



Overview of Asymmetric Warfare Strategy and International Relations in the Syrian War 2011

Haryanto Wibowo¹

¹Naval Staff and Command College, Indonesia

vinozio070809@gmail.com¹

Article Info

Article history:

Received: May 10, 2022

Revised: March 30, 2023

Accepted: April 28, 2023

Keywords:

Asymmetric Warfare,
Great Power,
International Relations,
Modern War,
Syrian War

DOI:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.33172/jp.v9i1.1693>

2549-9459/Published by Indonesia Defense University. This is an open-access article under the CC BY-NC license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

Abstract

This article focuses on analyzing the Asymmetric War carried out by the parties involved in the Syrian War. The actors analyzed were the state, the opposition, and the pro-revolutionary parties. With a qualitative approach, this study emphasizes content analysis methods. The framework of this research departs from the conflict in Syria which can be analyzed by the theory of Asymmetric Warfare by Rod Thornton and the theory of International Relations. The research results show that the conflict in Syria is part of Asymmetric Warfare, i.e. the support of military forces by foreign countries in the Syrian War conflict is urgently needed by each side (pro-revolutionary and pro-regime). In addition, viewed from international relations was a continuation of the Cold War launched by a great power country between Russia and the United States. It is therefore essential to undertake a thorough investigation of the current evolution of Modern War, particularly Asymmetric War.

INTRODUCTION

The revolution in Arab countries known as the Arab Spring has become a political phenomenon in the Middle East and globally. The term Arab Spring first appeared in the Western media, which was a series of anti-government protests, riots, and armed rebellions that spread to Arab countries in early 2011 (Manfreda, 2019). Among countries hit by demands for revolution, the case of the revolution in Syria is the one that has received the most attention from the international community. The conflict in Syria began with the arrest of 15 students who protested against the Syrian government led by President Bashar Al Assad in March 2011 in the city of Daraa (Starr, 2015). The protests turned into a revolution to bring down the Assad regime, it has turned into a bloody conflict between pro-revolution groups and pro-regime groups ruling Bashar al-Assad.

In its development, several opposition groups, mostly Islamist and nationalist groups agreed to form the Syrian National Council (SNC) as an interim government and a rival government to the Assad regime in August 2011 in Istanbul, Turkey (Luerdi, 2014). This agency is a forum for coordinating opposition groups against the Assad regime. Previously, in July 2011 the rebel group also formed the Free Syria Army (FSA) based in Antakya, Turkey. The FSA was formed as a military wing to deal with Assad loyalist troops and seize several important and strategic cities from the Assad regime. The formation of the SNC and the FSA did not automatically remove Assad from power and take over the national government in Syria. The intensity of the conflict between the opposition groups and the Assad regime is increasing and increasingly destructive. This conflict has forced more than 5.6 million Syrians into refugees in neighboring countries such as Lebanon, Turkey and Jord, and (CARE, 2022).

To gain a comprehensive understanding of the conflict and its implications, it is necessary to analyze the war through the framework of asymmetric warfare and international relations. Asymmetric warfare is a type of conflict in which two or more parties have unequal levels of power, resources, and capabilities, while international relations is the study of the interactions between states and other international actors. Asymmetric warfare is particularly relevant to the Syrian war because the conflict involves multiple actors with varying levels of power and resources.

The Syrian civil war has highlighted the importance of asymmetric warfare in contemporary conflicts. The unequal distribution of power and resources between the government and opposition forces has resulted in a conflict that is characterized by asymmetric tactics and strategies. The use of chemical weapons and the targeting of civilian populations are two examples of asymmetric tactics employed by the government and opposition forces (Council on Foreign Relations, 2018). Furthermore, the involvement of multiple actors with varying levels of power and resources has further complicated the conflict, making it difficult to resolve. As such, the Syrian civil war has demonstrated the need for a better understanding of asymmetric warfare and its implications for contemporary conflicts.

The Syrian war has had a profound impact on international relations, with countries around the world attempting to find a resolution to the conflict. The war has resulted in a massive refugee crisis, with millions of Syrian fleeing the country in search of safety and security. Additionally, the emergence of terrorist groups such as Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) has been enabled by the chaos of the war and has posed a serious threat to global security (Laub, 2023). As a result, the Syrian war has become a major issue in international relations, with countries attempting to find a way to bring an end to the conflict and restore stability to the region. Examining the Syrian war through the framework of asymmetric warfare and international relations can offer a more comprehensive understanding of the conflict and its consequences. By exploring the role, tactics, and strategies of each actor, as well as their motivations, it is possible to gain a deeper insight into the dynamics of the war. Furthermore, such an analysis can provide valuable insight into the implications of the actions taken by the various actors involved in the conflict. Asymmetric warfare is a local conflict with regional and global

impacts. Similarly, studying the conflict through the lens of international relations can offer valuable insight into the ramifications of the war for the region and the global community. It can elucidate the diplomatic initiatives taken to bring the war to a close, as well as the implications of the war for international security and stability.

Based on the background of the Syrian War that has been explained, identification and analysis of events related to Modern War theories that occurred between the two sides (pro-revolution and pro-regime) in the Syrian War in 2011 will be carried out as a present and future war strategy. Therefore, this research seeks to further investigate the conflict through the lens of asymmetric warfare theory and to examine its implications for international relations. In addition, the writing of this article conducts a review of strategy and international relations on the events of the Syrian War to benefit from the educative, inspirational, and instructive aspects.

METHODS

This article employs a qualitative research approach to explore the phenomenon under investigation. Qualitative research is a type of research that produces findings that cannot be achieved using statistical procedures or other quantitative methods. Qualitative research is a valuable tool for exploring the complexities of human experience, including the dynamics of individuals, groups, and societies. It can be used to examine people's lives, histories, behaviors, organizational structures, social movements, and kinship relations (Corbin et al, 2015 in Hennink, Hutter, & Bailey, 2020). Data were collected from a variety of secondary sources, including scientific articles, online news media, and relevant books. The data obtained were then analyzed by triangulation particularly to identify the significant characteristics and roles of each actor shown in the Syrian war. The process involves interpretation after careful consideration.

Asymmetric Warfare Theory

This article uses a qualitative approach using case studies. A qualitative approach is a research using interpretive rules or social critical science (Neuman, 2013). This qualitative analysis examines the strategy review and international relations of the 2011 Syrian war through a case study. Asymmetric Warfare is unconventional warfare (Bunker, 1999). It is defined as conflict, aside from traditional wars, initiated by a nation's institutions. It also happens mostly undercover, enacted at low intensity by parties such as guerrilla groups, drug cartels, or even special force divisions of regular armed forces. Perpetrators of asymmetric war include Sun Tzu, Lenin, Mao, and guerrilla leaders like Che Guevara and Marighella (Bunker, 1999; Bhonsle, 2004).

The incident of the Syrian War in 2011 in this article is seen from the perspective of asymmetric warfare by Thornton (2007). Rod Thornton in his book "Asymmetric Warfare", argues that Asymmetric Warfare is an act of violence carried out by the weak against the strong, where the weak can be either state actors or non-state actors, trying to produce deep influence at all levels of war by exerting the advantages they have. and take advantage of the vulnerabilities of the stronger party (Thornton, 2007). It is also a

form of conflict in which a militarily superior power is challenged by one or more inferior powers. This type of warfare is characterized by the use of unconventional tactics and strategies. Asymmetric warfare is defined as the nontraditional or irregular warfare between a militarily superior power and one or more inferior powers. The asymmetries tactics are used by the inferior powers as a tool to win (Mischuk & Mischuk, 2017). There are several aspects of asymmetric warfare according to Buffaloe (2006), namely (1) evaluating and defeating asymmetric threats, (2) conducting asymmetric operations, (3) understanding cultural asymmetry, and (4) evaluating asymmetric cost (Buffaloe, 2006).

International Relations Theory

International politics is a huge field. It explores everything from wars to revolutions to global gender inequalities to demands for international human rights to international trade. International Relations (IR) theory makes organizing generalizations about international politics. IR theory is a collection of stories about the world of international politics. In Addition, in the context of telling stories about international politics, IR theory doesn't just present what is going on in the world out there. IR theory also imposes its vision of what the world out there looks like (Weber, 2013). International relation is a discipline that involves a large number of facts about the world (Devraun, 1998). But as noted earlier, these facts will only become more meaningful and relevant when a framework is in place think (theory) as a place for these facts to be described, analyzed, and even taken into account something that will happen in the future.

In the discipline of International Relations, realism is a school of thought that emphasizes the competitive and conflictual sides of this science. The first assumption of realism is that the nation-state (usually abbreviated as 'state') is the main actor in international relations. There are other bodies, such as individuals and organizations, but their powers are limited. Second, the state is a solid unitary actor. National interests, especially in times of war, make countries speak and act with one voice. Third, decision-makers are rational actors in the sense that rational decision-making leads to the pursuit of national interests. Realism believes that people's selfishness and desire for power, together with their inability to trust others, lead to the theoretically predictable behavior of conflicts of interest and conflict (McGlinchey, Walters, & Scheinplflug, 2020).

The Syrian War has been a major source of tension in the international arena since 2011. It has been a major source of contention between the United States, Russia, and other regional powers. This conflict has been a major test of international relations theory, as it has highlighted the importance of power dynamics, the role of international organizations, and the impact of regional and global politics. The Syrian War has highlighted the importance of power dynamics in international relations. The conflict has been characterized by a struggle between the United States and Russia for influence in the region. The United States has sought to support the opposition forces, while Russia has sought to support the Assad regime. This has resulted in a power struggle

between the two countries, with each attempting to gain the upper hand in the conflict (Laub, 2023).

The Syrian War has also highlighted the role of international organizations in international relations. The United Nations has been heavily involved in the conflict, attempting to broker a peace agreement between the warring parties. The UN has also sought to provide humanitarian aid to those affected by the conflict (Mischuk & Mischuk, 2017; Shamieh, 2016). Finally, the Syrian War has highlighted the impact of regional and global politics on international relations. The conflict has been heavily influenced by the actions of regional powers, such as Iran and Turkey (Shamieh, 2016).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Asymmetric Warfare in the 2011 Syrian Case

The discourse surrounding asymmetric warfare has been used to rationalize and legitimize state brutality against nonstate actors and collective forms of punishment against entire populations that become embroiled in conflicts between powerful states (Mello, 2015). This type of warfare is seen as a defining feature of the "new wars" that emerged in the late twentieth century (Mello, 2015). It is characterized by three main components: the utilization of advanced conventional systems, non-contact warfare, and the use of precision strikes or high-technology non-nuclear weapons. In the Syrian case, the use of chemical weapons is an example of this characteristic. The primary operational objective of asymmetric warfare is to render the massing of large forces in a conventional war obsolete.

In the case of the Syrian war, the asymmetric characteristic can be seen based on unequal power between Assad's forces and his Russian allies versus the opposition armed forces, including the Islamic States. The Syrian National Coalition, Mujahideen, and Kurdish Democratic Union Party have been engaged in an asymmetric conflict with the Syrian Government to overthrow President Assad. As the rebels were unable to engage in symmetrical warfare, they resorted to unconventional tactics such as suicide bombings and targeted attacks. This conflict has been ongoing for some time, until the emergence of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), which has been fighting both the Syrian and Iraqi governments in an attempt to establish its state (Darwanto, 2020).

During an asymmetric conflict, certain groups experience a lack of human security. As the Syrian conflict intensifies, a larger portion of the population is affected. Additionally, there is evidence of bombing in regions with large civilian populations by the forces of Assad. Civilians and their property are the victims of indiscriminate attacks by opposition armed forces, including the Islamic State, which has besieged civilians, carried out direct attacks on civilians, and perpetrated numerous unlawful killings. Furthermore, reports indicate that chemical agents have been used, and thousands of women and girls have been subjected to sexual slavery and other abuses (Mischuk & Mischuk, 2017).

The United Nations Report of 2011 found that both government forces and non-state armed forces have been responsible for a range of violations of international humanitarian law. These violations include collective punishment, destruction of

property, denial of food and water, and torture of civilians. Additionally, the UN Independent International Commission of Inquiry has accused the Free Syrian Army and other opposition forces of unlawful killings, kidnapping, torture, sexual abuse, and the use of children as fighters. Furthermore, there have been directed and intentional attacks against buildings, materials, medical units, transport, and personnel. Both state and non-state armed forces have disregarded the rules relating to the humane treatment of detainees. The Human Rights Watch report has also found that the Syrian government has employed over 20 different methods of torture against detainees, who are held in inhumane conditions and denied medical assistance. Finally, the non-state armed forces have used videos of cruel killings of Syrian soldiers as a tool to threaten the government and civilians (Mischuk & Mischuk, 2017).

Parties involved in the Syrian War

Before analyzing the strategic aspects, first carried out the identification of the parties involved in the Syrian War conflict in 2011. The first group was the pro-revolutionary group which had the aim of forcing President Assad to resign, was then better known as the opposition group to take up arms by forming the Syrian National Council (SNC), a rebel group also formed the Free Syria Army (FSA) based in Turkey. While the pro-regime group is a group of President Assad's government. The main groups causing the conflict in Syria along with the involvement of foreign parties are:

President Bashar al-Assad and His Supporters.

President Bashar al-Assad took over as President of Syria in 2000, succeeding his father. Early in his reign, he positioned himself as a reformer. But sharp criticism slides when the public does not feel a significant change. Violent protests against the Assad regime emerged in March 2011 which led to the civil war to this day. The Assad regime is supported by the Alawite, Druze, and Ismaili minorities, many Christians who support Assad because of his secular policies. Iran, Russia, and China are countries that support the Assad regime, apart from being supported by that country, the Assad regime also has the support of the Lebanese Hezbollah group.

The foreign country that supports this group is Russia. Russia is a long-time ally of the Syrian state. The two countries have agreed to carry out arms trade since 1972. Syria permitted Russia to build a military base in the coastal area of Tartus. In his era, Russia managed to send weapons worth 135 million US dollars. Even in 1980, Russia and Syria signed a further cooperation pact that was valid for 20 years (Noor, 2014). Apart from Russia, another foreign country that supports the Assad regime is Iran. Iran and Syria are two countries that have good foreign relations. When Arab countries tried to isolate Syria at the Arab League summit in Damascus by sending low-level envoys, Iran instead sent its foreign minister to attend the summit (Burdah, 2008).

Syrian Opposition

Two opposition groups oppose and rebel against the Assad regime, namely (1) Syrian rebel groups including the Free Syrian Army (FSA), Syrian National Council

(SNC), and Syrian National Council for Opposition and Revolutionary Forces (SNCORF) which were formed on American initiative in Doha, Qatar; this coalition consists of 60 members from 22 former members of the SNC and (2) the Opposition Group against violence, anti-sectarianism, and anti-foreign intervention; are members of a coalition called the National Coordination Body for Democratic Change.

The foreign country that supports the opposition or pro-revolutionary conflict in Syria is Turkey. The wave of protests in Syria caused Turkey to openly recommend reforms in the government of Bashar Al-Assad and Syria to prefer to resolve the conflict on its terms. Apart from Turkey, the opposition groups get support from the United States and the NATO alliance. The United States and its allies in this case Saudi Arabia are very active in assisting the rebels or oppositions in Syria. Several reasons make the U.S. interfere in the political situation in Syria. On the one hand, the U.S. wants President Bashar Al-Assad to give up his power and make a transition of government. However, on the other hand, the U.S. has not found a suitable replacement to fill the chair of Al-Assad who will be left. The US has three important reasons that make them not turn away from the Middle East region including Syria. The first reason is that the U.S. is trying to maintain cheap oil supplies from the Middle East. Second, the U.S. has an important duty to maintain the existence of Israel over Palestine. Third, they want to prevent the emergence of ideological forces in the Middle East region.

United States of America

United States of America or the U.S. is a country that wants democratization in the land of Sham. Its allies also give the same support to the Syrian people to get democratic rights in their country. Saudi Arabia is one of its allies in carrying out a proxy war in Syria. The U.S. and its allies are very active in assisting the rebels/opposition in Syria. The U.S. has publicly announced it will send weapons to help rebels and opposition parties after believing allegations of the use of chemical weapons by Bashar Al-Assad's forces (Barnard & Shoumali, 2015).

The U.S. and its allies together want a change of leadership in Syria. Britain, France, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Lebanon, Qatar, and Turkey are among the U.S. allies, very actively supporting the opposition. In the year for \$60 million to their government. In addition, in 2013, they provided financial assistance to carry out attacks on troops and were also active in providing international legal sanctions through the UN agencies by using their respective positions at the UN. However, on the other hand, this method gets obstacles when Russia and China veto any resolutions that are considered detrimental to the Syrian government. Foreign intervention in Syria is not desired by these two countries, even though Russia already has a military base in Tartus.

Russia

Russia is a long-time ally of the Syrian state. Since the era of Hafez Al-Assad, the two countries have established cooperation and strong bilateral relations. Russia's involvement in the Syrian war has strong reasons for cementing their relationship. In addition to the Syrian government's request, Russia also feels it has interests that it

must protect. The two countries agreed to trade arms and this agreement has been signed by the leadership of Hafez Al-Assad in 1972. Even in 1980, Russia and Syria signed a further cooperation pact that was valid for 20 years.

In addition, Russia also sees Syria as a country that has an important role in the Middle East region. The geographical and political location as well as Syria's competitiveness in this region further add to the attractiveness of foreign countries to dominate this country. Various forms of intervention from foreign countries have begun to be intensified to include the interests of each country or party in Syria. It is certain that the intervention of these parties will disrupt and threaten the sustainability of Russian interests on the one hand and does not rule out the potential to destroy Syria (Mudore & Safitri, 2019).

Turkey

Turkey and Syria were noted to have had good relations before the conflict in Syria. The two countries are involved in bilateral cooperation in the form of signing the High-Level Strategic Cooperation Council (HLSCC) in Aleppo and Gaziantep, 12-13 September 2009. This cooperation is an agreement to jointly develop and improve cooperation in various fields ranging from politics to the economy. In addition, in this agreement, both of them agreed to strengthen bilateral relations and realize a common vision on several bilateral and regional issues. At the next meeting, the two signed as many as 50 MoUs in Damascus.

This cooperation has a positive impact on both countries. The wave of internal protests in Syria has resulted in increasingly tenuous relations between the two. Turkey recommends reforms in the government of Bashar Al-Assad and Syria prefers to resolve the internal conflict in their way. Openly, Turkey urges Al-Assad to step down from the presidency to create internal peace in Syria. However, this insistence was vehemently rejected by the Syrian government. As a result, Turkey imposed sanctions on Syria. The application of restrictions on the use of Turkish airspace for aircraft carrying military equipment to Syria and at the same time freezing HLSCC (Rendra, 2017).

Iran

Iran and Syria are two countries that have good and good foreign relations. Both of them work hand in hand and support each other in criticizing the existence of the state of Israel in the Middle East region. Both Syria and Iran, of them, have always dared to oppose the actions taken by Israel in the Middle East region, especially when they have hurt Palestinians and Gazans. When Arab countries tried to isolate Syria at the Arab League summit in Damascus by sending low-level envoys, Iran instead sent its foreign minister to attend the summit. Even though Iran itself is not a member of the Arab League.

As a partner in defending its interests in defending Palestine, Iran is a country that actively assists Hezbollah. If it turns out that the relationship between the two is destroyed, Iran will certainly have difficulty in providing aid supplies to the Hezbollah group in Lebanon. During the early two years of the conflict, Iran was very vocal in

defending the Syrian leader, Bashar Al-Assad. Iran is a country that is willing to make big sacrifices to maintain its "true" friendship with Syria, even though it does not yet involve the strategic interests and stability of its country's security.

Saudi Arabia

Saudi Arabia's involvement in the government of Bashar Al-Assad was proven on November 12, 2011 Saudi Arabia supported the temporary revocation of Syria's membership in the Arab League. The Saudi Arabian government stressed, "The Saudi Arabian government strongly condemns the incident and holds the Syrian authorities responsible for the security and protection of all Saudi Arabian interests in Syria,". The statement was the response of the Saudi Arabian government after hundreds of protesters supporting Bashar Al Assad on the same day broke into the Saudi Arabian embassy in Damascus and damaged some belongings of the embassy after breaking into the Saudi Arabian embassy. The emergence of Saudi Arabia's involvement emerged as an act of response to the actions of the government of Bashar Al-Assad which ignored criticism from countries and the international community for its human rights violations against the demonstrators. So, Saudi Arabia took the initiative to try to resolve the conflict.

Syrian War Strategy Review

After identifying the main actors and supporting countries against the two conflicting groups in the Syrian War, then an analysis of the conflicts that occurred will be carried out through a review of strategic aspects. The major battles carried out by pro-revolutionary and pro-regime groups in Syria are part of the asymmetric war between the supporting states of the two groups. Through the merging of two methods of warfare, both conventional and irregular warfare, other words, hybrid warfare occurred in the Syrian War.

This statement was supported on March 30, 2011, President Assad said that the demonstrations in Syria were part of the involvement of a foreign conspiracy. The conventional incident itself was marked by the use of military force by the Syrian government to overcome pro-revolution demonstrations throughout 2011. The connection with hybrid warfare in the context of the use of international military action in Syria was strengthened after the alleged use of chemical weapons on the outskirts of Damascus by the Assad regime on August 21, 2013. If an examination of the strategic elements of the two parties involved in the dispute is conducted, it is the responsibility of the countries that are backing the two sides to be analyzed in theory as can be seen in the next sub-section.

Ends

The main goal of the pro-revolutionary group is to overthrow the government under the leadership of President Bashar Al-Assad by prioritizing democracy in the Syrian government. While the pro-regime main goal is to maintain the government led by President-elect Bashar Al-Assad of the Baath Party.

Ways

The method used by both sides is to use military force. The first use of military force by the pro-regime Syrian government occurred in April 2011 against demonstrators, which can be said to be a civil war in Syria. Then there is assistance from pro-regime supporting countries, in this case, Russia. Through the presence of the Russian military base in Tartus, Syria has an advantage in helping to repel military attacks from outside. Since November 2011, Russia has stationed its warships in Tartus. The warships sent consisted of aircraft carriers, transport ships, and cruise missiles.

For opposition groups or pro-revolution groups, the method used is through rebellion due to the use of military force by the Assad government forces. This group formed organizations such as the Syrian National Council (SNC) and the Free Syria Army (FSA). The countries supporting this opposition group are the U.S. and the NATO Alliance. The U.S. plays an important role in supporting the armed forces of the rebels/oppositions. Weapons assistance is also provided so that the rebels/opposition parties can provide meaningful attacks on government troops.

Means

The means used by pro-regime groups, in this case, is the Assad government's using military force. At the beginning of the demonstration, the government used the force of combat vehicles and tanks to disperse the demonstrations carried out by pro-revolutionary parties. In addition, support from foreign countries for pro-regime groups, mainly Russia, is sending weapons to Syria worth 135 million US dollars. Meanwhile, the opposition groups receive support for weapons from the United States and the NATO Alliance. In 2013, they provided \$60 million in funding to enable them to launch attacks on government forces. In addition, US ally, Saudi Arabia also took steps that were not much different from the US. Various aid from Saudi Arabia was poured into Syria to help the rebels/opposition parties carry out attacks on government troops. Saudi Arabia has sent aid in various forms, be it weapons, funds, military training, or even in the form of greater salary rewards for FSA fighters.

International Relations Overview

The next discussion relates to the influence of the 2011 Syrian War conflict on international relations. The incident which is the source of the conflict that occurred in the Syrian War is part of the attention of the international world in addressing the internal problems of a country. In understanding the Syrian crisis, it can be seen that the conflict began with demands for the resignation of Assad by anti-Assad regime groups. The Assad regime is dictatorial, militaristic, and non-democratic. Assad has ignored demands to relinquish power as Syria's leader and has even responded to anti-regime demonstrations with violence. Assad's reluctance to step down forced anti-regime groups to organize forces by forming the FSA and SNC.

Support from permanent member countries of the UN Security Council such as Russia makes Assad confident to launch military operations against anti-regime groups. In several military operations, the Assad regime carried out brutal attacks both from

land and air against areas that had been captured by the SNC-FSA which caused more civilian casualties than the rebels. Assad does not seem concerned about the war crimes he has committed, including the use of chemical weapons with the support of the UNSC member countries. The war in Syria, which has become a world humanitarian crisis, does not necessarily encourage conflict resolution. The Syrian conflict has become a serious agenda for the United Nations and the United Nations Security Council, marked by various talks facilitated by the two institutions. However, efforts to internationalize the Syrian conflict which should have been marked by the involvement of other countries' forces under international organizations never materialized. Two draft UN Security Council resolutions have been vetoed by Russia. The presence of Russia in the UN Security Council is an obstacle in determining the resolution of the Syrian conflict (Gifkins, 2012).

Conflict resolution that is difficult to achieve cannot be separated from the intervention of other countries with an interest in Syria. Intervention usually means that it is biased or difficult to separate from taking sides with one party, for example on the rebel side or on the government in a country that is being hit by a political crisis or revolution. Betts (2012) says impartiality is simply the norm in most intervention cases. In this case study, the failure to make a conflict resolution in the Syrian case was due to the intertwined interests of the U.S., Russia, Turkey, and Iran. The United States has sought to promote a political solution to the conflict, while also providing support to opposition forces. Russia, on the other hand, has provided military support to the Syrian government and has sought to maintain its influence in the region. Iran has provided financial and military support to the Syrian government and has sought to maintain its influence in the region. Finally, Turkey has sought to limit the influence of the Syrian government and has provided support to opposition forces. As a result, these four countries have become increasingly involved in the conflict, and their interests have become increasingly clashed.

Benefit from analysis of the events of the Syrian War

Educational Aspect

Improved combat capability in the face of asymmetric threats based on hybrid warfare. The conflict in Syria is part of an asymmetric war between countries that support both sides of the conflict. The use of military power of a country does not deal directly with other countries or in this case, the actors who do it are conflicting. The capabilities and capabilities of a strong military force greatly affect the diplomacy of a country. In the Syrian war, it can be seen how countries that have interests have great military power or are great power countries.

Inspirational Aspect

The steps of the pro-revolutionary groups in fighting for the lives of the Syrian people need to be appreciated because, through the democratic struggle, the people expect a system of government that is just for its people. The pro-regime government's

belief in opposing the conflict in Syria is part of a foreign conspiracy, which is part of maintaining a government system that is not easily intervened by any party.

Instructive Aspect

The asymmetric war strategy that occurred in the Syrian War is part of one of the Modern War strategies. In the current era, the use of military force to deal with threats does not need to deal directly with these targets or threats. So that the mitigation of both personnel and material losses can be avoided. Preparation of personnel capabilities in dealing with asymmetric warfare based on hybrid warfare is needed to support the professionalism of soldiers' abilities in analyzing threats that occur. Learning from the Syrian war conflict in which both sides were exploited with the interests of the countries supporting their respective groups.

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

The strategic aspect that occurred in the Syrian War conflict in 2011, was part of the asymmetric warfare carried out by foreign countries supporting both sides (pro-revolutionary and pro-regime). The support of military forces by foreign countries in the Syrian War conflict is urgently needed by each side. It is used to achieve the goals of the disputing group. So, it can be said that establishing relations with great-power countries in the military field is needed when a country faces a threat that has greater military power.

The incident of the Syrian War, seen from the aspect of international relations, was a continuation of the Cold War launched by a great power country between Russia and the United States. The major international parties involved in the Syrian conflict have sought to protect their interests and objectives in the region, while also attempting to promote a political solution to the conflict that would be acceptable to all parties. The United States, Russia, Turkey, Iran, and Saudi Arabia are the major international parties involved in the conflict. Each of these countries has its interests and objectives in the conflict, and their involvement is driven by a combination of strategic, economic, and ideological considerations. Thus, the importance of a comprehensive study of the current development of Modern War, especially Asymmetric War. Measures of defense diplomacy against Great Power countries, are to be carried out in the context of asymmetric warfare and its development.

REFERENCES

- Barnard, A., & Shoumali, K. (2015). U.S. Weaponry is Turning Syria Into Proxy War with Russia. Retrieved March 29, 2023, from https://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/13/world/middleeast/syria-russia-airstrikes.html?_r=0
- Betts, R. K. (2012). *American Force: Dangers, Delusions, and Dilemmas in National Security*. Columbia: Columbia University Press.
- Buffaloe, D. L. (2006). *Defining Asymmetric Warfare a National Security Affairs Paper*.
- Burdah, I. (2008). *Konflik Timur Tengah: Aktor, Isu, dan Dimensi Konflik*. Yogyakarta:

- Tiara Wacana.
- CARE. (2022). *Syrian Refugee Crisis*.
- Council on Foreign Relations. (2018, April 16). Can Syria's Chemical Weapons Be Stopped? Retrieved March 29, 2023, from <https://www.cfr.org/interview/can-syrias-chemical-weapons-be-stopped>
- Darwanto, H. (2020). *Perang Asimetris*.
- Devraun, L. J. D. (1998). Reconsidering International Relations Theory. *South African Journal of Political Studies*, 25(1), 147–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02589349808705057>
- Gifkins, J. (2012). The UN Security Council Divided: Syria in Crisis. *Global Responsibility to Protect*, 4(3), 377–393. <https://doi.org/10.1163/1875984X-00403009>
- Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2020). *Qualitative Research Methods*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Laub, Z. (2023). *Syria's War and the Descent Into Horror*. Retrieved from <https://www.cfr.org/article/syrias-civil-war>
- Luerdi. (2014). *Konflik dalam Negara: Analisis Kasus Konflik Suriah (2011-2014)*. Pekanbaru: Universitas Riau.
- Manfreda, P. (2019, August 28). What is the Arab Spring?: an Overview of the Middle East Uprisings in 2011. Retrieved March 6, 2023, from <https://www.thoughtco.com/definition-of-the-arab-spring-2353029>
- McGlinchey, S., Walters, R., & Scheinpflug, C. (2020). *Dasar-Dasar Kajian Teori Hubungan Internasional* (Translated; T. A. Mukti, Ed.). Yogyakarta: Laboratorium Hubungan Internasional Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta.
- Mello, P. A. (2015). Asymmetric Warfare. In *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066109350053>
- Mischuk, M., & Mischuk, K. (2017). Asymmetric Warfare in Syria: A Challenge to the International Humanitarian Law. *University Law Bulletin*, 29, 140–144.
- Mudore, S. B., & Safitri, N. (2019). Dinamika Perang Suriah: Aktor dan Kepentingan. *Politea: Jurnal Kajian Politik Islam*, 2(2), 67–92.
- Neuman, W. L. (2013). *Metodologi Penelitian Sosial: Pendekatan Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif* (Translated, Ed.). Jakarta: Indeks.
- Noor, I. (2014). Analisis Intervensi Rusia dalam Konflik Suriah. Universitas Mulawarman, Samarinda.
- Rendra, D. S. M. (2017). Keterlibatan Turki dalam Konflik Suriah pada Tahun 2011-2012. *Jurnal Analisis Hubungan Internasional*, 6(2), 235–243.
- Shamieh, L. (2016). Asymmetric Warfare and Its Effect on the Neighboring Countries : Syria Crisis as a Case Study. In *Asymmetric Warfare: Conflict of the Past, the Present, and the Future*.
- Starr, S. (2015). *Revolt in Syria: Eye-Witness to the Uprising*. London: Hurst.
- Thornton, R. (2007). Asymmetric Warfare. In *Journal of Peace Research*. Cambridge: Polity.