



Why is the US-battle against the IS not going according to plan?



On August 21st 2015 the Swiss radio and tele-vision, SRF, headlined their website with:

"The US-battle against the Islamic State is not going according to plan." The terrorist group «Islamic State» is still gaining ground or can at least keep it, in Syria as well as in Iraq. And this is even though US-President Barack Obama commanded an aerial warfare against the terrorist organization a year ago, so SRF.

Why is the US-battle against the IS not going according to plan?

On August 21st 2015 the Swiss radio and tele-vision, SRF, headlined their website with: "The US-battle against the Islamic State is not going according to plan." The terrorist group «Islamic State» is still gaining ground or can at least keep it, in Syria as well as in Iraq. And this is even though US-President Barack Obama commanded an aerial warfare against the terrorist organization a year ago, so SRF. It is a fact that since the beginning of the anti-Islamic State coalition under US-leadership and their aerial attacks on Islamic State positions, the Islamic State wasn't noticeably weakened. SRF explained this with a statement by a former US-lecturer for military strategy, Gary Anderson. He is reported to have stated that aerial attacks and Iraqi troops would not suffice to regain the area occupied by the Islamic State.

But is this argumentation really tenable when you consider that in 2011 Libya was completely bombed by the NATO within about 7 months and the regime of Gaddafi removed?

This begs the question if the US-government is really combatting positions of the Islamic State, as officially claimed, or if they are pursuing another target? The US-government gave the answer to this themselves. On the 5th of July this year the US State Department answered a journalist's question by saying: "We don't know on which legal basis US-aerial attacks are flown against Syria." You didn't mishear. Who are the aerial attacks supposed to be targeted against?

Not against the Islamic State as officially announced?

No – against Syria. That is what it comes down to! The Syrian President Baschar al-Assad said in an interview in March this year in front of Russian journalists, I quote: "The Syrian army and their objects have not been bombed, but they bombard the infrastructure, which belongs to the Syrian people and this has negative consequences for us as a nation and country." Another answer to the question as to if it is really possible that the Islamic State hasn't been noticeably weakened came from President Assad in the same inter¬view. Hear now his answer as a countervoice: "The so-called anti-ISIS-coalition carries out about 10 aerial attacks a day in Syria and Iraq. About 60 rich countries belong to this anti-ISIS coalition. At the same time, compared to this, the relatively small Syrian airforce carries out 20 to 50 aerial-attacks a day against the Islamic State. Even if you are not a military expert, one can easily recognize, that the anti-ISIS-coalition doesn't have the aim to really combat the Islamic State [...] We can say frankly, that a true, real anti-terror-operation from the "anti-

Online link: www.kla.tv/6623 | Published: 03.09.2015



ISIS-coalition" hasn't been started to this day. The Syrian army causes more damage to the Islamic State on the battlefield in one day than the "anti-ISIS-coalition" in several weeks – well, it's only being puffed-up. And not only militarily speaking does an "anti-ISIS-coalition" not make any sense, but also politically. For an anti-terror-organization cannot consist of the same states that support the terrorists." so the Syrian President Baschar al-Assad. That the anti-terror-coalition under US-leadership should have supported the Islamic State, even US-President Barack Obama himself had admitted in a press conference in the Pentagon on July 6. I quote Obama: "We speed up the training of Islamic State forces in Iraq." so Obamas statement, if it wasn't a slip of the tongue. In any case, Obama's statement is still available to listen to on the YouTube account of the White House. Anyway, one thing seems certain: Ostensibly the US-govern¬ment is combating the Islamic State. But this is only as a pretext to continue to work on weakening Baschar al-Assad and his administration undisturbedly and to remove them entirely. As shown in our broad-casting series "The USA's war for resources", the US-government with dogged perseverance pursues the goal to bring every state which is not willing to bow to their domination to their knees. This unmistakably includes Syria.

from mv./ dd.

Sources:

http://www.srf.ch/news/international/us-kampf-gegen-den-is-laeuft-nicht-nach-plan

http://www.zeit.de/politik/ausland/2015-08/syrien-usa-schuetzt-rebellen-gegen-assad

http://www.rtdeutsch.com/25356/international/obamas-freudscher-versprecher-wir-beschleunigen-die-ausbildung-von-is-kraeften-im-irak/

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aupk9SG_WeY

http://www.kla.tv/4586

http://www.kla.tv/5667

This may interest you as well:

Kla.TV - The other news ... free - independent - uncensored ...



- → what the media should not keep silent about ...
- → Little heard by the people, for the people! ...
- → regular News at www.kla.tv/en

Stay tuned - it's worth it!

Free subscription to our e-mail newsletter here: www.kla.tv/abo-en

Online link: www.kla.tv/6623 | Published: 03.09.2015



Security advice:

Unfortunately countervoices are being censored and suppressed more and more. As long as we don't report according to the ideology and interests of the corporate media, we are constantly at risk, that pretexts will be found to shut down or harm Kla.TV.

So join an internet-independent network today! Click here: www.kla.tv/vernetzung&lang=en

Licence: © Creative Commons License with Attribution

Spreading and reproducing is endorsed if Kla.TV if reference is made to source. No content may be presented out of context. The use by state-funded institutions is prohibited without written permission from Kla.TV. Infraction will be legally prosecuted.