

Syria, A “Civil War” Supported by Washington and Its Allies. US Wants to Partition and Reconfigure the Middle East

The 1918 “Sykes-Picot” and the 2017 “Rojava” – Flogging the Same Dead Horse Twice

By [Ollie Richardson](#)

Global Research, July 12, 2017

[Oriental Review](#) 11 July 2017

Region: [Middle East & North Africa](#)

Theme: [Global Economy](#), [Oil and Energy](#),
[Terrorism](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

Throughout the “civil war” (all of the terrorists are supported by external States) in Syria, which began – according to the official narrative – in 2011, the parties involved either on the side of current Syrian President Bashar al-Assad or on the side of the “Syrian revolution” (jihadists but with the western PR firms and media behind it) and their aims and objectives have been clearly laid out either directly from the horse’s mouth or from independent journalists and scholars who dare to read between the lines:

- ISIS from the very beginning of the group’s creation sought to create a so-called “Islamic State”, where shia muslims are to be massacred and Islam as a whole perverted via a false concept of sharia law. Most of the terrorist organisation’s members come from Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and the Caucasus.
- The “Free Syrian Army” (FSA) receive US and EU training, weapons, and financing in order to fight directly against the Syrian Army, and thus push for Assad’s removal. They also curse shia muslims and behead captured soldiers, sometimes even eating their organs. In the ranks of this terrorist organisation are also Turks and Saudi nationals, but they are mostly traitorous Syrians who sold their soul for a few dollars.
- Al-Qaeda (all versions of Jabhat al-Nusra) is the father of ISIS and more or less seeks the same thing, although instead of building an “Islamic State” being the main aim, an “Islamic Emirate” is preferred instead. The difference is the latter is directly financed by the Gulf and Israel, and the former, apparently, is not.
- Turkey wants to expand its borders but at the same time to prevent a Kurdish State from popping up. Turkey also would like some influence over the governments in Syria, Iraq, Iran etc, and also wants to be the heart of the Sunni world. At first Turkey achieved its aims in Syria via its proxy “FSA” forces, but when the US suddenly propelled the creation of the Kurdish federation project “Rojava” Ankara [injected](#) its regular Army all the way up to al-Bab.
- Iran, which feels it has a debt to pay to Syria after its support during the Saddam Hussein era in Iraq, wants to keep Assad in power and ensure the stability and territorial integrity of the Syrian State. The main reason for this policy is known to all – to fend off Israel and Wahhabism. Hezbollah also falls under this category too.
- Russia is acting in the Middle East both on behalf of and along with all nations who refuse to tolerate Anglo-Saxon aggression but are unable to combat it

directly – either because of a lack of firepower or financing. Whether it is through the use of Sukhois, MiGs, T-90s, S-400s, Kornets, Tochkas – Russia will not allow the Syrian State, which was loyal to the USSR for so long, fall into the dirty hands of anti-Humanity and its western sponsors.

- USA wants to partition and reconfigure the Middle East according to the desires of neocons. The means and ways of achieving this aim have chopped and changed throughout the war, but the general theme of “*temporary business partners*” hasn’t changed at all.



And then there are the Kurds. Their aims and objectives, at least from the perspective of the outside world, have changed considerably: before the battle of Aleppo they seemed happy to help out Assad and to work with Syrian military volunteers in order to cleanse the land from ISIS. Russia even [opened](#) up a Kurdish representative office in Moscow, and Putin insisted on retaining good relations with the Kurds. But then the latter became impudent, and launched an attack on Al-Hasakah, ousting the Syrian Army from the town. This served as the Kurdish “*heel turn*”, as is known in professional wrestling, and ultimately resulted in Ankara and Moscow agreeing on a plan to jointly curtail the energy of the Kurds, which seemed to be focused on joining the North East of Syria to the North West for the purposes of building an autonomous State.

But today, after the liberation of Aleppo and now Mosul, and after the Syrian war has reached its last but longest phase – a settlement between all the belligerents, has the plan of the Kurds changed? Well, it would appear that not only have they not changed, but they have acquired an even more worrisome character than one could have perviously imagined. What does this mean?

Thus, the reader is advised to now spend some time reading [this article](#) written by Elijah Magnier, who compiled his own primary research, the sources of which are based in the command rooms in Syria/Iraq/Iran/Kurdistan.

Do you – the reader – notice a theme? Other than Israel (or the pre-1948 founders of the “promised land” concept) seemingly being behind most projects that aim to partition the Middle East and remove undesirable-for-them leaders, what should immediately jump out from historical memory is the similarities between the Kurds in 2017 and the arab tribes in 1918.

Besides being involved in removing the Kaiser, who wanted to build a railway trade network from Berlin to Baghdad and beyond, the British Empire also had its eye on the vast oil riches in the Middle East. In 1916 Britain signed a diplomatic accord with France, Italy, and Tsarist Russia. This is indeed known as the “[Sykes-Picot Agreement](#)”, which was nothing other than the looting of Mesopotamia’s resources. In order to implement this plan, Britain transferred over 1,500,000 troops from the European front to the vicinity of the Ottoman Empire. London justified this move with the excuse “*we need to ensure the transfer of Russian grain through the Dardanelles and more manpower in general*”.

By 1918 the British troops were still stationed in the Eastern theatre, and this temporary transfer was starting to look like a permanent occupation. As the British landed blow after blow on the Turkish Empire, the French felt betrayed by this move, as it weakened their

ability to fight the Kaiser. One million killed and two million wounded troops later, and Paris began to look like total pushovers. Following the Russian revolution of 1917, the details of this once secret “Sykes-Picot” Agreement were revealed, and it became known that France had negotiated concessions with Britain in the form of a slice of the occupied Ottoman lands (area “A” of the Sykes-Picot Agreement, which is modern day Syria and Lebanon). The assigned role of land protectorate to France hoped to dupe the arab tribes in the region into compliance in exchange for “independence” from Turkey. Area “B” of the Agreement – modern day Iraq, Kuwait, and Jordan – was supposed to be given to Britain. Italy and Tsarist Russia would promised other peripheral areas, such as the Turkish coast and islands.



After World War 1 the notorious “Lawrence of Arabia”, who was tasked with gaining the external support of the Hashemite Emir of Mecca for London’s land grab, admitted that Britain indeed planned to dupe not only the French troops, but also the leaders of arab tribes in the region into fighting for the British crown in order to usurp the Ottoman ruling power:

“I risked the fraud on my conviction that Arab help was necessary to our cheap and speedy victory in the East, and that better we win and break our word, than lose ... The Arab inspiration was our main tool for winning the Eastern war. So I assured them that England kept her word in letter and spirit. In this comfort they performed their fine things; but of course, instead of being proud of what we did together, I was continually and bitterly ashamed.”

Thomas Edward Lawrence, “Seven Pillars of Wisdom”. London: Cape, 1935, page 24.

After the plans were revealed and were no longer secretive, a new French-British declaration was issued, which strived for

“the complete and definite emancipation of the peoples so long oppressed by the Turks, and the establishment of national governments and administrations deriving their authority from the initiative and free choice of the indigenous populations”.

In 2017 the Kurdish people are willing to fall for the same trick used in 1918.

As is said – the rest is history. And it would appear that not only does history repeat itself, but with each repetition the consequences become more and more grave. In 2017 the Kurdish people are willing to fall for the same trick used in 1918. The use of the expression “fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me” may seem harsh in this context, as it is unfair to bracket all Kurdish people with the leadership of the YPG and PKK, but do the Kurds really expect the magic “Rojava” paradise to drop from the heavens just because America and friends sent their butchers to further carve up the already carved up Middle East? Is becoming cannon fodder for yet another illegal US military base the future the 20+ million Kurds envisaged? If so, then they can’t say that they weren’t warned...

Ollie Richardson is a Paris-based geopolitical analyst.

[**Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page**](#)

[**Become a Member of Global Research**](#)

Articles by: [Ollie Richardson](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca