

Turkey Attempts to Trigger a NATO-led War against Syria

Turkey fires rounds into Syria after unknown attackers fire mortars into Turkish border town.

By [Tony Cartalucci](#)

Global Research, October 04, 2012

[Land Destroyer](#)

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

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

After over a year [of harboring foreign terrorists](#) and supporting their operations near and across the Turkish-Syrian border, NATO-member Turkey has claimed it has “retaliated” with military force against “targets” inside Syria for an alleged attack on Turkish territory that it has blamed on the Syrian government.

Despite heavily armed listed-terrorist organizations operating in large numbers on both sides of the Turkish border with Turkey’s explicit approval and logistical support, the government in Ankara appears to have excluded the possibility that these terrorist forces, not the Syrian military, were responsible for the attack which consisted of mortar rounds the armed militants [are known to widely use](#).



Image: Terrorists operating in Syria pose next to a large mortar. Mortars of all sizes are a favorite of terrorists operating in and around Syria in NATO’s proxy bid to effect violent regime change. The mortars fired into Turkish territory could just as likely have come from terrorists Turkey itself is funding, arming, and harboring on behalf of long-planned NATO machinations. Unlike the Syrian government, the terrorists, Turkey, and by consequence, NATO, all have an actual motivation for launching the initial attack that has caused Turkey to retaliate and predictably call on NATO to intervene.

....

The New York Times itself, in its article titled, "[Turkey Fires Artillery at Syrian Targets in Retaliation for Civilian Deaths](#)," concedes that:

It was unknown whether the mortar shells were fired by Syrian government forces or rebels fighting to topple the government of President Bashar al-Assad. The Turkish response seemed to assume that the Syrian government was responsible.

Turkey's immediate, unwarranted act of military aggression, along with knee-jerk condemnations from the US bear all the hallmarks of an orchestrated event - or at the very least an attempt to opportunistically seize upon an isolated incident to disingenuously advance the West's collective geopolitical agenda.

Syria clearly has no interest in threatening the security of Turkey, nor any reason to attack Turkish territory which would surely give NATO the excuse it has been looking for to directly intervene on behalf of its faltering terrorist proxies.

Turkey Has Longed for a Pretext to Start War with Syria

It was previously reported that Turkey was intended by NATO, and more specifically, Wall Street and London, to lead efforts in carving out "safe havens" in Syria's north, and to do so either under a false "humanitarian" or false "security" pretext.

This has been confirmed by Fortune 500-funded, US foreign-policy think-tank, Brookings Institution which has blueprinted designs for regime change [in Libya](#) as well as [both Syria and Iran](#). In their 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 Doran, Kenneth Pollack, and Salman Shaikh

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-Asad 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 reassertion of Asad's control, and would cause spillover 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-Asad, whose family has ruled the country with an iron grip for over forty years. Syria is Iran's oldest and most important ally in the Arab world, and the Iranian regime has doubled down on Asad, providing him with financial aid and military support to shore up his regime. Asad'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 steadfast in its hostility toward Israel, and Asad's regime is also a longtime supporter of terrorist groups like Hizballah and Hamas, and has at times aided al-Qa'ida terrorists and former regime

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

Actually ousting Asad, however, will not be easy. Although the Obama administration has for months called for Asad 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 Asad 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-Qa'ida is urging fighters to join the fray in Syria, and sectarian killings and atrocities are growing. Should the violence continue to 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, Asad 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 Asad, but doing so in a way that keeps Syria an intact state capable of policing its borders and ensuring order at home. At the end of the day, however, removing Asad may not be doable

Image: 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.

....

Brookings continues by describing how Turkey's aligning of vast amounts of weapons and troops along its border in coordination with Israeli efforts in the south of Syria, could help effect violent regime change in Syria:

In addition, Israel's intelligence services have a strong knowledge of Syria, as well as assets within the Syrian regime that could be used to subvert the regime's power base and press for Asad's removal. Israel could posture forces on or near the Golan Heights and, in so doing, might divert regime forces from suppressing the opposition. This posture may conjure fears in the Asad regime of a multi-front war, particularly if Turkey is willing to do the same on its border and if the Syrian opposition is being fed a steady diet of arms and training. Such a mobilization could perhaps persuade Syria's military leadership to oust Asad in order to preserve itself. Advocates argue this additional pressure could

tip the balance against Asad inside Syria, if other forces were aligned properly.
-[page 6, Assessing Options for Regime Change, Brookings Institution](#).

Turkish leaders have clearly spent much time fabricating various excuses to meet Washington's demands in this regard by fabricating or taking advantage of violence Turkey itself is fostering along its own border with Syria.

The report would also mention Turkey's role in helping undermine, subvert, and carve out the ancient northern city of Aleppo:

Because creating a unified national opposition is a long-term project that will probably never fully succeed, the contact group, while not abandoning this effort, may seek more realistic goals. For example, it might concentrate maximum effort on breaking Asad's hold on, say, the elite of Aleppo, which is the commercial capital and which is also the city where Turkey has the greatest leverage. If Aleppo were to fall to the opposition, the demoralizing effect on the regime would be considerable.

Should this option fail, the United States can simply accept a bad situation in Syria or escalate to one of the military options below. -[page 6, Assessing Options for Regime Change, Brookings Institution](#).

The military options include everything from perpetuating violence to, [in Brookings' own words](#), "bleed it, keeping a regional adversary weak, while avoiding the costs of direct intervention," to Libyan-style "no-fly zones," to a full military invasion. It is clear, upon reading the Brookings memo, that the conspiracy has indeed begun to unfold since its writing - with various military options being prepared and various co-conspirators positioning themselves to execute them.

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 months](#) 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, [have been calling for a partial invasion of Syria](#) based on “humanitarian concerns.”

....

This latest exchange between Turkey and Syria is not the first. Turkey has fabricated stories before 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 continuously attempting to set a 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 multiple times by Russia and China.

That the UN has failed utterly to condemn the combined provocations and meddling in Syria’s affairs illustrates the absolute failure of supranational, let alone, global governance.

The original source of this article is [Land Destroyer](#)
Copyright © [Tony Cartalucci](#), [Land Destroyer](#), 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