The Causes of the Syrian Conflict Part 2

There is nothing unique about the Syrian conflict. It is a stage in the ambitious plan Washington and its minions have to control the entire Islamic world. We might refer to it as a plan for a “New Middle East” or a “New Caliphate,” or whatever we like. Islamist organizations controlled by the White House have and will continue to have a special role in this project. These organizations are international by their nature.

By concentrating control of the Islamists in its hands, Washington is also using them to concentrate power over the entire Middle East. That provides a very cheap, direct and effective scheme for controlling the region’s resources. Under this scheme of “centralized democracy,” Washington doesn’t have to negotiate with each individual sheikh. It only needs to give orders to the “caliphate’s” single Islamist leadership.

People like Erdoğan are unnecessary, harmful and dangerous in the context of these plans. Erdoğan obviously is a real leader who is guided by national interests; therefore, he “must go.”

Because the “New Middle East” is to be founded on Islam, there should be no problems with material demands by the natives. As we know, religious organizations are strict about recommending that their followers think less about material things and more about spiritual. It is particularly hard to ignore the recommendations of Muslim religious communities — they tend to stone people.

In the Arab Spring alone, the financial oligarchy of the West “earned” hundreds of billions of dollars by “freezing” the accounts of the regimes that were toppled in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, etc. It is frightening to imagine how much could they “earn” from the uncontrolled exploitation of the “Caliphate’s” resources. In that respect, the oil that the Middle East produces in abundance is of particular importance.

Let’s talk about some of that viscous black fluid’s properties.

The fact is that petroleum products, unlike natural gas, require the construction of complex engineering services, and petroleum products are used in every country in the world regardless of their climate, how well their people are educated, or the level of development of their economies. Oil is a universal means of exchange across the entire world. That is its chief significance. The US dollar is a worldwide currency put out by just one purely private shop — the Federal Reserve. The US dollar and oil should be directly linked, and they are.

If the Federal Reserve doesn’t want its paper to lose liquidity and intends that it continue being used strictly as a world currency, it needs for the United States to control oil production across the world, and not just oil production, but the buying and selling of oil, as well. Therefore, Washington is convinced that any leader who doubts the advisability of trading oil in dollars needs to be punished.

The countries of the Middle East are especially significant from the standpoint of controlling oil production and oil trading. Prices on the oil market are pegged to Dubai grade oil, and the largest oil producers in the Islamic world are Saudi Arabia, Iran, Kuwait, Iraq, UAE, Libya and Qatar. Some of those countries have always been under US control, and some are “lost sheep” who have been brought back into the fold. Some have yet to be driven back into the “fold”
One nuance needs to be clearly understood. The United States doesn’t make money by trading oil. It (or more precisely the Federal Reserve and the government in Washington that it controls) make money by printing dollars. The dollar needs to be supported by things of highly liquid material value — ideally oil and heroin. The thousands of soldiers in the US Army’s expeditionary force in Afghanistan are there precisely for that reason. They control the world production of heroin and are not there to teach the Afghans some kind of democracy and blah blah blah.

Now, we need to ask ourselves this. Aren’t the global plans of the US government (naturally, together with the Federal Reserve) too global? That question can be answered as follows. If a country emits a global currency, its strategy should also be global. Alas, that is the case.

Let’s examine some facts.

Why, for example, in 2008 did the United States form the Africa Command, which has the entire Dark Continent as its area of responsibility? J. Peter Pham, a US State Department and Defense Department advisor, says AFRICOM’s mission is to protect US access to African hydrocarbons.

Why was the Bush administration concerned with access to African oil? Had someone refused to sell it to American corporations? Not at all. Control of African oil had begun slipping out of US hands because a new player had emerged in Africa — China — and Sudan, Congo and Angola had become its chief suppliers. Then Sudan divided, and the oil-bearing regions of southern Sudan split off from the north; but the United States hasn’t yet got its hands on Angola, one of China’s biggest oil suppliers. So Washington still has a lot of work to do!

The United States is striving to control oil worldwide. Therefore, it is understandable why the government in Washington hated leaders like Hugo Chavez so much. It isn’t even that Venezuela produces too much energy to be independent. Hugo Chavez was building good relations with Russia and China, and that was a very bad thing for a country that was trying to stick its fingers into all the pots.

What was the Venezuelan leader’s rival, Capriles, promising? Capriles was threatening to cancel Russian arms deliveries and review the oil contracts with, naturally, both Russia and China. Chavez’s death from cancer was a little too timely...

But let’s get back to the subject of the article. What’s behind the Syrian conflict? I repeat. The events in Syria are significant in and of themselves. They become somewhat clear only in the context of the plans Washington (and the Federal Reserve) have for taking control of the Islamic world and in the context of supporting the dollar with liquid assets.

Presidents come and go in the White House, but US policy priorities stay the same. Why is that? Because they are the Federal Reserve’s priorities.

Why has Washington’s fight to control the global production and trade in oil become so intense over the past decade? To answer that question, we need to consider the following.

What is the United States today?

It has long since lost its former importance as the world’s largest industrial country. The US economy today is parasitic and service-based, and the country is inhabited not by metalworkers, but by clerks, dealers, realtors and others of that ilk. The prosperity of the United States no longer depends on the production of steel, cement, cars, refrigerators and trousers, i.e., on the production of goods. It is based on the printing of dollars. Therefore, Washington (and the Federal Reserve, of course) reacts very nervously when strong national leaders come to the fore in oil-producing countries. These leaders might question the security of the US dollar.

Syria doesn’t produce much oil. Meanwhile, everyone, without exception, must (from Washington’s standpoint) observe the American “order” of things.
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