

# افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نیاشد تن من مباد بدین بوم ویر زنده یک تن مباد  
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

[www.afgazad.com](http://www.afgazad.com)

[afgazad@gmail.com](mailto:afgazad@gmail.com)

European Languages

زبان های اروپایی

[http://english.pravda.ru/world/americas/03-10-2013/125795-kissinger\\_usa\\_syria-0/?mode=print](http://english.pravda.ru/world/americas/03-10-2013/125795-kissinger_usa_syria-0/?mode=print)

## Kissinger: USA needs the whole world, not just Syria

Yuri Skidanov

10/3/2013



Has the storm around Syria subsided? If so, why has the United States until recently insisted on the inclusion in the text of the UN resolution on chemical weapons of a provision on the possibility of using the army? Earlier in Valdai Russian President Vladimir Putin mentioned that he asked the Americans (likely Barack Obama) what the U.S. wanted to achieve in Syria and did not get a clear answer.

Meanwhile, the clarity could be introduced by Henry Kissinger, a patriarch and informal designer of the American foreign policy over the last forty years. His very interesting speech made two years ago escaped the attention of the world media and analysts.

What did Kissinger who, until recently, headed the list of the hundred leading intellectuals of the world talk about in late 2011? He talked about a war which, in his opinion, was inevitable.

The politician recommended ordinary people to move to the countryside and build a farm, and not forget to arm, as hungry crowds will be everywhere. Kissinger did not rule out attacks on elite shelter, apparently, by the same hungry crowds in search of food, and also in recognition of the brilliant results of policies that led to the war.

But why is the war inevitable? And who will launch it? Kissinger was candid saying that the United States was luring China and Russia in a trap, and the final nail in the coffin would be Iran, the main goal of Israel. He likened the U.S. to a sniper inciting a beginner to choose a weapon, and then shooting when this beginner was ready to act. He said that the victory will be taken only by a superpower, i.e., the United States. He concluded by saying that the one who controls the oil, the government and the food controls people.

The elderly veteran of diplomatic battles can afford to be candid, succinctly formulating the theses followed by the majority of the American elite, let's call it the "McCain elite." Indeed, the Middle East oil and footholds in the areas protected from a possible second ice age, without doubt, encourage the U.S. to expand its area of control. Yet, these pleasant conditions at this stage are secondary compared to the main goal - to neutralize, including by means of armed force and a World War, the two main geopolitical rivals - Russia and China. The goal is to show who remains a self-sufficient and uncontrolled master of the globe.

Kissinger was frank about it, saying that the American military were told that it was necessary to capture seven Middle Eastern countries and take over their resources, and they had nearly completed this task. He said that a new society and a new world order would be created, there will be only one superpower, and it will be the winning world government.

Seven Middle Eastern countries mentioned by Kissinger include Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the UAE, Iraq, Syria, Libya, and Iran. The task, indeed, would have been virtually completed, had Washington attacked Syria and put it under its control according to the Iraqi model. However, this has not happened. President Putin has timely intercepted the diplomatic initiative, and the U.S. could not refuse without completely losing the informal legitimacy in the eyes of the international community.

The consequences of the revelations of Snowden and aggression against Syria are a combination tough to swallow even for diplomacy of aircraft carriers and "Tomahawks." The role of U.S. President Barack Obama, whose arms were twisted by the political opponents among Republicans and their supporters among Democrats associated with the Israeli lobby who

insisted on tough measures, cannot be underestimated. Obama was able to oppose the plans publicly stated by Kissinger, and, obviously, designed by those behind Kissinger, namely, the political forces usually associated with the powerful Rockefeller clan.

Have these strategic plans been abandoned? Hardly. The fight is only beginning, as too much resources and expectations are associated with this vector of foreign policy. It is hardly a coincidence that in Russia liberal monetarists traditionally supporting the Rockefellers have dramatically revived. Recently a series of attacks have been launched against President Putin at the public and government level. The economic targets set in last year's series of Putin's decrees are being revised, newsworthy information from the Arctic to Mordovia is being created to shake the electoral support of the President of the Russian Federation, introducing the idea of " bloody regime" while implementing hidden tax increases and pensions cuts.

But these days there are not that many gullible people as they remember that the collapse of the Soviet Union happened under similar slogans. In the end it turned into a large-scale, but ordinary bloodless military operation of the information wars times.