

Turkey Preparing for Syria Occupation?

By [Tony Cartalucci](#)

Global Research, September 25, 2014

[Land Destroyer Report](#)

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

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

As Western-backed terrorists drive allegedly tens of thousands of refugees into Turkish territory, and amid what is being called a “sustainable, persistent campaign” of air assaults, missile strikes, and other assorted attacks on Syrian territory, the West is preparing to dust off plans to establish a “buffer zone” in northern Syria protected by NATO troops – particularly from Turkey.

Hurriyet Daily News in its article, [“Turkey’s top soldier inspects troops on Syrian border as gov’t signals joining anti-ISIL bid,”](#) indicated Turkey was preparing to join the unilateral, illegal strikes on Syria led by the US and backed by several Persian Gulf autocracies. Hurriyet reported:

Turkey’s land forces commander inspected troops along the Syrian border on Sept. 24, as the Turkish government signaled a policy change in actively joining the international coalition led by the United States against the jihadist threat in Iraq and Syria.

Land Forces Commander Gen. Hulusi Akar visited Turkey’s military facilities and troops deployed along the Syrian border, where he was briefed by officers in the field.

Turkey boosted its military presence along the Syrian border to deal with refugee influx in recent years and with the potential Syrian offensive last year. There are also reports that the army has intensified its military mobility in the region after the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) attacked the Syrian Kurds in the Kobane region bordering Turkey.




Image: Even maps of ISIS territory used by the Western media reveal well-defined corridors leading from Turkish territory and into both Syria and Iraq. It is clear that ISIS is not a “state,” but rather an invasion and occupation originating from NATO territory.

While last year’s planned military offensive was to directly strike at the Syrian Arab Army for provocations [later revealed to have been false flag attacks carried out against Turkey by the Turkish government itself](#), it appears that now the so-called “Islamic State,” (ISIS) will serve as cover for NATO’s extraterritorial ambitions.

ISIS, which is neither Islamic, nor a state, [is the culmination of years of US, European, Persian Gulf, and Turkish cash, weapons, and semi-covert support](#).

Turkey in particular [has served as a safe haven for ISIS terrorists for the past 3-4 years](#). In fact, maps showing ISIS’ territory across the Western media have clearly defined corridors leading directly from Turkish territory. The [billions in cash, weapons, equipment, and even vehicles used to build what is now a mercenary force](#) contesting power simultaneously in three nations – Lebanon, Syria, and Iraq – were provided by nations like Saudi Arabia and Qatar and funneled into terrorist hands by US CIA agents operating along Turkey’s border with Syria.


Despite the rhetorical shell game of renaming this mercenary force to confuse an unwitting public, no other explanation accounts for the scale of ISIS’ operations beyond concerted multinational state-sponsorship. If Syria, Lebanon, Iran, and Iraq are fighting ISIS, through the process of elimination, these state-sponsors – whether they admit it or not – can be easily identified.

Turkey’s Planned Occupation of Syria is a Documented Conspiracy

Carving off territory from Syria and creating “buffer zones” was part of the US agenda in Syria for years – long before the threat of ISIS was wielded as a potential pretext for direct US military intervention. ISIS is simply the latest construct being used to implement the strategy.

While the idea of a buffer zone is meant to look like the latest honest attempt to solve a growing regional crisis and to “win” the war in Syria, in reality this has been planned since at least March of 2012, where the idea was proposed by the corporate-financier funded Brookings Institution in their “Middle East Memo #21” “[Assessing Options for Regime Change](#)” where it stated specifically (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.”



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. Failing to sell the “humanitarian intervention,” the old “War on Terror” has been dusted off and utilized as a pretext.

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 (emphasis added):

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.

Clearly, a "buffer zone" is the next step for Western designs aimed at exacting regime change in Syria. It is also a step that merely needs a pretext to move forward. In 2012, fabricated border incidents with Turkey were being used to help implement this strategy but failed. Now the threat of ISIS is being used to resell the exact same scheme.

Turkey's Daily Sabah would report in an article titled, "[Turkish Army to be Authorized in Iraq and Syria. Davutoglu Says](#)," that:

Turkish government will ask for the parliament's authorization for military operations in Syria and Iraq, the newly-elected PM Ahmet Davutoğlu said at a press conference on Tuesday.

The paper would also report:

"There can be two different bills depending on the risks in the region," Davutoğlu said. "We hope that the security situation will not deteriorate for Turkey in the region and that we will not have to send armed forces."

Turkey will, however, take every means necessary against risks that will jeopardize the country's national security and the region's stability, according to Davutoğlu.

Of course, with US airstrikes carving out a vacuum soon to be filled with extremists uncontested by the Syrian Arab Army forced to back off in fear of provoking further Western aggression, the situation will undoubtedly "deteriorate." Just as Turkey staged false flag operations along its border last year in attempts to trigger a war with Syria directly, and by supporting terrorists resulting in a predictable humanitarian catastrophe now spilling over into Turkey' territory, the vacuum the US is intentionally creating is meant to be filled with terrorist mercenaries and NATO forces to protect them as the front is inched ever closer to Damascus in the form of a "buffer zone."

The only way for Syria to prevent this from happening is for it and its allies to quickly assemble tactical, strategic, and political means with which to fill the void in eastern Syria to prevent the West's "sustainable, persistent campaign" from taking root. Because if this campaign does take root, any attempts by Damascus to retake territory the West and its terrorist proxies are operating in may trigger a direct confrontation between the US and

Damascus – the ultimate provocation the West is searching for to conclude its long-stalled plans for regime change in Syria. Long-term US operations in Syrian territory, with or without Turkish forces involved, could still be turned into a trap by Syria and its allies. By avoiding provocations and direct military confrontation with the West, Syria can use proxy forces to ensnare the West in yet another protracted and costly quagmire. Such a strategy would require building up enhanced deterrence against further incursions toward vital Syrian population centers along with immeasurable political patience. The West will be left with further delays and complications, as well as immense costs that will become increasingly difficult to justify before an already war-weary Western public.

The original source of this article is [Land Destroyer Report](#)
Copyright © [Tony Cartalucci](#), [Land Destroyer Report](#), 2014

[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