

By Julie Levesque

From [Global Research](#) | Original Article

Iraq is once again front page news. And once again the picture that is presented to us in the Western mainstream media is a mixture of half truths, falsehoods, disinformation and propaganda. The mainstream media will not tell you that the US is supporting both sides in the Iraqi conflict. Washington is overtly supporting the Iraqi Shiite government, while covertly training, arming and funding the Sunni Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS). Supporting the influx of terrorist brigades in Iraq is an act of foreign aggression. But the mainstream media will tell you that the Obama administration is “concerned” by the actions committed by the terrorists.



The preferred narrative in the U.S. and most Western mainstream media is that the current situation is due to the U.S “withdrawal” which ended in December 2011 (more than 200 U.S. troops and military advisors remained in Iraq). This portrait of events in which the US withdrawal is to blame for the insurgency does not draw any connection between the U.S. invasion of 2003

and the occupation that ensued. It also ignores the death squads trained by U.S advisors in Iraq in the wake of the invasion and which are at the heart of the current turmoil.

As usual, the mainstream media does not want you to understand what’s going on. Its goal is to shape perceptions and opinions by crafting a view of the world which serves powerful interests. For that matter, they will tell you it’s a civil war.

What is unfolding is a process of “constructive chaos”, engineered by the West. The destabilization of Iraq and its fragmentation has been planned long ago and is part of the “Anglo-American-Israeli ‘military road map’ in the Middle East”, as explained in 2006 in the following article:

“This project, which has been in the planning stages for several years, consists in creating an arc of instability, chaos, and violence extending from Lebanon, Palestine, and Syria to Iraq, the Persian Gulf, Iran, and the borders of NATO-garrisoned Afghanistan.

The ‘New Middle East’ project was introduced publicly by Washington and Tel Aviv with the expectation that Lebanon would be the pressure point for realigning the whole Middle East and thereby unleashing the forces of “constructive chaos.” This “constructive chaos” –which generates conditions of violence and warfare throughout the region– would in turn be used so that the United States, Britain, and Israel could redraw the map of the Middle East in accordance with their geo-strategic needs and objectives. ...

The redrawing and partition of the Middle East from the Eastern Mediterranean shores of Lebanon and Syria to Anatolia (Asia Minor), Arabia, the Persian Gulf, and the Iranian Plateau responds to broad economic, strategic and military objectives, which are part of a longstanding Anglo-American and Israeli agenda in the region...

A wider war in the Middle East could result in redrawn borders that are strategically advantageous to Anglo-American interests and Israel...

Attempts at intentionally creating animosity between the different ethno-cultural and religious groups of the Middle East have been systematic. In fact, they are part of a carefully designed covert intelligence agenda.

Even more ominous, many Middle Eastern governments, such as that of Saudi Arabia, are assisting Washington in fomenting divisions between Middle Eastern populations. The ultimate objective is to weaken the resistance movement against foreign occupation through a “divide and conquer strategy” which serves Anglo-American and Israeli interests in the broader region.” (Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya, [Plans for Redrawing the Middle East: The Project for a “New Middle East”](#), November 2006)

Although the divide and conquer strategy is not new, it still works thanks to the media smoke screens and mirrors.



Engineering a civil war is the best way to divide a country into several territories. It worked in the Balkans and it is well documented that ethnic tensions were used and abused in order to destroy Yugoslavia and divide it into seven separate entities.

Today we are clearly witnessing the balkanization of Iraq with the help of the favorite imperial tool, namely armed militias, referred to as pro-democracy opposition or terrorists depending on the context and the role they have to play in the collective psyche.

Western media and government officials define them not by who they are, but by who they fight against. In Syria they constitute a “legitimate opposition, freedom fighters fighting for democracy against a brutal dictatorship”, whereas in Iraq, they are “terrorists fighting a democratically elected U.S.-supported government”:

“Known and documented, Al Qaeda affiliated entities have been used by US-NATO in numerous conflicts as ‘intelligence assets’ since the heyday of the Soviet-Afghan war. In Syria, the Al Nusrah and ISIS rebels are the foot-soldiers of the Western military alliance, which oversees and controls the recruitment and training of paramilitary forces.

The decision was taken by Washington to channel its support (covertly) in favor of a terrorist entity which operates in both Syria and Iraq and which has logistical bases in both countries. The Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham’s Sunni caliphate project coincides with a longstanding US agenda to carve up both Iraq and Syria into three separate territories: A Sunni Islamist Caliphate, an Arab Shia Republic, and a Republic of Kurdistan.

Whereas the (US proxy) government in Baghdad purchases advanced weapons systems from the US including F16 fighter jets from Lockheed Martin, the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham –which is fighting Iraqi government forces– is supported covertly by Western intelligence. The objective is to engineer a civil war in Iraq, in which both sides are controlled indirectly by US-NATO.

The scenario is to arm and equip them, on both sides, finance them with advanced weapons systems and then ‘let them fight’...

Under the banner of a civil war, an undercover war of aggression is being fought which essentially contributes to further destroying an entire country, its institutions, its economy. The

undercover operation is part of an intelligence agenda, an engineered process which consists in transforming Iraq into an open territory.

Meanwhile, public opinion is led to believe that what is at stake is confrontation between Shia and Sunni.” (Michel Chossudovsky, [The Engineered Destruction and Political Fragmentation of Iraq. Towards the Creation of a US Sponsored Islamist Caliphate](#), June 14, 2014)

We knew well before the beginning of the war on terror that Saudi Arabia was a major supporter of Islamic terrorism. But being a staunch U.S. ally Saudi Arabia is the exception to the rule proclaimed by George W. Bush after the 9/11 terrorist attacks: “We will make no distinction between those who committed these acts and those who harbor them.”



The fact of the matter is they always do make a distinction, especially when it comes to Saudi Arabia. But while its support for terrorism is acknowledged by the mainstream media, the latter ignores that the fact that the U.S. is (indirectly) supporting terrorist entities. In addition, mainstream journalists never address the reason why the U.S is not reacting to Saudi support for terrorists. The facts are clear: the US is supporting terrorism through allies like Saudi Arabia and Qatar. If those who shape the discourse in the mainstream media fail to connect the dots, it

is only because they don't want to.

In the Middle East, Saudi Arabia has been serving US interests as well as its own. The US alliance with Saudi Arabia shows the contempt the US actually has for democracy. This alliance alone clearly indicates that the goal of the US invasion of Iraq was not to bring democracy and freedom to Iraqis. For Saudi Arabia, a democratic Iraq would be a nightmare and a threat to its repressive monarchic rule:

“Ever since the overthrow of Saddam's regime in 2003, the Saudi regime has been emphatically hostile towards Iraq. This has been largely due to its deeply entrenched fear that the success of democracy in Iraq would undoubtedly inspire its own people. Another reason is the deeply rooted hatred – by Saudi Arabia's extremist Wahhabi Salafi religious establishment – towards the Shia. The Saudi regime also accuses Maliki, of giving Iran a freehand to dramatically intensify its influence in Iraq. The Saudi regime has made no secret that its overriding priority is to severely undermine what it perceives as highly perilous and yet growing Iranian influence.

Even though the Saudi regime vehemently opposed U.S. pull out from Iraq, nevertheless in Dec. 2011, Syria rather than Iraq became Saudi Arabia's principal target for regime change. The Saudi regime has consistently considered the Syrian regime of Bashar Al Assad, an irreplaceable strategic ally to its primary foe Iran. The Saudis moved swiftly to shore up the armed insurgents by deploying its intelligence services, whose instrumental role in establishing Jabhat Al Nusra JN was highlighted in an intelligence review released in Paris in January 2013. The Saudi regime also used its huge influence and leverage on not only Sunni tribal leaders in western Iraq, but also on Saudi members of AQI, convincing it that its principal battlefield must be Syria and that its ultimate goal should be deposing Bashar Al Assad's Alawite regime, since its overthrow would break the back-bone of the Iraqi Shia-led government and inevitably loosen Iran's grip on Iraq.” (Zayd Alisa [Resurgence of Al Qaeda in Iraq, Fuelled by Saudi Arabia](#) , March 3, 2014)

From Paul Bremer to John Negroponte

But the most important piece of the Iraqi puzzle is the Washington's covert support of the terrorists. To better understand the sectarian violence plaguing the country today, we need to understand what the US has done during the occupation. Paul Bremer, author of “My year in Iraq, the Struggle to Build a Future of Hope”, played an important role while he was Civil

Governor of Iraq in 2003-2004. Hopeful future for whom, one might ask when looking back at what he has done during that year. Certainly not for the Iraqis:

“When Paul Bremer dissolved the Iraqi National Security and Police Forces, he formed another one from mercenaries and sectarian militias who were backing and supporting the occupation. In reality, the nature of hideous crimes committed by these forces was the major motivation behind the sectarian violence killing of 2006-2007.

According to Geneva Convention Protocols, the occupation represented by Bremer, not only failed its duty to protect the population of the country under occupation, they officially formed militias and armed gangs to help them control the country.


Paul Bremer committed crimes against humanity and an act of cleansing and Genocide in Iraq by targeting thousands of innocent civilians through Interior Minister and Special Commandos Forces.” (Prof Souad N. Al-Azzawi, [US Sponsored Commandos Responsible for Abducting, Torturing and Killing Iraqis. The Role of Paul Bremer](#), January 4, 2014)

In 2004-2005, **US Ambassador John Negroponte** continued Bremer’s work. With his experience in crushing dissent in Central America with the help of bloodthirsty death squads during the 80’s, Negroponte was “the man for the job” in Iraq:

“US sponsored death squads were recruited in Iraq starting in 2004-2005 in an initiative launched under the helm of the US Ambassador John Negroponte, who was dispatched to Baghdad by the US State Department in June 2004...

Negroponte was the ‘man for the job’. As US Ambassador to Honduras from 1981 to 1985. Negroponte played a key role in supporting and supervising the Nicaraguan Contras based in Honduras as well as overseeing the activities of the Honduran military death squads.

In January 2005, the Pentagon, confirmed that it was considering:



‘forming hit squads of Kurdish and Shia fighters to target leaders of the Iraqi insurgency [Resistance] in a strategic shift borrowed from the American struggle against left-wing guerrillas in Central America 20 years ago’.

Under the so-called ‘El Salvador option’, Iraqi and American forces would be sent to kill or kidnap insurgency leaders, even in Syria, where some are thought to shelter. ...

Hit squads would be controversial and would probably be kept secret.

While the stated objective of the ‘Iraq Salvador Option’ was to ‘take out the insurgency’, in practice the US sponsored terror brigades were involved in routine killings of civilians with a

view to fomenting sectarian violence. In turn, the CIA and MI6 were overseeing ‘Al Qaeda in Iraq’ units involved in targeted assassinations directed against the Shiite population. Of significance, the death squads were integrated and advised by undercover US Special Forces.” (Prof Michel Chossudovsky, [Terrorism with a “Human Face”: The History of America’s Death Squads](#), January 04, 2013)

Now we are being told that ISIS has managed to put its hands on US-made sophisticated weapons. Make no mistakes. These weapons did not get there accidentally. The US knew exactly what it was doing when it armed and funded the “opposition” in Libya and Syria. What they did was not stupid. They knew what was going to happen and that is what they wanted. Some in the progressive media talk about blowback, when an intelligence asset goes against its sponsors. Forget about blowback. If that’s what it is, it was a very carefully planned “blowback”.

US Foreign Policy. Failed, Stupid or Diabolical

Some will argue that US foreign policy in the Middle East is a “failure”, that policymakers are “stupid”. It’s not a failure and they’re not stupid. That’s what they want you to think because they think you’re stupid.

What is happening now was planned long ago. The truth is that US foreign policy in the Middle East is diabolical, brutally repressive, criminal and undemocratic. And the only way out of this bloody mess is “a return to the law”:

“There is only a single antidote to the “civil war” that is now breaking Iraq apart – and that is a return to law and a convening of justice. The war launched by government leaders in 2003 against the people of Iraq was not a mistake: it was a crime. And those leaders should be held to account, under law, for their decisions.” (Inder Comar, [Iraq: The US Sponsored Sectarian “Civil War” is a “War of Aggression”, The “Supreme International Crime”](#), June 18, 2014)