

Syria's War Could Cause a Serious Mistake

There is real danger now that US foreign policy, that has been somewhat cautious so far under President Obama, could move toward disastrous involvement in a sectarian civil war in Syria. The thinking and rhetoric that led to this began well before Obama, and before September 2001. Although using a much less rash and more thoughtful approach, the Obama administration has been unable or unwilling to make fundamental policy changes in dealing with the Middle East.

Interfering in Syria, including covertly fomenting dissent in the first place, followed by the rhetoric that worsened it, and now supplying the weapons that will only multiply the deaths, is a mistake born of the mistake regarding Iran.

The hostility toward Iran that has been more or less constant since Reagan has by now turned what was initially a diplomatic blunder into something like tradition. It should have been stopped long ago. The obsession with Iran's nuclear capability makes no sense. It is a circle of illogic. We need not worry about weapons in the hand of friends, yet we insist on making Iran a foe. And why? The reason given is that they might make the weapons. And the more we treat them as foes, the more they may think they need weapons.

We are only assuming without proof they are preparing to make nuclear weapons. We actively sold Iran on nuclear power in the 50's and 60's, then cut off all fuel sales to them after the revolution, leaving them no choice but to learn to enrich their own.

The official and media demonization purposely omits the history, and most people don't bother to look it up. We created the adversarial relationship, behaving as if it were real.

This article is well worth reading, regarding unintended consequences of ill-planned policies and strategies: http://russiancouncil.ru/en/inner/?id_4=1557#top Seeds of the Syrian and Mali crises in Western Foreign Policy

The fault has been thinking of nations as chess pieces in a global power game without understanding the nature of each of them, including the internal balances that are needed for stability, governmentally and socially.

The kind of sectarian warfare that we unleashed in Iraq is already ongoing in Syria. It is not about freedom and democracy. It's about which sect gets the power. A secular government can keep relative peace between them. Take that away, and you get religious extremists on both sides, each trying to eliminate the other.

This article <http://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2013/06/us-actively-trying-prolong-syrian-civil-war>

asks the question "Is the U.S. Actively Trying to Prolong the Syrian Civil War?"

After all, that is exactly what it WILL do by arming the rebels. That is the kind of cynical manipulation that has been used for decades, having no regard for the human lives it ends or ruins, as long as they are elsewhere.

Syrian civil war: a one-way street

As the rebels have been rewarded for refusing to attend Geneva, it seems unlikely they will stop fighting and start talking <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/jun/14/editorial-syria-war-street>

In Syria, U.S. may find war centuries in the making

<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2013/06/14/hezbollah-lebanon-war-shiite-sunni/2416335/>

“President Obama has said his goal is to help the rebels protect themselves from Assad’s military. Doing so will place the United States firmly on the Sunni side of the Middle East conflict and in opposition to the growing Shiite military axis of Iran-Syria-Hezbollah, experts say.

“Both sides know how fragile the situation is, and all parties are aware and concerned that the situation could violently explode in an instant,” says Avi Melamed, a former Israeli senior official on Arab Affairs”

Why two sects of the same religion have developed such a hateful and violent antipathy is hard to understand. Protestant and Catholic Christians have had similar conflicts in the past, but seem to coexist in most places today with few problems.

What we do know is that there is no one more irrational and potentially violent than someone with a religion and a bad attitude, and getting between two of those is a bad idea.

US covert actions in Syria are nothing new. We were caught red-handed at it in 1957:

<http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/4328056?uid=3739552&uid=2&uid=4&uid=3739256&sid=21102323577121>

In 1949 the CIA engineered a coup in Syria, overthrowing its democratic government.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/March_1949_Syrian_coup_d%27%C3%A9tat

“According to Joseph Massad, a professor of Modern Arab Politics and Intellectual History at [Columbia University](#), the coup was sponsored by the United States [CIA](#) a conclusion in agreement with other historians such as Professor Douglas Little, and declassified records. The coup is also described by author Irene Gendzier, who states that “CIA agents Miles Copeland and Stephen Meade..were directly involved in the coup.”

Covert United States foreign regime change actions

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Covert_United_States_foreign_regime_change_actions

There is quite a long list. This article lists some of the better known ones.

“The U.S. has also covertly supported opposition groups in various countries without necessarily attempting to overthrow the government.”

Syria's Bloody CIA Revolution - A Distraction?

<http://www.sott.net/article/241383-Syrias-Bloody-CIA-Revolution-A-Distraction>

Since its creation in 1947, the CIA has mounted approximately 3,000 major operations and 10,000 minor operations of this nature, every one of them illegal and many of them "bloody and gory beyond comprehension". [According to former CIA agent John Stockwell](#) (who was involved in several such operations), by 1988, over six million people had been killed as a result.

In an interview with Amy Goodman on March 2, 2007, U.S. General Wesley Clark (Ret.), [explained](#) that the Bush Administration planned to "take out" seven countries in five years: Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and Iran. While the sequence of invasions seems to have been revised to some extent, the plan appears to be progressing nicely for the psychopathic lords of empire. But wait! The Bush government isn't in power anymore! Obama's in charge now, right? How can the Obama administration be following a foreign policy of subversion and mass murder that was devised under another president's leadership?! Unless the president really isn't the 'commander in chief'. Unless the position of the president of the USA is little more than a ceremonial one, and some other group, that transcends changes in administrations, actually dictates government policy. But that wouldn't be democratic, so obviously it's not true.

Stay out of Other Nations' Civil Wars

<http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/stay-out-other-nations-civil-wars?gclid=COvqxvGA57cCFRDI7AoduHoABw>

(Even if you started the war in the first place!)

“This is precisely the sort of conflict America should stay out of. The case against joining the Syrian fratricide is simple yet overwhelming: Americans have nothing at stake that warrants going to war. War should be a last resort, employed for interests that are truly vital. War should not be just another policy choice for impatient internationalists and frustrated social engineers.”

-cosmicrat June 15 2013