

Is it an axis of war or peace?

Report by: Haytham Manna



Translated by: Nebras Dalloul

The Scandinavian Institute for Human Rights / Haytham Manna Foundation

MAI/2018

We sat in front of T.V waiting for US President Donald Trump's decision to withdraw from the P5+1 agreement on Iran's nuclear programme signed two years ago. No one was waiting for a balanced or rational speech. Despite his psychological and mental state, which precludes the prospect of well-calculated or far-sighted policies, the character of the American president always reminds us of the verse "But which is malice nothing emerges except sparsely." (7-58). We do not think anyone would have expected a lesson in peace building, protecting the environment and human rights ... the most logical question, perhaps, was how much foolishness and lies this person would resort to, in purpose to justify his position on the most important multilateral negotiations in recent decades. Because diplomacy gives what violence does not give, and negotiation is the best way to resolve conflicts between people.

The American president started his speech by saying: "The Iranian regime is the leading country in sponsoring terrorism. It exports dangerous missiles, ignites conflicts in the Middle East and supports agents and terrorist militias such as Hezbollah, Hamas, the Taliban and al-Qaeda."

What is Mr. Trump talking about? Hamas, which has not since its founding a single operation against the people and the interests of the US or the West at all? Does not he know, or ignore by well, that the only intervention out carried out by Hamas on non-Palestinian issue was in Syria by the wing of Khaled Meshaal in Doha, and that happened with an American satisfaction, hoping not to say " American sponsorship". The result was keeping this approach away from the Hamas leadership?

He talks about Hizbollah, which is part of the Trump's ally Government of Mr. Saad Hariri, and whose political wing maintains almost regular relations with most European states? In addition, Hizbollah achieved, two days before Trump's speech, good results in the Lebanese parliamentary election?

He also mentioned The Taliban, an organization which is recognized by only two world's States, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates? Taliban led to the displacement of 950 thousand Hazar Shiites to Iran, which resulted in seeing thousands of them being recruiting in the Fatimids Brigade within (the allied forces in the axis of Objection and Resistance) ...

He also talks about Al Qaeda, but we all remember the statements of Obama's Vice-president Joe Biden, Mrs. Hillary Clinton on the ambiguity of the US regarding this organization?

Days after the signing of the nuclear agreement, to be more specific: on 20th of July 2015, the UN Security Council unanimously adopted resolution No 2231 (2015). The official web site of the UN mentions in its preface: "The diplomatic efforts to reach a comprehensive and long-term solution appropriate to the Iranian nuclear issue culminated in the Comprehensive Action Plan of 14th of July 2015 by the Russian Federation, Germany, China, France, the United Kingdom, the High Representative of the European Union and the Republic of Iran "The resolution provided for the termination of the provisions of the previous Security Council resolutions on the Iranian nuclear issue ... The web site adds: Member States are obliged under Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations to accept and implement Security Council resolutions.
www.un.org/ar/sc/2231

Mr. Trump's name was not yet entered the American or international political dictionary as a decision- maker at the time. There were two opposing and critical positions to the agreement: First, the position of Israel's Prime Minister Netanyahu, and the second one was the position of Saudi Arabia.

It is necessary to recall and keep reminding these facts, in order to realize the size and the tragic of Trump's withdrawal decision.

But the United States, despite its internal crises and rampant problems, remains the world's first economic and military power. The Treasury Department and the Congress remain the most important international economic policeman. Therefore, we cannot turn a blind eye at the result of any decision of this kind, especially since this decision is the third one where the American president standing in the world's face, the whole world's face and not only the Iranian, or Arab, or European. The Trump's three decisions yet are, respectively: withdrawing from the Paris Climate Accord, moving the US Embassy to Jerusalem, and recently withdrawing from the Iranian nuclear agreement.

Vulgar eras give quasi vulgar ideologies, and the periods of decline give foolish leaders and stray electorate in both sight and vision ... therefore, the management to finish a historical era is considered one of the greatest tests for every State and society in order to survive geopolitically and strategically ... So, how France was lucky due to establishing the Fifth Republic headed by

Charles De Gaulle in order to manage the ending of colonial era, and how Russia was unlucky due to managing the ending of the Soviet era by an insane man like Boris Yeltsin.

The first half of the 21st century marks the end of the American financial and military empire. But, this US-led Global System will not fall or finish with a stroke or a heart attack, but with the cancer cells that America once created, that is exactly what forced the American thinker Immanuel Wallerstein to believe that what he calls World- System would be fallen before the second half of this century.

We witnessed, during this millennium's first decade, the domination of the so-called neoconservatives and neoliberals. George W. Bush's adventures in Afghanistan and Iraq were a vivid translation of the useless stickling and the belief that America was capable of doing whatever it wanted by deploying the US military and its allies into direct wars in two countries which basically have been war-ravaged states for three decades at the time. Perhaps, one of the main reasons for Obama's success in two presidential terms is the actual need for years of restoration of wounds and sores resulting from his predecessor administration's policies.

Worth to say, that nowadays American societies produce a lightweight and short-lived memory horizontal culture. One American ambassador was surprised when I told him about Trump's success before the US election results. He seemed upset because I told him that the reason lies in the superficiality of the political reasoning of the ordinary middle-class American, who is always possible target and an ideal fertile ground for processes of political deception, misleading and containment carried out by experienced lobbyists. Donald Trump was not a philosopher or scholar, and he came up with more ridiculous and trivial ideas than those of Muammar Gaddafi, but he played on the narcissistic wound of an empire in a state of contraction and retreat. So, He shortened his political project to one idea:

“Nothing matters, but the States and its power”

.... And that was enough for him to occupy the most dangerous geostrategic position in the world.

Most of America's European allies cannot keep up with this horrifying demagogic project. This political project of "America Great Again", finds its only world ally which is the Israeli far- right government headed by prime minister Netanyahu who is allowed to stay at office just by following reckless policies, in spite of corruption and ignobility. In addition to the Israel, there is also an old-fashioned kingdom belongs to an out-dated era, with ambitions of a young man with limited and little experience. In less than two years, this young man has dominated over the

military and economic institutions, but he is in sustainable need to the U.S and the West in order to confirmation and keeping his internal authority and regional role.

It is truly a turbulent tripartite axis but has not yet officially declared itself. This axis consists of: the most powerful State in the world (the United States), the only nuclear state in the Middle East (Israel) and the wealthiest kingdom in the region (Saudi Arabia). This axis considers Iran as the greatest Satan, so its mission is not only to strike the Iranian nuclear project and to limit the Iranian role in the region, but also to eliminate the Iranian regime before celebrating the 40th anniversary of ousting the Shah.

No matter how Israel proud of its military superiority, because the region has turned now into a large military and human arsenal ... and Netanyahu cannot establish the Greater Israel and ending the Palestinian case even if all the world's countries stand with him. What the Israeli right does not understand yet is that the Palestinian people are not groups of Red Indians that is easy to be massacred or confined to islands surrounded by barbed wire and walls, and that its civil and civilized struggle is a beacon for freedom and emancipation in the world. Therefore, we have only few idiot people who praise the Israeli aggression, like one of Nusra Front founders, and the mercenary scum in the Middle East, like that foreign minister who is called by the Bahrain's people as "the fat man of corruption", or some power and wealth new-comers in the Gulf who believe that Israeli consent is a necessary condition to stay in power; or in the scene, while they are mainly considered by their own people as a source of contempt and disdain.

Could the countries of such axis to launch a new war in an area where the military conflict has not ended yet in five countries (Somalia, Libya, Yemen, Syria and Iraq)? That while sensory indicators suggest that Iraq will be the first to be survives from this Holocaust. Iraq had suffered too much of its long war with Iran, and that followed by Saddam Hussein invasion of Kuwait, which in turn followed by imposing international sanctions that are the hardest in the UN's history, and then the occupation of US - British which is the worst and perhaps the last in the history of what is known as direct colonialism. And last but not least, the ISIS project in which all the regional and international hands were immersed, and the multinational black blood were mixed and plumbed by the European, American, Gulf, Maghreb and Asian into Mesopotamia and Syria, and ended up fulfilling the predict of the Egyptian thinker Faraj Foda, who once said:

"They will pay the price dearly, when they are despised by everyone, rejected by everyone, and chased by everyone." It is the time when the alliance of Astana (Turkey-Russia-Iran) is advancing within the Syrian equation, in addition to dismantling the so-called the "Friends of the Syrian

people". Also, Europe now is looking for the stability in Libya after it became, after the Libyan people, paying the bill of post-Gaddafi violence?

whatever the Saudi talks about victories in Yemen, it does not forget that the regions that it is fighting against, had triumphed before against Ottoman Empire, Nasirism amongst others who all failed to dominate over it ... not because it is invincible or because Iran provides them with missiles or experts to develop weapons, but because violence is at the core of its political and social mentality. Violence could be used to manage compromises and to pursue serious and firm negotiations and political solutions, but it is difficult to neutralize violence with violence except through genocide. When violence becomes a means and a target, both oppressor and oppressed become equal, the death to America versus the death to Iran, the believer and the unbeliever, the democratic and the dictatorial, So exactly here lies the loss of the country and the people.

The Gulf region cannot be considered a serious military and popular front for a full-scale war against Iran. The current Saudi perception of Gulf and Arab national security is based on a shallow hypothesis presented by some Muslim Brotherhood journalists since 2011, which concluded to considering the main enemy of Arabs is Iran, not Israel. This hypothesis necessarily means a state of schism between the discourse of political regimes and the spontaneous sense of the public "le bon sens". This public sees the slow destruction of the Palestinian existence, and sees itself, willingly or not, as the next victim for the Zionist project in the region. It also sees the American unconditional and blind support for this functional entity (Israel) as the reason behind the arrogance of discourse and practice, in addition to creating a state of superiority over its peoples and countries. It also prompts people to seek help from Turkey, Iran, Russia and China or any other who stands with the Palestinians in the face of the annihilation project against them as a people and a State.

Does a Gulf prince realize how much humiliation is applied on the Palestinian, Arab and human conscience, when Trump's daughter Ivanka (who converted to Judaism after marrying Jared Kushner, a US and Israeli citizen), and her husband were talking about freedom, democracy and human rights that bring together the Americans and the Israelis, while there were more than 60 martyrs had been killed during the celebration of the opening of the US embassy in Jerusalem, due to their participation in a public peaceful protest?

The internal Gulf situation

The Gulf Cooperation Council GCC states have tried to adopt a policy of coordination and cooperation in what is possible, without slogans or bidding. The results of this policy have been useful to various States. It is clear that the events of 11th, September, 2001 have contributed indirectly to the survival of the need for such cooperation despite all personal disputes between some of GCC's rulers. However, since 2011, this trajectory has been shaken, and all achievements became fragments.

The problem began in Bahrain, the most interactive Gulf country with people's civil and peaceful movement, due to the people's political maturity, and the authorities' drawing back, according to many indicators, regarding political openness in this century first decade. Saudi forces entered Manama, and the peaceful civil movement was hit, and activists and political and human rights groups were subjected to the biggest arrests, prosecutions and banning. The Bahraini opposition has accused of what it has always fight against: foreign interference "Iranian", sectarianism, and acts of violence. We can say that all the openness delivered to the society by the King of Bahrain has ended up as fragmentations in less than two years of systematic repression.

The perspective of the two Hamads (HBKh and HBJ) in Qatar was based on considering the peoples' movement that started from Tunisia, as an opportunity for the emirate to play the role of the main godfather in the Arab region. Their role in sponsoring the Arab coverage to the Nato intervention in Libya, gave them the Westerners' confidence, and the possibility of repeating the Libyan scenario in syria through their alliance with Sarkozy and Erdogan in addition to their relations network with Muslim Brotherhood and the Jihadist groups. But necessarily, the power arrogance is always blind... And with the accumulation of Qatar's follies, the US decided to transfer the Syrian file to the former Saudi ambassador to Washington, Bandar bin Sultan, who also played the Jihad card in Syria, raising the religious slogan: " One who help in equipping a jihadist invader, will win the same God's blessing given to invader himself " , so Bandar this way has repeated what the two Hamads of Qatar had begun, but in others methods and names ... Although the Western countries were directly supervising through the operations rooms, in southern Turkey and northern Jordan, on the issues of armament and military action, but they all failed to have a joint military force and a credible political leadership. That resulted in ending up with the dominance of the jihadist factions who their danger has spilled over into neighboring countries. That is all what has made the strategy of Change through Militarism to be buried in the mill of "War on Terrorism".

It is necessary to recall these facts to understand the background of the Saudi-Qatari dispute and the process of fragmentation of the GCC, which ended up with imposing sanctions on Qatar by four Arab states (Egypt, Bahrain, UAE and Saudi Arabia). It is ironic and embarrassing joke to remember that the same sanctions were imposed by Hamad bin Jassim on Syria from the Arab League headquarter in Cairo?

Saudi Arabia cannot tolerate any Qatari "heresy" during the process of rebuilding the power centres in Riyadh, nor can it allow any single GCC member to play individually, whether in the Yemeni war, internal changes, or confrontation with Iran. So, it is not exaggerated to use the term WAR by the two parties of the dispute, as there are many mixed families, science students, businessmen and tribes have become victims of this confrontation, just because they live in the wrong period and wrong geography etc.

The Crown Prince's talk about reform and future projects is not a useful medicine for youth engagement in the Kingdom, especially in the absence of a serious reform road map that should begin with the restoration of the bonds between the society and the authorities. The harsh repressive campaigns against human rights activists and the chronic fear of reviving a worthy civil society are sweepingly eroding some "progressive" decisions about modernity. It should be recalled, in this occasion, that the detainees number of human rights activists in Saudi Arabia, according to the PADDH, exceeds that in any Arab country, (1) and it is no coincidence that Bahrain is in the second place.

Today, we are witnessing a direct military war in Yemen, and another indirect with the State of Qatar. So, the question now is: Do the three Gulf States bear the consequences of a third war on the Iranian front? For whom and why?

Iran

The Iranian regime is neither an angel, nor a role model ... and although the "Islamic" countries, when they have a constitution, consider Islam as the religion of the State constitutionally. But, in addition and also constitutionally, the Iranian regime considers that the State has a sect and Vilayat-e Faqih (supreme religious leadership). Although Iran adopts the principle of election, this principle is getting more and more inefficient due to the role of the regime saving agencies and the powers of the supreme leader and the Revolutionary Guards. If we talk about a totalitarian system, in the scientific sense, Iran with North Korea may be the last two models that preserve the character of totalitarianism, that in the sense of Stalinist as in the sense sought by Abul A'la

Maududi, the preacher of the Pakistani Islamic League. With this datum, there is no doubt that any export or promotion of this model will pose a danger to democrats throughout the region.

Worth mentioning, that the Iranian state is a deep-rooted state in history and foundation. It is well known that one of the reasons for the success of the Abbasid caliphate was its dependence on "*Dihqan*", i.e., the cadres of the fading Sasanian empire ... In the last four decades, Iranian politics has not moved away from the concept of Iran's high interests, as like as Turkey's governments of Erdogan who never raise the banner of ideology when it becomes in contradiction with national interest. Therefore, Iran's foreign policy, since the presidency of Rafsanjani and Khatami, has been based on advanced knowledge capabilities regarding the international and regional situations. Those are the ones who fought the battle of nuclear agreement. Every observer remembers how the Salhi / Zarif team has been subjected to slanders and accusations by the Iranian hardliners.

It is also necessary to understand the fact that Iranian peoples are ancient deep-rooted peoples rich of historical experiences, like those of modern age: the constitutional movement more than a century ago, the national government of Mosaddegh more than sixty years ago, ousting the Shah nearly 40 years ago. Those national experiences have made the majority of Iranian people believe that the serious and successful change could not be a foreign-made.

In fact, considering Iran as a homogenous bloc, and its society as a fusible material within IRGC and Qasim Soleimani, is stupid and unreal consideration. So Anyone, who believe that the Iranian decision-making centres can shortened the people by the religious apparatus and shortened the State by Qum, he knows nothing about this country more than our knowledge of the Chinese language. Therefore, one cannot rely on some "political hatred" opposition which is looking for any Satan to help in ousting this regime, and perhaps this "political hatred" is one of the main reasons for centres of different forces and different trends to be in one alliance against the nature under the slogan of saving the country from chaos and destruction. The change in Iran will not be but internally according to the available facts, and any foreign intervention will give the *status quo* longer years to stay alive.

Since its defeat in Vietnam, the United States has never fought a single war against a strong country. And all its wars were after the targeted country reach to the degree of weakness and disintegration. The small island model of Cuba may is the best example of that? We are also no longer in the Six- or Twenty-Day War. Today, confrontation in Gaza or southern Lebanon, for

example, means only knowing just the war's beginning date. How the situation would be when confrontation with the Iranian State?

As for the Gulf States, they supported Saddam Hussein in his war against Iran. But later, they were subjected to a military attack by the government of Saddam Hussein when he occupied Kuwait, and the trauma effect of that occupation has not yet disappeared. It is worth mentioning that stability is a major reason for the prosperity of Dubai as a continental economic centre, and for the steadfastness of the GCC countries in the face of the economic and political crises that the eastern Mediterranean has experienced. Does The Gulf has the luxury of demolishing this advanced situation by entering into various forms of violence whirlpools , which have experienced before by the rest countries of the region, just for satisfying the Israeli far- right?

Recently, Trump has declared the economic war against Iran, and he is now preparing for an international alliance that reminds us of the Axis countries in World War II. As we mentioned 20 years ago in our report on sanctions on Iraq: "Economic sanctions have only succeeded in increasing the suffering of the ordinary people and improving the living of the dominating class in the countries where it was applied." So, in our opinion, the main questions posed by the current situation are:

1. Do the European countries have the capability to form a front for self-protection from Trump's policies? We say self-defence because the ongoing US policy has serious economic and geo-political consequences on the European continent itself. Can the European countries reject the US sanctions and its international influence which affect the European institutions and its contracts with Iran? Do the Europeans will, at least, defend the Security Council resolutions on the nuclear agreement, and thus limit the US withdrawal from the agreement with only consequences on the United States itself?
2. Does the current staff of President Trump (Michael Pompeo, John Bolton, Jared Kushner, Gina Haspel, James Matisse ...) able to fight for Trump's declared battles and ensure an institutional and popular support for it?
3. Does the Israeli military think that the war with Iran has the military and security feasibility and with guaranteed results?
4. Do this Axis States engage in a proxy war with Iran on Syrian soil? In other words, do these states come out of the consensus that reached at the Vienna Conference, regarding the need to

put an end to the Syrian wars, by involving in new adventures that extend the war for unknown years to come?

5. But the following is the biggest question: Does Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman raise the question of whether his tripartite partnership with Trump and Netanyahu is a stabilizing factor for the kingdom? Or it does put the Kingdom, the UAE and the rest of the Gulf in a new war cannon that will not mercy anyone, and it will not open, In any case, the doors of progress and stability for both the ruler and the people all over the region?

To answer the first question, it is necessary to recall the Bush / Cheney era in the first decade of this century. That time, the neo-conservatives have already preceded Trump administration regarding direct false talk about the rights, the freedoms and the "international legitimacy". In the first five years following the events of September 11, 2001, the US administration tore up or faced basic projects for the reformation of the United Nations institutions and the construction of "human security" and the construction of the International Criminal Justice. All that happened by terrorizing the world's governments and forcing it to accept the U.S demands. However, Those American demands were in fact endangering the global peace and security system:

- Issuing the two Security Council resolutions No's 1422 and 1487 in purpose of not prosecuting American peacekeeping workers for charges regarding war crimes and others.
- Committing war crimes and torture in Afghanistan, in addition to returning the drug cultivation in this country where it has reached the highest percentage since the exit of Soviet troops.
- Setting up secret prisons in Europe and the eastern Mediterranean, in addition to opening the famous Guantanamo detention camp.
- Signing bilateral agreements with States that have ratified the Statute of the International Criminal Court in purpose of not prosecuting or punishing Americans on its territory.
- Occupation of Iraq without any legal or moral cover, making the occupation as simple matters by Security Council resolution. More terrible than that, was the signing of Resolution 17 by Paul Bremer, the first ruler in Iraq, which puts the occupation forces above accountability and law in Iraq.
- Adhering to the rejection of formation an international committee to oversee the Internet at the information summit as an alternative to the domination of single country (U.S) over this sector.

- A decision by American advisers to put a specific definition of crime of torture to circumvent what the U.S had signed before, I mean The Convention against Torture: "For them, torture means to apply physical harm on a person in a way that lead to one of body's part to be disrupted or damaged. While there is no damage, breakdown or disruption of body's parts, so the means of interrogation used are not considered torture and do not violate any American or international law or any applicable treaties in this regard". And for the first time in modern US history, habeas corpus is suspended.
- The American administration is monitoring banking operations in 7800 banking institutions all around world.
- Imposing a resolution demanding full and accurate reports on the humanitarian and charitable societies in the Islamic world, which play the role that governments are supposed to play in the face of poverty and misery, that finally led to the closure of some that societies or freezing the fund.
- Imposing obligations on any non-governmental organization that receives American civil or governmental assistance not to deal with any party accused of terrorism by the US administration.
- Issuing decisions authorizing them to detain persons, extrajudicial, who are not of American nationality, and when they wish and without even providing evidence of their accusations.
- Direct or indirect control by prominent neo-conservative figures on the American delegation to the UN, the World Bank presidency and other organizations.

The United States paid a heavy economic and political price for this policy, which, for an example, put an end to the political future of the British Prime Minister Tony Blair who supported it. This policy also gave empowerment to the "jihadist" groups rather than curbing it, in addition to strengthening the Iranian role in Iraq and the return of the Russian federalism and China to play an important role internationally. Therefore, despite the absence of strong European leaders and the difficult European situation, the reflex of self-defence still exists. Today, it is difficult for the European countries to join a reckless US policy that affects not only Iran and Russia but also direct economic interests of the most important European countries. Donald Tusk may have put his finger on the wound when he said, "With friends like Trump, we do not need enemies."

For answering the second question, it is important to say that withdrawing from the nuclear agreement is not a thoughtful and in-depth strategic vision of President Trump; it was just a repayment of a loan that he had already received from three billionaires who had an active role in financing his presidential campaign (Sheldon Edelson, Bernard Marcos and Paul Singer). And that all Trumps' attempts to pass this deal smoothly to be popularly accepted did not work. As the American scholar Elie Clifton notes in his important article "Follow the Money" , the president rejected advice from important US institutions and figures, like: his defence secretary, the chairman of the congress' Foreign Affairs Committee Ed Royce (R-CA), in addition to three of Washington's most important European allies, while there is also nearly two-thirds of Americans believe the United States should not withdraw from the agreement, according to CNN website on Tuesday morning, the day Mr. Trump delivered his announcement. "

To date, Marcos and Edelson, members of the Likud-Republican coalition, have received huge revenues from their investments: a full-fledged US alliance behind Israel, moving the US embassy to Jerusalem, and the official ignore of the term "occupied territories" to describe the West Bank and East Jerusalem as steps forward to bury the two states solution.

It is necessary to recall Edelson's calls for the launch of a nuclear strike against Iran as a negotiating measure and the threat to bring down Tehran if Iran does not completely abandon its nuclear programme. During an interview with Fox Business in 2015, Bernard Marcus summed up his position on the nuclear agreement by saying "business with Satan." He explained: Iran is the devil.

Today, we should ask the next big question: Do the American business world, the non-Zionist pressure groups, the Pentagon and the deep American institutions, agree to be dragged behind such president's policy? Noticing that is very famous within American scholars to consider Trump as a personality of massive deviation. Or maybe there is a huge sector, looking at these reckless policies for a reason to be added to his sexual and personal scandals and political confusion in purpose of raising the issue of his eligibility to continue in leading the United States of America.

Reader must not be surprised when asking about the Israeli military establishment and its position. The military establishment in Israel is at the centre of the decision-making regarding all security and war matters. As Yitzhak Rabin summed up before he assumed the premiership: "There are issues that cannot be relied upon by the Knesset and political parties, these issues need professionals and specialists". Hard to go behind a corrupt prime minister, who basically came from outside the military establishment, in any adventure bears unfavourable

consequences, for not saying guaranteed results. In fact, many specialists in the Israeli military issues consider that the idea of a comprehensive war, necessarily long, is not an acceptable idea to the military leaders today.

In my opinion, it is still possible to see a proxy war taking place on the Syrian territory between Axis states and Iran. The future of Syria is not on the agenda of any of the three countries. The US administration is playing the card of its military presence east of the Euphrates to achieve the gains possible. The Saudi position is emotional and reaction. The position of the Israeli government is against any end to the conflict which could be resulted in returning Syria, no matter who the president is, again as a confrontation state.

When one official from the Army of Islam OAI told a Saudi security officer SSO about a draft agreement with the Russian side about Douma, the Saudi officer replied: "Fight as much as you can", OAI replied: "But the losses will be huge". "Whoever pays 500,000 martyrs can also pay 800,000," SSO replied. But such an opinion requires a Saudi position that exceeds \$ 1 million, as assistance to a dying Coalition, or the mobilization Saudi channels like al-Arabiya and Al-Hadath. So, have the human and financial costs of Saudi involvement in Syria been discussed?

1. From the moment the Axis states will be talking about the withdrawal of the Iranian and pro-Syrian forces from Syria, this withdrawal will be, for the Iranian side, as part of a comprehensive deal that should not be discussed without the American return to the nuclear agreement and the lifting of sanctions etc. it is not possible, due to the power struggle in Iran, to accept less than to put the issue on the table.

2- Sure, the betting on an Israeli comprehensive intervention is impossible. It is also sure that the cost of the American forces' presence east of the Euphrates after the elimination of ISIS, in alliance with the Kurdish People's Protection Units, puts these forces in direct confrontation, not only with the Syrian government and its allies, Arab tribes and Syrian military factions Pro-Turkey, but also with the Turkish army itself. The international and regional complicity with Operation Olive Branch opens the Turkish president's appetite for a wide-ranging operation that puts an end to the military control of the Ocalan followers on more than 400 kilometres of the Syrian-Turkish border.

3. There is no practical possibility of military intervention by any of the Arab Quartet countries (Egypt, Saudi Arabia, UAE, Bahrain) in the midst of a fierce war in Yemen, an internal confused situation in Bahrain, critical conditions in Saudi Arabia regarding internal power struggle within

the royal family, and internal Egyptian conditions that prevented before the Egyptian military participation in the Arab coalition In Yemen, so how to afford the Syrian wars!!

4. It is not due to their love to the Syrians, but the continuation of the war in Syria for many years to come means that the neighbouring countries, which have succeeded in ensuring minimal cohesion and internal security over the past seven years, have been put into insecure and unsafe consequences.

5- The last and most important question remains:

Will Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman ask the question of whether a tripartite partnership with Trump and Netanyahu is truly within what he calls The Arab National Security? Is it a stabilizing factor for the kingdom, or it does put the Kingdom, the Emirates and the rest of the Gulf States in a new war cannon that will not mercy anyone, and it will not open, In any case, the doors of progress and stability for both the ruler and the people all over the region?

Perhaps, this question needs a separate report that we are working on it.

1) The Association published a non-exhaustive list of human rights activists this morning including:

Walid al-Khair, Abdul Aziz al-Shubaili, Mohammed al-Qahtani, Abdullah al-Hamed, Fadhil al-Manasif, Sulaiman al-Rashudi, Abdul Karim al-Khader, Fawzan al-Harbi, Ra'if Badawi, Saleh al-Ashwan, Issam Kushk, Abdul Aziz Al-Shabaili, Mohammed Al-Otaibi, Abdullah Al-Atawi, Mohammed Al-Rabiah, Ibrahim Almdimeig, Jane Al-Hathloul, Aziza Al-Yousef, Iman Al-Nafjan and Nora Fakhri.

- 1) Eli Clifton, Follow The Money: Three Billionaires Paved Way For Trump's Iran Deal Withdrawal, May 8, 2018
<https://lobelog.com/three-billionaires-paved-way-for-trumps-iran-deal-withdrawal/>