

People's Daily criticizes US' double standard toward Mosul and Aleppo

The two ongoing battles in the Middle East, namely Mosul offensive and Aleppo strike, actually share some common features, but driven by its intention to pursue self-interest, the West, represented by the US, has adopted double standard toward the two conflicts, the People's Daily said in a commentary published on Thursday under the byline of Zhongsheng.

The following is the translation of the article:

Two battles have erupted in the Middle East, namely Mosul offensive launched by the Iraqi government and Aleppo strike by Syrian government. Based on an analysis, it's easy to find similarities between the two wars.

The two cities are both second-largest in their countries with over one million populations. The Islamic State occupying Mosul and the Al-Nusra Front holding Aleppo have both been listed as terrorist organizations by the UN. In addition, both battles are military actions launched by governments to restore their lost territories with the support of big powers.

However, the Western world, represented by the US, holds completely different attitudes toward the two wars.

On one hand, it has sent troops to Mosul to fight against terrorism, and on the other, it is obstructing the strike on Aleppo and defends Al-Nusra Front. What's worse, citing connection between Syrian opposition and the terrorist organizations as an excuse, it impeded the counter-terrorism efforts of Russia and Syria, and even accused the two countries of human rights violations.

Pushed by Western countries in the name of human rights, the UN Human Rights Council has voted to start an independent special inquiry into the strikes on Aleppo, an attempt to prevent Russia and Syria from recovering the city.

Apparently, interests are the drivers of the US' double standard toward two battles. The mess in today's Iraq, a leftover of the US invasion, is a hot potato for Uncle Sam in the Middle East. Given the huge involvement of the US government, the country's credibility would be questioned both domestically and internationally if chaos in Iraq continues.

Therefore, the US places considerable emphasis on the Iraqi counter-terrorism campaign. Commentators pointed out that by supporting the Mosul attack of Iraqi government at this very time, Barack Obama can also solicit votes for the Democratic Party in the US elections.

When it comes to the Syrian crisis, the US and its Western allies set the resignation of Bashar Assad as a precondition of settlement and even present his stepping down as "political correctness". But as a matter of fact, such requirement has impeded the effective resolution of the crisis.

In terms of the geopolitical game, as the US' calculation in the Middle East was disrupted by Russia's aggressive intervention, the superpower would certainly make a counterbalance when devising its Syrian policy.

The current strategic deployment on the battleground of Mosul apparently is effective in wiping out the terrorists, but the latter may flee to Syria if the way to the west is not effectively blocked. Russia and Syria have already warned on this.

The Syrian crisis is more than a conflict between government's determination to maintain order and the public's demand for reforms, and involves national contradictions, religious conflicts, terrorism, and geopolitical game of big powers.

The Aleppo war, for example, is also a wrestle between Russia and the US, and Mosul battle cannot deny its relation with Syrian crisis. If major powers continue to play such games, it would be more difficult to seek a final settlement, and the innocent Syrian people will be the real victims of the endless tug of war.