who, together with the Taliban, control roughly a third of Afghanistan, at least as much as they previously controlled prior to the military engagement of the United States and its allies in November of 2001.

President Trump Addresses the Taliban

During a recent August, 2017 presidential address to the nation, President Trump reminded viewers that a previous early withdraw from Iraq cost America the war in that country. The lack of US troops permitted the uncontested, or poorly contested, ascendancy of the Islamic State, which has increased its zone of terror from western Iraq to Syria and to the east as well. Consequently, the president announced his firm resolve to beef up America's involvement to end the conflict in Afghanistan by means of devastating force to be inflicted by American troops:

"We will fight to win. From now on, victory will have a clear definition: Attacking our enemies, obliterating ISIS, crushing al Qaeda, preventing the Taliban from taking over Afghanistan, and stopping mass terror attacks against America before they emerge" ([CNN](#)).

Although the Pentagon had previously (June, 2017) announced a deployment of up to 3,900 new troops to Afghanistan, that announcement cannot be taken as authoritative since the president announced in his August address that the numbers would remain unspecified to maintain the element of surprise necessary to conduct a successful campaign:

"America's enemies must never know our plans or believe they can wait us out" ([PBS News](#)).

Will the President be Able to Institute a New Foreign Policy?

During his National Address (as well as during his presidential campaign), President Trump insisted that under his leadership the United States is embarking on a *new* foreign policy path: The US, he said, will no longer be involved in wars for the sake of nation building, but rather for peace and stability. Echoing the president, Secretary of State Tillerson specified that the United States would advance "peace talks" with the Taliban and allied terrorists without

“preconditions.” In other words, negotiations, so it seems, should be open to input from all concerned parties without any foreign agenda to be imposed.

Unfortunately, the president’s policy involves overt threats to neighboring Pakistan, a nation that has harbored Taliban insurgents seeking asylum by crossing the mountainous Afghan border into its equally mountainous regions, which have historically served as an incubator for terrorists threatening Afghanistan. Rather than leaving this adroit diplomatic maneuver to the Chinese (deeply desirous for peace in the region) who have recently courted economic-political favor with the Pakistani government *via* the New Silk Road Initiative (an economic boon for Pakistan), the president’s American bravado got the best of him thereby forcing him into a foreign policy *faux pas*, which will need correcting. If not corrected, relationships with Pakistan will continue to deteriorate driving them into further Chinese and Russian alliance.

Mr. Trump would do well to adhere to his campaign plan to cooperate with Russia and China to end terrorism rather than trying to do it solo or with NATO but without Russia and China or by flying in the face of Sino-Russo objections. Unfortunately, it behooves Neocon warhawks and their liberal allies in the United States to continue painting Russia as the bad guy when, in fact, a cooperative venture would do much to stabilize the war-torn region and advance global peace.

The world is groping for peace and the United States (*apparently* contrary to the wishes of its elected president) continues to make maneuvers that promise more and greater conflict. Recently (July 13, 2017), Frank-Walter Steinmeier, the President of Germany, visited German troops stationed in Afghanistan to whom he communicated Germany’s continued resolve to maintain its military presence in Afghanistan alongside the United States and other NATO allies; Steinmeier however, is looking for peace. Like President Trump as well

as Russian and Chinese diplomats (and political leaders throughout Eastern Europe and elsewhere), Steinmeier seems to think that future peace entails the respect of national sovereignty and the curtailment of globalism, nation building or any form of neo-colonialism.”

In Steinmeier’s words to the troops, “I came to” Afghanistan to “speak with President Ghani about the steps that are needed and can be taken toward a serious and credible peace process in Afghanistan. My message to him today was”:

“The future of this country is not primarily in the hands of Germany, NATO or international donors. It is first and foremost in the hands of the Government of Afghanistan, and it hinges on the government’s efforts to unite this divided country. None of this will be possible without the acceptance of a central government in Kabul, without a political settlement with the various ethnic and religious groups, including the Taliban. That is part of the reality which we, but above all political leaders in Afghanistan, have to recognise. Your presence here cannot take the place of a political settlement. Your presence can only create both time and space for a political settlement, one that Afghans themselves must both desire and work out. Nothing more – but also nothing less” ([Der Bundespräsident](#))

The German approach is inclusive, yet it leaves future decision making to the AFGHANS THEMSELVES, NOT TO SOME FOREIGN GLOBAL POWER OR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION. This is the preferred position of President Trump and Russian President Vladimir Putin as well as that of Xi Jinping, President of China. Unfortunately, Neocon Warhawks such as John McCain et al on the extreme right along with their army of liberal counterparts on the extreme left are committed to preserving an antedated *status quo* which views the United States as the world’s policeman and as God’s viceroy on earth entrusted with a “Manifest Destiny” to spread outdated eighteenth century liberal economic, political and anti-Christian

cultural ideas around the globe.

They hope thereby to make the world safe for liberal democracy via the global deployment of increasingly confused American troops who are beginning to wonder who the “good guy” really is and what exactly they are fighting for. CNN, President Trump’s favorite “[Fake News](#)” outlet, has gone as far as asserting that Russia is supplying weapons to the Taliban, its sworn enemy in Afghanistan. The Russian response: “prove it” – “there is no evidence”. According to [Russia’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs](#):

“We paid attention to the lampoon of the American CNN television channel about alleged supplies of weapons to the Afghan Taliban by Russia.”

“It is hardly possible to seriously perceive video materials in which old small arms are demonstrated, the origin of which is impossible to establish. The weapons are not stamped by the manufacturer and serial numbers are defaced. In addition, the weapons shown are typical. As is known, such samples were produced not only in Russia, but also in other countries, including Eastern Europe, from where in the early 2000s, Americans massively imported them to [Afghanistan](#).”

“Recently, the Taliban attacked the base of the Afghan National Security Forces in Helmand province, using American armored vehicles “Humvee”. What conclusion can be drawn based on this information using the logic of CNN?”

“As we have repeatedly stated, the accusations of a number of Western and some echoing Afghan mass media regarding alleged support from the Russian Federation by the militants of the Taliban movement are unfounded. To date, neither the Afghan authorities nor the command of the [US](#) and [NATO](#) contingents in

the IRA have provided evidence that would confirm these speculations.

Thus, regardless of how liberal media outlets are portraying Russian resistance to US troop deployment in Afghanistan, **the truth is that Russia is delighted by America's presence in Afghanistan**, which has long been a training ground for terrorists such as Daesh, ISIL *et al* that threaten Russia and are therefore considered terrorists groups by the Russian government. In short, the United States, if it is doing what it is reported to be doing, is fighting against Russia's enemies in Afghanistan and thereby assisting Putin to secure his own borders.

However, since the debacle in Syria, Russian diplomats have little trust for American initiatives. While in Syria, war-hawks like Senator McCain portrayed the conflict as a war against terrorists when in fact it became public knowledge that the Americans were stealthily aiding and abetting the terrorists in service of the liberal ideological and economic interests of ruling profiteers contrary to the Russians who were engaged in a real battle with the real terrorists.

Because Russia supports America's war on terrorism *close to its borders* in Afghanistan, it is a natural ally in the fight.

The Russians however, due to their growing mistrust of America's intentions, are proceeding cautiously, interpreting American intervention with a grain of salt. Therefore, Alexander Grushko, the Russian envoy to NATO recently stated that his country fears that Afghanistan is becoming a hornet's nest for terrorists of all sorts, implying that he is unsure of America's intentions: Will American involvement curtail or exacerbate the challenge of terrorism to global peace and Russian security? Grushko indicated to reporters gathered in Brussels that Moscow hopes NATO will provide full information as to just "how the Alliance is planning to conduct future operations in Afghanistan."

"There is a serious threat of Afghanistan turning into a safe haven for terrorists as, unfortunately, the hold of the Islamic State [referring to Daesh, a terrorist group banned in Russia] is not weakening."

Grushko's concern is confirmed by reports that America's efforts against terrorists in Afghanistan are starting to sound a bit like reports that previously came out of Syria.

According to the [New York Times](#) and the [BBC](#), a US airstrike on a compound in Helmand province, Afghanistan, resulted in deaths to *friendly Afghan forces (forces opposed to and fighting against terrorists throughout Afghanistan)*:

"During a US-supported (Afghan security) operation, aerial fires resulted in the deaths of the friendly Afghan forces who were gathered in a compound."

This widely reported fact engenders several provocative questions to be followed in upcoming weeks: Will future reports change under President Trump? Will the US assist Russian brokered efforts to bring world peace and thus be a peace-maker itself? or will President Trump succumb to tiresome Neocon voices in favor of ongoing conflict in the name of liberal ideology, personal interests, and veiled chicanery leading to ever more conflict and profitable war?

NOTE:

Both the Taliban and Al Qaeda are radical Sunni Muslims committed to Jihad and theocratic government; both are opposed to the influence of Western culture and the secular governments put in place by Western leaders.

From 1996 to 2001, the Taliban enforced strict Sharia law over most of Afghanistan prior to the US invasion in 2001. The United States assisted the Taliban with Stinger missiles and an array of military supplies in the 1980s, when these terrorists were combatting the Soviet Union in Afghanistan.

During their 1996 to 2001 rule, the Taliban Mujahideen interfered with UN humanitarian shipments to famished men, women, and children, massacred Afghan civilians, scorched fertile land and destroyed thousands of homes. The Taliban was opposed by the Northern Alliance spearheaded by Russia, Iran, Turkey and India and then later used by the United States to defeat the Taliban and install its own compliant government, a puppet state amenable to secular liberal interests.

The Taliban consists of militants drawn primarily from Afghanistan itself. It is an

indigenous nationalistic movement in favor of an Islamic government and opposed to the Western backed secular state in Afghanistan.

The Taliban is therefore a legitimate stake-holder having a legitimate claim to some share in a future Afghani government.

Al-Qaeda, on the other hand, consists primarily of educated Arabs, a few Afghans and a healthy contingent of Egyptians. Al-Qaeda was formed by an Arab, Osama Bin Laden, to spread global Jihad against liberal forces supported by the United States in favor of its ally, Israel. The Taliban invited Ben Laden to Afghanistan where they sheltered him as he planned terrorist attacks.

US Forces Facing Russian Troops in Syria, Will they Cooperate to Defeat ISIS?

[\(New Era World News\)](#)

DURING HIS PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN Donald Trump gave many signs indicating a possible rapprochement with Russia in order to forward the war against terrorism. Since his election, political observers have been watching carefully to assess movements relative to this implicit commitment. As the data roles in, it is now possible to make some preliminary remarks based on actions taken by the new president during his first sixty days in office. Before doing so, it is helpful to review a [New Era Forecast](#) issued a month ago (February, 21).

FORECAST:

*“The United States and Russia will continue down a path of rapprochement but not without significant interference, which can be expected from all ends of the political and social-cultural spectrum. Constant, well orchestrated, and confusing series of events can be expected as agents from both the left and right proceed to push confrontation with Russia to a boiling point. Nonetheless, in the long run, the shadow government will fail as it has consistently failed and been out maneuvered in its foreign policy initiatives for the past decade – we have no discernible reason to believe that this chain of events will cease unfolding. **The shadow-government is being opposed by more than Mr. Trump.***

The real question is what will Mr. Trump do? Will he continue down the road of his immediate predecessors, or be bold enough to set America on a new course?

Following that forecast, it was stated that *if* the new president continued with the *foreign policy* of the Bush and Obama administrations (as he *appears* to be doing), if he pursued the same path as his predecessors ([a path favored by Neocon War Hawks and Liberal Globalists](#)), American Foreign Policy would continue its downward slide and America would continue suffering one foreign policy embarrassment after another while earning the ire of other nations around the globe. President Obama was never able to disengage from war or to defeat ISIS; Trump however, has vowed to obliterate them, *implicitly* with Russian cooperation. It is this cooperation, above all else, that makes him an enemy of the Neocons (even though they are for the most part Republicans) and their Liberal allies deeply imbedded in ruling establishment.

The Trump Team is facing stiff opposition not only from an entrenched bureaucracy but from die hard members of the armed

service committee and intelligence community who still view Russia through the lens of Soviet Communism or who are so committed to global liberalism that Russia (whom they realize is increasingly becoming a Christian nation-state, a purveyor of traditional family values, and an avowedly anti-liberal global power) must be stopped. Thus, if Trump plans to improve relations with Russia, he will be vehemently opposed by those who continue to insist upon the ideological export of liberal (economic and moral) American values, those who view themselves as patriots whose sacred duty is to confront the nefarious Russian Bear whose commitment to national sovereignty and Christianity is a threat to their global hegemony and the advancement of their Liberal Global Agenda.

<https://youtu.be/wLinzSIcIac>

Therefore, it was also stated,

“If Mr. Trump moves too quickly, he will not be able to withstand the tumultuous tsunami that is being gathered for a melancholy day of release; he must first cultivate relationships among international leaders (something he has done too little of) who have a very different view of America and American Foreign Policy than that being fed to him by Neocon war-hawks such as Sen. John McCain”, a man who keeps discrediting himself by accusing anyone opposed to his myopic interventionist military policy as “working for Vladimir Putin”, even if the others he assails are US Senators themselves.

<https://youtu.be/bcuB42e2eCM>

Finally, it was also stated in February that

*“It is not time for fisticuffs, so yes, Newera tends to believe that **Mr. Trump has come out with a (foreign policy) rope a dope in Round One**, at least partially so. If he is able to eventually pound ISIS into oblivion with Russian cooperation, he will build up a tidal wall of good-will and support composed of many international components that spell peace, a peace woven into a wall that will be able to withstand any Tsunami the Deep State can bellow in his direction.”*

However, it was warned:

*“**If President Trump collapses before the bellowing winds and succumbs to the mounting global pressures of liberalism, if he fails to deliver on his campaign promises and follows the lead of Neocon war-hawks like Sen. John McCain, New Era foresees an abject failure on the horizon and the ultimate collapse of American Foreign Policy and the waning of American influence.**”*

Unfortunately, Mr. Trump appears to be following the foreign policy of the Neocon and Liberal establishment. Consequently, **the honeymoon given him by foreign nations is coming to an end**. They have waited to see if he would deliver on his promises to treat all nations fairly, to cooperate with Russia to defeat terrorism and to start a new page in American history battling liberalism and seeking an Era of Peace. *Apparently*, he will do none of these things and continue the foreign policy of his predecessor built on the back of American military might.

World leaders have been looking on and refraining from imminent action while holding things in suspension waiting to see what Trump would do. They are no longer waiting; instead, **global trends are reverting back to where they were before**

Trump took office, the international movement against liberalism has recommenced. As forecast, **the United States will either cooperate with this movement and be a purveyor of peace or it will suffer continued embarrassment.** New Era holds to this forecast with the caveat that **the United States might be pulled into the peace initiative in spite of its current bravado bolstered by an enormous military buildup.** [President Trump has not decreased but has already increased the military budget by \\$54 billion](#) and is beefing up the American military presence around the globe to the ire of China, Russia, Turkey and many third world nations. The remainder of this article is concerned with US foreign policy in the Middle East and how it is alienating Turkey and leading to a surprise *tete a tete* between **US and Russian forces NOW within a grenades distance of each other on the battlefield of North-Central Syria** where **THEY ARE BOTH BATTLING ISIS-ISIL-ISLAMIC STATE AT THE SAME TIME AND IN THE SAME PLACE.** This unexpected rubbing of shoulders in Syria offers a glimmer of hope that might signify the beginning of an ongoing cooperation. Don't hold your breath however, Sen. John McCain happens to be in the mix:

McCain "made a secret trip to a Kurdish-held region in northern Syria last weekend to speak with US military officials, rebel fighters, and leaders in the region."

On Wednesday, (March 23) Julie Tarallo, a McCain spokesperson confirmed the mission, with the following TWEET

This via a McCain spokeswoman:

“Senator McCain traveled to northern Syria this week to visit U.S. forces deployed there and to discuss the counter-ISIL campaign and ongoing operations to retake Raqqa. Senator McCain’s visit was a valuable opportunity to assess dynamic conditions on the ground in Syria and Iraq. President Trump has rightly ordered a review of U.S. strategy and plans to defeat ISIL. Senator McCain looks forward to working with the administration and military leaders to optimize our approach for accomplishing ISIL’s lasting defeat.”

What is Happening in Syria and How it Might Affect Relationships with Russia and Turkey

President Obama alienated Turkey with his ongoing support of the **Kurdish People’s Protection Units (YPG)**, whom the Turks view as an ally of the **Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK)**, which operates in Turkey and is designated by Ankara as a terrorist organization. **President Trump is headed down the same road.** Foreign Policy Magazine [notices the trend](#). On March 21 they pointed out that warhawks and top US commanders regard the YPG as “[the only viable option for ousting the Islamic State](#) [Daesh].” If the YPG represents the only viable solution, clearly **Washington has ruled out cooperation with Russia, the most obvious solution.**

Following its own initiative, an initiative ostensibly calculated to *Make America Look Great Again*, the Pentagon is deploying 1,000 troops to assist the **Syrian Defense Forces (SDF)** to battle the Deash in Raqqa. The SDF, is a Kurdish dominated militia established in 2015 and sponsored by the United States to help establish a Kurdish enclave in Northern Syria. The SDF is composed primarily of Kurds fighting under their own banner of **People’s Protection Units (YPG)**. More specifically, it might be said that **the YPG is a Kurdish**

dominated militia, which is fighting alongside the American backed SDF who are opposed to radical Islamic terrorists and also to the Russian-backed Syrian government of Bashar al Assad. Currently the SDF is planning to engage in an all-out assault on Raqqa, the capital and stronghold of ISIS-ISIL or the Islamic State. According to [The Foreign Policy Group](#) (FP)

“Even as the Trump administration weighs its options, the U.S. military is ramping up for the assault, drawing up plans to deploy up to 1,000 more American soldiers to Syria in support of the YPG and allied forces, known collectively as the Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF), which [have advanced](#) mere miles from the city (of Raqqa). Pentagon officials [assess](#) that the roughly 27,000 Kurds in the 50,000-strong SDF are the more effective, experienced fighters.”

The [New York Times](#) (March 15) corroborated this report by FP:

“The U.S. military has drawn up early plans that would deploy up to 1,000 more troops into northern Syria in the coming weeks, expanding the American presence in the country ahead of the offensive on the Islamic State’s de facto capital of Raqqa.”

“The deployment...would potentially double the number of U.S. forces in Syria and increase the potential for direct U.S. combat involvement in a conflict that has been characterized by confusion and competing priorities among disparate forces.”

The plan to deploy 1,000 more troops is meant to bolster a previous deployment of United States Marines already ordered by President Trump. On March 9, the [Guardian](#) reported on the deployment of several hundred US Marines to Syria:

“A few hundred marines with heavy artillery have been

deployed to Syria in preparation for the fight to oust [Islamic State](#) from its self-declared headquarters of Raqqa, a senior US official said on Wednesday.”

“The marines moving into [Syria](#) are positioning howitzers to be ready to help local Syrian forces, said the official, who was not authorised to discuss the deployment publicly.

There are already approximately 500 U.S. Special Operations forces in Syria operating alongside the SDF. They are complemented by an additional 250 Army Rangers and 200 US Marines. **The additional 1,000 U.S. troops will most likely be part of the 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit** that are part of a

“... [flotilla of ships loaded with 2,200 Marines that is now steaming toward the region](#) – and the U.S. Army’s 82nd Airborne Division, of which 2,500 recently arrived in Kuwait.”

Regarding this deployment, [Turkish Prime Minister, Binali Yildirim](#) cautioned US leaders:

“If (Washington) insists on carrying on this operation with terror organizations (Kurds whom the Turks consider as terrorists and public enemy number one), our relations will be harmed – that is clear.”



Turkish Prime Minister Binali Yildirim

Prime Minister Yildirim's statement is especially meaningful in the context of the [Astana Meetings](#) previously hosted by Russia, Iran and Turkey (in Astana, Kazakhstan), which have resulted in a military coalition consisting of Turkey, Russia, and Iran, already operating in Syria where they are acting as a peacekeeping force. Rather than joining the peace initiative, the US continues following its own foreign policy thereby driving Turkey further away from Washington. In fact, **this latest US maneuver, might also compromise US relationships with the United Nations**, which is beneficiary of Russian efforts at Astana: The Russian, Turks and Iranians provided the military backbone which brought the contending parties to the UN sponsored meeting of diplomats in Geneva (Feb 2017).

[The cooperating powers all agreed to the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of the Syrian nation](#), implying that **they will uphold the right of Syria as a sovereign nation**, a nation entitled to determine for itself who its leaders will be and who will be invited to fight alongside it against common enemies.

*“The delegations of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Russian Federation and the Republic of Turkey, in line with the Joint Statement of their Foreign Ministers made in Moscow, on December 20, 2016 and the **UN Security Council resolution 2336...**”reaffirm their commitment to the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of the Syrian Arab Republic as a multi-ethnic, multi-religious, non-sectarian and democratic state.”*

Sergey Lavrov, Foreign Minister of Russia emphasized this point:

The talks in Astana are “an important contribution to... a comprehensive political settlement in Syria which will continue in wider activities in Geneva.”

The prospect of ongoing US support of Kurds, esp. in Northern Syria, is seen in Ankara as a threat to Turkish security, a threat seemingly ignore by Donald Trump, a threat that drives Turkey deeper into a meaningful coalition with Russia.

To make the scenario extremely interesting, Russia is also backing the Kurds also to the ire of Turkey who is simultaneously fighting side by side with Russia as agreed to by the Astana Accords. The whole complicated situation is growing ever more complex. Turkey has been assisting Syrian Government forces (Assad’ forces backed by Russia) as they move toward Manbij a city held by US backed Kurds; therefore the US has deployed troops there to oppose a Turkish offensive. As reported by the [New York Times](#) :

“In recent weeks, U.S. Army Rangers have been sent to the city of Manbij west of Raqqa (in NW Syria) to deter Russian, Turkish and Syrian opposition forces all operating in the area, while a Marine artillery battery recently deployed near Raqqa (70 miles SW) has already come under fire, according to a defense official with direct knowledge of their

operations."

It is interesting that Syrian forces supported by the Syrian government engaged in warfare with Islamic terrorists in their own country are referred to as "*opposition forces*". Opposition to whom, to the United States? If the Russian-Turkish backed Syrian army is fighting ISIS (Islamic State) and is called the "*opposition*", who is the United States fighting?

Turkey finds itself in a quandary, it is assisting Russia who is supporting Syrian President Bashar al-Assad. At the same time, it is a NATO member and thus a US ally. The United States has been backing rebel forces against Assad and supposedly, at the same time, also fighting Islamic terrorists such as ISIS and Daesh whom the Russians and Turks are also fighting. **Turkey has indicated that it would commit ground troops to help US backed forces topple Raqqa but that eventuality is contingent upon US relinquishing its support of the Kurds (YPG) whom the Russians are also supporting.**

Moreover, as a result of the Russian brokered Astana Accords, Syrian rebels, that is those that are Syrian and *not* Islamic terrorists imported from throughout the Middle East, Syrian rebels who were opposed to Assad are now working with the Assad government to oust radical Islamic terrorists, which means if the terrorists are defeated there are virtually no indigenous forces of any considerable size left opposing the Syrian government; who will the United States support then? That is who will the United States support in Syria once ISIS or the Islamic State is defeated? **Ostensibly, the Kurds will have the backing of both the United States and Russia**, the preferred diplomatic position for both countries *vis a vis* Turkey. That is, **it is better for the United States to have strained relations with Turkey over the Kurds if Russia also has strained relations with the Turks and for the same reason!** Turkey will just have to get use to it – the US and Russia are apparently headed down a course leading to some

type of cooperative agreement even if it is happening *willy nilly*.

The unexpected might be occurring, viz., Russia and the US are being pulled together by supporting the Kurds in Syria albeit at risk of exacerbating relations with Turkey. Sarah El Deeb is one of the few to recognize the unexpected. As reported in the [Chicago Tribune](#):

“Ankara (that is, Turkey) has effectively unified Russia and the U.S. in the goal of limiting Turkish expansion in the north (North Syria where the Kurds live). Syrian experts say Ankara has lost influence to realize its aim of pushing the Kurdish forces back to the east of Manbij across the Euphrates. Moreover, Washington is pushing ahead with partnering with the Kurdish-led forces in the planned attack on Raqqa, despite Turkish opposition.”

According to [Ragip Soylu](#) a reporter for [New Turkey](#), Turkey's efforts to disrupt the US-Kurd alliance

“...has been tossed away as the Russian military and U.S. Special Forces moved last week in Syria's Manbij to prevent Turkish-backed Syrian opposition forces from attacking the city,”

Russia has taken an unexpected stance on Manbij, instead of advancing on the city, THEY ARE WORKING TO PREVENT any further Syrian-Turkish advance deeply desired by the Turks. They are now involved in the mutual defeat of ISIS. At the moment they, the United States and Russia, are involved in planning an assault on ISIS in Raqqa and mutual support of the Kurds; the latter to the chagrin of the Turks

Complex as it is to discern, **the future is perhaps beginning in Manbij and Raqqa**, as [U.S. Lt. Gen. Stephen Townsend](#), of the anti-ISIS coalition has said:

“All the forces acting in Syria have converged within hand-grenade range of one another. We encourage all forces to remain focused on the counter-ISIS fight and concentrate their efforts on defeating ISIS and not toward other objectives that may cause the coalition to divert energy and resources away from Raqqa.”

In other words, the US is not focused on toppling the Assad government (at least not now and possibly not again in the future). **The mission is for once clear: defeat ISIS.** This is **something both the Americans and Russians can agree upon.** The Russian are *not* looking for war between its allies, Turkey and Syria, versus the US forces in Manbij or Raqqa. **Turkish and Syrian troops moving toward Manbij were halted** due to a [deal brokered by Russia that established a “buffer zone”](#) between the Kurds and advancing Turk-Syrian forces. This zone is intended to **protect the Kurds** in Manbij and to keep Russian backed Syrian and Turkish troops out of conflict with the United States, esp. since they are all, as US General Townsend has stated: *“within hand-grenade range of one another.”*

Unfortunately, [Turkey has not honored the zone:](#)

“On Thursday, Syrian government media said Turkish shelling killed a number of its troops. Kurdish officials said Turkish advances continued even despite the buffer zone.”

Turkey, long a backer of terrorism throughout the Middle East, is now suffering a bout of what appears to be irremediable consternation. Since **the United States and Russia are now face to face in Syria**, since **the United States and Russia are both supporting the Kurds** in Syria, since **the United States and Russia are both fighting ISIS** in Syria simultaneously and at the same exact location, **it will be difficult for Turkey to play anymore deceptive games designed to advance its own agenda and keep the two superpowers apart.** The Turks however have at least three allies in this game, viz., the US Neocons,

global liberals, and Israeli Zionists who will do anything to hinder real peace by keeping the two apart!

Nonetheless, will the United States begin to coordinate efforts with Russia to

(1) Protect Manbij, a city held by US backed Kurdish-led forces thereby increasing tensions with Turkey but lessening them with Russia (for the US that is)?

(2) Somehow pacify or restrain Turkey – something much easier if they cooperate – thereby bringing Turk dreams for a renewed Ottoman Empire or at least an Arab World under Turk domination to naught and as a result bring Turkey's leaders to their senses?

(3) Defeat ISIS in a mutual effort to “*bomb the shit out of them*” as Trump promised during his campaign – Raqqa represents the possibility of fulfilling a campaign promise and of moving towards normalizing relations with Russia, although in a very unexpected way as explained above.

Or will the US act to salvage its relations with Turkey thereby lessening support for the Kurds and increasing tensions with Russia? Quite possibly Turkey will have to make a choice, that is, to seek a deeper alliance with the United States or Russia; either way, it will have to come to grips with the Kurds whom neither is likely to abandon. The only player in the region with more to lose than Turkey, is Israel (Saudi Arabia also stands to lose, but not as much as Israel) who has benefited from the enormous pounding its enemies have given to each other over these years – Israel benefits by continued conflict – it does not want peace between the US and Russia nor mutual-agreement over Syria and the Kurds. It remains to be seen what Israel will do in this situation; it has already [violated Syrian airspace this past week.](#)

"The Syrian military said the Israeli strikes had targeted a military installation near Palmyra (in Syria)."

"The incident was highly unusual in that it also saw the Israeli military break its customary silence over raids in Syria to release a statement to admit that its aircraft had been targeted while operating there."

"Overnight, March 17, IAF aircrafts [sic] targeted several targets in Syria," said the statement."

The United States might not be fighting Syria at the moment but Israel is apparently trying to keep Syrian ally Iran from sending weapons to Hezbollah stationed on the Syrian side of the Golan Heights. Israel is *not* averse to violating international law to carry out its objectives, nor was Turkey who is now paying a price for its transgressions. [Is Israel about to learn a similar lesson or will they influence the Trump administration to keep up war on Syria once ISIS is obliterated?](#)

"Brig Gen Nitzan Nuriel, a former director of counter-terrorism in the Israeli prime minister's bureau, said conflict with Hezbollah was inevitable as the group sought ever more advanced anti-aircraft missiles, heavy rockets and tactical weapons, but he believed Assad had seriously misread the situation."

"Assad has not read the map correctly," he said. "He believes it is only a question of weeks or months before he can declare a full victory and is looking to the next stage. I believe he is mistaken and that clashes in [Syria](#) will stay with us for the next three to six years."

“Discussing Russia’s role in Syria, he added more controversially: “Russia got the messages it needs to receive from Israel.” That was, he said: “Israel will not allow anyone, including Russia to get in the way of implementing our military mission.”

Although Israel favors continued conflict, as long as its enemies are killing each other and as long as Syria is potentially neutralized along with its ally Iran, although Israel favors such things, New Era is forecasting eventual peace – if the US and Russia actually cooperate to defeat ISIS – which means something will have to give in Israel, perhaps something significant.