International Journal of Applied Social Science
Volume 7 (11&12), November & December (2020) : 706-714
Received : 30.10.2020; Revised : 13.11.2020; Accepted : 29.11.2020

RESEARCH ARTICLE
ISSN : 2394-1405 (Print)
DOI: 10.36537/IJASS/7.11&12/706-714

The Syrian War – A Conflict of Power and Politics

GAUTAM SOOD
Assistant Professor
Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, Punjabi University, Patiala (Punjab) India

ABSTRACT

The Syrian conflict, which began in March 2011, stands as one of the most devastating and socially disruptive wars of the 21st century, transforming the social fabric of Syria and reshaping global humanitarian and migration discourses. Originating as a peaceful protest inspired by the Arab Spring, it rapidly escalated into a brutal civil war — a multifaceted confrontation involving domestic factions, regional powers, and global superpowers — marked by sectarian fragmentation, foreign interventions, and an unprecedented refugee crisis resulting in mass displacement. Viewed through the lens of conflict theory, the conflict reflects deep-seated struggles over power, resources, and ideology, while processes of social stratification and identity politics have intensified existing inequalities and communal divisions. Over the years, more than 465,000 people have been killed, over a million injured, and approximately 12 million uprooted from their homes. Drawing on a sociological lens, this paper examines how forced migration and mass dislocation have redefined social networks, cultural continuity, and diaspora formation. The discussion offers a structured sociological analysis of the conflict's causes, the experiences of affected populations and the challenges of rebuilding a fractured society. This paper also analyses the role of regional and global actors, the evolution of rebel groups, and the course of peace negotiations, offering a structured understanding of the ongoing humanitarian crisis and the challenges that lie ahead for Syria.

Key Words : Syria, Civil War, Arab Spring, Free Syrian Army, ISIS, Refugees, Russia, United States, Security Council, Peace Talks

INTRODUCTION

The Syrian Civil War began on March 15, 2011 and since then has claimed more than 465,000 lives, injured over a million people, and displaced roughly 12 million Syrians – nearly half the country's pre-war population. A localized call for reform and freedom turned into a civil war with deep sectarian, geopolitical, and humanitarian dimensions. From a sociological perspective, the conflict is not merely an accumulation of violent events, but the result of long-standing structural inequalities, identity-based divisions, and contested legitimacy of state authority. Conflict theory provides a useful lens to examine how unequal access to resources, suppression of dissent, and entrenched power hierarchies culminated in mass unrest. Similarly, social movement theory helps explain the initial mobilization, while social disintegration theory contextualizes the breakdown of institutions and trust that followed. This paper presents a chronological and analytical overview of the war's origins, key actors, major developments, and humanitarian consequences, integrating sociological concepts to deepen understanding of the Syrian crisis.

Causes of the Uprising: The Genesis

The outbreak of the Syrian conflict in 2011 was not the result of a single incident but the culmination of multiple, deeply rooted pressures. The Syrian conflict has its roots in deep-seated political repression, economic hardship, and societal frustration. Years of political repression, socio-economic disparity, historical grievances and environmental hardships had eroded public trust in

How to cite this Article: Sood, Gautam (2020). The Syrian War – A Conflict of Power and Politics. *Internat. J. Appl. Soc. Sci.,* **7** (11&12) : 706-714.

state institutions and strained the fabric of society. From a sociological perspective, these conditions represent overlapping structural strains that eroded social cohesion and heightened the potential for collective action. When a triggering incident occurred, these underlying tensions rapidly surfaced, transforming scattered discontent into widespread mobilization. The major structural and immediate factors that set the stage for the uprising are as follows.

Political and Economic Discontent:

For decades, Syria had been governed by the Ba'ath Party under the rule of Hafez al-Assad and later his son, Bashar al-Assad. These regimes maintained strict authoritarian control over public life, curbing dissent and restricting political freedoms. Syrians lived under an authoritarian system that centralized power within the Assad family and its close network of loyalists. Political dissent was met with repression, curtailing freedom of speech, assembly, and political participation. Economically, state-led development stagnated, with high youth unemployment, widespread underemployment, and unequal distribution of resources reinforcing feelings of exclusion. Patronage networks benefited a small elite, leaving large segments of the population frustrated by blocked mobility and entrenched inequality. The tipping point came in 2011, in the southern city of Daraa, where 15 schoolboys were arrested and tortured for writing pro-democracy slogans on walls. The death of one of the boys, a 13-year-old named Hamza al-Khateeb, under torture sparked widespread outrage, transforming simmering frustrations into organized protest. As protests spread to other cities, the government responded with overwhelming force, using live ammunition, arbitrary arrests, and torture. This violent crackdown only galvanized public anger and led to an intensification of the uprising.

Influence of the Arab Spring:

The early months of 2011 saw a surge of optimism across the Arab world as mass protests in Tunisia and Egypt successfully ousted entrenched rulers. These events provided both a symbolic and practical framework for collective action in Syria, demonstrating that entrenched authoritarian regimes could be challenged through mass mobilization. Social media played a critical role in transmitting images, slogans, and tactics from one country to another, fueling a sense of solidarity and shared struggle. Following the successful revolutions in Tunisia and Egypt, Syrians began organizing peaceful demonstrations demanding political reform, democratic governance and an end to corruption. Syrians began to gather in public spaces, calling for political reforms, transparency, and basic democratic freedoms. However, the Assad government responded with overwhelming force, using live ammunition, arbitrary arrests, and intimidation, effectively radicalizing a movement that had begun with peaceful intentions.

Sectarian and Historical Underpinnings:

Although the early protests were largely non-sectarian in nature, the regime's strategy and the ensuing militarization of the conflict brought latent sectarian tensions to the fore. Syria's population is predominantly Sunni Muslim, yet the ruling elite and military-security apparatus have long been dominated by the Alawite , a sect to which President Assad belongs. The Sunni Muslim majority harbored long-standing grievances over political marginalization under an Alawite-dominated leadership a dynamic reinforced by unequal access to power, resources, and state patronage. These grievances were compounded by historical traumas, most notably the 1982 Hama massacre, Hafez al-Assad's forces killed tens of thousands in a crackdown on an uprising against the regime led by the Muslim Brotherhood. Such collective memories were kept alive in family narratives and community discourse, reinforcing distrust toward the state. As the conflict deepened, sectarian identity became a rallying point for various groups, both within Syria and among external actors seeking to influence the war's trajectory.

Displacement and Social Unrest:

Between 2007 and 2010, Syria experienced one of the worst droughts in its modern history, devastating agricultural production and livestock herding. Crop failures and economic collapse in rural areas forced over 1.5 million people–predominantly small-scale farmers and their families–to migrate to already overcrowded cities such as Damascus, Aleppo, and Homs. This mass displacement placed unprecedented strain on urban infrastructure, job markets, and housing availability, deepening poverty and exacerbating inequality. Food prices soared, unemployment rates rose sharply, and tensions between rural migrants and established urban residents intensified. While rarely highlighted in

mainstream political analyses, this environmental crisis played a significant role in creating the social and economic instability that fueled the early unrest.

Escalation into Civil War:

By mid-2011, what began as scattered protests had transformed into an armed resistance movement, driven by the regime's intensifying violent crackdown against civilians. Reports of indiscriminate shootings, mass arrests, and reports of torture created deep mistrust between the state and its citizens, shutting down the possibility of peaceful resolution. As defections from the Syrian military grew—often involving soldiers ordered to fire on unarmed civilians—they organized themselves into the Free Syrian Army (FSA). Initially conceived as a defensive force to protect protestors and opposition-held areas, the FSA soon became a central actor in the armed opposition.

The regime's portrayal of the uprising as a foreign-backed conspiracy, along with targeted repression of particular communities, began to harden group identities and intensified sectarian narratives. The Free Syrian Army aimed to overthrow the Assad regime. The government, in turn, escalated its military campaign against opposition-held territories. Towns and neighborhoods perceived as supporting the rebels were subjected to aerial bombardments, sieges, and chemical attacks. As violence spread, Syria descended into a multi-sided civil war, with both government and opposition forces accused of human rights abuses. Armed clashes quickly spread from the southern city of Daraa to major cities like Homs, Hama each becoming symbolic battlegrounds of fierce fighting. State forces deployed heavy weaponry, including tanks and artillery, in densely populated areas, escalating both the scale and the intensity of violence.

Foreign involvement magnified the conflict's complexity. International actors entered the fray early, each driven by strategic, ideological, or sectarian interests. The Assad government received political, financial, and military support from allies such as Iran and Hezbollah, while opposition factions–fragmented and sometimes competing among themselves–received varying degrees of backing, ranging from weapons to intelligence, from Gulf states including Turkey and Western powers. This external involvement not only increased the flow of arms and funding but also entrenched divisions, making a negotiated settlement increasingly unlikely.

By the end of 2011, Syria had crossed a critical threshold. The combination of militarized state repression, fragmented opposition forces, deepening sectarian polarization, and escalating foreign intervention had pushed Syria past the threshold from civil unrest into a protracted and multi-faceted civil war. The conflict ceased to be defined by its original calls for political reform and instead evolved into a complex struggle involving local militias, transnational extremist factions, regional rivalries, and global power contests.

International Involvement and Proxy Dimensions:

Syria's war soon became a theater for international rivalry and proxy conflicts. The conflict rapidly evolved from a domestic uprising into a deeply internationalized war, shaped not only by internal divisions but also by the strategic calculations of regional and global powers. Foreign states and non-state actors were drawn in by ideological affinities, sectarian alignments, geopolitical ambitions and security concerns. The result was a patchwork of alliances and proxy battles, where external military, financial and political interventions directly altered the balance of power on the ground. This outside involvement prolonged and intensified the conflict and made any political settlement far more complex.

Allies of the Assad Regime:

From the outset, President Bashar al-Assad retained the unwavering support of key allies who viewed the survival of his regime as essential to their own strategic interests. The Assad regime received strong backing from Russia, Iran, and the Lebanese militia Hezbollah. Russia's intervention in September 2015 marked a turning point, as its airstrikes and military support helped stabilize the regime's control over key territories. Russian airstrikes targeted opposition-held territories, providing crucial cover for Syrian ground offensives, while advisory support, weapons supplies and diplomatic backing at the United Nations shielded Assad from punitive measures.

Iran played an equally vital role, seeing Syria as a central link in its "Axis of Resistance" against Western and Israeli influence. Tehran sent military troops from the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) and logistical aid, and coordinated the deployment of thousands of fighters from Hezbollah and Shia militias from Iraq and elsewhere, reinforcing Assad's position. Iraq's Shia militias, often with Iranian direction, also bolstered pro-regime operations. On the diplomatic front, both Russia and China consistently vetoed UN Security Council

resolutions that sought to sanction Assad or authorize military action against his government, ensuring his continued international legitimacy in certain forums.

Support for the Opposition:

The armed opposition, fragmented into numerous factions, drew varying degrees of support from states that opposed Assad's rule. Several Sunni-majority countries, including Turkey, Qatar, and Saudi Arabia, supported various rebel factions opposed to Assad. Turkey emerged as one of the most significant patrons, providing safe havens, arms and logistical support to rebel groups along its border. Turkey, launched military operations against both ISIL and Kurdish groups near its border, especially in Afrin and Manbij, leading to tensions with the United States. Ankara's motivations blended ideological solidarity with certain Islamist factions and a desire to curtail Kurdish autonomy movements in northern Syria.

Qatar and Saudi Arabia also funneled substantial financial resources and weaponry to opposition groups, often backing different factions according to their own political and sectarian preferences. The United States initially pursued covert measures, including a CIA-run program launched in 2013 to train and arm vetted rebel forces, but the program was criticized for its limited effectiveness and was later discontinued. Over time, U.S. involvement shifted focus toward counterterrorism, especially after the rise of ISIL, culminating in direct missile strikes on regime targets in 2017 and 2018 and extensive coalition airstrikes against ISIL-held territory, besides supporting Kurdish-led Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF) in northeastern Syria.

Israel, though not formally aligned with the Syrian opposition, pursued its own security objectives by conducting repeated airstrikes on pro-Assad forces and Hezbollah positions inside Syria, , targeting Hezbollah supply lines and Iranian military installations, aiming to disrupt weapons transfers and prevent Iranian entrenchment near its borders.

Chemical Weapons and the US "Red Line":

The question of chemical weapons became a critical point of escalation in the international debate over Syria. In 2012, U.S. President Barack Obama warned that the use of such weapons would cross a "red line" and provoke a decisive response. When reports emerged in 2013 that Assad's forces had used sarin gas against civilians in Ghouta, the Obama administration refrained from direct military action at the time, amidst a deal brokered by Russia that led to the dismantling of Syria's declared chemical weapons stockpile. However, allegations of further chemical attacks persisted, undermining confidence in that deal. The turning point came in April 2017, when another suspected sarin attack in Khan Shaykhun prompted direct U.S. cruise missile strikes against a Syrian airbase. In April 2018, following a similar incident in Douma, the United States, the United Kingdom and France launched coordinated joint airstrikes on facilities alleged to be linked to Syria's chemical weapons program. These interventions signaled a willingness to respond militarily to chemical attacks, but they stopped short of a broader intervention to end the war.

Peace Talks and Diplomatic Gridlock:

Efforts to negotiate a peaceful resolution to the Syrian conflict unfolded across multiple diplomatic platforms, yet each initiative was been hampered by entrenched mistrust, diverging geopolitical agendas and the intractable question of President Bashar al-Assad's political future. These talks revealed deep fractures not only within Syrian society but also among the foreign powers shaping its fate.

The Geneva Process (2012–2017):

The first major diplomatic initiative was the Geneva process. Initiated under auspices of the United Nations, the Geneva Process sought to bring the Syrian government and opposition representatives together to negotiate a ceasefire and outline a political transition. While the early rounds produced frameworks for power-sharing and humanitarian access, the talks repeatedly stalled over the central issue of Assad's role in any post-war arrangement. The regime insisted on his continued leadership, while the opposition demanded his removal as a precondition for progress — a deadlock that eroded trust and undermined the UN's credibility as a neutral mediator.

The Astana Talks (2017):

Spearheaded by Russia, Iran and Turkey, the Astana format marked a shift from broad political negotiations to more pragmatic, security-focused discussions. The resulting "de-escalation plan" divided Syria into four zones intended to reduce hostilities and protect civilians. On paper, this framework suggested a pathway to easing the humanitarian crisis; in practice, however, violations

were frequent, aerial bombardments persisted and control of these zones became yet another arena for competing military interests.

The Sochi Conference (2018):

In early 2018, Russia convened the Sochi Conference, presenting it as a forum for advancing a new Syrian constitution and fostering intra-Syrian dialogue. Yet many opposition groups boycotted the event, viewing it as an attempt to bypass the UN-led Geneva track and cement Moscow's dominance over the peace process. The absence of key actors, coupled with the perception of bias, meant that the conference produced few tangible outcomes beyond reaffirming existing divisions.

Fragmentation and Rebel Group Dynamics:

As the conflict deepened, Syria's opposition landscape fractured into a complex web of armed factions with shifting alliances, divergent goals, and competing sources of support. What began as a relatively unified uprising against the Assad regime splintered into dozens of groups, each pursuing its own vision for Syria's future — or, in some cases, its own survival. This fragmentation not only prolonged the war but also made diplomatic resolution far more elusive.

Free Syrian Army (FSA):

The Free Syrian Army emerged in mid-2011 as the earliest organized military opposition to the Assad regime, founded by defectors from the Syrian Arab Army who refused orders to fire on protesters. Initially, the FSA represented both the hope and the image of a unified, disciplined rebellion. Its stated goal was to protect civilians, overthrow Assad's government, and establish a democratic Syria. In its formative years, the FSA benefited from significant political and material support from Western powers and Gulf states, who viewed it as a moderate alternative to Islamist militias.

However, the FSA's early promise was undermined by structural weaknesses. The group was never a truly centralized army but rather a loose coalition of local militias operating with varying levels of training, resources, and ideological alignment. Attempts to unify command often faltered in the face of personal rivalries, logistical hurdles, and competing foreign agendas. As the conflict dragged on, better-funded Islamist groups — many with transnational networks and ideological cohesion — began to overshadow the FSA both on the battlefield and in media narratives.

By the mid-2010s, the FSA's influence had declined sharply. Some of its units were absorbed into Islamist coalitions, others dissolved entirely, and still others shifted allegiance depending on local circumstances or foreign sponsorship. Although remnants of the FSA continued to operate in certain regions – particularly under Turkish patronage in northern Syria – the movement no longer held the central, symbolic position it once occupied in the opposition landscape. Its trajectory reflected the broader fragmentation of the Syrian rebellion, in which external intervention, ideological polarization, and resource competition steadily eroded the dream of a unified insurgent front. While the FSA initially received widespread support, its structure remained fragmented, and extremist factions began to gain influence. Groups such as Jabhat al-Nusra and the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) emerged, introducing more radical ideologies and brutal tactics to the conflict.

Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL):

ISIL's entry into the Syrian conflict in 2013 marked a decisive shift in both the intensity and international dimension of the war. Initially an offshoot of al-Qaeda in Iraq, the group capitalized on the chaos of Syria's civil war and the instability spilling over from Iraq to establish a territorial foothold in the country's east and northeast. Within months, ISIL had captured major urban centers such as Raqqa and Deir ez-Zor, proclaiming a so-called "caliphate" that rejected national borders in favor of a transnational Islamist state. Its governance model was defined by extreme brutality – public executions, systematic torture, sexual enslavement of minorities, and the destruction of ancient cultural sites — all designed to instill fear and enforce ideological control.

Beyond its military gains, ISIL proved adept at propaganda and recruitment, using social media to reach disaffected individuals across the globe. Thousands of foreign fighters traveled to Syria, swelling the group's ranks and fueling a narrative of global jihad. On the battlefield, ISIL's presence complicated the dynamics of the war: while it occasionally fought the Assad regime, it also waged violent campaigns against other rebel factions, including those nominally aligned with Western interests. The need to confront ISIL became a central justification for foreign military intervention, bringing a broad international coalition into Syria and further entangling

the conflict.

Jabhat Fateh al-Sham (formerly al-Nusra Front):

Formed in late 2011 as the Syrian branch of al-Qaeda, Jabhat al-Nusra quickly earned a reputation as one of the most effective and ruthless rebel factions on the battlefield. Its fighters were battle-hardened, highly disciplined, and skilled in insurgent warfare – qualities that made the group both a valuable ally and a dangerous rival to other rebel factions. Initially, its affiliation with al-Qaeda drew immediate hostility from the United States and other Western nations, which designated it a terrorist organization. Nevertheless, in the fluid alliances of the Syrian war, Jabhat al-Nusra occasionally collaborated with more moderate groups in joint offensives against the Assad regime.

In 2016, the group announced it was severing ties with al-Qaeda and rebranded itself as Jabhat Fateh al-Sham (JFS) in an attempt to reframe its public image and appeal to a wider base of opposition supporters. The leadership framed the move as an effort to unify the Syrian rebellion and reduce the pretext for international intervention against it. However, despite the new name, its core ideology — rooted in Salafi-jihadism — remained unchanged, and many observers regarded the rebranding as a strategic maneuver rather than a substantive ideological shift.

JFS's relations with other rebel groups were often uneasy. While it shared short-term military objectives with certain factions, its rigid Islamist vision and history of sectarian violence frequently brought it into conflict with more nationalist or secular elements of the opposition. These tensions sometimes escalated into open fighting, particularly as JFS sought to consolidate control over opposition-held territories. By absorbing smaller Islamist factions and engaging in battles against rivals, JFS both expanded its influence and deepened the fragmentation of the Syrian opposition landscape. Its evolution reflected a broader pattern in the conflict, where groups continually adapted their identities and alliances to survive in an ever-shifting battlefield shaped by ideology, resources, and foreign intervention.

Hezbollah:

Hezbollah's involvement in the Syrian conflict signaled a significant expansion of the war's regional dimension. Based in Lebanon and long supported by Iran, Hezbollah entered the fray in 2012 as one of the Assad regime's most capable and disciplined allies. The group framed its intervention as a defensive measure to protect Shia holy sites and counter what it described as a Western- and Gulf-backed insurgency threatening the "axis of resistance" against Israel and U.S. influence in the Middle East.

On the ground, Hezbollah's fighters brought battlefield experience honed during years of conflict with Israel. They played a critical role in retaking key strategic areas such as Qusayr in 2013, securing supply lines between Damascus and the Lebanese border, and reinforcing regime positions in contested territories. However, Hezbollah's involvement also intensified sectarian polarization, framing the Syrian war in increasingly Shia–Sunni terms and deepening hostility with Sunni-majority states. The group's visible role in supporting Assad further entrenched divisions within Lebanon itself, risking spillover violence and political instability. In the broader geopolitical calculus, Hezbollah's presence tied Syria's fate more closely to Iran's regional ambitions, making the conflict even harder to resolve.

Kurdish YPG and Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF):

The rise of the Kurdish People's Protection Units (YPG) marked another pivotal chapter in the Syrian conflict. Emerging from the Kurdish-majority regions of northern Syria, the YPG positioned itself as both a defender of local communities and an effective fighting force against ISIL. Its disciplined ranks, strategic adaptability, and strong grassroots support enabled it to secure and hold large territories in the north and northeast, including the key city of Kobani after a protracted siege in 2014–2015.

Recognizing the YPG's battlefield effectiveness, the United States and its coalition partners provided arms, training, and air support, eventually helping to form the Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF) — a multi-ethnic alliance that included Arabs, Assyrians, and other minorities. The SDF's military successes were matched by its efforts to establish a semi-autonomous administration based on principles of local governance, gender equality, and secularism, creating an alternative political vision in contrast to both the Assad regime and Islamist factions.

Yet the SDF's alliance with the U.S. came at a steep geopolitical cost: Turkey viewed the YPG as an extension of the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), which Ankara designates as a terrorist organization. This perception

prompted Turkish military incursions, including the 2018 operation in Afrin and repeated threats to seize Manbij and other areas under SDF control. The Kurdish forces thus found themselves in a precarious position — militarily strong yet diplomatically vulnerable, dependent on foreign protection while surrounded by hostile powers.

Post-2018: Fragmented Fronts and Enduring Displacement

The period following 2018 marked a phase of entrenched stalemate in Syria's political and military landscape—no longer defined by sweeping nationwide offensives, but by fractured, localized battles shaped by competing regional and global powers. Large-scale territorial shifts had slowed, yet violence and instability persisted across multiple fronts. By late 2019, the Assad regime—with sustained backing from Russia and Iran—had regained control over most of the country's urban centers and strategic regions. The opposition was pushed into shrinking pockets of territory, most notably the northwestern province of Idlib, the last major rebel stronghold. Idlib was a contested zone dominated by Hay'at Tahrir al-Sham (HTS), a jihadist group formerly affiliated with al-Qaeda, alongside hardline militants and smaller opposition factions. While a series of Russian–Turkish ceasefire arrangements briefly slowed hostilities, the Syrian government and its Russian allies repeatedly resumed bombardments, striking military positions and civilian infrastructure alike, creating recurrent humanitarian emergencies and displacing hundreds of thousands.

Elsewhere, cities once synonymous with fierce resistance such as Homs and Eastern Ghouta were recaptured by Syrian government forces after intense sieges. These victories solidified the regime's hold over central and western Syria but left behind communities scarred by displacement, property destruction, and lingering mistrust. Sporadic insurgent attacks, security crackdowns, and lingering resentment among the local population ensured that peace was far from secure and that tensions remained high.

Northern Syria witnessed further complications with Turkey's seizure of Afrin during Operation Olive Branch in partnership with elements of the Free Syrian Army in early 2018. This operation forced Kurdish YPG forces from the area, but also displaced tens of thousands of civilians amid reports of rights abuses and looting. Farther east, Manbij emerged as another flashpoint, where the US military presence alongside Kurdish-led Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF) stoked fears of a direct confrontation with Turkey, which continued to regard the YPG as an existential security threat. In the east and northeast, the United States maintained a scaled-down presence focused on counter-ISIL operations and support for the Kurdish-led Syrian Democratic Forces. This fragile balance between NATO allies underscored the risk of accidental escalation. Meanwhile, remnants of the so-called Islamic State, although stripped of their territorial "caliphate" by 2019, persisted in the desert regions through guerrilla-style insurgency operations targeting both Syrian regime and SDF positions—particularly in the Deir ez-Zor region and desert areas.

Meanwhile, Turkey, meanwhile, deepened its control over parts of northern Syria, primarily to counter Kurdish militias it perceived as terrorist threats, through additional military incursions into areas such as Ras al-Ayn and Tel Abyad, aiming to establish a "safe zone" and prevent further Kurdish entrenchment. These incursions displaced thousands more civilians, including many Kurds, and intensified tensions with both Damascus and Washington. These overlapping fronts underscored a central reality of post-2018 Syria: the war no longer followed a single axis, but rather a fragmented and highly localized conflict shaped by competing foreign agendas.

Diplomatically, the years following 2018 brought occasional but significant developments. There was a notable shift in the Arab world's stance toward the Assad government. From 2021 onwards, several countries—including the United Arab Emirates, Egypt, and eventually Saudi Arabia—began re-engaging with Damascus. Despite this regional thaw, Western governments remained skeptical of normalizing relations with Assad. International sanctions, particularly those from the United States and European Union, continued to cripple Syria's economy, fueling inflation and pushing millions deeper into food insecurity. Western governments maintained that lifting sanctions in the absence of political reform would only entrench authoritarian rule.

The humanitarian toll of the conflict has remained staggering. Syria's war has generated one of the largest refugee crises since the Second World War. As per the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), by the late 2010s, over 5.5 million Syrians had fled the country and an additional 6.5 million displaced internally. Neighboring states continue to bear the greatest burden: Turkey hosts more than 3.6 million Syrian

refugees, while Lebanon and Jordan together shelter over 1.5 million, straining public services, overcrowded refugee settlements, placing immense strain on public services, housing, and employment markets and heightening socio-political tensions within host communities. Jordan's refugee camps, such as Za'atari, grew into sprawling semi-permanent settlements.

Inside Syria, an estimated 6.5 million people remained internally displaced, often forced to move multiple times as fighting shifted from one district to another. Many lived in overcrowded camps or makeshift shelters with limited access to clean water, food, and medical care. The destruction of hospitals, schools, and critical infrastructure further deepened the suffering.

Many Syrians, unable to find stability in the region, have risked dangerous journeys to Europe, where they face perilous crossings, exploitation by human traffickers, and increasing political hostility in host states. While the tragedy of these journeys drew global sympathy, it also provoked political backlash in host countries, leading to tightening borders, hardening asylum policies and the rise of anti-immigrant sentiment. Although some returns have been recorded — such as the 66,000 people who went back in 2017 — these movements have primarily been to areas under Syrian regime or Turkey-backed control, often under conditions criticized by human rights groups as unsafe or coercive. For millions, the prospect of a safe and dignified return remains a distant hope, making displacement one of the most enduring legacies of the Syrian conflict.

Today, Syria remains deeply fragmented. Government forces dominate much of the west and south; the Kurdish-led SDF administers the northeast; Turkey oversees parts of the north; and HTS maintains its grip on Idlib. While front lines have largely solidified, the political, economic and humanitarian crises continue to worsen. Without a credible peace process and large-scale reconstruction, millions remain caught between exile, poverty, and an uncertain future in a country profoundly reshaped by more than a decade of war.

Conclusion:

The Syrian Civil War stands as one of the starkest reminders of how domestic repression, sectarian fault lines and the strategic ambitions of global and regional powers can intersect to produce not just a conflict, but a generation's worth of devastation. What began as calls for reform spiraled into a multi-layered war that has redrawn alliances, altered borders in practice, and eroded the bonds of trust within Syrian society.

Despite years of military campaigns, shifting battlefronts, and high-profile peace initiatives, a durable political settlement remains out of reach. The war's legacy will not be measured solely in the ruins of cities or the millions displaced, but in the deep social fractures, loss of cultural heritage, and the normalization of displacement and violence in everyday life.

For the international community, the challenge is twofold: to prevent the conflict from reigniting in new forms, and to commit to a long-term process of reconstruction, justice, and reconciliation that addresses not only the physical rebuilding of Syria, but the healing of its social fabric. Without this, the war's end will remain only a technical ceasefire — its wounds still open, and its future still hostage to the forces that tore it apart.

REFERENCES

Cockburn, P. (2015). *The rise of Islamic State: ISIS and the new Sunni revolution*. Verso Books.

Kelley, C. P., Mohtadi, S., Cane, M. A., Seager, R. and Kushnir, Y. (2015). Climate change in the Fertile Crescent and implications of the recent Syrian drought. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **112**(11) : 3241–3246.

Leenders, R. and Mansour, K. (2018). Humanitarianism, state sovereignty, and authoritarian regime maintenance in the Syrian War. *Political Science Quarterly*, **133**(2) : 225–257.

Phillips, C. (2015). *Sectarianism and conflict in Syria*. *Third World Quarterly*, **36**(2) : 357–376.

Phillips, C. (2016). The battle for Syria: International rivalry in the new Middle East . Yale University Press.

Web References :

Al Jazeera (2018, April 14). *Syria's war: Who is fighting and why*. [Internet] [Available at: https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2018/4/14/syrias-war-who-is-fighting-and-why] [Retrieved on: 09.09.2019]

BBC News (2018, February 25). *Syria profile – Timeline*. [Internet] [Available at: https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east14703995] [Retrieved on: 25.03.2019].

Human Rights Watch (2013, August 21). *Syria: Government likely culprit in chemical attack*. [Internet] [Available at: https://www.hrw.org/news/2013/08/21/syria-

government-likely-culprit-chemical-attack] [Retrieved on: 05.12.2018].

International Crisis Group (2012). *Syria's mutating conflict* (Middle East Report No. 128). [Internet] [Available at: https://www.crisisgroup.org/middle-east-north-africa/eastern-mediterranean/syria/syrias-mutating-conflict] [Retrieved on: 05.12.2018].

Reuters (2018, February 13). *Timeline: Chemical weapons attacks in Syria*. [Internet] [Available at: https://www.reuters.com/article/us-mideast-crisis-syria-chemical-timeli-idUSKCN1FY1G7] [Retrieved on: 09.09.2019].

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2018). Syria emergency. [Internet] [Available at: https://www.unhcr.org/syria-emergency.html] [Retrieved on: 09.09.2019].

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) (2018). 2018 humanitarian needs overview: Syrian Arab Republic. [Internet] [Available at: https://reliefweb.int/report/syrian-arab-republic/2018-humanitarian-needs-overview-syrian-arab-republic] [Retrieved on: 13.08.2019].

U.S. Department of State (2018). Syria: Country reports on human rights practices. [Internet] [Available at: https://www.state.gov/reports/2018-country-reports-on-human-rightspractices/syria/] [Retrieved on: 09.09.2019].

****