

# The Syria-Iran-Turkey Triangle: A New War Scenario in the Middle East

By [Global Research](#)

Global Research, November 27, 2011

[World Bulletin](#) 24 November 2011

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

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [IRAN: THE NEXT WAR?, SYRIA](#)

*While there were good connections and relations between Syria and Turkey only a year ago, today we began to talk different scenarios about the NATO intervention led by Turkey against Syria.*

Most commentators suggest that Syria came to the end of the road. Interestingly, old-friend Turkey is among the states which raise their loud voices against the Syrian Assad regime. "Our wish is that the Assad regime, which is now on a knife-edge, does not enter this road of no return, which leads to the edge of the abyss," Turkish prime minister, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, said. "No regime can survive by killing or jailing. No one can build a future over the blood of the oppressed."

While there were good connections and relations between Syria and Turkey only a year ago, today we begin to to talk about different scenarios about NATO intervention led by Turkey against Syria.

Although the Turkish position is being portrayed as a defender of oppressed Syrian people in the world media, there are some questions which cannot be answered independently of war scenarios led by the U.S. against Iran.

Today, we will try to look at the roots of Turkey's position on events in Syria and its connection with the plans of global actors on the Middle East and new war scenarios in the region.

Looking at the Syrian Case from Different Viewpoints...

In this analysis, we do not talk about the oppressions of Assad regime. It is true that Bashar Al-Assad is a dictator and oppressor president and also unhesitatingly, Syrian people need to live in better conditions. Additionally, it is not possible to approve any pressure and oppression against the Syrian people. All things which are said in this issue are true...

But, we want to look at the big-not small- picture of the Syrian case in the light of new plans on Middle East. As Michel Chossudovsky, from the Centre for Research on Globalization, says, "While the Syrian regime is by no means democratic, the objective of the US-NATO Israel military alliance is not to promote democracy. Quite the opposite, Washington's intent is to eventually install a puppet regime."

In "Winning Modern Wars" General Wesley Clark states the following:

“As I went back through the Pentagon in November 2001, one of the senior military staff officers had time for a chat. Yes, we were still on track for going against Iraq, he said. But there was more. This was being discussed as part of a five-year campaign plan, he said, and there were a total of seven countries, beginning with Iraq, then Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Iran, Somalia and Sudan.”

After we read these sentences, it is required for us to think again about all the Middle Eastern developments and events. The Syrian case is not exception...

According to Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya, from the Centre for Research on Globalization, “Damascus has been under pressure to capitulate to the edicts of Washington and the European Union. This has been part of a longstanding project. Regime change or voluntary subordination by the Syrian regime are the goals. This includes subordinating Syrian foreign policy and de-linking Syrian from its strategic alliance with Iran and its membership within the Resistance Bloc.”

“War preparations to attack Syria and Iran have been in ‘an advanced state of readiness’ for several years,” says Michel Chossudovsky. “The July 2006 bombing of Lebanon was part of a carefully planned ‘military road map’. The extension of ‘The July War’ on Lebanon into Syria had been contemplated by US and Israeli military planners. It was abandoned upon the defeat of Israeli ground forces by Hezbollah.”

On the other hand, according to Chossudovsky, “the road to Tehran goes through Damascus. A US-NATO sponsored war on Iran would involve, as a first step, a destabilization campaign (‘regime change’) including covert intelligence operations in support of rebel forces directed against the Syrian government.” Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya also supports Chossudovsky’s argument in a detailed manner. Nazemroaya says:

“The events in Syria are also tied to Iran, the longstanding strategic ally of Damascus. It is not by chance that Senator Lieberman was demanding publicly that the Obama Administration and NATO attack Syria and Iran like Libya. It is also not coincidental that Iran was included in the sanctions against Syria. The hands of the Syrian military and government have now been tied internally as a new and broader offensive is being prepared that will target both Syria and Iran.”

In addition to them, Stephen Lendman’s approach is very helpful in order to understand the real picture in the Middle East:

Israel wants regional rivals removed. Washington and key NATO partners want independent regimes ousted, replaced with subservient ones.

At issue is establishing regional dominance. New targets can then confronted politically, economically, and/or belligerently.

Fabricated IAEA Iranian documents escalated tensions. Rhetorical saber rattling followed. Stiffer sanctions are threatened and perhaps war.

Syria’s been targeted for months. Libya’s insurgency was replicated. Street battles rage daily. Violence engulfs the country. Assad’s government is unfairly blamed. Washington’s dirty hands are at fault. So are Israel’s and other conspiratorial allies.

According to former UK official Alastair Crooke, there is a “great game” in the issue of Syria and Iran. “Regime change in Syria is a strategic prize that outstrips Libya – which is why Saudi Arabia and the west are playing their part.” he said. “(S)et up a hurried transitional council as sole representative of the Syrian people, irrespective of (its legitimacy); feed in armed insurgents from neighboring states; impose sanctions that will hurt the middle classes; mount a media campaign to denigrate any Syrian efforts at reform; try to instigate divisions within the army and the elite; and ultimately President Assad will fall – so its initiators insist.”

Moreover, “suppose this was a Hollywood script conference and you have to pitch your story idea in 10 words or less. It’s a movie about Syria. As much as the currently in-research Kathryn Hurt LockerBigelow film about the Osama bin Laden raid was pitched as ‘good guys take out Osama in Pakistan’, the Syrian epic could be branded ‘Sunnis and Shi’ites battle for Arab republic’.” says Pepe Escobar. “Yes, once again this is all about that fiction, the “Shi’ite crescent”, about isolating Iran and about Sunni prejudice against Shi’ites.”

Last developments/events in Syria and the Turkish viewpoint...

“Washington and the E.U. have pushed Turkey to be more active in the Arab World. This has blossomed through Ankara’s neo-Ottomanism policy. This is why Turkey has been posturing itself as a champion of Palestine and launched an Arabic-language channel like Iran and Russia,” says Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya. He adds: “Ankara, however, has been playing an ominous role. Turkey is a partner in the NATO war on Libya. The position of the Turkish government has become clear with its betrayal of Tripoli. Ankara has also been working with Qatar to corner the Syrian regime. The Turkish government has been pressuring Damascus to change its policies to please Washington and appears to possibly even have a role in the protests inside Syria with the Al-Sauds, the Hariri minority camp in Lebanon, and Qatar. Turkey is even hosting opposition meetings and providing them support.”

Again, as Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya emphasizes: “The violence in Syria has been supported from the outside with a view of taking advantage of the internal tensions and the anger in Syria. Aside from the violent reaction of the Syrian Army, media lies have been used and bogus footage has been aired. Weapons, funds, and various forms of support have all been funnelled to elements of the Syrian opposition by the U.S., the E.U., the March 14 Alliance, Jordan, and the Khalijis. Funding has been provided to ominous and unpopular foreign-based opposition figures, while weapons caches were smuggled from Jordan and Lebanon into Syria.”

We, gradually, have seen the changing position of Turkey on Syria. Today, many Syrian opponents are organized in Turkey. Even, Syrian Deputy Foreign Minister Faisal al-Mikdad claimed that Ankara helped establish the opposition Syrian National Council (SNC) and Free Syrian Army (FSA). SNC recognition accompanied Syria’s suspension.

On the other hand, as Tony Karon says, “The current Turkish government sees itself as a bridge between the West and the Arab world, and even between the West and Iran. And it is also as a supporter of Arab democracy and the principle that conflicts must be resolved by political solutions that reflect the popular will. In Libya, despite its longstanding relationships with Colonel Gaddafi, it has pressed for a democratic political solution, remaining actively engaged with and support of the Benghazi-based opposition at the same time as maintaining its good offices with the regime. It has done the same with Syria, urging the regime to make democratic reforms, and criticizing the use of force against demonstrators

— and allow Syrian opposition groups to use Istanbul as a base from which to try and organize themselves.”

While Robert W. Meryy encourages Turkey for its role in the Middle East by saying that “Turkey should be encouraged to develop its role as Islamic interlocutor, perhaps even as something of a core state for Islam. It can help guide the Middle East through its current travails and struggles far better than the United States can. That’s because we live in the era of the Clash of Civilizations.”; Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya criticizes Turkey’s new role in the region:

Turkey is viewed in Washington and Brussels as the key to bringing the Iranians and the Arabs into line. The Turkish government has been parading itself as a member of the Resistance Bloc with the endorsement of Iran and Syria. U.S strategists project that it will be Turkey which domesticates Iran and Syria for Washington. Turkey also serves as a means of integrating the Arab and Iranian economies with the economy of the European Union. In this regard Ankara has been pushing for a free-trade zone in Southwest Asia and getting the Iranians and Syrians to open up their economies to it.

In reality, the Turkish government has not only been deepening its economic ties with Tehran and Damascus, but has also been working to eclipse Iranian influence. Ankara has tried to wedge itself between Iran and Syria and to challenge Iranian influence in Iraq, Lebanon, the Caucasus, and Central Asia. Turkey also tried to establish a triple entente between itself, Syria, and Qatar to push Syria away from Tehran. This is why Turkey has been very active vocally against Israel, but in reality has maintained its alliance and military deals with Tel Aviv. Inside Turkey itself, however, there is also an internal struggle for power that could one day ignite into a civil war with multiple players.

.....

This project to manipulate and redefine Islam and Muslims seeks to subordinate Islam to capitalist interests through a new wave of political Islamists, such as the JDP/AKP. A new strand of Islam is being fashioned through what has come to be called “Calvinist Islam” or a “Muslim version of the Protestant work ethic.” It is this model that is being nurtured in Turkey and now being presented to Egypt and the Arabs by Washington and Brussels.

This “Calvinist Islam” also has no problem with the “reba” or interest system, which is prohibited under Islam. It is this system that is used to enslave individuals and societies with the chains of debt to global capitalism.

Today, Libya’s model targets Syria. According to Israel’s Mossad-linked DEBKAFfile, NATO and Turkey plan intervening in Syria by enlisting and arming thousands of insurgent forces. Saudi Arabia, Lebanon’s Hariri March 14 Alliance, Jordan and Israel are involved. Washington’s in charge and orchestrating events.

On the other hand, Michel Chossudovsky claimed that “Turkey is a member of NATO with a powerful military force. Moreover, Israel and Turkey have a longstanding joint military-intelligence agreement, which is explicitly directed against Syria.” He adds:

...A 1993 Memorandum of Understanding led to the creation of (Israeli-Turkish) ‘joint committees’ to handle so-called regional threats. Under the terms of the Memorandum, Turkey and Israel agreed ‘to cooperate in gathering intelligence

on Syria, Iran, and Iraq and to meet regularly to share assessments pertaining to terrorism and these countries' military capabilities.'

Turkey agreed to allow IDF and Israeli security forces to gather electronic intelligence on Syria and Iran from Turkey. In exchange, Israel assisted in the equipping and training of Turkish forces in anti-terror warfare along the Syrian, Iraqi, and Iranian borders.

As supportive information to this argument, Tony Karon says, "some analysts suggest there's already a tacit agreement among U.S. and Saudis that Turkey will take the lead in shaping any international response to the Syria crisis. The Israeli media has suggested that some in Washington see the breakdown between Turkey and Iran over Syria as an opportunity to draw Ankara back into the U.S.-Israeli camp on dealing with Iran.

Moreover, "There is increased talk of military pressure to come through arming members of the opposition to the Syrian regime — should it persist in its obstinacy and bloody repression — could lead to rebellion and a split within the Syrian army." says Raghida Dergham. "While NATO will not engage in airstrikes against the regime in Damascus — on par with its operations in Libya — the alliance may provide financial support and armaments to the dissidents through Turkey in support of ground operations, not air strikes, should the regime continue with its military approach. The countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) may also follow suit. Last week, the GCC countries said they were running out of patience with the Syrian regime and began a wider effort in close collaboration with Turkey. This has made Iran increasingly concerned, perhaps even irate as well — something which everyone is now closely observing to see how it shall be translated on the ground in Syria, Lebanon and Iraq as well."

Iran-Turkey rivalry in the Middle East and the Syrian case...

"With the 'Arab Spring', Iran started to see Turkey as the major obstacle/rival before its regional policy," says Associate Professor Mehmet Sahin. "The main reason of the fact that Iran is uncomfortable with Turkey is Turkey's increasing influence on the region. It should not be overlooked that Iran came first among the countries following the Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's visits to Egypt, Tunisia, Libya within the scope of the 'Arab Spring' tour. As long as Turkey is effective in the region, Iran draws away from the region. "

As a parallel comment, Tony Karon said that "even while Turkey has distanced itself from the U.S. strategy of isolating and pressuring Iran over its nuclear program, Tehran and Ankara are also rivals for influence in the wider Middle East."

We can see this rivalry between Turkey and Iran in the Syrian case again. In the comment of Turkey's Hurriyet Daily News, it is said that "It is no secret that Turkey and Iran have a different approach toward the Arab Spring and especially on its effects on Syria. After Iraq and Afghanistan, Syria has become another regional issue where Ankara and Tehran follow diverging policies."

On the other hand, according to Tony Karon, "Turkey and Iran are Syria's key foreign allies, but they have very different relationships with Damascus — Tehran's being a long-established strategic alliance, while Ankara's is based on having lately emerged as the key source of trade and investment critical to Syria's prospects — and very different ideas on how the Assad regime should deal with the political crisis."

Today, we know that Iran feels discomfort from Turkey's hurtful policies on the Middle East. Whilst Iran was satisfied from Turkey, what has changed? According to the Economist, "Turkey's mollycoddling of the mullahs has angered America, most recently when Mr. Erdogan's government voted against imposing further sanctions on Iran at the United Nations last year. Turkey has since sought to make amends. It has agreed to NATO plans for a nuclear-defence missile shield that is clearly aimed at Iran. And after some dithering, it is co-operating with the alliance's military operations in Libya."

Because of this reality, Iran warns Turkey regularly. Associate Professor Mehmet Sahin categorizes Iranian authorities' criticism for Ankara:

According to the Iranian authorities;

1- Turkey wants to give an explicit message to Iran and Russian Federation by letting the deployment of NATO's missile shield with early warning radar system on her territories.

2- The fact that Turkey suggests countries such as; Egypt, Tunisia, and Libya a new regime model, based on a 'secular system', is an unexpected and unbearable situation, as the people in the region are Muslim.

3- Turkey which is under the pressure of the U.S., Israel, and Saudi Arabia, has been making its third strategic mistake by trying to liven up the protest demonstrations in Syria.

As the Iranian authorities made these statements above, they could not also stop accusing Turkey. In this context, they claim that Turkey follows its foreign policy 'in accordance with the directives of the U.S., as well as in order to protect the interests of the U.S. and to protect Israel.' They suggest that the main objective of the Missile Shield Project is to protect Israel. At the same time, the Iranian authorities, who made statements, underline that Turkey will face new problems in the region, particularly in terms of the commercial affairs with Iran, if she maintains her current foreign policy.

Iran-Syria Relations and the possibility of Major Regional War...

"And what do Iran's 'Revolutionary Guards' think of Syria? They believe that Assad's government constitutes an exception," says Wahied Wahdat-Hagh. "They claim that whilst almost all Arab governments have been touched by the change afoot in the Arab world, with most of these falling due to their 'pro-Western' policies, Syria is 'an exception.' Syria is counted amongst the 'ranks of resistance,' they say."

On the other hand, when Amir Taheri focuses on the details of Iran-Syria relations, he gives place to these sentences in his article:

Iran, however, stands dead set against the scheme. Over the last decade, Syria has become more of a client state than an ally.

Iran has kept Syria's moribund economy alive with frequent cash injection and investments thought to be worth \$20 billion, and also gives Syria 'gifts,' including weapons worth \$150 million a year. Tehran sources even claim that key members of Assad's entourage are on the Iranian payroll.

During Bashar's presidency, the Iranian presence has grown massively. Iran

has opened 14 cultural offices across Syria, largely to propagate its brand of Shiite Islam. Iran's Revolutionary Guard also runs a 'coordination office' in Damascus staffed by 400 military experts, and Syria is the only Mediterranean nation to offer the Iranian navy mooring rights.

The two countries have signed a pact committing them to 'mutual defense.' Syria and North Korea are the only two countries with which Iran holds annual conferences of chiefs of staff.

Moreover, "Under a mutual defense pact signed between Syria and Iran in 2005, Syria agreed to allow the deployment of Iranian weapons on its territory. On June 15, 2006, Syria's defense minister, Hassan Turkmani, signed an agreement with his Iranian counterpart for military cooperation against what they called the 'common threats' presented by Israel and the United States. 'Our cooperation is based on a strategic pact and unity against common threats,' said Turkmani. 'We can have a common front against Israel's threats,'" says Mitchell Bard. He also looks at the strategic importance of Syria for Iran in his article:

Syria harbors in Damascus representatives of ten Palestinian terrorist organizations including Hamas, Islamic Jihad, the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP), and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine all of which are opposed to advances in the peace process between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. These groups have launched terrible attacks against innocent Israeli citizens, which have resulted in hundreds of deaths. Syria also supports the Iranian-funded Hezbollah.

For more than 30 years, Lebanon was essentially controlled by Syria. With Syrian acquiescence, Lebanon became the home to a number of the most radical and violent Islamic organizations. Hezbollah (Party of God), in particular, has been used by the Syrians as a proxy to fight Israel.

Today, we began to talk about the elimination of these two allies. Although some observers only focuses on the Syria, many of them indicate "regional war". In this regional war, Iran will be main target. According to Austin Bay, the civil war has now expanded into a twilight regional war between Iran and NATO, with Turkey as NATO's frontline actor.

As a parallel comment, "The involvement of Iran, Turkey, Saudia Arabia, and other Gulf states has turned the Syrian uprising from an internal event - resulting from mass poverty, oppression, and a lack of economic and political future - into a potential regional war." says Zvi Bar'el. "Syria, whose regional strategic importance is based less on oil and natural resources, and more on its strong relationship with Iran and ability to intervene in Iraqi affairs, has been able to prevent the establishment of a military front against it. As opposed to the immediate international consensus that allowed for a military offensive in Libya, there has been no initiative to promote a similar UN Security Council in regards to Syria."

On the other hand, "All the ingredients for a conformation led by the U.S. against Iran exist," says Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya. "Iranophobia is being spread by the U.S., the E.U., Israel, and the Khaliji monarchies. Hamas has been entangled into the mechanisms of a unity government by the unelected Mahmoud Abbas, which would mean that Hamas would have to be acquiescent to Israeli and U.S. demands on the Palestinian Authority. Syria has its hands full with domestic instability. Lebanon lacks a functioning government and Hezbollah is increasingly being encircled."

Today, we are hearing some allegations in order to aim Iran at the target. Necessarily, we are thinking that while Syria is second target, the main target is Iran in the Middle East?

Wayne Madsen's comments approve our argument: "Israel's strategy is to make certain that its plans to attack Iran's nuclear facilities and, perhaps other targets, meet no opposition from diplomatic circles in the United States... Israel has placed its own interests well beyond and in contravention of those of the United States."

He also mentions a polarization between regional powers as a component part of this puzzle:

"Countries in Asia are scrambling to join the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) as full members. Confronted by a belligerent United States, NATO, and Israel intent on toppling the governments of Syria and Iran, the economic, cultural, and de facto collective security pact that comprises Russia, China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan announced after its prime ministers' summit in St. Petersburg that SCO would soon be opening its doors for full membership for Pakistan, Iran, and India. The Asian nations want to freeze the United States out of interference in Asia."

Moreover, "The structure of military alliances respectively on the US-NATO and Syria-Iran-SCO sides, not to mention the military involvement of Israel, the complex relationship between Syria and Lebanon, the pressures exerted by Turkey on Syria's northern border, point indelibly to a dangerous process of escalation," says Michel Chossudovsky. "Any form of US-NATO sponsored military intervention directed against Syria would destabilize the entire region, potentially leading to escalation over a vast geographical area, extending from the Eastern Mediterranean to the Afghanistan-Pakistan border with Tajikistan and China."

### Syria and the Iran Factor

If we attach the excuses against Iran to this polarization process, it can be more easily to read this picture...

According to Wayne Madsen, "Israel, using its agents of influence in the UN delegations of the United States, Britain, Germany, Canada, Sweden, and the Netherlands, has ensured that International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Director General Yukiya Amano has tainted his agency's report on Iranian nuclear developments in a manner that would have never been tolerated by his predecessor, Mohammed ElBaradei. Amano certainly took no interest in the fact that his own nation, Japan, was secretly producing nuclear weapons at the Fukushima nuclear complex in contravention of IAEA rules. The aftermath of the destructive earthquake in Japan laid open the secret work going on at Fukushima. Amano is perfectly willing to act as a cipher for Israel and the Israel Lobby in 'discovering' IAEA violations by Iran."

On the other hand, giving an ear to Pepe Escobar about the producing fabrication causes in order to aim Iran at the target can be very helpful:

It's Christmas in October – as the United States government has just handed it the perfect gift; in the excited words of US Attorney General Eric Holder, "A deadly plot directed by factions of the Iranian government to assassinate a foreign ambassador on US soil with explosives."

....

The plot is very handy to divert attention from Saudi Arabia as the beneficiary of a multi-billionaire US weapons sale. And also very handy to divert attention from Holder himself – caught in yet another monstrous scandal, on whether he told lies regarding Operation Fast and Furious (no, you can't make this stuff up), a federal gun sting through which no less than 1,400 high-powered US weapons ended up, untracked, in the hands of – you guessed it – Mexican drug cartels. Seems like the Fast and the Furious franchise is the entertainment weapon of choice across all levels of the US government.

Washington wants to 'unite the world' against Iran ('world' meaning the North Atlantic Treaty Organization – NATO) and is graphically threatening to take Iran to the United Nations Security Council – all over again.

So let's anxiously wait for a hushed R2P ("responsibility to protect") resolution ordering NATO to establish a no-fly zone over every House of Saud prince across the world. A resolution which would be interpreted as a NATO mandate to bomb Iran into regime change. Now that's a script you can believe in.

In recent days, Turkey sends severe messages to Syria. Do this mean that Turkey preferred to be on America and NATO's side in this polarization war in the region?

The Turkish government said it was suspending joint oil exploration and considering stopping electricity supplies to its neighbor. What does it mean for Turkey's position?

As Tony Karon says, "Turkey fears Syria being turned into another sectarian quagmire on the same lines as Iraq, but it's not following the line of its BRIC allies — Russia, China, Brazil, India and South Africa — at the U.N."

"Turkey's new approach to Syria also has the potential to create tension with Iran in the medium term," says Nihat Ali Ozcan. "A possible shift of power will end the role of Syria as the 'strategic ally' of Iran; which will in turn assign a partial responsibility for such an outcome to Turkey."

Additionally, Kaveh L Afrasiabi warns Turkey about its policies against Iran and Russia: "As Turkey's principal energy partners, Russia and Iran provide roughly 70% of Turkey's energy imports, yet both Tehran and Moscow are about to send Ankara the chills of negative reactions if Turkey goes ahead with its threat of sanctions on Syria. Already, Turkey's embrace of the bid by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to station an anti-missile radar on its territory has angered both Russia and Iran."

And he adds: "Turkey is bound to lose a great deal of its appeal as conflict mediator in the region if it continues to alienate neighbors like Iran and Syria by pursuit of regime change in Damascus. This is in light of its willingness to host Syrian opposition groups which are now setting up shop in Turkey for a Libya-style transitional government, thus overlooking the major differences between Libya and Syria."

In contrast to Nihat Ali Ozcan and Kaveh L Afrasiabi's comments, Barçın Yinanç looks at the issue from a some different perspective. "While the AKP has burned most of the bridges with the Bashar al-Assad regime, it seems that its stance on Iran has not yet been affected," she said. Yinanç adds:

News about a possible Israeli attack on Iran, triggered by the U.N. nuclear watchdog's report due to be released this week, will turn eyes to Turkey, whose policies in the recent past have been in favor of Iran when it came to efforts to increase international pressure on Tehran.

Now that the regional rivalry between Turkey and Iran has intensified, will Turkey change its stance on Iran? Will it make Turkey happy to see that international pressure intensifying on the country, prompting fresh sanctions? Is a military strike on Iran the worst option as far as Turkey's interests are concerned?

....

It looks like Turkey is not going to deviate from this stance, even if Iran's role in the Arab Spring increasingly conflicts with Turkey's interests. Or at least one can say that Iranian actions have not come to such a point of damaging Turkish interests that they would prompt Ankara to change its stance on the nuclear issue. After all, Turkish-Iranian history has been about avoiding open hostilities despite intense regional rivalry behind the scenes.

....

The realignment of Turkey's policies with those of the Western bloc during the Arab Spring must have eased Western concerns that Turkey has been leaning too much in favor of Iran. Yet, does Davutoglu believe he still has the trust of the Iranians and does he believe he still has influence over Iran due to his personal relations? Will he again consider the conditions appropriate enough to step in? This remains to be seen.

Conclusion...

As Robert Dreyfuss emphasizes:

The New York Times carries a piece titled: "U.S. Tactics in Libya May Be a Model for Other Efforts." By model, of course, they mean the mobilization of lethal force, including coordinated bombing attacks and precision missile strikes, tied closely to rebel military tactics, jointly run by the United States and NATO. In it, President Obama's advisers—including Ben Rhodes, the humanitarian interventionist hawk who supported the U.S. war in Libya—suggest that the Libyan action might easily be applied elsewhere. "How much we translate to Syria remains to be seen," says one adviser, anonymously. And the Times notes:

"The very fact that the administration has joined with the same allies that it banded with on Libya to call for Mr. Assad to go and to impose penalties on his regime could take the United States one step closer to applying the Libya model toward Syria."

And he concludes his article so: "It's fair to say that Syria and Iran are far more difficult cases than Libya, a empty desert nation whose civil conflict was likely not to spread. By contrast, war in Syria could affect Iraq, Turkey, Lebanon, Israel and Jordan, and war in Iran could have incalculable consequences from Pakistan and Afghanistan to the Persian Gulf. Still, you can already imagine the drumbeat from neocons and liberal interventionists that the United States cannot allow Syrians, or Iranians, to be massacred."

After looking at this big picture, it seems that the Syrian case is connection with broader

agendas. Here, it is required for Turkey to think its position on Syria again and again...

Although Turkey claims that it will not be a pawn for the regional war, its actions and comments say a different thing.

Today, the U.S., the West, and the NATO do not care about the future of Syrian people. Nor do they desire more democratic systems in the Middle East. Their only aim is to guarantee their oppression systems. If, today, Bashar Al-Assad says that O.K., I will abandon Iran, I will block Iran's passing weapons to Hezbollah and Palestinian groups, and also I want to cooperate with the U.S. and the West in the region after that; we will see that all these disinformation and manipulation processes will, gradually, be abandoned in the world media and psychological war against Syria will end. In the event of any changing in policies of Syria, both the U.S. and the West will keep their mouth shut about Assad's oppressions to his people...

So, Turkey backs the wrong horse again. What a shame!

The original source of this article is [World Bulletin](#)  
Copyright © [Global Research](#), [World Bulletin](#), 2011

---

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

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

Articles by: [Global Research](#)

**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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)  
[www.globalresearch.ca](http://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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)