

Conflict between the United States and Syria

Student's Name

Institution

Introduction

The buzzing insurgence of the civilians in the several Middle-Eastern countries against their autocratic government turned into armored rebellion in Syria. The autocratic rulers and their activities seemed to be the unbreakable tyranny. Yet the power of civilians shook their throne. Bashar al-Assad, the president of Syria, has been in office for more than 40 years. It should be noted that he is not an elected president and Syria is not a democratic country. He inherited the supreme power from his father. Thus, he considers himself the eligible ruler of Syria and does not think of accountability, honesty, and democracy. This sense of feeling made him the despotic ruler.

Historical Background to the Conflict

It was reported that the government forces of Syria used chemical weapons against the militias fighting against Assad forces. According to Heydemann (2013), “As the Syrian revolution enters its third year, the risks to regional stability are escalating”. Aggression and violence are all over Syria including its border regions. On the other hand, the egocentricity is much important to the U.S. government and they settle their foreign policy based on that egocentricity they are blaming Assad regime depending on the U.S. intelligence report and keeping diplomatic pressure on Assad government. According to Sharp and Blanchard (2013), “Members of Congress and Administration officials are debating options for responding militarily to President Bashar al Assad’s forces’ reported use of chemical weapons in attacks on rebel-held areas and civilians”.

U.S. Economic War against Syria

The meeting was held by eight leaders in Lough Erne located in Northern Ireland, urged for an international conference due to the ongoing turbulence in Syria. Now, the Obama administration is seemingly in confidential contract with Iran and Russia since these two countries are considered to be the Syrian buffer states. According to the report, an American Plan B was rejected by the Obama administration. The U.S. administration and the Pentagon are undertaking charitable rescue program. Western diplomats in Lebanon stated that it is considered to be equal to Marshal Plan. Indeed, the pro-Zionist propensity to the U.S. administration and occupying nature of the Israeli government are much active in this regard. Alternatively, “Obama administration’s decision to directly supply weapons to the Syrian opposition may end up torpedoing the possibility of a political settlement” (Hallinan, 2013).

Actually, Washington wants to take control over the Syrian economy which will open the door to govern Syria in one sense. The U.S. administration wants to secure tree hundred billion dollars in the name of rebuilding post-Assad Syrian government where International Monetary Fund economists assess the value which consists of half a trillion dollars. Yet Syrians are able to rebuild their country. Although financial help is much greeted by the Syrians, they do not want to surrender the Syrian Arab Republic to a novel western monetary order. “What is hidden in the war on Syria is reported to be much bigger than has been divulged to date” (Lamb, 2013).

Some Western Diplomatic sources stated that some Gulf countries and the U.S. government attempted to bribe Syrian President’s cousin, Rami Makhlouf, and some Syrian nationalists to break the affiliation with the government but failed whereas many Syrian capitalists fell into the trap. The U.S. government and its co-partners seem to initiate an economic war constricting economic sanctions by which common people are affected in various ways. Actually, the common people are suffering from food, medical facilities, and fuel costs.

The U.S. and its foreign policy makers want to dismiss Makhoul and others like him because they are the main barrier in implementing the Western economic scheme in Syria. Makhoul and his company are the main source of financial power of the Syrian government and have the economic strength to rebuild Syria. The reason for targeting Makhoul and other businessmen is to weaken the Syrian economy that will make the path smoother to occupy Syria which is more certain than military action to damage a country like Syria. According to Lamb (2013), “The targeting of Mr. Rami Makhoul and dozens of like-minded Syrian businessmen, who refused to abandon their country, continues”

Alleged Chemical Weapons Attack

The turmoil turned into armed rebellion in its third year. The Syrian militias are fighting against government forces. During this time period, the momentum between government forces and militias has often shifted. The Syrian government wants to retain its advantages in artillery, air power, and armored equipment. The latest and most deadly incident of August 21 was a sequence of reported occurrences. Syrian armed forces emerged to have used deadly chemical weapons despite President Obama’s prior statement. Using deadly weapons would mean the change of viewpoint of international community on Syria. The U.S. government showed intelligence investigation telling that Assad regime used chemical weapons against civilians on August 21 “which prompted US threats of air strikes against the Syrian government” (RTE news, 2013).

The Obama administration disclosed the report on August 30, 2013. The Syrian government firmly denied the allegation.

U.S. Intelligence Report on August 21 Incident

The unspecified précis of the U.S. intelligence community's evaluation published by the White House are given below:

- The United States declares that the Syrian government used deadly chemical weapons that killed hundreds of people at the suburbs of Damascus in Syria. John Kerry, the foreign minister of the U.S., claimed several times the same charges in front of the electronic and print media.
- A primary assessment based on the report of 21st attack determined that 1,429 people were murdered in the chemical weapons attack.
- The U.S. intelligence community has needed skills that help it to assess those Syrian chemical weapons itself.
- On the basis of intelligence report the U.S. government declared that it was not the opposition that organized the attack. This means that the mutineers have not used the deadly weapons.
- Satellite picture reveals that attacks from a regime-controlled area hit neighborhoods where the chemical attacks seemingly occurred.

Syria Is Becoming Obama's Iraq

Once a former president George W. Bush used to claim that Iraq possesses the mass destructive weapons but his claim was proved wrong. In the very similar fashion, the later president Barack Obama claimed that Syria has chemical weapons; therefore, Syrian president Bashar al-Assad crossed the boundary of Obama's imaginary "red line". This trick may befool very few Americans because most of the people of the U.S. do not believe their president after the substantial NSA intelligence work scandal. In a recent journey to Jordan, Obama provoked the direct war between Syria and the U.S. Obama administration has spent a lot of military,

financial, and diplomatic capital on the Syrian conflict and each advancement means bringing the U.S. closer to a direct military interference. Obama administration is supplying arms to the rebels who are using them against their own countrymen and, of course, responsible for mass killing. Obama administration has been sending thousands of guns to the rebels by the direct help of Qatar and Saudi Arabia. If this weapon trafficking had been stopped, many lives would have been saved. Furthermore, the allegation against Syria using chemical weapons is more ambiguous because according to the UN representative, "The rebels have used chemical weapons, not the Syrian government" (Cooke, 2013).

The opinions of several analysts are that the government of Syria would have no intention to use chemical weapons since they possess vast conventional weapons. On the other hand, the Obama administration made the neighboring countries like Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey to sever relations with Syria. America's foreign policy over Syria has turned an already-fragile area into a blazing tinderbox. Moreover, anti-Syria puppet countries like Saudi Arabia and Israel are taking terrific supporting risks, which hinder Obama's activity. It should be noted that the U.S. is awfully hated the whole Arab region. According to Cooke (2013), a European Union diplomat said that:

It would be the first conflict where we pretend we could create peace by delivering arms... If you pretend to know where the weapons will end up, then it would be the first war in history where this is possible. We have seen it in Bosnia, Afghanistan and Iraq. Weapons don't disappear; they pop up where they are needed.

Nevertheless, Obama is anxious of the domestic politics of his own country since Americans do not like any war in the Middle East and they know that arming rebels means

strengthening the people who are defined as terrorists and against whom the U.S. and its

likeminded countries fighting since 2001.

The Future of the Syrian Revolution

Although the imperialist powers are planning to shape the result of the rebellion, the revolutionary forces are still in the leading position who can lead post-Assad Syrian government. The crisis turned into a new look when the government forces tried to suppress the revolutionary fighters hoping that they would be able to smash the rebels before any insurrection occurred by them. Even though numerous casualties took place so far, yet the Free Syrian Army did not lay down their arms. In the meantime, mutineers launched a revolt in Syria's industrial and commercial center in the city of Aleppo. Assad was compelled to deploy air strike on that city. After the air strike, ten thousand people fled both Aleppo and Damascus. Indeed, the resistance in these cities was very strong. The mutineers captured tanks and that incident created a desertion and panic to the government forces. The rebels occupied the entire cities while the government forces were trying to control over the two main cities. Instead, four top ranked security personnel were killed during urban clash that revealed the weakness of the Assad government and his forces. Sustar (2013) stated that "With Assad's iron grip on Damascus and Aleppo now broken, the Syrian bourgeoisie—mostly Sunni Muslims—may finally be willing to desert the regime as a wave of factory closures in Aleppo hammers them economically".

According to Sustar (2013), the British socialist John Rees considers it as a counter attack:

Imperialist intervention in Syria has led many on the international Left—mistakenly—to write off Syrian revolutionary forces as having been hijacked by the United States and its regional proxies, Turkey, Saudi Arabia and Qatar. According to this logic, the

international left and antiwar movement must confine themselves to opposing imperialist intervention and withhold support for the Syrian revolutionary movement.

Rees tries to focus on the anti-imperialistic character of Assad regime. The growth of the armed resistance has uncovered the contradictions of imperialist policy. The fact that the United States and European powers provoked warlike attack did not result from Russian and Chinese disagreement. If Washington planned a straight attack on Syria, it would form an alliance with other countries willing to do it. Actually, the U.S. never supplied heavy weapons to the FSA, which indicates Turkey who could have provided arms to the mutineers. Consequently, fighters are getting several heavy weapons like AK-47s, rocket-propelled grenades, and other artillery instruments. Those weapons do not contain anti-tank or anti-aircraft weapons.

The Pretended Humanitarian Intervention in Syria

Anybody may be amazed by the report published by the western media failing to distinguish between the right and wrong news. All the reports come out from the U.S. press describing the Obama administration as a negotiator of “peaceful” resolution to the inconsistency in Syria. In fact, these gracious and virtuous initiatives are to hide the terrible human suffering that has ultimately engulfed Syria. It is one of the bloody responsibilities of the U.S. policy. According to Baraka (2013),

Diplomacy, for the U.S., has meant calling for regime change from the outset and then encouraging Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Israel, their client states in the region, to arm, train and provide political support for a military campaign with the objective of effectively dismembering the Syria State.

After two years with the killing of thousands of people, the U.S. and other related organizations leading to more direct interference by the West to eliminate the regime is being

prepared in the shape of a peace meeting scheduled to be held in June. The U.S. government demands a peaceful diplomatic solution. It is predicated to the rivalry groups to have an intermediary government where Assad is not expected to play any role. Thus, the U.S. intention is very clear that there will be no active effort to resolve the conflict. Conversely, the U.S. stance also corroborates the real aim of the meeting that the U.S. wants to rationalize direct military intervention. In this regard, Cartalucci (2013) mentioned the following:

With help from the C.I.A., Arab governments and Turkey have sharply increased their military aid to Syria's opposition fighters in recent months, expanding a secret airlift of arms and equipment for the uprising against President Bashar al-Assad, according to air traffic data, interviews with officials in several countries and the accounts of rebel commanders.

Since the U.S. and their policy makers want to cover the main problem of Syria where humanitarian intervention can be a perfect ideological cover through which internal rationalization can be continued easily as the global "gendarme" of the capitalist order. They are talking about human rights. But everybody knows that it is nothing but a trick to claim that the international community had a moral and legal responsibility to save the threatened people from any kind of damage. According to Baraka (2013),

The NATO intervention in Bosnia and Kosovo, the assault on Iraq to "save" the Iraqi people from Saddam Hussein, and most recently the NATO attack on Libya that brought to power a rag-tag assortment of anti-African racists, have solidified the idea among many in the U.S. that humanitarian intervention to protect human rights through aggressive war is justifiable.

Furthermore, it is not a new articulation of white power declaring the right to unilaterally attack on any state. They do not consider it as flabby attempt to sovereignty. The U.S. and European publics are irrespective of ethnicity or race. They have made the world a much more dangerous place for the people. A picture of recent wars depicts that in Libya, the death toll is 50,000; in Afghanistan, it is 30,000; in Syria, the number of deaths is 80,000; and in Iraq, it is 1,000,000. All these lives are laid down by the U.S. and their co-forces in the name of humanitarian intervention or in order to make them free from their autocratic ruler.

The United States intervention in several countries is given below: (Data from Bricmont, 2006)

Country	Year
---------	------

Italy	1948
Guatemala	1963
Mongolia	1996
Philippines	1950
Bolivia	1966
Bosnia	1998
Lebanon	1950
Chile	1964, 1970
Yugoslavia	2000
Indonesia	1955
Italy	1960-1980s
Nicaragua	2001
Vietnam	1955
Portugal	1974-1975
Bolivia	2002
British Guyana	53-64
Australia	1972-1975
Slovakia	2002
Japan	1958-1970s
Jamaica	1976
Georgia	2003
Nepal	1959
Panama	1984, 1990
El Salvador	2004
Laos	1960
Nicaragua	1984, 1990
Afghanistan	2004
Brazil	1962
Haiti	1987-1988
Iraq	2004
Dominican Republic	1962
Bulgaria	1990
Ukraine	2005
Russia	1996

Recent Humanitarian Interventions in Libya

The recent humanitarian intervention in Libya made the UN Security Council change its Resolution 1973. The Resolution will act for the threatened people to protect them from any kind of attack. The basis of the resolution was humanitarian consideration. In a part of Libya, especially in the city of Ben-Ghazi, thousands of people got maltreatment and hundreds of them

were killed. Thus, the UN Security Council brought the allegation against Libya and felt anxiety against the Libyan government. The military intervention is supposed to be lawful due to authorization of the UN Security Council under chapter no. VII of the UN agreement. The provisions of the UN Charter are very clear for humanitarian intervention.

Humanitarian Non-intervention in Bahrain, Qatar, and Yemen

The U.S. government always tries to bear influence on several countries. Bahrain, Qatar, and Yemen are the countries which governments always like to stay inside the influential circle of the U.S. These countries work as buffer states of the U.S. If the U.S. government takes any decision that is related to the foreign affairs and if that has a regional impact on the Middle East region, then these buffer states are always ready to support it. Since these states governments' home and foreign affairs are influenced by the U.S., they have no accountability. Thus, the U.S. government never tries to impose humanitarian intervention in these countries.

9 Theories

Transnationalism or Realism

In international relations, transnationalism is regarded as a social phenomenon. In transnationalism, the academic research program grown out of the insubstantial inter-connectivity. In the early 20th century, the term was disseminated by Randolph Bourne as a novel way of thoughts about relations between cultures. Perhaps, transnationalism is an economic procedure related to the worldwide reform of the production system. The common term 'globalization' is also known as economic transnationalism after the spreading of the Internet and wireless systems. Transnationalism is seen in the multinational companies where the decision makers want to maximize the profits and minimize the costs sticking to their most professional means being callous of political boundaries. Actually, transnationalism is a mean of

increasing border relations of people. Here, state boundaries are meaningless. People, groups, organizations, and states are combined and related to each other where cultural and political characteristics of nations are united with various levels. Transnationalism is a part of globalization.

Liberalism

In international relations, idealism is the forerunner of liberalism. It is a concept of people who consider themselves as “realists”. They established the concept of idealism which is also known as utopianism. Another name of idealism is “Wilsonianism”. Idealism is a concept of thought which shapes the internal political philosophy and the objective of the foreign policy of a state. Liberalism suggests that state preferences are the main determinant of state behavior. Realism and liberalism are different in actions. Liberalism suggests plurality in actions even the state reveals itself as a unitary actor. Therefore, preferences vary from state to state depending on several factors like culture, economic system, or government. Liberalism also believes that communication between states is not bounded to the political or security levels, it is rather related to multilevel sectors like economic, cultural, and several others through commercial firms, organizations or individuals. Consequently, without having a chaotic international system, there is an abundance of opportunities for assistance and the broad notions of power.

Feminism

In early 1990s, the feminist approaches became accepted in international relations. The approaches highlight that women's knowledge and experiences continue to be expelled from the lessons of international relations. The main logic of the feminist international relations is that gender relations are essential to international relations since IR highlight the function of diplomatic wives and conjugal relationships that assist sex trafficking. Jacqui True, the feminist

international relations scholar, differentiates between empirical, analytical, and normative feminism. Women and gender relations are seen in empirical feminism as empirical characteristics of international relations. Analytical feminism argues that the hypothetical structure of international relations has a gender partiality. Theorizing as part of an agenda for change is seen by normative feminism.

Conclusion

Current situation indicates that the conflict between the Syria regime and the U.S. government reaches the climax. Syria has been suffering from domestic crisis for nearly three years. Bashar al-Assad, the president of Syria, and his forces experience problems with controlling the ongoing turmoil. Meanwhile, the U.S. and their supporters feel concern for boundless sufferings of the common people of Syria. Most of the international relations specialists say that the anxiety of the U.S. is not for the common people but to gain control over Syria. Finance must be another influential factor to cross the threshold of Syria. Moreover, the trick of chemical weapons seems to play a vital role in this regard. Nevertheless, the conflict turned into a complicated situation while the U.S. is being instigated by Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and Israel. They want the U.S. to attack on the Syrian government forces. If this happens, though the probability of direct military attack is very low, the world might face a disastrous condition.

References

Baraka, A. (2013). *Syria and the sham of "humanitarian intervention"*. Retrieved from

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/syria-and-the-sham-of-humanitarian-intervention/5337490>

Bricmont, J. (2006). *Humanitarian imperialism: Using human rights to sell war*. Retrieved from

<http://www.kropfpolisci.com/humanitarian.imperialism.bricmont.pdf>

Cartalucci, T. (2013). *In Syria, there are no moderates*. Retrieved from

<http://landdestroyer.blogspot.com/2013/09/in-syria-there-are-no-moderates.html>

Cooke, S. (2013). *Syria is becoming Obama's Iraq*. Retrieved from

<http://workerscompass.org/syria-is-becoming-obamas-iraq/>

Hallinan, C. (2013). *Syria and the monarchs: A perfect storm*. Retrieved from

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/conn-hallinan/syria-proxy-war_b_3495444.html

Heydemann, S., (2013). *Syria's Uprising: Sectarianism, regionalisation, and state order in the*

Levant. Retrieved from http://www.fride.org/download/WP_119_Syria_Uprising.pdf

Lamb, L. (2013). *War by another name in Syria*. Retrieved from

<http://www.counterpunch.org/2013/06/19/war-by-another-name-in-syria/>

Sharp, J. M., & Blanchard, C. M. (2013). *Armed conflict in Syria: Background and U.S.*

response. Retrieved from <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL33487.pdf>

Sustar, L. (2013). *What is the future of the Syrian revolution?* Retrieved from

<http://socialistworker.org/2012/08/16/future-of-syrias-revolution>

US and Russia agree to press UN to set date for Syrian peace conference. (2013). *RTE News*.

Retrieved from <http://www.rte.ie/news/2013/1007/478777-syria/>