Clinton Emails Reveal Plan To Destroy Syria, Target Iran, Threaten Assad’s Family

By Brandon Turbeville

Author’s Note: The quotes for this article were provided by virtue of a Wikileaks release of the trove of emails belonging to Hillary Clinton. While Wikileaks merely provided the “email” text, the quotes are actually from an article written by James P. Rubin for Foreign Policy entitled “The Real Reason To Intervene In Syria.” Thus, the email is not an email at all, but a published article most likely in Clinton’s inbox by virtue of someone having mailed it to her or having signed up for Foreign Policy’s newsletter. While the quotes in this article are not Clinton’s words nor are they an email communication, the article will remain posted due to the fact that the quotes are indeed real and thus, an important statement coming from one of the premier organizations involved in the creation and implementation of U.S. foreign policy planning. Still, Clinton’s tenure as Secretary of State undoubtedly represented an implementation of the very strategy described in Rubin’s article. Regardless, the mistake made in this article was entirely accidental and we apologize for any confusion that has taken place as a result.

The Hillary Clinton emails have recently been released by virtue of Clinton’s use of a private email server, WikiLeaks, and the Freedom of Information Act and they stand as potentially one of the most damning sets of emails ever exposed to the light of day. With 30,322 emails having been written or received by Clinton and the fact that Clinton herself has been so heavily involved in untold amounts of treachery during her tenure as Secretary of State alone, the emails are a veritable treasure trove of both incriminating information for Clinton and vindicating information for those who have been critical of her in the past.

One email alone regarding the Syrian crisis demonstrates the veracity of what many who have been labeled “conspiracy theorists” have claimed for years – namely, that the United States has organized, directed, and supported the destabilization of Syria for its own geopolitical goals as well as those of Israel.[1] It also confirms the methodology and geopolitical goals behind the destabilization as well as cynical and brazen attempts by the Clinton State Department and Obama White House to go so far as to put Assad’s family in danger in order to intimidate him into abandoning his post.

The email reveals how the United States was determined to destroy Syria both for its own geopolitical purposes but also in order to cripple Iran and Hezbollah, both for the United States and Israel’s benefit, with the essential encirclement and weakening of the Iranian position being one of the goals. Whomever authored the text is clearly in favor of a direct U.S. military assault on Syria and all of these objectives, according to the emails, were worth risking a military confrontation with Russia.

For instance, in regards to the question of the possibility of Israel launching a “pre-emptive” attack on Iran, the email, as posted by WikiLeaks, read:

The best way to help Israel deal with Iran’s growing nuclear capability is to help the people of Syria overthrow the regime of Bashar Assad. Negotiations to limit Iran’s nuclear program will not solve Israel’s security dilemma. Nor will they stop Iran from improving the crucial part of any nuclear weapons program — the capability to enrich uranium. At best, the talks between the world’s major powers and Iran that began in Istanbul this April and will continue in Baghdad in May will enable Israel to postpone by a few months a decision whether to launch an attack on Iran that could provoke a major Mideast war.
The email continues by explaining the real reason Israel would like to see the Iranians weakened, albeit still propagating the lie that there was ever any evidence to suggest that the Iranians were actually moving toward a nuclear weapon to begin with. Still, it manages to blow the lid on the biggest open secret in the Middle East – the fact that Israel is indeed armed with nuclear weapons. The email reads,

Iran’s nuclear program and Syria’s civil war may seem unconnected, but they are. For Israeli leaders, the real threat from a nuclear-armed Iran is not the prospect of an insane Iranian leader launching an unprovoked Iranian nuclear attack on Israel that would lead to the annihilation of both countries. What Israeli military leaders really worry about — but cannot talk about — is losing their nuclear monopoly. An Iranian nuclear weapons capability would not only end that nuclear monopoly but could also prompt other adversaries, like Saudi Arabia and Egypt, to go nuclear as well. The result would be a precarious nuclear balance in which Israel could not respond to provocations with conventional military strikes on Syria and Lebanon, as it can today. If Iran were to reach the threshold of a nuclear weapons state, Tehran would find it much easier to call on its allies in Syria and Hezbollah to strike Israel, knowing that its nuclear weapons would serve as a deterrent to Israel responding against Iran itself. Back to Syria. It is the strategic relationship between Iran and the regime of Bashar Assad in Syria that makes it possible for Iran to undermine Israel’s security — not through a direct attack, which in the thirty years of hostility between Iran and Israel has never occurred, but through its proxies in Lebanon, like Hezbollah, that are sustained, armed and trained by Iran via Syria. The end of the Assad regime would end this dangerous alliance. Israel’s leadership understands well why defeating Assad is now in its interests.

Of course, Israel might find itself in a much better situation across the Middle East if it did not consistently provoke its neighbors, threaten warfare, and destabilize the region. It might find its situation more stable if it did not constantly violate the borders of its neighbors. It might find its reputation better if it were not engaged in a systematic attempt to eradicate the people whose land Israeli settlers stole years ago and continue to steal today.

The author is somewhat honest in their presentation of the reasoning behind the attempt to destroy Assad, however, when he/she points to the fact that the destruction of Syria would result in the severance of the “Shiite crescent” and the arc of resistance to Anglo-American/Israeli imperialist and geopolitical agendas. The author writes,

Speaking on CNN’s Amanpour show last week, Defense Minister Ehud Barak argued that “the toppling down of Assad will be a major blow to the radical axis, major blow to Iran.... It’s the only kind of outpost of the Iranian influence in the Arab world...and it will weaken dramatically both Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas and Islamic Jihad in Gaza.” Bringing down Assad would not only be a massive boon to Israel’s security, it would also ease Israel’s understandable fear of losing its nuclear monopoly. Then, Israel and the United States might be able to develop a common view of when the Iranian program is so dangerous that military action could be warranted. Right now, it is the combination of Iran’s strategic alliance with Syria and the steady progress in Iran’s nuclear enrichment program that has led Israeli leaders to contemplate a surprise attack — if necessary over the objections of Washington. With Assad gone, and Iran no longer able to threaten Israel through its, proxies, it is possible that the United States and Israel can agree on red lines for when Iran’s program has crossed an unacceptable threshold. In short, the White House can ease the tension that has developed with Israel over Iran by doing the right thing in Syria.

The author then moves on to the question of ensuring that Assad is swayed by the fact that his family is
threatened. The author says,

The rebellion in Syria has now lasted more than a year. The opposition is not going away, nor is the regime going to accept a diplomatic solution from the outside. With his life and his family at risk, only the threat or use of force will change the Syrian dictator Bashar Assad’s mind.

The author of the email also writes about how to literally turn the Syrian crisis into Libya 2.0. The author states,

The Obama administration has been understandably wary of engaging in an air operation in Syria like the one conducted in Libya for three main reasons. Unlike the Libyan opposition forces, the Syrian rebels are not unified and do not hold territory. The Arab League has not called for outside military intervention as it did in Libya. And the Russians are opposed. Libya was an easier case. But other than the laudable purpose of saving Libyan civilians from likely attacks by Qaddafi’s regime, the Libyan operation had no long-lasting consequences for the region. Syria is harder. But success in Syria would be a transformative event for the Middle East. Not only would another ruthless dictator succumb to mass opposition on the streets, but the region would be changed for the better as Iran would no longer have a foothold in the Middle East from which to threaten Israel and undermine stability in the region. Unlike in Libya, a successful intervention in Syria would require substantial diplomatic and military leadership from the United States. Washington should start by expressing its willingness to work with regional allies like Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and Qatar to organize, train and arm Syrian rebel forces. The announcement of such a decision would, by itself, likely cause substantial defections from the Syrian military. Then, using territory in Turkey and possibly Jordan, U.S. diplomats and Pentagon officials can start strengthening the opposition. It will take time. But the rebellion is going to go on for a long time, with or without U.S. involvement.

The author then turns her sights upon the potential war with Russia her foreign policy might cause as the email states,

The second step is to develop international support for a coalition air operation. Russia will never support such a mission, so there is no point operating through the UN Security Council. Some argue that U.S. involvement risks a wider war with Russia. But the Kosovo example shows otherwise. In that case, Russia had genuine ethnic and political ties to the Serbs, which don’t exist between Russia and Syria, and even then Russia did little more than complain. Russian officials have already acknowledged they won’t stand in the way if intervention comes. Arming the Syrian rebels and using western air power to ground Syrian helicopters and airplanes is a low-cost high payoff approach. As long as Washington’s political leaders stay firm that no U.S. ground troops will be deployed, as they did in both Kosovo and Libya, the costs to the United States will be limited. Victory may not come quickly or easily, but it will come. And the payoff will be substantial. Iran would be strategically isolated, unable to exert its influence in the Middle East. The resulting regime in Syria will see the United States as a friend, not an enemy. Washington would gain substantial recognition as fighting for the people in the Arab world, not the corrupt regimes. For Israel, the rationale for a bolt from the blue attack on Iran’s nuclear facilities would be eased. And a new Syrian regime might well be open to early
action on the frozen peace talks with Israel. Hezbollah in Lebanon would be cut off from its Iranian sponsor since Syria would no longer be a transit point for Iranian training, assistance and missiles. All these strategic benefits and the prospect of saving thousands of civilians from murder at the hands of the Assad regime (10,000 have already been killed in this first year of civil war). With the veil of fear lifted from the Syrian people, they seem determine to fight for their freedom. America can and should help them — and by doing so help Israel and help reduce the risk of a wider war.

Not only is it incredibly frightening to envision a Secretary of State, much less a President, who so indifferent to such a potentially catastrophic consequence of her actions. If the author of the email was indeed Clinton herself, it is quite telling since she clearly asserted that the Russians would simply not respond and would knuckle under when faced with the might of the United States. Regardless, how very wrong the author was.

At worst, the email shows a an individual knowingly working toward the destruction of a secular reformist and sovereign government with the acknowledged result of mass civilian deaths for the benefit of geopolitical interests of both the United States and other nations with little concern for the fact that such military action could very well provoke a third world war scenario with a nuclear power. At best, the author of the email is unmatched in incompetence since he/she was willing to provoke a war with Russia for their own agenda, believing that Russia would not respond. If the author was Clinton, neither of these portrayals qualify her for anything other than a prolonged stay at a psychiatric hospital or prison. If the author was someone else, then Clinton’s circle of friends and advisers is as every bit eaten up with madness as Clinton herself.
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