

Syrian Peace Deal: UN's Cloak to NATO's Dagger

By [Tony Cartalucci](#)

Global Research, April 09, 2012

landdestroyer.blogspot.com 9 April 2012

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

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

Turkey begins fabricating “cross border” incidents to justify Brookings prescribed “safe havens” inside Syria.

From the very beginning, US policy makers admitted that Kofi Annan’s “peace mission” to Syria was nothing more than a ruse to preserve NATO’s proxy forces from total destruction and create “safe havens” from which to prolong the bloodshed. It was hoped that with established “safe havens” in Syria, protected by Turkish military forces (Turkey has been a NATO member since 1952) violence and pressure verses the Syrian government could be perpetually increased until it finally collapsed and the carving up of Syria could commence.



US foreign-policy think-tank, Brookings Institution has blueprinted designs for regime change [in Libya](#) as well as [both Syria](#) and [Iran](#). In their latest report, “[Assessing Options for Regime Change](#)” it is stated (emphasis added):

“An alternative is for diplomatic efforts to focus first on how to end the violence and how to gain humanitarian access, as is being done under Annan’s leadership. This may lead to the creation of safe-havens and humanitarian corridors, which would have to be backed by limited military power. This would, of course, fall short of U.S. goals for Syria and could preserve Asad in power. From that starting point, however, it is possible that a broad coalition with the appropriate international mandate could add further coercive action to its efforts.” -[page 4, Assessing Options for Regime Change, Brookings Institution](#).

Saving Syria: Assessing Options for Regime Change

Daniel Byman, Michael Dees, Kenneth Pollack, and Salwan Shakab

SYRIA IS TRAPPED ON A CRUMBLING PRECIPICE, and however it might fall will entail significant risks for the United States and for the Syrian people.

The brutal regime of Bashar al-Assad is employing its loyal military forces and sectarian thugs to crush the opposition and reassert its tyranny. Even if Bashar falls, Syria may not be out of the woods: an increasingly likely alternative to the current regime is a bloody civil war similar to what we saw in Lebanon, Bosnia, Congo, and most recently in Iraq. The horrors of such a war might even exceed the brutal repressions of Assad's control, and would cause spill-over into Syria's neighbors—Turkey, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, and Israel—that could be disastrous for them and for American interests in the Middle East.¹

But the unrest in Syria, which is now entering its second year, also offers some important opportunities, ones that would come from the fall of the regime of Bashar al-Assad, whose family has ruled the country with an iron grip for over forty years. Syria is Iraq's oldest and most important ally in the Arab world, and the Iranian regime has doubled down on Assad, providing him with financial aid and military support to shore up his regime. Assad's departure would deal a significant blow to Tehran, further isolating it at a time when it has few friends in the region or the world. In addition, Damascus is resolute in its hostility toward Israel, and Assad's regime is also a longtime supporter of terrorist groups like Hezbollah and Hamas, and has at times aided al-Qaida terrorists and former regime

donors in Iraq. The regime's collapse, therefore, could have significant benefits for the United States and its allies in the region.

Actually ousting Assad, however, will not be easy. Although the Obama administration has for months called for Assad to go, every policy option to remove him is flawed, and some could even make the situation worse—seemingly a recipe for inaction. Doing nothing, however, means standing by while Assad murders his own people, and Syria plunges into civil war and risks becoming a failed state. Already the violence is staggering: as of March 2012, at least 8,000 Syrians have died and thousands more have been arrested and tortured in trying to topple the regime. At the same time, Syria is fragmenting. The Syrian opposition remains divided, and the Free Syrian Army is more a brand than a meaningful, unified force. Al-Qaida is urging fighters to join the fray in Syria, and sectarian killings and atrocities are growing. Should the violence continue or intensify, Syria's neighbors may increase their meddling, and instability could spread, further weakening already-fragile neighbors like Iraq and Lebanon.

So to protect U.S. interests, Assad cannot triumph. But a failed Syria, one wracked by civil war, would be just as bad. Thus, U.S. policy must walk this tight-rope, trying to remove Assad, but doing so in a way that keeps Syria as much as possible capable of policing its borders and ensuring order at home. At the end of the day, however, removing Assad may not be viable

Image: Also out of the Brookings Institution, Middle East Memo #21 “[Assessing Options for Regime Change \(.pdf\)](#),” makes no secret that the humanitarian “responsibility to protect” is but a pretext for long-planned regime change.

....

And while “peace” was being peddled by Kofi Annan, the US, UK, France, and members of the West’s proxy Arab League simultaneously called for Assad to stand down and withdraw troops from secured cities while openly declaring that arms and cash would continue to flow to the rebels. The “Friends of Syria” summit would even ludicrously declare [that “wages would be paid](#) to rebels to continue their battle to overthrow Syrian President Bashar al-Assad. Clearly the label “peace deal” is inappropriate for a proposal that seeks to empower and indeed see one side prevail militarily over another whose hands are purposefully tied. It is an unconditional surrender to foreign-funded terrorists simply labeled as a “peace deal.”

The Brookings Institution’s “safe havens” and “humanitarian corridors” are meant to be established by NATO-member Turkey, [who has been threatening to partially invade Syria for weeks](#) in order to accomplish this. And while Turkey claims this is based on “humanitarian concerns,” [examining Turkey’s abysmal human rights record](#) in addition to its own ongoing genocidal campaign against the Kurdish people both within and beyond its borders, it is clear they are simply fulfilling the agenda established by their Western patrons on Wall Street and in the city of London.



Photo: Turkish tanks entering Iraq to raid Kurdish towns and hunt suspected rebels in 2008. More recently, Turkey has been [bombing "suspected" rebel bases](#) in both Turkey and Iraq, as well as [conducting mass nationwide arrests](#). Strangely, as Turkey verifiably does what Libya's Qaddafi and Syria's Assad have been accused of doing, in all of their hypocrisy, [are now calling for a partial invasion of Syria](#) based on "humanitarian concerns."

....

Now, Turkey is fabricating stories involving Syrian troops "firing across" the Turkish-Syrian border. [The New York Times published these bold accusations](#) before admitting further down that "it was unclear what kind of weapons caused the injuries on Sunday around six miles inside Turkish territory," and that "there were conflicting accounts about the incident." As are all the accusations used by NATO, the UN, and individual member states to justify meddling in Syria's affairs, these tales involve [hear-say from the rebels themselves](#).

It is clear that Turkey, NATO, and the UN are attempting to set the pretext for the establishment of "safe havens" and "humanitarian corridors" intended to circumvent the UN Security Council which has seen attempts to green-light military intervention vetoed twice by Russia and China. As the UN "peace deal" deadline of April 10 comes and goes, we can expect an ever increasing din of propaganda purporting Syrian violations against Turkish sovereignty, the continued propaganda campaign accentuating the "victimization" of NATO's death squads, and the public roll-out of Brookings' Turkish established "safe haven" within Syrian territory.

...

The UN "peace deal" was a rouse from the beginning. The West has no intention of leaving Syria intact and will seek all means by which to prevail in toppling the government, carving up the country along sectarian lines, plunging it into perpetual violence as it has Libya, and moving next toward Iran. While it is essential to expose the truth behind Syria's unrest, is also important to [identify the corporate-financier interests](#) driving this nefarious agenda [and boycott them entirely](#) while [seeking out viable local solutions](#) to support instead. If none exist, it is our duty to use our time, money, attention, and resources to create such alternatives instead of perpetuating the self-serving agenda unfolding before us.

Ultimately it is "we the people" paying into this current paradigm that allows it to continue moving forward, therefore it by necessity must be "we the people" who undermine and ultimately replace it.



[SYRIA: NATO's Next "Humanitarian" War?](#)

ONLINE INTERACTIVE I-BOOK

- by Prof. Michel Chossudovsky - 2012-03-11

ONLINE INTERACTIVE I-BOOK. The insurgency in Syria is based on the "Libya Model": it is integrated by mercenaries and Al Qaeda affiliated paramilitary brigades supported by British, French and Turkish Special Forces...

The original source of this article is landdestroyer.blogspot.com

Copyright © [Tony Cartalucci](http://TonyCartalucci.com), landdestroyer.blogspot.com, 2012

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Tony Cartalucci](#)

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