

America's Ground War "Against" or "In Support" of The Islamic State? ISIS Supplied Via Turkey, a US Excuse to Seize Syria

By [Tony Cartalucci](#)

Global Research, November 03, 2015

[Land Destroyer Report](#) 3 November 2015

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

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)


In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

With the announcement of US special forces joining Western-backed militants on the ground in Syria, many still appear confused as to exactly what the implications of this move are. As if to assure the public that indeed, the move is to use the so-called Islamic State (ISIS/ISIL) as a pretext to invade and occupy Syrian territory, the Washington Post has published an article explaining the move in detail titled, "[Obama has strategy for Syria, but it faces major obstacles.](#)"

In it, it states openly that ISIS is being supplied via Turkey. It states specifically that:

They will increase air operations in northern Syria, particularly in the Turkish border area to cut the flow of foreign fighters, money and materiel coming in to support the Islamic State.

Of course, it should be noted that Turkey itself has been a NATO member since the 1950's, with a US airbase located on Turkish territory at Incirlik for nearly as long. Since the war started in Syria in 2011, the US has admittedly operated along the Turkish-Syrian border. The New York Times and the Washington Post itself has reported on numerous occasions regarding the US Central Intelligence Agency steering weapons to militant groups across this very border.



Sources: Institute for the Study of War, Hurriyet Daily News

THE WASHINGTON POST

Image: For months – if not years – those looking at ISIS and Al Qaeda territory in Syria can see, flowing like a river, their support has originated in NATO-member Turkey. The most recent Washington Post article all but admits that is the case, but claims it can only be stopped by holding Syrian territory. It is clear however, that NATO, Turkey, and the US possess the ability but intentionally lack the will to stop this flow before it enters Syria – specifically to create a pretext to invade.

There are also multi-billion dollar refugee camps built in a joint effort between Western governments and nongovernmental organizations and the Turkish government itself along the border, as well as US-run training camps for “moderate rebels.”

The question becomes then, if ISIS is receiving the summation of its “foreign fighters, money, and material” from Turkey, and the US is operating all along the Turkish border, why isn’t it being interdicted *before* it reaches Syria? Washington Post answers that too, but in the way of a denial from an unnamed Pentagon official:

This step is not to be considered “the start of a no-fly zone or a creeping no-fly zone. That’s just not the intent,” the Pentagon official said.

But of course it should be considered the start of a creeping no-fly-zone – because that is precisely why ISIS was created to justify in the first place, and that is precisely what is materializing before the world’s eyes. And the Washington Post elaborates on just what this no-fly-zone will lead to amid this feigned fight with ISIS:

Defeating the Islamic State in Syria, under Obama's strategy, rests on enabling local Syrian forces not only to beat back Islamic State fighters but to hold freed territory until a new central government, established in Damascus, can take over.

There already is a central government in Damascus, that should ISIS supply lines flooding out of NATO territory be cut, could easily reestablish control over this "freed territory" the Washington Post refers to. But the Post is careful to mention the term, "new central government," or in other words, a government hand-selected by the US and its regional partners, affiliated with the terrorists that have laid waste to Syria since 2011.

Invading Syria with US special forces-backed militants, and taking and holding Syrian territory [is verbatim the plan laid out by US foreign policymakers](#) from various corporate-financier funded policy think-tanks, and more specifically the Brookings Institution.

As reported during [the initial US announcement of "boots on the ground,"](#) the plan to create "safe zones" to then expand further within Syria with the ultimate goal being the toppling of Damascus, has been ongoing since at least 2012.

In the March 2012 Brookings Institution "Middle East Memo #21" "[Assessing Options for Regime Change](#)" it is stated specifically that (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.

The plan to use US special forces to take and hold Syrian territory was also specifically laid out in a June 2015 Brookings document literally titled, "[Deconstructing Syria: A new strategy for America's most hopeless war.](#)" In it, it stated that (emphasis added):

The idea would be to help moderate elements establish reliable safe zones within Syria once they were able. American, as well as Saudi and Turkish and British and Jordanian and other Arab forces would act in support, not only from the air but eventually on the ground via the presence of special forces as well. The approach would benefit from Syria's open desert terrain which could allow creation of buffer zones that could be monitored for possible signs of enemy attack through a combination of technologies, patrols, and other methods that outside special forces could help Syrian local fighters set up.

Were Assad foolish enough to challenge these zones, even if he somehow forced the withdrawal of the outside special forces, he would be likely to lose his air power in ensuing retaliatory strikes by outside forces, depriving his military of one of its few advantages over ISIL. Thus, he would be unlikely to do this.

The Washington Post's recent article confirms that this is precisely what is being done in Syria - the execution of long-laid plans obvious since at least June of 2014, but documented

in detail since June of this year.



Image: Russia is already legally operating in Syria, under invitation by the Syrian government itself. The US has no such authorization from Syria, or the UN, and its activities in Syrian airspace and on Syrian soil are illegal. As such, the Russians and their Syrian counterparts have no obligation to avoid operating in areas the US is attempting to create defacto “no-fly-zones” and “safe zones” in. Furthermore, could Syria and Russia marshal further support from a wider front of allies, their own international force could enter and permanently occupy these areas targeted by the US to prevent America’s illegal occupation.

The only question left regarding this obvious, long-stated plan is, since it has been so openly and transparently pursued, what has Syria and its allies, particularly Russia who is now engaged militarily in Syria, going to do to expose and confound it?

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