

Review of: "The Failure of Diplomatic Mediations in the Syrian Conflict – A Comparative Analysis"

M. A. Ellakkis¹

¹ Tarbiat Modares University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article exhibits a noticeable absence of impartiality that cannot be disregarded. To clarify, what is commonly referred to as the Syrian revolution initially stemmed from public discontent with corruption within the Syrian government. However, in the same year, 2011, it evolved into a comprehensive military confrontation involving extremist groups backed by Gulf funding and American strategizing (as evidenced by Trump's admission of America's role in establishing ISIS and statements from the State Department regarding Qatari support for ISIS).

Conversely, there is a deficiency in properly identifying the influential actors in the Syrian conflict and the scope of their influence. The influence of the United States, Russia, and Iran cannot be equated with that of Arab nations that reestablished diplomatic ties with Syria and mended relations following years of discord.

Drawing upon the principles of game theory, it is apparent that successful negotiations in Syria hinge on a prior political accord among the primary stakeholders in the Syrian crisis. Each nation currently involved in Syria possesses its own distinct political, economic, and military objectives, which necessitate thorough examination and understanding. This groundwork is essential for presenting the available options to each country and, subsequently, engaging in reasoned negotiations, leading to possible solutions.