

# US-Turkey Edging Up to Syrian Border. Pretext to Invade, Establish ISIS “Safe Haven” in Northern Syria?

By [Tony Cartalucci](#)

Global Research, November 28, 2015

[Land Destroyer](#) 28 November 2015

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

Theme: [Terrorism](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

*US demands Turkey to “seal” notorious 100 km border region with Syria, but may be pretext to invade and establish long-sought after “safe haven” for terrorists in Syria.*

*In the most open admission yet that NATO-member Turkey has been allowing a torrent of supplies, weapons, fighters, and equipment to flow across its borders with impunity and into the hands of the self-proclaimed “Islamic State” (ISIS), the US has urged Ankara to seal the remaining 100 km border region yet to be closed by Syrian and Kurdish forces.*



The Wall Street Journal in its article, “[U.S. Urges Turkey to Seal Border](#),” reported that:

The Obama administration is pressing Turkey to deploy thousands of additional troops along its border with Syria to cordon off a 60-mile stretch of frontier that U.S. officials say is used by Islamic State to move foreign fighters in and out of the war zone.

The U.S. hasn’t officially requested a specific number of soldiers. Pentagon officials estimated that it could take as many as 30,000 to seal the border on the Turkish side for a broader humanitarian mission. Cordoning off just one section alone could take 10,000 or more, one official estimated.

Coincidentally, the Wall Street Journal also reports that 30,000 troops are also precisely what is estimated to be needed to carve out a NATO-occupied “safe zone” within Syria, one US policymakers have planned [since 2012 as a means of protecting Western-backed militants](#) from Syrian – and now Russian – attacks.

The WSJ reports:

U.S. officials, including the Pentagon and the State Department, conducted an assessment this fall of how many troops it would take to create a safe zone, and concluded that it would take about 30,000 troops. Officials used that figure as a reference point to estimate the needs for a cordon, but said that could turn out to require fewer troops.


### US Intentions are Dubious at Best

Although some may find US calls for the border to be secured from the Turkish side welcomed, in reality, the summation of support for ISIS and other terrorist groups operating in Syria have long been crossing Turkey’s borders, with Ankara and Washington’s full knowledge and with [Ankara and Washington having orchestrated the immense multi-year logistical operation themselves](#).

---

## Stopping Islamic State

After the Paris attacks, the U.S. wants Turkey to put new forces on its border with Syria to block Islamic State transit routes.



Source: Turkish and U.S. officials

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

*Image: The WSJ claims the US wants Turkey to stop ISIS transit routes. Transit routes from where to where? And is this finally an admission that the so-called "civil war" in Syria was really a NATO-sponsored invasion all along?*

Not only has it been revealed that the US State Department itself was running terrorists and weapons from [as far as Croatia and Libya, through Turkey, and into northern Syria](#), it has been reported by prominent Western newspapers, including the New York Times that both US intelligence agents and US special forces have been operating along the very Turkish-Syrian border. ISIS and other terrorist organizations have been moving weapons and fighters over since the conflict began in 2011.

Increasing pressure from Washington on Ankara appears directly proportional not to America's will to defeat ISIS, but to the necessity of addressing growing public awareness that indeed, ISIS is being supported from beyond Syria's borders by certain state sponsors and not from within Syria itself.

That coincidentally the same number of troops needed to invade and occupy northern Syria have been called up to line the Turkish-Syria border to "secure it" is likely not a coincidence at all. In all likelihood, the West would like to attempt to make an incursion into Syria under the guise of having been provoked at the border, and then "needing" to cross over into Syria to pursue the provocateurs.

The United States and Turkey, [with their ambush of a Russian Su-24 over Syria](#), have proven just how far the West is willing to go to get an advantage, even superficially, over Russia, even if it means resorting to extreme treachery. Another "power move" wrung from this impending "border operation" seems all but inevitable.

This increasingly desperate geostrategic posture comes at a time when Russia has begun bombing ISIS-bound convoys emerging from Turkish territory almost on the border itself. Syrian armed forces are likewise close to closing off this very border region from within their own territory. Syrian troops have approached the Euphrates River's west bank and will begin moving north toward the Turkish border itself. Once this region is retaken by Russian-backed Syrian troops, there will be no "safe zone" for NATO to establish.

### **Race to the Finish Line**

To ensure that NATO's plans are fully derailed along the Turkish-Syrian border, Russian-backed Syrian troops must ensure a substantial deterrence exists specifically to face this threat. Diplomatically, offers to establish a border guard or peacekeeping force on the Syrian side to compliment NATO's within Turkish territory may be the best way to ensure NATO's ambitions remain where they are.

What the Wall Street Journal and the policy think-tanks it is repeating attempt to lay out is a narrative that claims in order to stop terrorists from passing through Turkish territory and into Syria, for some reason NATO needs to occupy Syria itself.



*Image: A Russian-led multinational peacekeeping force placed along the 100 km border region facing off NATO troops in Turkey would not only put a final end to the Syrian conflict, it would wrest control of the West's self-proclaimed role as international arbiter over the world's affairs. Those who join the peacekeeping force would form the new face of a multipolar world order set to displace Wall Street and London's unipolar order.*

It is a narrative that defies reason and logic, and also fails to address the ports of entry terrorists, funds, and weapons are entering into Turkish territory from before heading onward to Syria - likely because those are ports - seaports and airports - controlled directly by NATO and Ankara itself.

As the conflict appears to be drawing to a conclusion favorable to Syria and its allies, Damascus, Moscow, and Tehran must remain vigilant of the West's designated "wild cards," Turkey in the north, and Israel to the southwest. When tensions between NATO seem at their highest, what is more likely at play is a means of creating collective "plausible deniability" for NATO ahead of another act of war by one of its individual members or allies.

For Moscow in particular, the downing of its Su-24 should be fair warning that while cooperation should continue to be sought as a matter of good diplomacy, treachery must be expected as a matter of good strategic planning.

The original source of this article is [Land Destroyer](#)  
Copyright © [Tony Cartalucci](#), [Land Destroyer](#), 2015

[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](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)